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The SHARE mobility percentage system is based on the following principles:

- **Comparability of the levels of qualifications**
  - at the Home and Host HEIs
  - verifiable via the alignment of national qualification frameworks and/or regional qualification frameworks (AQRF for the ASEAN region; QF for the European Higher Education Area for the EU)

- **Comparability of the levels of the study programmes’ learning outcomes**
  - between Home and Host HEIs
  - verifiable on the basis of the descriptions of the programmes and courses available at the HEIs
Figure 18: An example of ASEAN-EU comparability and compatibility
THE SHARE PERCENTAGE SYSTEM FOR MOBILITY: BASIC PRINCIPLES

• A qualification represents 100% of a programme’s outcomes and in order to graduate, a student must demonstrate he/she has attained and validated the outcomes and been assigned the total number of associated credits

• The SHARE mobility percentage system for the recognition, transfer and conversion of credits takes into account the weight of the students’ mobility outcomes (= a percentage) in their full study programme at their Home HEI

• The applied mobility percentage is fixed by HEIs before the Learning Agreement is signed
THE SHARE PERCENTAGE SYSTEM FOR MOBILITY

Case 2: Applying the SHARE Mobility Percentage to a Host study programme

- **International Business Administration**
  - 15% LOs mobility

- **International Business Studies**

- **Home university**
  - 160 credits to be gained during mobility
  - 24 Home credits

- **Host university**
  - 120 credits to achieve during mobility
  - 18 Host credits
Figure 19: The SHARE mobility percentage system for the recognition, transfer and conversion of credits between ASEAN countries

COUNTRY A
HOME HEI A
Qualification: Bachelor
Programme: International Business Administration
Learning Outcomes associated to 160 Credits A (CTS A)

Student’s Mobility Percentage 15%
Mobility Outcomes transferable
Mobility associate credits 24 CTS A 18 CTS B

COUNTRY B
HOST HEI B
Qualification: Degree
Programme: International Business Management
Learning Outcomes associated to 120 Credits B (CTSB)

Programmes and Qualifications Outcomes are Comparable and Compatible
QUESTIONS FOR DISCUSSION

• Is the “SHARE percentage system for mobility”, based on existing QF’s and the use of learning outcomes applicable in the ASEM-context?
• Are all countries/HEIs equally ready for it
  • Are Qualifications Frameworks in place?
  • Are programmes described in terms of learning outcomes?
• What about the instruments used, e.g. learning agreements: is it realistic in an ASEM context?
PART II:
GRADE CONVERSION
AT GHENT UNIVERSITY:
A PRAGMATIC APPROACH
GRADE CONVERSION: THE PRINCIPLES

• European HEIs have different grading scales and passing rates
• Mobility students have the right to a fair conversion of the grades they’ve obtained during a period of study abroad
• Each HEI should produce a grading table for each degree course within a specific subject area
• This will help ensure the transparency of the grading culture and the accurate conversion of grades for mobility students
GRADING TABLES (GRADE DISTRIBUTION)

- Based on number of students that passed
- Distribution of the number of students for each passing grade (in percentages)
- By ISCED-code (International Standard Classification of Education)
# EXAMPLE OF A GRADING TABLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grades used in institution (from highest to lowest passing grade)*</th>
<th>Number of passing grades awarded to the reference group</th>
<th>Percentage of each grade with respect to the total passing grades awarded</th>
<th>Cumulative percentage of passing grades awarded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Grading systems/approaches may be established at national level.
CURRENT CONTEXT: EUROPE

- Many European institutions
  - Are stuck in 2008… (A-B-C-D-E-F)
  - Do not use ISCED-codes
  - Use a pass/fail system
- Unlike what is mentioned in the ECTS Users’ Guides, in the Erasmus Charter for Higher Education Institutions…
No consensus on the use of credit system

E.g. Three major credit transfer systems are in use in the Asia:

- AUN – ACTS: the AUN ASEAN Credit Transfer System
- UMAP – UCTS: the University Mobility in Asia and the Pacific Credit Transfer Scheme
- SEAMEO – RIHED ACTF: the SEAMEO – RIHED Academic Credit Transfer Framework

And certainly no consensus on grade conversion…
NEED FOR AN ALTERNATIVE, PRAGMATIC APPROACH

- Since academic year 2018-2019: introduction of a new system at Ghent University, included in the Education and Examination Code
- 5 consecutive steps: preferably step 1, if not possible then 2, if not possible then 3 etc.
A 5-STEPS APPROACH

• Step 1: Grade distribution table with ISCED reference group
• Step 2: Grade distribution table at the level of the institution / programme / course
• Step 3: Grade distribution table at country level
• Step 4: Grade distribution table based on the A-B-C-D-E scale
• Step 5: No grade distribution table

(+ Pass/Fail)
1. GRADE DISTRIBUTION TABLE WITH ISCED REFERENCE GROUP

- The ‘normal’ (ECTS Users’ Guide compliant) system
- To be found by means of Egracons (see earlier) or websites/Transcript of Records of partner institutions
- Collected available information on a sharepoint-site available throughout the university
2. GRADE DISTRIBUTION TABLE AT THE LEVEL OF THE INSTITUTION / PROGRAMME / COURSE

Grading tables

+ new item or edit this list

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Name (EN)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BE</td>
<td>Facultés Universitaires Saint Louis a Bruxelles</td>
<td>ICHEC Brussels Management School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE</td>
<td>Haute École 'Groupe ICHEC - ISC Saint-Louis - ISIFISC'</td>
<td>ICHEC Brussels Management School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE</td>
<td>Université de Liège</td>
<td>University of Liege</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE</td>
<td>Université Catholique de Louvain</td>
<td>University of Louvain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CY</td>
<td>JUSTUS-LIEBIG-UNIVERSITÄT GIESEN</td>
<td>University of Gießen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE</td>
<td>GEORG-AUGUST-UNIVERSITÄT GÖTTINGEN</td>
<td>University of Göttingen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE</td>
<td>UNIVERSITÄT HAMBURG</td>
<td>University of Hamburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE</td>
<td>KARLSRUHER INSTITUT FÜR TECHNOLOGIE</td>
<td>KIT – Karlsruhe Institute of Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE</td>
<td>Technische Hochschule Köln</td>
<td>University of Cologne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE</td>
<td>UNIVERSITÄT LEIPZIG</td>
<td>University of Leipzig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE</td>
<td>JOHANNES GUTENBERG-UNIVERSITÄT MAINZ</td>
<td>Johannes Gutenberg University Mainz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>UNIVERSIDAD DE CADIZ</td>
<td>University of Cadiz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>UNIVERSIDAD DE LEON</td>
<td>The University of León</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>Universidad Complutense de Madrid</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ECTS-Einstufungstabellen

Since the winter semester 2014/2015, the KIT offers a grade point average on the website. In the Diploma Supplement, the ECTS-Einstufungstablellen are shown. The ECTS-Einstufungstablellen are based on the calculation of the average grade. The ECTS-Einstufungstablellen show the distribution of the individual grades over the entire cohort. They are based on the average grade of the entire cohort. The ECTS-Einstufungstablellen are available for each study period.
3: GRADE DISTRIBUTION TABLE AT COUNTRY LEVEL

- Either from egracons
- Or: based on our own statistically relevant available data (not so easy…)
- Included in Sharepoint site
4: GRADE DISTRIBUTION TABLE BASED ON THE A-B-C-D-E SCALE

- The pre-2009 ECTS Grading Table (A-B-C-D-E-scale) is still used by many European universities…
- In essence this is also a (very rudimentary) grade distribution table (and better than nothing)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Distribution</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5: NO GRADE DISTRIBUTION TABLE

- Very often the case outside the Erasmus+ programme countries
- But also still with Erasmus-partner institutions
- Advise to the programmes: communicate in advance about the methodology for grade conversion to be used, preferably on the basis of clear agreements with the partner institution
PASS-FAIL

- Special case = institutions / programmes / courses without grading; just PASS/FAIL
- Impossible to translate this in a local grade (although many attempt, but on what basis?)
- Proposal (legally possible): use the pass/fail and not give a local grade
- Consequence: these courses do not count to calculate a final grade
MORE INFORMATION

See

QUESTIONS FOR DISCUSSION

- What are the obstacles for HEIs in Europe and in Asia to produce grading tables (per ISCED code)?
- Can a pragmatic approach be helpful for grade conversion within the ASEM-context?
- What do we need to put into place?