

Foundation for the Accreditation of Study Programmes in Germany

Accreditation Council

**Activity Report
2013**

Head office of the Foundation for the Accreditation of Study Programmes in Germany (Stiftung zur Akkreditierung von Studiengängen in Deutschland)
Adenauerallee 73, 53113 Bonn, Germany

Tel.: 0228-338 306-0
Fax: 0228-338 306-79

E-mail: akr@akkreditierungsrat.de
Web address: <http://www.akkreditierungsrat.de>

Editor: Franz Börsch M.A., Dr. Olaf Bartz
Bonn, June 2014

Simultaneously Annual Report in the sense of § 44 State Budget Code for North-Rhine Westphalia

Reproduction and use in electronic systems – including excerpts – only permissible with prior written consent of the Foundation for the Accreditation of Study Programmes in Germany.

Activity Report 2013

Reporting period: January to December 2013

Contents	Page
Foreword	5
Overview	6
1 Further development of system accreditation	7
2 External evaluation of the Foundation and confirmation of ENQA membership	10
3 Strategic planning of the Accreditation Council	12
4 Activities of the Accreditation Council in the year 2013: Tasks and results	13
4.1 Accreditation of agencies	13
4.2 Assessment of the accreditation	14
4.3 Resolutions of the Accreditation Council	16
4.4 Internal quality assurance	17
4.5 Events of the Accreditation Council	17
4.6 Project groups of the Accreditation Council	18
5 International cooperation	18
6 Information and communication	19
6.1 Presentation, information, and consultation	19
6.2 Publication of accreditation data	20
6.3 Communication with the	21
6.4 Statistical data	22
7 Resources	22
7.1 Finances	22
7.2 Configuration of human, spatial and material resources	23
Appendixes	24

For easier readability, gender-neutral is not used throughout the text. In accordance with the principles of equal treatment, corresponding terms always refer to man and women.

Foreword

The accreditation exists by virtue of the constant confrontation with the self-imposed targets. Accreditation must constantly ask whether these targets, such as the improvement of academic quality, can be achieved using the chosen methods. The external perspective is of particular importance not only in individual accreditation procedures, but also in efforts to continuously develop the accreditation system as a whole. The Accreditation Council (Akkreditierungsrat) is also dependent on the critical external perspective which challenges established patterns of thought and action, offers encouragement, and stimulates further developments.

With this in mind, the Accreditation Council has acknowledged its evaluation by ENQA in the previous year as valuable, and will use its encouragement for the work of the coming years to reflect on its own activities and develop new perspectives while taking into account external input. The recommendations of the international expert group in the context of the evaluation as well as the numerous encouragements and comments on its activities from the German Council of Science and Humanities (Wissenschaftsrat), the German Rectors' Conference (Hochschulrektorenkonferenz), the Standing Conference of the Ministers of Education and Cultural Affairs of the Länder (Kultusministerkonferenz), the student bodies, and the social partners were the basis for the strategic planning which the Accreditation Council resolved on for its office term from 2013 to 2017.

The Accreditation Council can see itself confirmed in its activities from several angles, thanks to the analyses and feedback of the evaluation group.. The evaluators state with confidence in their summary evaluation that

the Foundation for the Accreditation of Study Programmes in Germany plays a key role in the decentralized higher education and quality assurance system of Germany, and that the Accreditation Council, as a central decision-making body of the Foundation, has succeeded in balancing the various interests of the stakeholders and actors in the system, and in guaranteeing the functionality of the system in a sustainable manner.

In concrete terms, the efforts of the Accreditation Council towards continuous quality enhancement have been reflected in the revision of the rules for system accreditation. Also in this regard, the Accreditation Council has incorporated all involved HEIs, agencies, and expert groups into the development process and used their experience to optimise the processes.

On behalf of the members of the Accreditation Council, I would like to thank our partners in the accreditation system and look forward to continued good cooperation.



Bonn, June 2014 Professor Dr. Reinhold R. Grimm

Overview

1st quarter 2013

74th Accreditation Council Meeting on 20 February 2013 in Berlin

14th Foundation Council Meeting on 1 March 2013 in Berlin

Accreditation Council Resolution: Further development of system accreditation

Accreditation Council Resolution: Opening of the procedure for reaccreditation of the Accreditation Agency for Study Programmes in Health and Social Science (AHPGS)

Accreditation Council Resolution: Opening of the procedure for reaccreditation of Agency for Quality Assurance and Accreditation of Canonical Programmes of Studies in Germany (AKAST)

Accreditation Council Resolution: Creative leeway in the Common Structural Guidelines of the Länder

Foundation Council Resolution: Amendment to statutes of fees

2nd quarter 2013

75th Accreditation Council Meeting on 3 June 2013 in Berlin

Reconstitution of the Accreditation Council and election of Chairperson

Nomination of the Accreditation Council's project group "Strategy"

Accreditation Council Resolution: Accreditation of AQ Austria

Accreditation Council Resolution: Study models with several standard periods of study

3rd quarter 2013

76th Accreditation Council Meeting on 10 September 2013 in Berlin

Conclusion of the evaluation of the Foundation for the Accreditation of Study Programmes in Germany

First process for random sample assessments in system accreditation

4th quarter 2013

77th Accreditation Council Meeting on 13 December 2013 in Munich

15th Foundation Council Meeting on 14 November 2013 in Berlin

Accreditation Council Resolution: Strategic planning of the Accreditation Council for the term of office 2013-2017

Accreditation Council Resolution: Accreditation of the Agency for Quality Assurance and Accreditation of Canonical Programmes of Studies in Germany (AKAST)

Accreditation Council Resolution: Opening of the procedure for the reaccreditation of evaluation agency Baden-Württemberg (evalag)

1. Further development of system accreditation

Five years after the introduction of system accreditation, the Accreditation Council approved a revised version of the Rules and Criteria for system Accreditation in February 2013. This step was preceded by a long and intensive evaluation process which was aimed at comprehensively using the experiences gathered thus far by all involved actors in order to optimise this rather young instrument of quality assurance.

In order to ensure an exchange of information and experiences between Accreditation Council and agencies that is as direct as possible, the Accreditation Council had, as early as the introduction of system accreditation, agreed to observe the first two procedures of each agency, and to dispatch reporters from its own ranks for this purpose.

In its method of evaluating the procedures and implementing the knowledge gained in the process to concrete amendments of the rules, the Accreditation Council followed two principle considerations:

On the one hand, the Council selected a broad participation format which not only made use of the concrete experiences of actors involved directly in the procedures, but also incorporated the relevant recommendations of the German Rectors' Conference (HRK), the Standing Conference of the Ministers of Education and Cultural Affairs of the Länder in the Federal Republic of Germany (KMK), and the German Council of Science and Humanities, as well as the different perspectives of the stakeholders into its own working group on "System Accreditation".

On the other hand, the Accreditation Council reacted to the proposal by HEIs and agencies

to make the process for further development of the accreditation rules more transparent by explicitly presenting both the need for change as well as for the modifications of the rules. This occurred in the report on initial experiences with system accreditation and the Accreditation Council's statement on the further development of system accreditation.

That the Accreditation Council integrated not only its own reporters, but also the representatives of the affected HEIs, expert groups, and the agencies into the feedback process proved itself particularly helpful with regard to generating know-how. The German Council of Science and Humanities' recommendations exhibited a pleasingly high level of congruence with the evaluation results and conclusions of the Accreditation Council, and were also taken into consideration in the further development of system accreditation.

Overall, the Accreditation Council came to a positive conclusion regarding the implementation of system accreditation. Thus, the vast majority of those involved in the procedures found the rules for system accreditation to have proven useful in concrete accreditation practice, and indeed both with regard to their manageability and in terms of the targets intended with the procedure.

The Accreditation Council also used the results of its evaluation to further develop the rules for system accreditation where sensible and necessary, and to make adjustments to its resolutions within the existing system.

Amendments (carried out) that were of central significance can be summarised in the following overview:

1. Admission requirements: Since the previously applicable requirements for admission led to uncertainties for those involved in the

procedures, and since procedures were occasionally introduced at a time when a quality assurance system was not ready to be assessed, the Accreditation Council refined the requirements and the procedural steps for preliminary assessment. The HEI must verify that it has submitted a formalised HEI-wide quality assurance system, and must present this as an example based on at least one study programme which has "passed through" the system to be accredited.

In future, the preliminary assessment will take on the function of a plausibility assessment: Instead of estimating whether the procedure is successful the focus lies on ascertaining whether the set-up of a formalised HEI-wide quality assurance system is presented in a plausible manner, that is whether there is a subject of evaluation.

2. Experts: The quality of an accreditation procedure stands in close relation to the quality of the experts involved. The selection, preparation, and support of the experts therefore represents an important component of the procedure.

The Accreditation Council has therefore refined the requirements regarding the selection and preparation of experts for system accreditation in the rules for system accreditation. The agency must henceforth ensure that the expert groups consist predominantly of persons with several years of experience in academic leadership functions, in study programme design, and in quality assurance of teaching and learning.

Furthermore, the agency must guarantee that the experts are comprehensively prepared for their relevant activity, their specific role, and the concrete accreditation procedure. The size, orientation, and professional heterogeneity of the HEI shall be taken into account when set-

ting up the expert group. In addition, further experts are to be involved where appropriate for random samples.

The German Council of Science and Humanities' recommendations regarding the establishment of an index of all experts will be acted on by the Accreditation Council in a form that is yet to be discussed in order to keep experts better informed about developments. It will develop a concept for promoting the exchange of information and knowledge between experts active in system accreditation, together and in agreement with the agencies. In this regard, it will also consult on the setting up of a cross-agency pool of experts, as well as on institutionalised information and further education events for the experts listed in the pool.

3. Site visits: In order to be able to adapt the design of on-site visits to the respective requirements in individual procedures, the Accreditation Council put stronger emphasis on the already existing creative leeway in its rules. Thus, the design of the second on-site visit and in particular the selection of further relevant discussion sessions should in future be defined by the expert group itself.

4. Random samples: The interdependency between the quality assurance system of the HEI and the quality of those study programmes offered which have completed the system should be evaluated with the help of random samples in system accreditation. As an empirically designed component of the procedure, the instrument of the random sample is, in principle, associated with great potential. In practice, however, the random samples have proven suitable only for finding the systemic causes of study programme defects under certain conditions. The Accreditation Council therefore agreed to increase the effectiveness and efficiency of the procedure through

stronger integration of the random sample elements in system accreditation procedures, to increase the flexibility of experts when designing random samples tailor-made to individual cases, and to modify the rules for system accreditation accordingly. Whilst the experts gain freedom in choosing those features assessed in the feature random sample, random samples in their standard form – with the exception of regulated study programmes – will be dispensed with in future. The random sample assessment of study programmes with regard to function and content will be integrated into the feature random sample.

The instrument of the half-time random sample will also be dispensed with. Instead, the HEI will deliver to the agency, after half of the first accreditation period, a self-evaluation which contains an overview of the quality assurance procedures carried out thus far in the accreditation period.

5. Cooperations and Joint Programmes:

Study programmes which are offered by several HEIs play a particular role in system accreditation since responsibilities for quality assurance are shared by different parties. Within the framework of system accreditation, the applying HEI must therefore guarantee the quality of the study programmes in all parts of the study programme – also in those parts which are offered by another (foreign) HEI

For reasons of traceability and transparency, and to guarantee international recognition, the scope and manner of existing cooperations with other HEIs, companies, and other institutions, as well as the agreements forming the basis of the cooperation, are to be outlined in the accreditation procedure.

6. Transparency and documentation: The expert opinion forms the key basis for the accreditation decision both in programme and

system accreditation. There subsequently exists a close relationship between the quality of the expert report, from which the underlying evaluation benchmarks must emerge, and the quality of the accreditation procedure as a whole.

The Accreditation Council has therefore refined the standards for expert reports and for the justification of accreditation decisions. In future, only one expert report shall be compiled in system accreditation, in which the evaluation of each criterion for system accreditation is plausibly justified and documented. The expert report shall also continue to contain a resolution recommendation regarding the system accreditation and an evaluation of the knowledge gained from the random samples.

7. Units: In particularly exceptional cases, system accreditation can also be requested for study-related organisational units of an HEI, as long as the unit has management competences as well as operational responsibility for teaching and learning, that is, for planning and carrying out the study programmes offered by the HEI and for quality assurance in teaching and learning.

Even though the Accreditation Council still considers it necessary to avoid the accreditation of such systems in which the relevant processes and structures exist parallelly without any connection to other system units and in which interdependencies are not apparent. On the other hand, HEIs should have the opportunity to initially have individual units accredited in order to make the path to system accreditation of the entire HEI easier to plan. Therefore, the Accreditation Council has agreed to design the admission requirements for the system accreditation of study-related organisational units to be less restrictive. In this way, it

will no longer be assumed that HEI-wide quality assurance system is already in place.

☞ [Opinion of the Accreditation Council regarding further development of system accreditation \(20 February 2013\)](#)

2. External evaluation of the Foundation and confirmation of ENQA membership

In its articles of association the Foundation for the Accreditation of Study Programmes in Germany has committed itself to undertake regular external evaluations with international participation.. In the process of external evaluations, an independent expert group will assess both the fulfilling of the legal obligations pursuant to the German Accreditation Foundation Law (ASG), as well as the fulfilling of the *Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area* (ESG) of the *European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education* (ENQA). The procedures and results of such external evaluations represent valuable feedback on the work of the Accreditation Council and offer important information regarding improvements and the further development of the German accreditation system.

In the autumn of 2011, the implementation of evaluation procedures was requested from the ENQA Management Board. In 2012, the Accreditation Council prepared itself for the assessment and entrusted a working group with carrying out a comprehensive self-evaluation. The results of this self-evaluation were summarised in a report which the Accreditation Council approved at its 73rd Meeting on 29 November 2012. To be able to take account of the different perspectives of the interest groups regarding the work of the Foundation, the Ac-

creditation Council requested opinions from the German Rectors' Conference, the Standing Conference of the Ministers of Education and Cultural Affairs of the Länder, the Länder, the Free Coalition of Student Bodies (fzs), the Confederation of German Employers, the Confederation of German Trade Unions, and the agencies which found their way into the self-evaluation report. In addition, the opinions were made available to the members of the evaluation group as a further source of information.

The on-site visit for the external evaluation of the Foundation took place at the beginning of June 2013 in Berlin. There, the experts conducted extensive discussions with the members of the Foundation organs, the employees of the head office, as well as further actors in the accreditation system. The results of the evaluation are documented in the expert report for the evaluation of the Foundation for the Accreditation of Study Programmes in Germany, dated 31 July 2013.

In this detailed and significant report, the expert group reached an overall positive conclusion that highlighted the particular significance of the Accreditation Council for the German system of quality assurance in the area of higher education:

“The Foundation for the Accreditation of Study Programmes in Germany – and in particular its main body, the Accreditation Council – plays a key role in Germany’s decentralised higher education and quality assurance systems. The federal structure of Germany and its diversified system of higher education have led to a unique organisation of quality assurance, with a strong emphasis on the role of the HEIs themselves, a plurality of accreditation agencies with different profiles and a small keystone organization whose main function is to keep

together in a sustainable way the various pieces of the whole system.”

The experts also underline the function of the Accreditation Council as an intermediary between the stakeholders involved and their various interests:

“At present, the Council plays an invaluable role as a clearing house of the diverse and sometimes contradictory interests of the main groups of stakeholders and actors involved (HEIs, governments, students, employers, agencies, European/international associations, and the public in general), and this aspect is, by necessity, reflected in its policies and activities.”

The fulfilling of the *Standards and Guidelines* was also positively appraised with two restrictions:

“The Panel finds that there is full compliance with six of the eight ESG and substantial compliance with two more – those referring to the Foundation’s independence and its resources. On the first one, the Panel finds that the Council is faced with a difficult federal set-up, but has all the same taken steps to disengage itself from dominant stakeholders. On the second point, the Panel finds that the Council has made the most with the resources put at its service and can only plea for a better alignment between the Council’s endowment and its core role.”

In this regard, however, the experts pointed out – as was already the case in the previous evaluation – that the resources available to the Foundation are in fact sufficient for performing its routine duties, but are not sufficient for the proactive designing and further development of the system on an international scale:

“With the current level of resources it is difficult to see how the Accreditation Council could

play in the future the central and proactive role in German external quality assurance that its position really calls for, or how the international aspects could be further strengthened and the German quality seal could be constructively promoted abroad.”

The evaluation report concludes with a range of recommendations from the expert group which, from the perspective of the Accreditation Council, are of particular interest for further work in the area of quality development. Thus the Accreditation Council has already implemented the recommendation to draft a strategy for further development of the system and for internationalisation, and approved a strategic plan for the office term 2013-2017 in December 2013 (see Chapter 3).

A whole range (a great deal? A whole number?) of encouragements from the expert group were reflected here, such as the previously called for intensification (as the demanded intensification?) of the activities of the Accreditation Council in the international context (see Chapter 5).

The experts attribute an important function to the Accreditation Council with regard to the critical observation of system accreditation and the results for the German accreditation system:

“It will be of paramount importance for the overall development of the German quality assurance system and for the Council itself to carry out a careful evaluation of the development of system accreditation; such an evaluation should consider the multifaceted consequences of this development on the operations of the Council and the accreditation agencies, as well as on quality assurance and quality improvement at the various types of HEIs, with a view to striking a desirable balance between the two types of accreditation.”

The Accreditation Council has already been active in this regard, too, and has resolved to make its monitoring procedures more flexible. Above all, the amendments aim at being able to set thematic priorities every two years from now on, and to design the assessment procedures more in line with individual demands (see Chapter 4.2).

☞ [Self-evaluation report on the external evaluation of the Foundation for the Accreditation of Study Programmes in Germany \(29 November 2012\)](#)

☞ [Expert report on the evaluation of the Foundation for the Accreditation of Study Programmes in Germany \(31 July 2013\)](#)

3. Strategic planning of the Accreditation Council

At the beginning of its new office term 2013-2017, the Accreditation Council used the experiences from the past few years as well as suggestions from third parties to comprehensively discuss the future priorities and optimisation possibilities for its work. The result of these deliberations was incorporated in the strategic plan of the Accreditation Council. Above all, the countless suggestions and comments from the German Council of Science and Humanities, the German Rectors' Conference, the Standing Conference of the Ministers of Education and Cultural Affairs of the Länder, the student bodies, and the social partners, as well as from the international expert group within the framework of the ENQA evaluation provided a valuable basis for the process of developing the strategy. For the purpose of preparing a corresponding strategy document, the Accreditation Council appointed a working group at its 75th Meeting on 3 June

2013, in which the interest groups were represented by one person each.

The Accreditation Council's strategic plan aims at a new orientation with regard to content within the framework of the given structures. Having mostly completed the reform of the structure of studies, the appreciable academic quality and quality development will henceforth be a more significant part of the work of the Accreditation Council. This includes the questions of academic feasibility of the programmes, national and international mobility of students, the particular research basis of Masters study programmes, as well as the particular significance of discipline-specific aspects and orientation towards professional qualification.

Moreover, the Accreditation Council is making efforts to improve the cost-benefit ratio in the area of programme accreditation. Here, the focus lies initially on the question which costs are produced by the accreditation process itself and which is produced by the general curriculum design of study programmes. In light of this, the Accreditation Council will make efforts to seek out best-practice models which integrate the accreditation procedures into HEI-internal procedures in an effective and efficient manner, so as to accordingly minimise the additional costs associated with accreditation.

A crucial factor for the success of the system accreditation will be whether the system-accredited HEIs handle their freedom responsibly upon receiving the seal of the Accreditation Council, and whether they in principle guarantee that study programmes certified by them comprehensively and universally satisfy the applicable quality criteria.

Since the Accreditation Council has not thus far had any direct relationship with the system-accredited HEIs, it will approach these HEIs in order to develop suitable forms of cooperation together. At the same time, the Accreditation Council is aware of the necessity to comprehensively investigate system accreditation and its subsequent effects, and to support corresponding research projects within its means (?) [the bounds of its capabilities].

Another key point of the work of the Accreditation Council, as outlined in the strategic plan, is the promotion of the internationalisation of quality assurance at German HEIs. For example this will involve simplifying the accreditation of Joint Programmes (see Chapter 5), assessing possibilities of issuing the Accreditation Council's seal to foreign study programmes, or even attracting further renowned international agencies for activities in Germany.

Overall, the Accreditation Council aspires to adjust the relationship between HEIs, agencies, and Accreditation Council, so as to expand its previous role of setting rules and testing for compliance, by the function of a dialogue-oriented working committee. In consideration of corresponding international experiences, the Accreditation Council notes that monitoring parts as well as quality-developing elements are combinable under the aegis of the same institutions and procedures.

[↪ Strategic plan of the Accreditation Council for the office term 2013-2017 \(13 December 2013\)](#)

4. Activities of the Accreditation Council in the year 2013: Tasks and results

4.1 Accreditation of agencies

The accreditation and reaccreditation of accreditation agencies is one of the key legal tasks to be carried out on a regular basis by the Accreditation Council. Only agencies certified by the Accreditation Council are entitled to accredit Bachelor's and Master's study programmes or HEI-internal quality assurance systems, and to grant these the quality seal of the Accreditation Council. The admittance of accreditation agencies is currently limited to a maximum of five years, and may be subject to conditions, which fulfillment is assessed by the Accreditation Council. For the admittance of an agency, the Accreditation Council appoints an independent expert group and, in the case of reaccreditation, also refers to experiences from the previous accreditation period. The assessment is based on criteria which ensure a high level of comparability, transparency and reliability of the procedures carried out by the admitted agencies, and therefore represent an important prerequisite for the international recognition of accreditation decisions.

In the previous year, the Accreditation Council had initiated the accreditation procedure for AQ Austria, and had decided to perform a shortened assessment procedure in this case. The reason for shortening the procedure was that the activities of the newly founded, cross-sector Austrian Agency for Quality Assurance and Accreditation were linked formally as well as content-relatedly to the activities of the predecessor institute AQA, which was accredited until the year 2014. In April 2013, the experts appointed by the Accreditation Council presented their expert report, on the basis of

which the Accreditation Council resolved to accredit AQA Austria under two conditions.

Furthermore, the Accreditation Council initiated the processes for reaccreditation of the agencies Accreditation Agency for Study Programmes in Health and Social Science (AHPGS) and Agency for Quality Assurance and Accreditation of Canonical Programmes of Studies in Germany (AKAST) in February 2013, and initiated the process to reaccredit evalag in December 2013.

In the same year, the Accreditation Council resolved to accredit the Agency for Quality Assurance and Accreditation of Canonical Programmes of Studies in Germany (AKAST) under four conditions. The decision regarding the AHPGS procedure is planned for the first quarter of 2014. With an average duration of less than one year for the procedure, the Accreditation Council has again satisfied its claim of being able to carry out the accreditation of agencies rapidly and efficiently.

For the purposes of quality improvement, an agencies' accreditation may be associated with recommendations and conditions. Therefore, the assessment of the fulfilling of the conditions as a follow-up measure to the accreditation, is one of the elementary tasks of the Accreditation Council. Generally, an agency has nine months to fulfil the conditions; in the Reporting Period, the Accreditation Council has ascertained that the conditions in the accreditation procedure for the reaccreditation of AQAS have been fulfilled.

To guarantee the continuous improvement of the processes and procedures the members of the Accreditation Council as well as those of the expert groups and the Managing Directors of the affected agency are, upon conclusion of a process, asked to provide information on

their satisfaction with the procedure or the transparency of the accreditation decision.

Comprehensive information on individual accreditation decisions are available on the website of the Accreditation Council.

www.akkreditierungsrat.de

4.2 Assessment of the accreditation procedures

In addition to the regular accreditation of agencies, another core task of the Accreditation Council is to assess accreditation procedures of study programmes and the system accreditation, carried out by the agencies. This task is performed by the Accreditation Council on the basis of a procedure which allows for both random sample-based as well as ad-hoc assessments of accreditation decisions. Within the framework of the random sample-based assessment, generally four programme accreditation procedures and one system accreditation procedure are assessed per year and per agency. The ad-hoc assessment is undertaken when there are indications of inadequate performance of an accreditation procedure or a faulty accreditation decision.

► Procedures of the assessment

The random sample and ad-hoc assessment of accreditation procedures is performed file-based. For this purpose, the the Accreditation Council's head office receives procedure-related documentation which includes, inter alia, the self-evaluation report of the HEI, information on selecting and commissioning the expert groups as well as on the performance of the site-visit, the expert opinion, the opinion of the HEI, and the agencies' accreditation resolution. In order to guarantee a secure infor-

mation situation, the agency is given the opportunity to provide a detailed opinion in the course of the assessment procedure. If deficiencies in the procedure become apparent during the assessment, the management board of the Accreditation Council decides on how to proceed. The spectrum of possible decisions ranges from the instruction to amend the agencies' procedural practice, to the obligation of amending a concrete accreditation decision, to the imposition of an administrative fine or – in the case of persistent and serious breaches of the criteria and/or rules of procedure of the Accreditation Council – to the revocation of the accreditation.

► Results of the assessment

In the reporting period, the Accreditation Council assessed a total of 42 accreditation procedures of study programmes and two system accreditation procedures on a random sample basis and also handled two ad-hoc assessment procedures.

On multiple occasions, assessment procedures were concluded without procedural defects being ascertained. On various occasions marginal defects were ascertained, though these had no effect on the outcome of the procedures. In individual assessment procedures, objections led to the subsequent issuing of a condition or necessitated a renewed assessment of the study programme with consideration of particular criteria. None of the assessed programme accreditation procedures showed any defect so serious that the accreditation would have had to be revoked. In one case, the Accreditation Council obliged an agency to withdraw a condition and in another case to correct the wording of a condition already declared. In some cases, the Accreditation Council requested the affected agency to amend a certain practice permanently or to take other

suitable remedial action. But it should be emphasised that agencies themselves often announced, in the course of the statement, that they were taking remedial action or had already done so. In these cases only a reporting obligation existed for the agencies in question.

In one case, an agency submitted complaints against a decision of the Management Board. The Management Board had previously obliged the agency to declare a subsequent condition concerning the academic feasibility of the study programme under consideration of the special requirements of the extra-occupational profile. The complaints were rejected due to the recommendation of the Accreditation Council's complaints commission.

Following the phase of programme accreditation procedure assessments, two procedures of system accreditation were initially assessed on a random sample basis in 2013, so at the time being no unequivocal statements on the quantity and quality of ascertained defects can be made. In addition, some of the ascertained defects were down to the novelty of the procedure or such rules of procedure which have been now modified accordingly in the course of further development of system accreditation.

Nevertheless, when ascertaining defects, the Management Board made recourse to the corrective instruments proven in programme accreditation. Thus, an agency was required to report on the implementation of a practice amendment it had already announced. In one case, the Accreditation Council had issued a reminder regarding the subsequent assessment of a partial criterion and requested the agency to adjust its decision where appropriate to satisfy the new state of findings. No decision was examined and no complaints were lodged against a decision of the Management Board.

► Further development of the assessment procedures

Essentially, there are two aims associated with the assessment of accreditation procedures: On the one hand, it leads to a revision of the accreditation resolution made by an agency in case of significant incorrect decisions, so in this sense it represents an instrument of user protection; on the other hand, it aims at the avoidance of errors in future procedures, and therefore also at the perspective growth in the quality of the procedures overall. For this purpose, the results of the assessment procedures are evaluated comprehensively at regular intervals – on a cyclical basis again in 2013 – and deliberated by the Accreditation Council.

The final evaluation confirmed this year, that the ad-hoc assessment of accreditation procedures is an important instrument of the Accreditation Council for reacting to concrete complaints or – upon the presence of corresponding indications – for being able to operate on its own initiative.

The random sample-based assessments have also contributed to significant improvements to the routines and procedures of particular agencies. Since then, however, the effect of the random samples has been increasingly limited to the specifically assessed individual procedures. New knowledge of the agencies' working methods or the development potential of the method of carrying out the procedures, in particular in programme accreditation, is only gained to a limited extent.

From this background, the Accreditation Council developed a pilot procedure in 2012, the so-called cross-sectional evaluation, which allows a deeper examination of selected criteria, procedural rules and decision regulations in a larger number of procedures. The concept of the cross-sectional evaluation initially seemed

to be more suitable to counteract errors in procedures or decisions, and therefore to prospectively increase the accreditation procedures' quality. However, this procedure also showed the weaknesses of an assessment based on file-records. Nonetheless, findings based on the results of the criteria's assessment could be generated, which led to an improvement of the resolutions, issued by the Accreditation Council.

In light of the knowledge gained, the Accreditation Council will fundamentally refine its instruments of assessment in 2014 and place special emphasis on the topics of academic quality and dialogue orientation in accordance with its strategic plan.

4.3 Resolutions of the Accreditation Council

Besides the resolutions on the further development of system accreditation (see Chapter 1), on strategic planning (see Chapter 3) and on the accreditation of agencies (see Chapter 4.1), the Accreditation Council approved a resolution on the interpretation of the Common Structural Guidelines of the Länder during the reporting period.

From the beginning the accreditation was based on the intention of promoting the HEIs' freedom of scope and – if they so desired – of supporting the establishment of profiles in the higher education area as well as on contributing to an appropriate diversification of available programmes. With this in mind, the leeway offered by the Common Structural Guidelines for the Länder is to be put to greater use in practice. The Accreditation Council therefore agreed to explicitly communicate to the HEIs that this creative leeway exists, where it exists and in what context it can be used. The Council revised its resolution "Norms for the Interpretation of the Common Structural Guidelines

of the Länder" and complemented it with a description of creative leeways for minimum size of modules, maximum size or duration of modules and partial module examinations. The Accreditation Council emphasised in its resolution that the HEIs' ability to handle the creative leeway of the structural guidelines in a manner which is productive for their study programmes, is of indicative importance and goes beyond the HEI in question. Quality culture requires that the HEIs put emphasis on the quality of study when designing their study programmes under their own impetus and in a comprehensive manner.

[☞ Resolution regarding Interpretation of the Common Structural Guidelines for the Länder](#)

4.4 Internal quality assurance

Already in 2007, i.e. shortly after the establishment of the Foundation, the Accreditation Council implemented a system of internal quality assurance whereby continuous assessment and improvement of all internal processes were to guarantee a qualitatively high-value fulfilment of the legal tasks in as efficient a way as possible. The focus of the Accreditation Council's internal quality assurance is the systematic and critical assessment of its work by an independent working group as well as with the help of regular feedback from the relevant interest groups.

The project group "Quality Assurance" will only be able to draw up its first quality report this year in the second half of 2014 due to organisational reasons, such that there are currently no results available from the analysis of the individual service and support processes of the Foundation for 2013.

The quality report will be available on the website of the Accreditation Council immediately after its approval.

4.5 Events of the Accreditation Council

► Conference "Quality Assurance and Quality Development in Europe"

On 21 and 22 March 2013, the Accreditation Council, together with the DAAD, held a two-day conference on the subject of "Quality Assurance and Quality Development in Europe" in Berlin. Around 80 participants from Germany and other European countries attended the conference. The event's purpose was to give an overview of the methods existing within Europe in regard to internal and external quality assurance. Several working groups illustrated (different) quality assurance systems from selected regions of Europe and analysed their strengths and weaknesses. In addition, discussions were held regarding the influence and significance of transnational instruments such as those of the qualification framework or the European Register.

► Event for preparing experts for the accreditation procedures of the agencies Accreditation Agency for Study Programmes in Health and Social Science (AHPGS) and Agency for Quality Assurance and Accreditation of Canonical Programmes of Studies in Germany (AKAST)

The Accreditation Council attributes key significance to the experts' intensive preparations for their accreditation procedures with regard to the procedural quality. In the run up to the on-site visits, the Council therefore prepared the expert groups fundamentally at all-day seminars for their activities connected to concrete accreditation procedures. The preparation measures ensure that the experts have a

clear understanding of their role in the assessment procedure and possess comprehensive knowledge of the evaluation standards.

On 7 May 2013, the Accreditation Council held an expert seminar for preparations concerning the procedures of accrediting the Accreditation Agency for Study Programmes in Health and Social Science (AHPGS) and the Agency for Quality Assurance and Accreditation of Canonical Programmes of Studies in Germany (AKAST).

4.6 Project groups of the Accreditation Council

At its 73rd Meeting on 29 November 2012, the Accreditation Council set up the working group "Expertise and Professionalism" at the encouragement of members of the professional practice. It includes representatives of the HEIs, the professional practice, the Länder, students and agencies. The working group's mission is to investigate in which manner and to what extent subject-specific aspects and questions of professional qualification are treated in the procedures of programme and system accreditation. During the reporting period, the working group came together at four meetings and will presumably present a concluding report to the Accreditation Council at the end of 2014.

5. International cooperation

Quality assurance and quality development represent an important requirement for the realisation of the European Higher Education Area. The continuous promotion of international cooperation in the area of accreditation and quality assurance is therefore one of the core duties transferred to the Accreditation Council

by the Länder. Mainly it is about promoting mutual understanding of the systems of quality assurance, developing comparable criteria, methods and standards of quality assurance and improving the transparency of the range of studies so as to simplify the mutual recognition of qualifications and the student mobility.

In this context, the respective European and international networks of quality assurance, to which the Foundation belongs as an active member, play a major role. These include, for example, the European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA) and the International Network for Quality Assurance Agencies in Higher Education (INQAAHE).

As a result of its international networking, the Accreditation Council offers assessment procedures for Accreditation Agencies according to the *Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area* (ESG). That way synergies are used in the assessment of the agencies and debates on the international standards in the accreditation procedures are promoted. The results of the assessments regularly form the basis for decisions regarding the agencies' membership in the European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA) and for their enrolment in the European Quality Assurance Register for Higher Education (EQAR).

The Accreditation Council was involved in the discussion process associated with revising the ESG, and compiled a corresponding commentary on the suggested amendments.

[☞ Comments by Germany on the Draft Initial Proposal for "Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area"](#)

International networks: The Accreditation Council is a long-time active member of benchmark European and international networks for quality assurance such as the European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA) and the International Network for Quality Assurance Agencies in Higher Education (INQAAHE). Within the framework of its opportunities, the Council regularly takes part in international working groups, meetings, and conferences, and is represented by members of the head office in the European working group "Structural Reforms", the European Quality Assurance Forum, the European Quality-Audit-Network, as well as the ENQA project groups "Internal Quality Assurance," and "Impact of Quality Assurance". This international involvement and cooperation allows the Accreditation Council to bring its expertise to the international stage, and at the same time to learn from the experiences of foreign partners.

► **Cooperation project AC – NVAO:** In April 2013 at the Meeting of the Joint Science Conference, the Ministers for Science from both the federal and the state (Länder) level resolved a "Strategy for the Internationalisation of the HEIs in Germany", in which the federal government and the Länder emphasised their desire to improve the internationalisation of the HEIs. In this context, the pilot project of the Accreditation Council and its Dutch partner organisation NVAO is in place to enable the simplification of accreditation procedures regarding German-Dutch and German-Flemish Joint Programmes. It is planned to develop joint regulations for the accreditation of Joint Programmes and to put the HEIs in the position of being able to choose between the Dutch and the German accreditation regulations and a corresponding accreditation agency. It is in-

tended to resolve upon these framework regulations in Autumn 2014.

6. Information and communication

6.1 Presentation, information, and consultation

Furthermore the accreditation system is characterized by a dynamic development process as a result of the international complexities in the area of quality assurance. The Foundation satisfies the interest in relevant information through various communication measures and offers. Basically, this includes electronic media as well as contributions to conferences, events and various national and international project groups.

Besides publishing the press releases via the Science Information Service (Informationsdienst Wissenschaft), the Foundation's website (www.akkreditierungsrat.de) also represents an important instrument in the publication of accreditation data and the preparation of information for the Länder, HEIs, agencies, and public interest groups. The website contains an overview of all resolutions of the Accreditation Council. The resolutions, as well as relevant documents of the Standing Conference of the Ministers of Education and Cultural Affairs of the Länder and the German Rectors' Conference are also available at the Foundation's website as PDF files. Moreover, the website contains overall information on the German accreditation system, the members of the organs and committees of the Foundation, as well as the agencies accredited by the Accreditation Council.

Apart from the information offered on the website, the Länder (Standing Conference of the Ministers of Education and Cultural Affairs of the Länder) and also the HEIs (German Rec-

tors' Conference) are kept informed about the results of the Accreditation Council and Foundation Board meetings. In addition, the Foundation presents an Activity Report every year which provides information on the results of the Foundation's work as well as current developments in accreditation on a national and international level. The Activity Report is published as a PDF document and is publicly available in German and English. The Foundation's head office also publishes quarterly a newsletter which provides information on the results of the Accreditation Council meetings, new developments in the German accreditation system, personnel, and appointments or events being planned. Moreover, the agencies, and also the higher education institutions, are kept informed about the application of rules, criteria and structural guidelines on accreditation in the form of an event-based, electronically delivered circular letter.

The Accreditation Council is continuously consulted in questions of accreditation and quality assurance, but also in questions of study reform and the Bologna Process, and is represented by its members and employees at specialist conferences, seminars, and expert discussions etc.. Areas of constant representation include for instance the working group "Continuation of the Bologna Process", the working group for drafting the "German Qualification Framework for Life-Long Learning", and various other networks and working groups of the employers, for example.

Countless discussions between members of the Management Board and various actors from the areas of HEI, politics, and society have also proven themselves to be helpful and purposeful. It is equally important to answer a large number of telephonic and written enquiries on general matters of accreditation, the resolutions of the Accreditation Council or cur-

rent accreditation procedures, coming from students, HEIs, ministries, professional associations, employees, employers and agencies. The head office of the Foundation is generally open Monday to Friday, 9am to 5pm and provides advice services free of charge.

6.2 Publication of accreditation data

All accreditation data are made available to the interested public on the Accreditation Council's website:

► **Agencies:** All agencies being entitled to issue the Council's quality seal by the Accreditation Council's certification, are listed on the website of the Accreditation Council. In the interest of high transparency, the resolution regarding an accreditation as a whole, including conditions and deadlines associated with the accreditation, the expert review reports, self-evaluation reports as well as the opinions of the agencies are also published. The information is available in German and English.

► **Study programmes:** Study programmes which are granted with the seal of the Accreditation Council are published in the database of accredited study programmes. This database, linked with the Higher Education Compass of the German Rectors' Conference, is available on the website of the Accreditation Council and offers information on accreditation deadlines, conditions associated with accreditation where applicable, the experts involved and the evaluation carried out by the experts.

► **System-accredited HEIs:** Whilst the accredited study programmes of a system-accredited HEI are listed in the database of accredited study programmes, the website also offers an overview of all system-accredited HEIs.

► **Statistical data:** Besides the accreditation data, related to study programmes, the website of the Accreditation Council also has statistics on accredited study programmes ready which provide information on the number of currently accredited study programmes and categorises those by duration of study, qualification designation, subject groups, HEI type, Bundesland (federal state of Germany) and standard period of study. The agencies add the accreditation data to the database and update it. The head office of the Accreditation Council executes the release of data sets following a formal inspection.

All data is edited in regard of study programmes both for the statistics and for the database. Therefore, in system accreditation those study programmes which have been issued the quality seal of the Accreditation Council by the accredited HEI are also published. In this way, prospective students, HEIs and employers, the Länder and interested members of the public can quickly and comprehensively inform themselves about all accredited study opportunities. The database does not yet offer the possibility of informing oneself of system-accredited HEIs. In regard of the increasing information needs a corresponding concept that stipulates the publication of conditions and expert opinions in system accreditation as well as the preparation of information on the affected HEIs has already been worked out.

Furthermore the Accreditation Council together with the German Rectors' Conference, is involved in the European database project *Grossroads*. With the involvement of accreditation institutions in Austria (excl. state universities), Belgium (Flemish area), Denmark, France (study programmes in engineering), Germany, the Netherlands, Poland, Slovenia and Switzerland, the database, available at

www.grossroads.eu, provides the user with comprehensive information on accredited study programmes as well as HEI and the accreditation system of the countries involved.

[*grossroads*](#)

6.3 Communication with the agencies

A constructive and cooperative collaboration between Accreditation Council and agencies is one of the basic requirements for an effective accreditation system in Germany.

Instruments proven to be useful for a comprehensive mutual exchange of information between the actors are the involvement of all agency representatives in the working groups of the Accreditation Council, the regular round table discussions between Accreditation Council and agencies as well as the membership of a representative of the agencies in the Accreditation Council. The member nominated by the agencies, with an advisory vote, has the duty to represent the agencies and to inform these of the results of the deliberations following the Meetings of the Accreditation Council.

Before approving resolutions with fundamental significance for the accreditation system and the accreditation procedures, the Accreditation Council consults with the agencies. In this way, the experiences of the agencies from accreditation practice can be taken into account as required without eventually questioning the Accreditation Council's regulatory sovereignty. The Accreditation Council informs the agencies about new or amended resolutions of the Accreditation Council as well as changes in the common or specific guidelines of the Länder in a timely manner in the form of circular letters from the chairperson.

In 2013, the members of the Accreditation Council and the agencies came together at two

round table discussions on 3 May 2013 and 6 November 2013. The deliberation's subject was, amongst others, the standards of the agencies for their expert opinions, opportunities for joint public relations, the Accreditation Council's strategic plan for its coming term of office, and a test run of the discussion-based evaluation of processes for the accreditation of study programmes.

The accompaniment of accreditation procedures by members of the Accreditation Council or the head office also represents a good opportunity for an exchange of information and experience between Accreditation Council and agencies. During the reporting period four procedures of system accreditation were accompanied.

6.4 Statistical data

By the end of December 2013, 8,227 Bachelor's and Master's study programmes offered by state or state-recognised HEIs in Germany, were granted with the Accreditation Council's quality seal.¹ A total of 17 HEIs had successfully carried out a process of system accreditation by the same point in time. This corresponds to a share of approximately 4.3 per cent of all HEIs.² The number of accredited study programmes has risen from 50 per cent to around 54 per cent of all Bachelor's and

Master's study programmes offered compared to the previous year.

The web pages of the Accreditation Council offer information on the current figures at

www.akkreditierungsrat.de

7. Resources

7.1 Finances

The funding of the Accreditation Council is jointly performed by the 16 Länder, pursuant to § 4 para. 1 of the Accreditation Foundation Act (Akkreditierungs-Stiftungs-Gesetz). The Länder guarantee funding only to the extent that the Accreditation Council's administrative expenditure is not covered by fees in principle levied for the accreditation of agencies (see Chapter 4.1) and for the assessment of accreditation procedures (see Chapter 4.2).

For the financial year 2013, the Standing Conference of Finance Ministers (Finanzministerkonferenz) ascertained the Länder's annual contributions of €330,000 to the Accreditation Council. Since 2010, the Foundation has received an annual grant of €27,000 from the Länder as compensation for the additional personnel requirements resulting from the ENQA presidency of the Foundation's managing director. With the departure of the previous managing director the basis for this special grant is not applicable. With respect to upcoming tasks, particularly in connection with the external evaluation (see Chapter 7), the Standing Conference of the Ministers of Education and Cultural Affairs of the Länder has approved the Foundation's application to rededicate the special funds and make these available through 2013.

The budget consultation for the years 2014-2016 took place in autumn 2013. However, no

¹ The figures stated here are based on the master data of the database of the Accreditation Council. In the database are listed all accredited study programmes or opportunities for study, provided these have been entered into the database by the Accreditation Agencies. This also includes study programmes which have received the seal of the Accreditation Council in the course of system accreditation. The number of system-accredited HEIs was calculated on an event basis.

² At 391 HEIs according to the information in the Higher Education Compass of the German Rectors' Conference www.hochschulkompass.de

increase could be achieved to the annual grants. Payments for 2014 shall be €380,000, for 2015 it shall be €397,000, and for 2016 it shall be €415,000.

The Accreditation Council's fee revenues from the accreditation of agencies and the monitoring and assessment of accreditation procedures have fully remained at the Foundation since 2012. When calculating fees, the Foundation takes only administrative expenditure as a basis – i.e. the costs actually arising. As a result of the evaluation of the statutes of fees in the years 2011 and 2012, the Foundation Board resolved on a moderate increase in fees at its 14th Meeting on 1 March 2013. This amended statute of fees entered into force on 19 April 2013 following approval by the Ministry for Innovation, Science, and Research of the state of North-Rhine Westphalia.

The Foundation's annual financial statement shows for the year 2013 revenues of around €447,629.61 and total outgoings of €446,257.69, less a deficit of €1,330.42 from the years 2011 and 2012. A residue of €41.50 remains.

7.2 Configuration of personnel, space, and resources

According to the employment plan, the personnel configuration of the Foundation's head office includes a managing director (100 per cent), four consultants (3 full-time equivalents), and an office administrator (50 per cent). Furthermore, the Foundation employs a temporary student associate for 20 hours per month. The employees – except the temporary associate – are all graduates of HEIs; remuneration is executed according to the wage regulations of the Public Sector Collective Agreement of the Länder (TV-L). In the months March to De-

cember 2013, a 75 per cent position remained vacant due to maternity/paternity leave.

As a result of the budget consultation mentioned under 7.1, the employment plan of 2014 will be augmented by one 50 per cent position in each of the areas consultation and office administration.

At the head office in Adenauerallee 73, Bonn, the Accreditation Council has four office spaces rented with a total area of approx. 120 square metres.

For the six workspaces currently occupied five new computers, one tablet, and one new server could be procured in 2013. The procurement of one more computer is planned for the beginning of 2014.

Appendixes

Appendix 1 Members of the organs and committees

Appendix 2 Meeting dates

Members of the organs and committees

► Members of the Accreditation Council

Chairperson

Professor Dr Reinhold R. **Grimm**

Vice-Chairperson

Ministerial Director Dr Simone **Schwanitz**, Ministry of Science, Research and the Arts for Baden-Württemberg

HEI Representatives

Professor Dr Stefan **Bartels**, Lübeck University of Applied Sciences, (Fachhochschule Lübeck)

Professor Dr Holger **Burckhart**, University of Siegen (Universität Siegen)

Professor Dr Reinhold R. **Grimm**

Professor Dr Ute von **Lojewski**, Münster University of Applied Sciences, (Fachhochschule Münster)

Representatives of the Länder

State Secretary Helmut Dockter, Ministry of Innovation, Science, and Research for North-Rhine Westphalia

Dr Susanne **Reichrath**, Representative for Higher Education, Science and Technology of the Prime Minister of Saarland

Ministerial Director Dr Simone **Schwanitz**, Ministry of Science, Research and the Arts for Baden-Württemberg

Ministerial Director Dr Adalbert **Weiß**, Bavarian State Ministry of Sciences, Research, and the Arts

Representatives of professional practice

Dr. h.c. Josef **Beutelmann**, Chairman of the Management Boards and General Director of Barmenia Versicherungen (insurance companies)

Petra **Gerstenkorn**, member of the Federal Board of the United Services Union (Bundesvorstand von ver.di)

Thomas **Sattelberger**, former member of the management board of Deutsche Telekom AG

Dr Regina **Görner**, IG Metall executive board

Jörg **Wollny**, Interior Ministry of the State of Brandenburg

Students

Isabella **Albert**, Aachen University of Applied Sciences (FH Aachen)

Alexander **Buchheister**, RWTH Aachen University

International Representatives

Dr Sijbolt **Noorda**, former president of Association of Universities in the Netherlands (vereniging van universiteiten- VSNU)

Professor Martine **Rahier**, Rector of University of Neuchâtel (Universität Neuchâtel)

Representative of Agencies (with an advisory vote)

Professor (emeritus) Dr Reinhard **Zintl**, Otto-Friedrich University, Bamberg (Otto-Friedrich-Universität Bamberg)

► Members of Foundation Board

Chairman

State Secretary Martin **Gorholt**, Ministry of Science, Research, and Culture for Brandenburg

Deputy Chairman

Dr **Kathöfer**, General Secretary of German Rectors' Conference

Länder Representatives

State Secretary Martin **Gorholt**, Ministry of Science, Research, and Culture for Brandenburg

State Secretary Dr Henry **Hasenpflug**, Saxon State Ministry of Science and the Arts

State Secretary Ingmar **Jung**, Hessian Ministry for Science and the Arts

State Secretary Dr Knut **Nevermann**, Senate Administration for Education, Science, and Research Berlin

State Secretary Sebastian **Schröder**, Ministry of Education, Science, and Culture for Mecklenburg-Vorpommern

State Secretary Marco **Tullner**, Ministry of Science and Economic Affairs for Saxony-Anhalt

HEI Representatives

Prof Dr Horst **Hippler**, President of German Rectors' Conference

Dr **Kathöfer**, General Secretary of German Rectors' Conference

Professor Dieter **Lenzen**, President of Free University of Berlin (Freie Universität Berlin)

Professor Micha **Teuscher**, Rector of University of Neubrandenburg (Hochschule Neubrandenburg)

► Members of the Management Board

Chairman

Professor Dr Reinhold R. **Grimm**

Members

Dr Olaf **Bartz**, Managing Director of Foundation for the Accreditation of Study Programmes in Germany

Professor Dr Reinhold R. **Grimm**, formerly of Friedrich-Schiller University Jena (Friedrich-Schiller-Universität Jena)

Ministerial Director Dr Simone **Schwanitz**, Ministry of Science, Research and the Arts for Baden-Württemberg

► Complaints commission

Professor Dr Dietmar von **Hoyningen-Hüne**, formerly of the University of Mannheim (Hochschule Mannheim)

Professor Ute von **Lojewski**, Münster University of Applied Sciences, (Fachhochschule Münster)

Alexander **Buchheister**, RWTH Aachen University

► QA project group

Professor Dr Reinhold R. **Grimm** (Chairman)

Alexander **Buchheister**, RWTH Aachen

Thomas **Sattelberger**, former member of the management board of Deutsche Telekom AG

► Working group on Expertise and Professionalism

Dr Regina **Görner**, formerly of IG Metall executive board (Chair)

Isabella **Albert**, Student at Aachen University of Applied Sciences (FH Aachen)

Professor of Engineering Dr Stefan **Bartels**, Lübeck University of Applied Sciences, (Fachhochschule Lübeck)

State Secretary Helmut Dockter, Ministry of Innovation, Science, and Research for North-Rhine Westphalia

Professor Ulrich **Heiß**, Vice President of Technical University of Berlin (Technische Universität Berlin)

Thomas **Sattelberger**, former member of management board of Deutsche Telekom AG

Professor Tassilo **Schmitt**, University of Bremen, Institute for the Science of History (Universität Bremen, Institut für Geschichtswissenschaft)

Meeting dates

► Meetings of the Accreditation Council in 2013

74th Meeting on 20 February 2013 in Berlin

75th Meeting on 3 June 2013 in Berlin

76th Meeting on 10 September 2013 in Berlin

77th Meeting on 13 December 2013 in Munich

► Meetings of the Foundation Board in 2013

14th Meeting on 1 March 2013 in Berlin

15th Meeting on 14 November 2013 in Berlin

► Meetings of the project group Expertise and Professionalism in 2013

1st Meeting on 6 February 2013

2nd Meeting on 15 May 2013

3rd Meeting on 11 July 2013

4th Meeting on 11 September 2013