

What is particularly important when reviewing and evaluating dual degree programs?

Especially for system-accredited universities: What characteristics require particular attention, and how does accreditation differ from that of "normal," non-dual degree programs?

Who exactly is responsible for assessing the criteria at system-accredited universities (external reviewers?)

How are degree programs handled that integrate study and practical training in terms of time and content but do not award credits for the practical training? Why should these not receive the dual label?

When collaborating with a vocational school, must §§ 9 and 19 MRVO also be reviewed, or is the review under § 12(6) MRVO sufficient?

What characteristics/criteria distinguish work-based or work-integrated concepts from the AR's perspective?

Vocational training is generally shorter than a degree program. Is systematic integration required throughout the entire course of study in a training-integrated model, or only during the period when training and study run concurrently?

The MRVO (Explanatory Memorandum, Section 12(6)) requires at least a university and a company as learning locations. Some vocational training programs are offered (exclusively) in a fully school-based format at a vocational school, e.g., Medical Laboratory Technician, Media Assistant, ...the practical components are carried out at the school: In such special cases, should the vocational school be considered equivalent to a company?

How is the integration of content between the university and company components intended? What specific aspects must be considered during accreditation?

What changes result from system accreditation specifically for the accreditation of dual master's degree programs?

How can the various types of dual study programs be distinguished from one another?

Fundamental question: What minimum percentage of the total credit hours must the practical phases account for in order for the program to be considered (purely formally) a dual degree program?

If (parts of) the practical phase = learning phase, how are credits then "allocated" between the academic and practical phases?

How long should the process be expected to take? (Agency/AR)

Distinction between systematic vs. selective integration of content: Is a specific frequency required?

Are there differences in accreditation between continuing education and consecutive dual master's programs?

Should work-integrated degree programs generally be accredited as "dual"?

What must be considered for accreditation in dual degree programs with an intensive study track (75 ECTS credits per year)?

What exactly does "interlinked organizationally and contractually" mean? Are there, for example, key requirements that must be met?

Is there a minimum ECTS requirement for practical phases below which accreditation as a dual degree program is excluded, even if the substantive, contractual, and organizational integration is exemplary?

How can full-time employment and full-time study be integrated?

How should students be involved in the self-assessment process?

Are dual degree programs always intensive programs, or how do they differ?

Are part-time dual degree programs possible?

This question is central to the quality dialogue on "dual degree programs"

Are nursing degree programs considered dual by definition? The legislature has regulated this for midwifery. Both degree programs are very similar—why the different treatment?

It seems to me that the different focus of the assessment at universities and vocational academies is important.

Shouldn't a distinction be made between purely dual degree programs and dual study formats within a degree program?

Must examination formats necessarily differ between dual students and regular students? Who determines this? The AR or the universities?

Dual degree programs are designed as such. A part-time degree program does not meet these criteria, does it?

The idea of establishing the transfer between theory and practice through the integration of learning locations overlooks the fact that the transfer is carried out by individual learners. It is worth asking whether this can be achieved didactically only through integration or also through spaces for reflection within individual learning locations.