

Accreditation Report

Program Accreditation – Combined Degree Program / Partial Degree Program

Template Version 03 – August 1, 2025

[▶ Table of Contents](#)

University	
Responsible Agency	
Responsible Officer	
Accreditation Report dated	Date

Combined degree program <i>(If there are more than 5 combined degree programs, repeat the table as necessary)</i>		Program 1	Program 2	Program 3	Program 4	Program n
Location (if applicable)						
Degree title						
Mode of study	Dual Integrating education, vocational training, and practical experience (E/V/P) Work-based/vocational training (b/a)	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> p <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> p <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> p <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> p <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> p <input type="checkbox"/>
	Intensive program	b <input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/>	b <input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/>	b <input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/>	b <input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/>	b <input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/>
	International degree program	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Joint Program	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Cooperation § 19 / § 20 MRVO	§ 19 <input type="checkbox"/> §20 <input type="checkbox"/>	§ 19 <input type="checkbox"/> § 20 <input type="checkbox"/>	§ 19 <input type="checkbox"/> §20 <input type="checkbox"/>	§ 19 <input type="checkbox"/> §20 <input type="checkbox"/>	§ 19 <input type="checkbox"/> §20 <input type="checkbox"/>
	On-campus program	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Distance learning	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Online	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Full-time/Part-time (F/P)	F <input type="checkbox"/> P <input type="checkbox"/>	F <input type="checkbox"/> P <input type="checkbox"/>	F <input type="checkbox"/> P <input type="checkbox"/>	F <input type="checkbox"/> P <input type="checkbox"/>	F <input type="checkbox"/> P <input type="checkbox"/>
	Standard duration of study (semesters)					
ECTS credits						
For master's programs: consecutive/continuing education (c/e)		c <input type="checkbox"/> c <input type="checkbox"/>	k <input type="checkbox"/> w <input type="checkbox"/>	k <input type="checkbox"/> w <input type="checkbox"/>	k <input type="checkbox"/> w <input type="checkbox"/>	k <input type="checkbox"/> w <input type="checkbox"/>
Language of instruction (if exclusively a foreign language)						
German as an admission requirement /Proficiency level (if language of instruction is exclusively a foreign language)						
Admission to the program						
Admission capacity ¹						
Average number* of first-year students ¹						
Average number* of graduates ¹						
*Reference period						
Initial/Concept Accreditation (I/C)		I <input type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/>	I <input type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/>	I <input type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/>	I <input type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/>	E <input type="checkbox"/> K <input type="checkbox"/>
Reaccreditation No.						

¹ Please specify whether per academic year or semester (A/S)

Sub-program <i>(If there are more than 5 sub-programs, repeat the table as necessary)</i>		Sub-program 1	Sub-program 2	Sub-program 3	Sub-program 4	Sub-program n
Location (if applicable)						
Assigned combined degree program						
Degree title						
Mode of study	Dual	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Integrating education, vocational training, and practical experience (E/V/P)	a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> p <input type="checkbox"/>	a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> p <input type="checkbox"/>	a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> p <input type="checkbox"/>	a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> p <input type="checkbox"/>	a <input type="checkbox"/> b <input type="checkbox"/> p <input type="checkbox"/>
	Work-based/vocational training (b/a)	b <input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/>	b <input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/>	b <input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/>	b <input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/>	b <input type="checkbox"/> a <input type="checkbox"/>
	Intensive program	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	International degree program	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Joint Program	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Cooperation § 19 / § 20 MRVO	§ 19 <input type="checkbox"/> §20 <input type="checkbox"/>	§ 19 <input type="checkbox"/> § 20 <input type="checkbox"/>	§ 19 <input type="checkbox"/> §20 <input type="checkbox"/>	§ 19 <input type="checkbox"/> §20 <input type="checkbox"/>	§ 19 <input type="checkbox"/> §20 <input type="checkbox"/>
	On-campus program	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Distance learning	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Online	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Full-time/Part-time (F/P)	F <input type="checkbox"/> P <input type="checkbox"/>	F <input type="checkbox"/> P <input type="checkbox"/>	F <input type="checkbox"/> P <input type="checkbox"/>	F <input type="checkbox"/> P <input type="checkbox"/>	F <input type="checkbox"/> P <input type="checkbox"/>	
Duration of study (semesters)						
ECTS credits						
For master's programs: consecutive/continuing education (c/e)		c <input type="checkbox"/> c <input type="checkbox"/>	c <input type="checkbox"/> c <input type="checkbox"/>	c <input type="checkbox"/> c <input type="checkbox"/>	c <input type="checkbox"/> c <input type="checkbox"/>	c <input type="checkbox"/> c <input type="checkbox"/>
Language of instruction (if exclusively a foreign language)						
German as an admission requirement/level (if the language of instruction is exclusively a foreign language)						
Admission to the program						
Admission capacity ¹						
Average number* of first-year students ¹						
Average number* of graduates ¹						
*Reference period						
Initial/Concept Accreditation (I/C)		I <input type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/>	I <input type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/>	I <input type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/>	I <input type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/>	E <input type="checkbox"/> K <input type="checkbox"/>
Reaccreditation No.						

Contents

1	Summary	6
1.1	Combined degree program 01	6
1.1.1	Brief Profile of the Program	6
1.1.2	Summary Quality Assessment by the Review Panel.....	6
1.1.3	The Agency's proposed decision regarding compliance with the formal criteria as per the review report (Section 1).....	6
1.1.4	Proposed decision by the review panel regarding compliance with the technical and content-related criteria as per the review report (Section 2).....	7
1.1.5	Separate approval for regulated degree programs pursuant to § 24(3), sentence 1, and § 25 (1), sentence 5 of the MRVO.....	7
1.2	Sub-degree program 01	8
1.2.1	Brief profile of the sub-program	8
1.2.2	Summary Quality Assessment by the Review Panel.....	8
1.2.3	The Agency's proposed decision regarding compliance with the formal criteria as per the review report (Section 1).....	8
1.2.4	Proposed decision by the expert panel regarding compliance with the technical and substantive criteria as set forth in the expert opinion (Section 2)	9
1.2.5	Separate approval for regulated partial degree programs pursuant to § 24(3), sentence 1, and § 25(1), sentence 5 MRVO.....	9
1.3	Sub-program n	10
1.3.1	Brief profile of the sub-program	10
1.3.2	Summary quality assessment by the review panel.....	10
1.3.3	The Agency's proposed decision regarding compliance with the formal criteria as per the review report (Section 1).....	10
1.3.4	Proposed decision by the review panel regarding compliance with the technical and content-related criteria as per the review report (Section 2).....	11
1.3.5	Separate approval for regulated partial degree programs pursuant to § 24(3), sentence 1, and § 25(1), sentence 5 MRVO.....	11
2	Audit report: Fulfilment of the formal criteria.....	12
2.1	Program Structure and Duration (Section 3, Paragraphs 1–3 of the MRVO).....	12
2.2	Recognition and Credit Transfer (Section 3(4) MRVO).....	13
2.3	Program Profiles (Section 4 MRVO)	13
2.4	Admission Requirements and Transfers Between Programs (§ 5 MRVO)	13
2.5	Degrees and Degree Titles (Section 6 MRVO)	14
2.6	Modularization (Section 7 MRVO).....	14
2.7	Credit Point System (Section 8 MRVO).....	14
2.8	If applicable: Special criteria for cooperation with non-higher education institutions (Section 9 MRVO).....	15

2.9	<i>If applicable</i> : Special provisions for joint programs (Section 10 MRVO).....	15
3	Expert opinion: Fulfilment of the academic and content-related criteria	16
3.1	Key areas of evaluation / Focus of quality development	16
3.2	Combination model (<i>optional</i>).....	16
3.3	Qualification Objectives and Level of Completion (Section 11 MRVO).....	17
3.4	Coherent program concept and adequate implementation (Section 12 MRVO).....	20
3.4.1	Curriculum (Section 12(1), sentences 1 through 3 and 5 MRVO).....	20
3.4.2	Mobility (Section 12(1), sentence 4 MRVO).....	23
3.4.3	Documentation and Publication (Section 12(1), Sentence 6 MRVO).....	26
3.4.4	Staffing (Section 12(2) MRVO).....	29
3.4.5	Resource allocation (Section 12(3) MRVO)	32
3.4.6	Examination system (Section 12(4) MRVO).....	35
3.4.7	Feasibility of Study (Section 12(5) MRVO).....	38
3.4.8	<i>If applicable</i> : Special profile requirement (Section 12(6) MRVO).....	41
3.4.9	<i>If applicable</i> : Dual (Section 12(7) MRVO)	44
3.5	Academic and Content-Related Structure of the Degree Programs (Section 13 MRVO)	47
3.5.1	Up-to-date nature of the academic and scientific requirements (Section 13(1) MRVO)	47
3.5.2	<i>If applicable</i> : Teacher training (§ 13 (2) and (3) MRVO)	50
3.6	Academic performance (Section 14 MRVO)	53
3.7	Diversity, gender equality, and compensation for disadvantages (Section 15 MRVO).....	55
3.8	<i>If applicable</i> : Special provisions for joint programs (Section 16 MRVO).....	58
3.9	<i>If applicable</i> : Collaborations with non-higher-education institutions (Section 19 MRVO).....	61
3.10	<i>If applicable</i> : University collaborations (Section 20 MRVO).....	64
3.11	<i>If applicable</i> : Special criteria for bachelor's degree programs at vocational academies (Section 21 MRVO).....	66
4	Review procedure	70
4.1	General Information.....	70
4.2	Legal Basis.....	70
4.3	Panel of Experts	70
5	Data Sheet	72
5.1	Program Information.....	72
5.1.1	Combined Degree Program 01	72
5.1.2	Sub-program 01	73
5.1.3	Sub-program n	74
5.2	Accreditation Data	75
5.2.1	Combined degree program 01	75
5.2.2	Sub-program 01	75
5.2.3	Sub-program n.....	76

6	Glossary.....	77
----------	----------------------	-----------

1 Summary

Note: *If this checklist is used exclusively for the evaluation of partial degree programs within an already accredited combined degree program, the following text passages in the checklist regarding the combined degree program must be deleted.*

1.1 Combined Degree Program 01

1.1.1 Brief Profile of the Program

This section (length ≤ 0.75 pages) should specifically address the following topics/aspects:

- *Integration of the program into the institution, the program's relationship to the institution's profile, mission statement, and specific focus*
- *Qualification objectives / learning outcomes and academic focus areas*
- *Special features (e.g., varying program durations for different specializations, program-specific collaborations)*
- *Special teaching methods*
- *Target group(s)*

1.1.2 Summary quality assessment by the review panel

This chapter (length ≤ 0.75 pages) should contain assessments of the following topics/issues:

- *Overall impression of the quality of the program, summary of the review*
- *Strengths and weaknesses*
- *For reaccreditation: Further development of the program during the accreditation period and, if applicable, implementation of recommendations from the previous accreditation.*
- *Examples of best practices within the university*
- *Reasons for rejecting accreditation, if applicable*

1.1.3 The Agency's proposed decision regarding compliance with the formal criteria as per the audit report (Section 1)

The formal criteria are

met

not met

If at least one criterion is not met: After thorough consultation with the institution, the Agency proposes the following condition(s) to the Accreditation Council:

Condition 1 (Criterion ##): [Text]

Condition n (Criterion ##): [Text]

If serious deficiencies are identified in the area of formal criteria: The accreditation agency proposes to the Accreditation Council that accreditation be denied.

Note 1 (Criterion ##): [Text] Note n

(Criterion ##): [Text]

1.1.4 Proposed decision of the expert panel regarding fulfillment of the technical and content-related criteria in accordance with the expert report (Section 2)

The subject-matter and content criteria are

met

Not met

If at least one criterion is not met: The review panel proposes the following condition(s) to the Accreditation Council:

Condition 1 (Criterion ##): [Text]

Condition n (Criterion ##): [Text]

If serious deficiencies are identified: The review panel proposes to the Accreditation Council that accreditation be denied.

Note 1 (Criterion ##): [Text] Note n

(Criterion ##): [Text]

1.1.5 Separate approval for regulated degree programs pursuant to § 24(3) sentence 1 and § 25(1) sentence 5 MRVO

Here, where applicable, the approval of the experts pursuant to § 25(1), sentences 3 and 4 MRVO for regulated degree programs shall be documented.

1.2 Sub-program 01

1.2.1 Brief profile of the sub-program

This chapter (length ≤ 0.75 pages) should specifically address the following topics/matters:

- *Integration of the program component into the university, the program component's relationship to the university's profile / mission statement / specific focus of the university*
- *Qualification objectives / learning outcomes and academic focus areas*
- *Special features (e.g., varying program durations for different specializations, program-specific collaborations)*
- *Special teaching methods*
- *Target group(s)*

1.2.2 Summary quality assessment by the review panel

This chapter (length ≤ 0.75 pages) should contain assessments of the following topics/issues:

- *Overall impression of the quality of the program, summary of the review*
- *Strengths and weaknesses*
- *For reaccreditation: Further development of the program component during the accreditation period and, if applicable, implementation of recommendations from the previous accreditation.*
- *Examples of good practice within the institution*
- *Reasons for the rejection of accreditation, if applicable*

1.2.3 The Agency's proposed decision regarding compliance with the formal criteria as set forth in the audit report (Section 1)

The formal criteria are

met

not met

If at least one criterion is not met: After thorough consultation with the institution, the Agency proposes the following condition(s) to the Accreditation Council:

Condition 1 (Criterion ##): [Text]

Condition n (Criterion ##): [Text]

If serious deficiencies are identified in the area of formal criteria: The accreditation agency proposes to the Accreditation Council that accreditation be denied.

Note 1 (Criterion ##): [Text] Note n

(Criterion ##): [Text]

1.2.4 Proposed decision of the expert panel regarding fulfillment of the technical and content-related criteria in accordance with the expert opinion (Section 2)

The subject-matter and content criteria are

met

not met

If at least one criterion is not met: The expert panel proposes the following condition(s) to the Accreditation Council:

Condition 1 (Criterion ##): [Text]

Condition n (Criterion ##): [Text]

If serious deficiencies are identified: The panel of experts recommends to the Accreditation Council that accreditation be denied.

Note 1 (Criterion ##): [Text] Note n

(Criterion ##): [Text]

1.2.5 Separate approval for regulated partial degree programs pursuant to § 24(3), sentence 1, and § 25(1), sentence 5, MRVO

Here, where applicable, the approval of the experts pursuant to § 25(1), sentences 3 and 4 MRVO for regulated degree programs shall be documented.

1.3 Sub-degree program n

1.3.1 Brief profile of the sub-program

This section (length ≤ 0.75 pages) should include, in particular, information on the following topics/matters:

- *Integration of the sub-program into the institution, relationship of the sub-program to the institution's / mission statement / specific orientation of the institution*
- *Program Objectives / Learning Outcomes and Academic Focus Areas*
- *Special features (e.g., varying program lengths for different specializations, program-specific partnerships)*
- *Special teaching methods*
- *Target group(s)*

1.3.2 Summary quality assessment by the review panel

This chapter (length ≤ 0.75 pages) should contain assessments of the following topics/issues:

- *Overall impression of the quality of the program, summary of the evaluation*
- *Strengths and weaknesses*
- *For reaccreditation: Further development of the program component during the accreditation period and, if applicable, implementation of recommendations from the previous accreditation.*
- *Examples of good practice within the institution*
- *Reasons for rejecting accreditation, if applicable*

1.3.3 The agency's proposed decision regarding compliance with the formal criteria as per the review report (Section 1)

The formal criteria are

met

not met

If at least one criterion is not met: After thorough consultation with the institution, the agency proposes the following condition(s) to the Accreditation Council:

Condition 1 (Criterion ##): [Text]

Condition n (Criterion ##): [Text]

If serious deficiencies are identified in the area of formal criteria: The accreditation agency proposes to the Accreditation Council that accreditation be denied.

Note 1 (Criterion ##): [Text] Note n

(Criterion ##): [Text]

1.3.4 Proposed decision of the expert panel regarding fulfillment of the technical and content-related criteria in accordance with the expert opinion (Section 2)

The subject-matter and content criteria are

met

not met

If at least one criterion is not met: The expert panel proposes the following condition(s) to the Accreditation Council:

Condition 1 (Criterion ##): [Text]

Condition n (Criterion ##): [Text]

If serious deficiencies are identified: The review panel proposes to the Accreditation Council that accreditation be denied.

Note 1 (Criterion ##): [Text] Note n

(Criterion ##): [Text]

1.3.5 Separate approval for regulated partial degree programs pursuant to § 24(3), sentence 1, and § 25(1), sentence 5, MRVO

Where applicable, the approval of the reviewers pursuant to § 25(1), sentences 3 and 4 MRVO for regulated degree programs should be documented here.

2 Review report: Fulfilment of formal criteria

(pursuant to Art. 2(2) StAkkStV and §§ 3–8 and § 24(3) MRVO¹)

The formal criteria must be met by every (sub)degree program. The explanations may also be provided in summary form for multiple (sub)degree programs, provided that the reviews reach the same conclusion.

Evidence

Which key documents and in which version (draft/published) are referenced in the audit report? For example²

- General and/or Framework Examination Regulations of University XY
- Study and Examination Regulations, and, if applicable, Admission Regulations for the xy program
- Program-specific (or program-part-specific) copy of the Diploma Supplement for the (program or program part) xy (in German / English)
- Cooperation agreement between University X and non-university educational institution Y
- ...

2.1 Program Structure and Duration (Section 3, Paragraphs

1–3 MRVO) Status/Evaluation

Verbatim excerpts from the self-report must be marked as quotations.

[Text]

Proposed Decision

Criterion is met / is not met. *If the criterion is not met: justification and, if applicable, proposal for a condition.*

After thorough consultation with the institution, the agency proposes the following condition: [Text]

1 In addition to the State Treaty on Study Program Accreditation, the legal basis is the **##insert the state ordinance of the university's state of location here##** (see also 3.2). For the sake of simplicity, the reporting template provided by the Accreditation Council refers to the model state ordinance. The text of the State Treaty on Study Program Accreditation and the corresponding state ordinance can be found here: <https://www.akkreditierungs-rat.de/de/akkreditierungssystem-rechtliche-grundlagen/gesetze-und-verordnungen/gesetze-und-verordnungen>.

2 The following list provides examples of evidence that may be relevant to a criterion. The list is neither exhaustive nor binding, but serves as a guide.

2.2 Recognition and Credit Transfer (§ 3 (4) MRVO)

Status/Assessment

Verbatim excerpts from the self-report must be marked as quotations.

[Text]

Proposed Decision

Criterion is met / is not met. *If the criterion is not met: justification and, if applicable, proposal for a condition.*

After thorough consultation with the university, the agency proposes the following requirement:

[Text]

2.3 Program Profiles (§ 4 MRVO)

Status/Evaluation

Verbatim excerpts from the self-evaluation report must be marked as quotations.

[Text]

Proposed Decision

Criterion is met / is not met. *If the criterion is not met: justification and, if applicable, a proposed condition.*

After thorough consultation with the institution, the agency proposes the following condition: [Text]

2.4 Admission requirements and transitions between degree programs (Section 5 MRVO)

Status/Assessment [Text]

Proposed decision

Criterion is met / is not met. *If the criterion is not met: justification and, if applicable, proposal for a condition.*

After thorough consultation with the institution, the agency proposes the following condition: [Text]

2.5 Degrees and Degree Titles (Section 6 MRVO)

Status/Assessment

Direct quotations from the self-report must be marked as such.

[Text]

Proposed Decision

Criterion is met / is not met. *If the criterion is not met: justification and, if applicable, proposal for a condition.*

After thorough consultation with the institution, the agency proposes the following condition: [Text]

2.6 Modularization (§ 7 MRVO)

Status/Evaluation

Verbatim excerpts from the self-report must be marked as quotations.

[Text]

Proposed Decision

Criterion is met / is not met. *If the criterion is not met: justification and, if applicable, proposal for a condition.*

After thorough consultation with the institution, the agency proposes the following condition: [Text]

2.7 Credit Point System (Section 8

MRVO) Status/Assessment

Direct quotations from the self-report must be marked as such.

[Text]

Proposed Decision

Criterion is met / is not met. *If the criterion is not met: justification and, if applicable, a proposed condition.*

After thorough consultation with the institution, the agency proposes the following condition: [Text]

2.8 If applicable: Special criteria for cooperation with non-higher education institutions (Section 9 MRVO)

Status/Evaluation

Verbatim excerpts from the self-report must be marked as quotations.

[Text]

Proposed decision

Criterion is met / is not met. *If the criterion is not met: justification and, if applicable, proposal for a condition.*

After thorough consultation with the institution, the agency proposes the following condition: [Text]

2.9 If applicable: Special provisions for joint programs (Section 10 MRVO)

Status/Evaluation

Direct quotations from the self-report must be marked as such.

[Text]

Proposed Decision

Criterion is met / is not met. *If the criterion is not met: justification and, if applicable, a proposed condition.*

After thorough consultation with the institution, the agency proposes the following condition: [Text]

3 Expert opinion: Fulfilment of the subject-matter criteria

(pursuant to Art. 3(2), sentence 1, no. 4 StAkkStV in conjunction with Art. 4(3), sentence 2a StAkkStV and §§ 11 through 16; §§ 19–

21, and § 24(4) MRVO³)

The report must document the evaluation of each (sub)program, taking each criterion into account. Depending on the nature of the combined program model, however, it may be appropriate to evaluate individual aspects, criteria, or sub-criteria at a level that spans (sub)programs in order to avoid duplication and better illustrate broader contexts.

Depending on the nature of the combined program model pursued by the institution, certain subject-specific criteria may be relevant only to a limited extent when evaluating the combined program. This must be clearly indicated in each case.

3.1 Key Areas of Evaluation / Focus of Quality Development

- *Topics that played a prominent role in the evaluation:*
- *Further development of the programs during the accreditation period and implementation of recommendations from the previous accreditation.*
- *Changes / improvements during the current process (with regard to content) (see also Chapter 3.1)*

3.2 Combination model (optional)

This chapter may be used, if applicable, to present the combination model in its entirety.

3 In addition to the State Treaty on Study Program Accreditation, the legal basis is the **##insert the state regulation of the university's home state here##** (see also 3.2). For the sake of simplicity, the reporting template provided by the Accreditation Council refers to the model state regulation. The text of the State Treaty on Study Program Accreditation and the corresponding state ordinance can be found here: <https://www.akkreditierungs-rat.de/de/akkreditierungssystem-rechtliche-grundlagen/gesetze-und-verordnungen/gesetze-und-verordnun-gen>.

3.3 Qualification objectives and degree level (§ 11 MRVO)

a) Aspects common to all (sub)programs (if applicable)

Facts and assessments that apply equally to all (sub)programs in the bundle must be documented in this section. Such cross-program aspects should not be repeated in the program-specific assessments; a cross-reference to this section is sufficient there.

Verbatim excerpts from the self-evaluation report must be marked as quotations.

[Text]

b) (Sub)Program-Specific Evaluation of

Combined Program 01

Evidence

Which key documents are referenced in the status report and evaluation for this criterion? For example⁴

- *Program document(s) in which the overall qualification objectives of the (partial) program are formally established (e.g., study and examination regulations, module handbook),*
- *Additional versions of the qualification objectives pursued in the (partial) degree program as a whole that were taken into account in the evaluation (e.g., the institution's comments on Section 11 MRVO in the self-evaluation report, Diploma Supplement)*
- *Location where the qualification objectives pursued in the (partial) degree program as a whole are publicly accessible (e.g., website with URL)*
- ...

Status

Verbatim excerpts from the self-evaluation report must be marked as quotations.

[Text]

Evaluation: Strengths and Areas for Improvement

[Text]

4 The following list provides examples of evidence that may be relevant to a criterion. The list is neither exhaustive nor binding, but is intended as a guide.

Proposed Decision

Met / Not met. *If not met: Justification and, if applicable, proposal for a condition.*

The review panel proposes the following condition(s):

[Text]

If applicable: The review panel makes the following recommendations: [Text]

Sub-program 01 Evidence

Which key documents are referenced in the status report and evaluation for this criterion? For example⁵

- *Program document(s) in which the overall qualification objectives of the (partial) program are formally established (e.g., study and examination regulations, module handbook),*
- *Additional versions of the qualification objectives pursued in the (partial) degree program as a whole that were taken into account in the evaluation (e.g., the institution's comments on Section 11 MRVO in the self-evaluation report, Diploma Supplement)*
- *Location where the qualification objectives pursued in the (partial) degree program as a whole are publicly accessible (e.g., website with URL)*
- ...

Status

Verbatim excerpts from the self-evaluation report must be marked as quotations.

[Text]

Evaluation: Strengths and Areas for Improvement

[Text]

Proposed Decision

Met / Not met. *If not met: Justification and, if applicable, proposal for a condition.*

5 The following list provides examples of evidence that may be relevant to a criterion. The list is neither exhaustive nor binding, but is intended as a guide.

The review panel proposes the following condition(s):

[Text]

If applicable: The review panel makes the following recommendations: [Text]

Sub-program n Evidence

Which key documents are referenced in the status report and evaluation for this criterion? For example⁶

- *Program document(s) in which the overall qualification objectives of the (partial) program are formally established (e.g., study and examination regulations, module handbook),*
- *Additional versions of the qualification objectives pursued in the (partial) degree program as a whole that were taken into account in the evaluation (e.g., the institution's comments on Section 11 MRVO in the self-evaluation report, Diploma Supplement)*
- *Location where the qualification objectives pursued in the (partial) degree program as a whole are publicly accessible (e.g., website with URL)*
- ...

Status

Verbatim excerpts from the self-evaluation report must be marked as quotations.

[Text]

Evaluation: Strengths and Areas for Improvement

[Text]

Proposed Decision

Met / Not met. *If not met: Justification and, if applicable, proposal for a condition.*

The review panel proposes the following condition(s): [Text]

⁶ The following list provides examples of evidence that may be relevant to a criterion. The list is neither exhaustive nor binding, but is intended as a guide.

If applicable: The review panel makes the following recommendations: [Text]

3.4 Coherent program concept and adequate implementation (Section 12 MRVO)

3.4.1 Curriculum (Section 12(1), sentences 1 through 3 and 5 MRVO)

a) Aspects common to (sub)programs (if applicable)

Facts and assessments that apply equally to all (sub)programs within the bundle must be documented in this section. Such cross-program aspects should not be repeated in the program-specific assessments; a cross-reference to this section is sufficient there.

Verbatim excerpts from the self-evaluation report must be marked as quotations.

[Text]

b) (Sub)Program-Specific Evaluation of

Combined Program 01

Evidence

Which key documents are referenced in the status and evaluation for this criterion? For example

- *Study and Examination Regulations for Program xy*
- *Admission Regulations for Degree Program xy*
- *Course Catalog for the xy Program*
- *Objectives-Module Matrix for the xy degree program*
- *Framework Examination Regulations / General Examination Regulations of xy University*
- ...

Status

The university presents the following curriculum for the (combined/partial) degree program XY

Insert the study plan here, citing the source

If applicable: additional text-based explanations. Direct quotations from the self-report must be marked as such.

Evaluation: Strengths and Areas for Improvement

Direct quotations from the self-report must be marked as such.

[Text]

Proposed decision

Met / Not met. *If not met: Reason and, if applicable, a proposed condition.*

The review panel proposes the following condition(s):

[Text]

If applicable: The review panel makes the following recommendations: [Text]

Sub-program 01 Evidence

Which key documents are referenced in the status report and evaluation for this criterion? For example

- *Study and Examination Regulations for Program xy*
- *Admission Regulations for the xy Program*
- *Module Handbook for the xy degree program*
- *Objectives-Module Matrix for the xy degree program*
- *Framework Examination Regulations / General Examination Regulations of University XY*
- ...

Status

The university submits the following curriculum for the (combined/partial) degree program XY

Insert the study plan here, citing the source

If applicable: additional text-based explanations. Direct quotations from the self-report must be marked as such.

Evaluation: Strengths and Areas for Development

[Text]

Proposed decision

Met / Not met. *If not met: Justification and, if applicable, a proposed requirement.*

The review panel proposes the following requirement(s):

[Text]

If applicable: The review panel makes the following recommendations: [Text]

Sub-program n Evidence

Which key documents are referenced in the status report and evaluation for this criterion? For example

- *Study and Examination Regulations for Program xy*
- *Admission Regulations for the xy Program*
- *Module Handbook for the xy degree program*
- *Objectives-Module Matrix for the xy degree program*
- *Framework Examination Regulations / General Examination Regulations of XY University*
- ...

Status

The university presents the following curriculum for the (combined/partial) degree program XY

Insert the study plan here, citing the source

If applicable: additional text-based explanations. Direct quotations from the self-report must be marked as such.

Evaluation: Strengths and Areas for Improvement

[Text]

Proposed decision

Met / Not met. *If not met: Justification and, if applicable, a proposed requirement.*

The review panel proposes the following requirement(s):

[Text]

If applicable: The expert panel makes the following recommendations: [Text]

3.4.2 Mobility (Section 12(1), Sentence 4 MRVO)

a) (Partially) cross-program aspects (if applicable)

Facts and assessments that apply equally to all (sub)programs within the bundle must be documented in this section. Such aspects common to all (sub)programs should not be repeated in the (sub)program-specific assessments; a cross-reference to this section is sufficient there.

Verbatim excerpts from the self-evaluation report must be marked as quotations.

[Text]

b) (Sub)Program-Specific Evaluation of

Combined Program 01

Evidence

Which key documents are referenced in the status report and evaluation for this criterion? For example

- Regulatory documents in which the provisions for the recognition of coursework and examination achievements completed at other institutions of higher education, or for the transfer of competencies acquired outside the higher education sector, are established (e.g., General /Framework Examination Regulations, Study and Examination Regulations for the xy program)*

- *Statistics on incoming/outgoing students in the xy program*
- *Program documentation(s) in which program-specific optional and/or mandatory study abroad periods are established*
- *Cooperation agreement(s) with foreign partner universities*
- ...

Status

Direct quotations from the self-report must be marked as such.

[Text]

Evaluation: Strengths and Areas for Development

[Text]

Proposed Decision

Met / Not met. *If not met: Justification and, if applicable, proposal for a condition.*

The review panel proposes the following condition(s):

[Text]

If applicable: The review panel makes the following recommendations: [Text]

Sub-program 01 Evidence

Which key documents are referenced in the status report and evaluation for this criterion? For example

- *Regulatory documents in which the provisions for the recognition of coursework and examination achievements completed at other institutions of higher education, or for the crediting of competencies acquired outside the higher education sector, are established (e.g., General /Framework Examination Regulations, Study and Examination Regulations for the xy program)*
- *Statistics on incoming/outgoing students in the xy program*
- *Program documentation(s) in which program-specific optional and/or mandatory study abroad periods are specified*
- *Cooperation agreement(s) with foreign partner universities*
- ...

Status

Direct quotations from the self-evaluation report must be marked as such.

[Text]

Evaluation: Strengths and Areas for Improvement

[Text]

Proposed Decision

Met / Not met. *If not met: Justification and, if applicable, proposal for a condition.*

The review panel proposes the following condition(s):

[Text]

If applicable: The review panel makes the following recommendations: [Text]

Sub-program n Evidence

Which key documents are referenced in the status report and evaluation for this criterion? For example

- *Regulatory documents in which the provisions for the recognition of coursework and examination achievements completed at other institutions of higher education, or for the transfer of competencies acquired outside the higher education sector, are established (e.g., General /Framework Examination Regulations, Study and Examination Regulations for the xy program)*
- *Statistics on Incoming and Outgoing Students in the xy Program*
- *Program documentation(s) in which program-specific optional and/or mandatory study abroad periods are specified*
- *Cooperation agreement(s) with foreign partner universities*
- ...

Status

Direct quotations from the self-report must be marked as such.

[Text]

Evaluation: Strengths and Areas for Improvement

[Text]

Proposed Decision

Met / Not met. *If not met: Justification and, if applicable, proposal for a condition.*

The review panel proposes the following condition(s):

[Text]

If applicable: The review panel makes the following recommendations: [Text]

3.4.3 Documentation and Publication (Section 12(1), Sentence 6 MRVO)

a) (Partially) program-wide aspects (if applicable)

Facts and assessments that apply equally to all (sub)programs within the bundle must be documented in this section. Such aspects common to all (sub)programs should not be repeated in the (sub)program-specific assessments; a cross-reference to this section is sufficient there.

Verbatim excerpts from the self-evaluation report must be marked as quotations.

[Text]

b) (Sub)Program-Specific Evaluation of

Combined Program 01

Evidence

Which key documents are referenced in the status report and evaluation for this criterion? For example

- *Regulatory documents in which the degree program, course of study, examination requirements, module descriptions, and admission requirements—including provisions for compensating for disadvantages for students with disabilities or chronic illnesses—are established*
- *Location(s) where the degree program, curriculum, examination requirements, module*

and admission requirements, including provisions for compensating for disadvantages for students with disabilities or chronic illnesses, are published (e.g., website(s) with URL)

- ...

Status

Direct quotations from the self-report must be marked as such.

[Text]

Evaluation: Strengths and Areas for Development

[Text]

Proposed Decision

Met / Not met. *If not met: Justification and, if applicable, proposal for a condition.*

The review panel proposes the following condition(s):

[Text]

If applicable: The review panel makes the following recommendations: [Text]

Sub-program 01 Evidence

Which key documents are referenced in the status report and evaluation for this criterion? For example

- *Regulations in which the degree program, course of study, examination requirements, module descriptions, and admission requirements—including provisions for compensating for disadvantages for students with disabilities or chronic illnesses—are established*
- *Location(s) where the degree program, curriculum, examination requirements, module descriptions, and admission requirements—including provisions for compensating for disadvantages for students with disabilities or chronic illnesses—are published (e.g., website(s) with URL)*
- ...

Status

Direct quotations from the self-report must be marked as such.

[Text]

Evaluation: Strengths and Areas for Development

[Text]

Proposed Decision

Met / Not met. *If not met: Justification and, if applicable, proposal for a condition.*

The review panel proposes the following condition(s):

[Text]

If applicable: The review panel makes the following recommendations: [Text]

Sub-program n Evidence

Which key documents are referenced in the status report and evaluation for this criterion? For example

- *Regulations in which the degree program, course of study, examination requirements, module descriptions, and admission requirements—including provisions for compensating for disadvantages for students with disabilities or chronic illnesses—are established*
- *Location(s) where the degree program, curriculum, examination requirements, module descriptions, and admission requirements—including provisions for compensating for disadvantages for students with disabilities or chronic illnesses—are published (e.g., website(s) with URL)*
- ...

Status

Direct quotations from the self-report must be marked as such.

[Text]

Evaluation: Strengths and Areas for Development

[Text]

Proposed Decision

Met / Not met. *If not met: Justification and, if applicable, proposal for a condition.*

The review panel proposes the following condition(s):

[Text]

If applicable: The review panel makes the following recommendations: [Text]

3.4.4 Staffing (Section 12(2) MRVO)

a) (Partially) program-wide aspects *(if applicable)*

Facts and assessments that apply equally to all (sub)programs within the bundle must be documented in this section. Such aspects common to all (sub)programs should not be repeated in the (sub)program-specific assessments; a cross-reference to this section is sufficient there.

Verbatim excerpts from the self-evaluation report must be marked as quotations.

[Text]

b) (Sub)Program-Specific Evaluation of

Combined Program 01

Evidence

Which key documents are referenced in the status report and evaluation for this criterion? For example

- *Overview of the professorships assigned to the program*
- *Course integration matrix*
- *(Short) CVs of the faculty members assigned to program xy*
- *If applicable, staffing growth and/or appointment planning for the xy program*
- *Location where the measures for staff selection and qualification are described (e.g., self-report, separate document xy)*
- ...

Status

Direct quotations from the self-report must be marked as such.

[Text]

Evaluation: Strengths and Areas for Improvement

[Text]

Proposed Decision

Met / Not met. *If not met: Justification and, if applicable, proposal for a condition.*

The review panel proposes the following condition(s):

[Text]

If applicable: The review panel makes the following recommendations: [Text]

Sub-program 01 Evidence

Which key documents are referenced in the status report and evaluation for this criterion? For example

- *Overview of the professorships assigned to the program*
- *Course integration matrix*
- *(Short) CVs of the faculty members assigned to the xy program*
- *If applicable, staffing growth and/or appointment planning for the xy program*
- *Location where the measures for staff selection and qualification are described (e.g., self-report, separate document xy)*
- ...

Status

Direct quotations from the self-report must be marked as such.

[Text]

Assessment: Strengths and Areas for Development

[Text]

Proposed Decision

Compliant / Non-compliant. *In case of non-compliance: Justification and, if applicable, proposal for a condition.*

The review panel proposes the following condition(s):

[Text]

If applicable: The review panel makes the following recommendations: [Text]

Sub-program n Evidence

Which key documents are referenced in the status report and evaluation for this criterion? For example

- *Overview of the professorships assigned to the program*
- *Course integration matrix*
- *(Short) CVs of the faculty members assigned to program xy*
- *If applicable, staffing growth and/or appointment planning for the xy program*
- *Location where the measures for staff selection and qualification are described (e.g., self-report, separate document xy)*
- ...

Status

Direct quotations from the self-report must be marked as such.

[Text]

Evaluation: Strengths and Areas for Development

[Text]

Recommended decision

Met / Not met. *If not met: Reason and, if applicable, a proposed condition.*

The review panel proposes the following condition(s): [Text]

If applicable: The review panel makes the following recommendations:

[Text]

3.4.5 Resource allocation (Section 12(3) MRVO)

a) Aspects common to all (sub)programs (if applicable)

Facts and assessments that apply equally to all (sub)programs in the bundle must be documented in this section. Such cross-program aspects should not be addressed again in the program-specific assessments; a cross-reference to this section is sufficient there.

Verbatim excerpts from the self-evaluation report must be marked as quotations.

[Text]

b) (Sub)Program-Specific Evaluation of

Combined Program 01

Evidence

Which key documents are referenced in the status report and evaluation for this criterion? For example

- *Site visit by the evaluation team as part of the on-site inspection*
- *Location where the facilities, equipment, laboratories, and similar resources are described (e.g., self-evaluation report, separate document xy)*
- *If applicable, location where the IT equipment required for the degree program is described (e.g., self-report, separate document xy)*
- *If applicable, investment plans for the accreditation period*
- *If applicable, library concept*
- ...

Status

Direct quotations from the self-evaluation report must be marked as such.

[Text]

Evaluation: Strengths and Areas for Improvement

[Text]

Proposed Decision

Met / Not met. If not met: Justification and, if applicable, proposal for a condition.

The review panel proposes the following condition(s):

[Text]

If applicable: The review panel makes the following recommendations: [Text]

Sub-program 01 Evidence

Which key documents are referenced in the status report and evaluation for this criterion? For example

- *Inspection of the institution by the review panel as part of the on-site visit*
- *Location where the facilities, equipment, laboratories, and the like are described (e.g., self-report, separate document xy)*
- *If applicable, the location where the IT equipment required for the degree program is described (e.g., self-report, separate document xy)*
- *If applicable, investment planning during the accreditation period*
- *If applicable, library concept*
- ...

Status

Direct quotations from the self-evaluation report must be marked as such.

[Text]

Evaluation: Strengths and Areas for Improvement

[Text]

Proposed Decision

Met / Not met. *If not met: Justification and, if applicable, proposal for a condition.*

The review panel proposes the following condition(s): [Text]

If applicable: The review panel makes the following recommendations: [Text]

Sub-program n Evidence

Which key documents are referenced in the status report and evaluation for this criterion? For example

- *Inspection of the institution by the review panel as part of the on-site visit*
- *Location where the facilities, equipment, laboratories, and the like are described (e.g., self-report, separate document xy)*
- *If applicable, the location where the IT equipment required for the program is described (e.g., self-report, separate document xy)*
- *If applicable, investment planning during the accreditation period*
- *If applicable, library concept*
- ...

Status

Direct quotations from the self-evaluation report must be marked as such.

[Text]

Evaluation: Strengths and Areas for Improvement

[Text]

Proposed Decision

Met / Not met. *If not met: Justification and, if applicable, proposal for a condition.*

The review panel proposes the following condition(s): [Text]

If applicable: The panel of experts makes the following recommendations:

[Text]

3.4.6 Examination System (Section 12(4) MRVO)

a) Aspects common to all (sub)programs (if applicable)

Facts and assessments that apply equally to all (sub)programs in the bundle must be documented in this section. Such cross-program aspects should not be repeated in the program-specific assessments; a cross-reference to this section is sufficient there.

Verbatim excerpts from the self-evaluation report must be marked as quotations.

[Text]

b) (Sub)Program-Specific Evaluation of

Combined Program 01

Evidence

Which key documents are referenced in the status and evaluation for this criterion? For example

- *Regulatory documents in which the examination formats used in the program are bindingly defined (e.g., Study and Examination Regulations for Program XY, Framework Examination/General Examination Regulations of University XY)*
- *If applicable, the examination concept for the xy program*
- *Module Handbook for the xy Program*
- *Review of exams, theses, project work, and similar materials by the review panel as part of the on-site visit*
- ...

Status

Direct quotations from the self-evaluation report must be marked as such.

[Text]

Evaluation: Strengths and Areas for Improvement

[Text]

Proposed Decision

Met / Not met. *If not met: Justification and, if applicable, proposal for a condition.*

The review panel proposes the following condition(s):

[Text]

If applicable: The review panel makes the following recommendations: [Text]

Sub-program 01 Evidence

Which key documents are referenced in the status report and evaluation for this criterion? For example

- *Regulatory documents in which the examination formats used in the program are bindingly defined (e.g., Study and Examination Regulations for the xy program, Framework Examination Regulations/General Examination Regulations of xy University)*
- *If applicable, the examination concept for the xy program*
- *Module Handbook for the xy Program*
- *Review of exams, theses, project work, and similar materials by the review panel as part of the on-site visit*
- ...

Status

Direct quotations from the self-evaluation report must be marked as such.

[Text]

Evaluation: Strengths and Areas for Improvement

[Text]

Proposed Decision

Met / Not met. *If not met: Justification and, if applicable, proposal for a condition.*

The review panel proposes the following condition(s): [Text]

If applicable: The review panel makes the following recommendations: [Text]

Sub-program n Evidence

Which key documents are referenced in the status and evaluation of this criterion? For example

- *Regulatory documents in which the examination formats used in the program are bindingly defined (e.g., Study and Examination Regulations for the xy program, Framework Examination Regulations/General Examination Regulations of xy University)*
- *If applicable, the examination concept for the xy program*
- *Course Catalog for the xy Program*
- *Review of exams, theses, project work, and similar materials by the review panel as part of the on-site visit*
- ...

Status

Direct quotations from the self-evaluation report must be marked as such.

[Text]

Evaluation: Strengths and Areas for Improvement

[Text]

Proposed Decision

Met / Not met. *If not met: Justification and, if applicable, proposal for a condition.*

The review panel proposes the following condition(s): [Text]

If applicable: The review committee makes the following recommendations:

[Text]

3.4.7 Feasibility of study (§ 12(5) MRVO)

a) (Partially) cross-program aspects (if applicable)

Facts and assessments that apply equally to all (sub)programs within the bundle must be documented in this section. Such aspects common to all (sub)programs should not be repeated in the (sub)program-specific assessments; a cross-reference to this section is sufficient there.

Verbatim excerpts from the self-evaluation report must be marked as quotations.

[Text]

b) (Sub)Program-Specific Evaluation of

Combined Program 01

Evidence

Which key documents are referenced in the status and evaluation for this criterion? For example

- *Study and Examination Regulations for the degree program xy (if applicable, in the language of instruction if it is not exclusively German)*
- *Study plan(s) for the xy program*
- *Module handbook for the degree program xy (if applicable, in the language of instruction if it is not exclusively German)*
- *If applicable, examination concept for the degree program xy*
- *Study progress analyses for the xy degree program*
- *Results of ongoing monitoring of academic success (e.g., from course evaluations, workload surveys, program evaluations, and graduate surveys) with regard to the feasibility of the program and the measures derived from these findings*
- ...

Status

Direct quotations from the self-report must be marked as such.

[Text]

Assessment: Strengths and Areas for Improvement

[Text]

Proposed Decision

Met / Not met. *If not met: Justification and, if applicable, proposal for a condition.*

The review panel proposes the following condition(s):

[Text]

If applicable: The review panel makes the following recommendations: [Text]

Sub-program 01 Evidence

Which key documents are referenced in the status report and evaluation for this criterion? For example

- *Study and Examination Regulations for the degree program xy (if applicable, in the language of instruction if it is not exclusively German)*
- *Study plan(s) for the degree program xy*
- *Course Catalog for the xy Program (in the language of instruction, if applicable, when it is not exclusively German)*
- *If applicable, examination guidelines for the xy degree program*
- *Program progress analyses for the xy degree program*
- *Results of the continuous monitoring of academic success (e.g., from teaching evaluations, workload surveys, program evaluations, graduate surveys) with regard to the program's feasibility and measures derived therefrom*
- ...

Status

Direct quotations from the self-evaluation report must be marked as such.

[Text]

Assessment: Strengths and Areas for Improvement

[Text]

Proposed Decision

Met / Not met. *If not met: Justification and, if applicable, proposal for a condition.*

The review panel proposes the following condition(s):

[Text]

If applicable: The review panel makes the following recommendations: [Text]

Sub-program n Evidence

Which key documents are referenced in the status report and evaluation for this criterion? For example

- *Study and Examination Regulations for the degree program xy (if applicable, in the language of instruction if it is not exclusively German)*
- *Study plan(s) for the degree program xy*
- *Module handbook for the degree program xy (if applicable, in the language of instruction if it is not exclusively German)*
- *If applicable, examination concept for the degree program xy*
- *Study progress analyses for the xy degree program*
- *Results of the continuous monitoring of academic success (e.g., from teaching evaluations, workload surveys, program evaluations, graduate surveys) with regard to the program's feasibility and measures derived therefrom*
- ...

Status

Direct quotations from the self-report must be marked as such.

[Text]

Assessment: Strengths and Areas for Improvement

[Text]

Proposed decision

Met / Not met. *If not met: Reason and, if applicable, a proposed condition.*

The review panel proposes the following condition(s): [Text]

If applicable: The review panel makes the following recommendations: [Text]

3.4.8 If applicable: Specific profile requirements (Section 12(6) MRVO)

a) Aspects common to all (sub)programs (if applicable)

Facts and evaluations that apply equally to all (sub)programs in the bundle must be documented in this section. Such cross-program aspects should not be addressed again in the program-specific evaluations; a cross-reference to this section is sufficient there.

Verbatim excerpts from the self-evaluation report must be marked as quotations.

[Text]

b) (Sub)Program-Specific Evaluation of

Combined Program 01

Evidence

Which key documents are referenced in the status report and evaluation for this criterion? For example

- *Description of the program's distinctive features and the associated institutional requirements in the self-evaluation report and/or a separate document xy*
- *For online/distance/hybrid degree programs: didactic concept*
- *For online/distance/hybrid degree programs: Location where the technical infrastructure (e.g., teaching/learning platform, online library, etc.) is described (e.g., self-report, separate document xy)*
- *For online/distance/hybrid degree programs: if applicable, evaluation of the technical infrastructure (teaching/learning platform, online library, etc.) by the review panel during the on-site visit*
- *For online/distance/hybrid degree programs: teaching/learning materials, study guides, etc., if applicable*
- *For international degree programs conducted entirely in a foreign language: relevant course materials, module descriptions, etc., in the language of instruction*
- *For part-time degree programs: Location where the measures ensuring the compatibility of studies and work are described (e.g., self-report, separate document xy)*

- ...

Status

Direct quotations from the self-report must be marked as such.

[Text]

Evaluation: Strengths and Areas for Development

[Text]

Proposed Decision

Met / Not met. *If not met: Justification and, if applicable, proposal for a condition.*

The review panel proposes the following condition(s):

[Text]

If applicable: The review panel makes the following recommendations: [Text]

Sub-program 01 Evidence

Which key documents are referenced in the status report and evaluation for this criterion? For example

- *Description of the program's profile and the associated institutional requirements in the self-evaluation report and/or a separate document xy*
- *For online/distance/hybrid degree programs: didactic concept*
- *For online/distance/hybrid degree programs: Location where the technical infrastructure (e.g., teaching/learning platform, online library, etc.) is described (e.g., self-report, separate document xy)*
- *For online/distance/hybrid degree programs: if applicable, evaluation of the technical infrastructure (teaching/learning platform, online library, etc.) by the review panel as part of the on-site visit*
- *For online, distance learning, or hybrid programs: teaching and learning materials, course materials, etc., as applicable*
- *For international degree programs conducted entirely in a foreign language: relevant course materials, module descriptions, etc., in the language of instruction*

- *For part-time degree programs: Location where the measures ensuring the compatibility of studies and work are described (e.g., self-report, separate document xy)*
- ...

Status

Direct quotations from the self-report must be marked as such.

[Text]

Evaluation: Strengths and Areas for Development

[Text]

Proposed Decision

Met / Not met. *If not met: Justification and, if applicable, proposal for a condition.*

The review panel proposes the following condition(s):

[Text]

If applicable: The review panel makes the following recommendations: [Text]

Sub-program n Evidence

Which key documents are referenced in the status report and evaluation for this criterion? For example

- *Description of the program's profile and the associated institutional requirements in the self-evaluation report and/or a separate document xy*
- *For online/distance/hybrid degree programs: didactic concept*
- *For online/distance/hybrid degree programs: Location where the technical infrastructure (e.g., teaching/learning platform, online library, etc.) is described (e.g., self-evaluation report, separate document xy)*
- *For online/distance/hybrid degree programs: if applicable, evaluation of the technical infrastructure (teaching/learning platform, online library, etc.) by the review panel during the on-site visit*
- *For online/distance/hybrid degree programs: teaching/learning materials, study guides, etc., if applicable*

- *For international degree programs conducted entirely in a foreign language: relevant course materials, module descriptions, etc., in the language of instruction*
- *For part-time degree programs: Location where the measures ensuring the compatibility of studies and work are described (e.g., self-report, separate document xy)*
- ...

Status

Direct quotations from the self-report must be marked as such.

[Text]

Evaluation: Strengths and Areas for Development

[Text]

Proposed Decision

Met / Not met. *If not met: Justification and, if applicable, proposal for a condition.*

The review panel proposes the following condition(s):

[Text]

If applicable: The review panel makes the following recommendations: [Text]

3.4.9 *If applicable:* Dual (§ 12(7) MRVO)

a) Aspects common to all (sub)programs *(if applicable)*

Facts and assessments that apply equally to all (sub)programs within the bundle must be documented in this section. Such cross-program aspects should not be repeated in the program-specific assessments; a cross-reference to this section is sufficient there.

Verbatim excerpts from the self-evaluation report must be marked as quotations.

[Text]

b) (Sub)Program-Specific Evaluation of**Combined Program 01****Evidence**

Which key documents are referenced in the status report and evaluation for this criterion? For example

- *program documents (e.g., module descriptions, study and examination regulations) in which the systematic integration of content between the university and workplace learning environments
/ practice partners*
- *Sample cooperation agreement between the university and the company / practice partner*
- *If applicable: cooperation agreements with the operators of other learning locations (e.g., vocational school, Chamber of Industry and Commerce)*
- *...*

Status

Direct quotations from the self-report must be marked as such.

[Text]

Evaluation: Strengths and Areas for Development

[Text]

Proposed Decision

Met / Not met. *If not met: Justification and, if applicable, proposal for a condition.*

The review panel proposes the following condition(s):

[Text]

If applicable: The review panel makes the following recommendations: [Text]

Sub-program 01 Evidence

Which key documents are referenced in the status report and evaluation for this criterion? For example

- *program documents (e.g., module descriptions, study and examination regulations) in which the systematic integration of content between the university and workplace learning environments*

/ practice partners

- *Sample cooperation agreement between the university and companies / practice partners*
- *If applicable: cooperation agreements with the operators of other learning locations (e.g., vocational school, Chamber of Industry and Commerce)*
- ...

Status

Direct quotations from the self-report must be marked as such.

[Text]

Evaluation: Strengths and Areas for Development

[Text]

Proposed Decision

Met / Not met. *If not met: Justification and, if applicable, proposal for a condition.*

The review panel proposes the following condition(s):

[Text]

If applicable: The review panel makes the following recommendations: [Text]

Sub-program n Evidence

Which key documents are referenced in the status report and evaluation for this criterion? For example

- *program documents (e.g., module descriptions, study and examination regulations) in which the systematic integration of content between the university and workplace learning environments*
/ practice partners
- *Sample cooperation agreement between the university and companies / practice partners*
- *If applicable: cooperation agreements with the operators of other learning locations (e.g., vocational school, Chamber of Industry and Commerce)*
- ...

Status

Direct quotations from the self-report must be marked as such.

[Text]

Evaluation: Strengths and Areas for Development

[Text]

Proposed Decision

Met / Not met. *If not met: Justification and, if applicable, proposal for a condition.*

The review panel proposes the following condition(s):

[Text]

If applicable: The review panel makes the following recommendations: [Text]

3.5 Academic and Content-Related Structure of the Degree Programs (Section 13 MRVO)

3.5.1 Up-to-date nature of the academic and scientific requirements (Section 13(1) MRVO)

a) Aspects common to (some) degree programs (if applicable)

Facts and assessments that apply equally to all (sub)programs within the bundle must be documented in this section. Such aspects common to all (sub)programs should not be repeated in the (sub)program-specific assessments; a cross-reference to this section is sufficient there.

Verbatim excerpts from the self-evaluation report must be marked as quotations.

[Text]

b) (Sub)Program-Specific Evaluation of

Combined Program 01

Evidence

Which key documents are referenced in the status and evaluation for this criterion? For example

- *Study and Examination Regulations for the xy program*
- *Module handbook for the degree program xy*
- *Qualifications Framework for the subject/discipline xy (with indication of source)*
- *Location where measures / processes are described that ensure continuous*

ensures that the curriculum's subject-matter content and methodological and pedagogical approaches are reviewed and adapted (e.g., self-assessment)

- ...

Status

Direct quotations from the self-report must be marked as such.

[Text]

Evaluation: Strengths and Areas for Improvement

[Text]

Proposed Decision

Met / Not met. *If not met: Justification and, if applicable, proposal for a condition.*

The review panel proposes the following condition(s):

[Text]

If applicable: The review panel makes the following recommendations: [Text]

Sub-program 01 Evidence

Which key documents are referenced in the status report and evaluation for this criterion? For example

- *Study and Examination Regulations for the degree program xy*
- *Module Handbook for the xy program*
- *Qualifications Framework for the Subject/Discipline xy (including source)*
- *Location where measures/processes are described that ensure the continuous review and adaptation of the subject-specific content and the methodological and didactic approaches of the curriculum (e.g., self-report)*
- ...

Status

Direct quotations from the self-report must be marked as such.

[Text]

Evaluation: Strengths and Areas for Improvement

[Text]

Proposed Decision

Met / Not met. *If not met: Justification and, if applicable, proposal for a condition.*

The review panel proposes the following condition(s):

[Text]

If applicable: The review panel makes the following recommendations: [Text]

Sub-program n Evidence

Which key documents are referenced in the status report and evaluation for this criterion? For example

- *Study and Examination Regulations for the degree program xy*
- *Module Handbook for the xy Program*
- *Qualifications Framework for the Subject/Discipline xy (including source)*
- *Location where measures / processes are described that ensure the continuous review and adaptation of the subject-specific content and the methodological and didactic approaches of the curriculum (e.g., self-report)*
- ...

Status

Verbatim excerpts from the self-report must be marked as quotations.

[Text]

Evaluation: Strengths and Areas for Improvement

[Text]

Proposed Decision

Met / Not met. *If not met: Justification and, if applicable, proposal for a condition.*

The review panel proposes the following condition(s):

[Text]

If applicable: The review panel makes the following recommendations: [Text]

3.5.2 If applicable: Teacher training (Section 13(2) and (3) MRVO)

a) Aspects common to all (sub)programs (if applicable)

Facts and evaluations that apply equally to all (sub)programs within the bundle must be documented in this section. Such cross-program aspects should not be repeated in the program-specific evaluations; a cross-reference to this section is sufficient there.

Verbatim excerpts from the self-evaluation report must be marked as quotations.

[Text]

b) (Sub)Program-Specific Evaluation of

Combined Program 01

Evidence

Which key documents are referenced in the status report and evaluation for this criterion? For example

- *KMK Standards “Standards for Teacher Education: Educational Sciences”*
- *Joint state requirements for subject-specific sciences and subject-specific didactics in teacher education*
- *State school law, if applicable*
- *State regulations and other provisions regarding teacher education, if applicable*
- *Study and Examination Regulations and Module Handbook for the xy degree program*
- ...

Status

Direct quotations from the self-report must be marked as such.

[Text]

Evaluation: Strengths and Areas for Development

[Text]

Proposed Decision

Met / Not met. *If not met: Justification and, if applicable, proposal for a condition.*

The review panel proposes the following condition(s):

[Text]

If applicable: The review panel makes the following recommendations: [Text]

Sub-program 01 Evidence

Which key documents are referenced in the status report and evaluation for this criterion? For example

- *KMK Standards "Standards for Teacher Education: Educational Sciences"*
- *Joint state requirements for subject-specific sciences and subject-specific didactics in teacher education*
- *State school law, if applicable*
- *State regulations and other provisions regarding teacher education, if applicable*
- *Study and Examination Regulations and Module Handbook for the xy degree program*
- ...

Current status

Direct quotations from the self-report must be marked as such.

[Text]

Evaluation: Strengths and Areas for Development

[Text]

Proposed Decision

Met / Not met. *If not met: Justification and, if applicable, proposal for a condition.*

The review panel proposes the following condition(s):

[Text]

If applicable: The review panel makes the following recommendations: [Text]

Sub-program n Evidence

Which key documents are referenced in the status report and evaluation for this criterion? For example

- *KMK Standards "Standards for Teacher Education: Educational Sciences"*
- *Joint state requirements for subject-specific sciences and subject-specific didactics in teacher education*
- *State school law, if applicable*
- *State regulations and other provisions regarding teacher education, if applicable*
- *Study and Examination Regulations and Module Handbook for the xy degree program*
- ...

Current status

Direct quotations from the self-report must be marked as such.

[Text]

Evaluation: Strengths and Areas for Development

[Text]

Proposed Decision

Met / Not met. *If not met: Justification and, if applicable, proposal for a condition.*

The review panel proposes the following condition(s): [Text]

If applicable: The review committee makes the following recommendations:

[Text]

3.6 Academic Success (Section 14 MRVO)

a) Aspects common to all (sub)programs (if applicable)

Facts and evaluations that apply equally to all (sub)programs in the bundle must be documented in this section. Such cross-program aspects should not be addressed again in the program-specific evaluations; a cross-reference to this section is sufficient there.

Direct quotations from the self-report must be marked as such.

[Text]

b) (Partial) Program-Specific Evaluation

Combined Degree Program 01

Evidence

Which key documents are referenced in the status report and evaluation for this criterion? For example

- *Document(s) in which the instruments of continuous monitoring used in the program are described and defined (e.g., evaluation regulations, QM manual, process descriptions, etc.)*
- *Sample questionnaire for program, teaching evaluation, or graduate survey*
- *(Sample) evaluation results from the previous accreditation period*
- ...

Status

Direct quotations from the self-evaluation report must be marked as such.

[Text]

Assessment: Strengths and Areas for Improvement

[Text]

Proposed Decision

Met / Not met. *If not met: Justification and, if applicable, proposal for a condition.*

The review panel proposes the following condition(s):

[Text]

If applicable: The review panel makes the following recommendations: [Text]

Sub-program 01 Evidence

Which key documents are referenced in the status report and evaluation for this criterion? For example

- *Document(s) in which the instruments of continuous monitoring used in the program are described and defined (e.g., evaluation regulations, QM manual, process descriptions, etc.)*
- *Sample questionnaire for program, teaching evaluation, or graduate survey*
- *(Sample) evaluation results from the previous accreditation period*
- ...

Status

Direct quotations from the self-evaluation report must be marked as such.

[Text]

Assessment: Strengths and Areas for Improvement

[Text]

Proposed Decision

Met / Not met. *If not met: Justification and, if applicable, proposal for a condition.*

The review panel proposes the following condition(s): [Text]

If applicable: The review panel makes the following recommendations: [Text]

Sub-program n Evidence

Which key documents are referenced in the status report and evaluation for this criterion? For example

- *Document(s) in which the instruments used for continuous monitoring in the program are described and defined (e.g., evaluation regulations, QM manual, process descriptions, etc.)*
- *Sample questionnaire for program, teaching evaluation, or graduate survey*
- *(Sample) evaluation results from the previous accreditation period*
- ...

Status

Direct quotations from the self-evaluation report must be marked as such.

[Text]

Assessment: Strengths and Areas for Improvement

[Text]

Proposed Decision

Met / Not met. If not met: Justification and, if applicable, proposal for a condition.

The review panel proposes the following condition(s):

[Text]

Where applicable: The review panel makes the following recommendations:

[Text]

3.7 Diversity, gender equality, and equal opportunity (§ 15 MRVO)**a) Aspects common to all (sub)programs (if applicable)**

Findings and evaluations that apply equally to all (sub)programs within the cluster must be documented in this section. Such cross-program aspects should not be repeated in the program-specific evaluations; a cross-reference to this section is sufficient there.

Verbatim excerpts from the self-evaluation report must be marked as quotations.

[Text]

b) (Sub)Program-Specific Evaluation of Combined Program 01

Evidence

Which key documents are referenced in the status report and evaluation for this criterion? For example

- *University-wide and, if available, program-specific policies on diversity, gender equity, and support for students in special circumstances*
- *Section describing how the university-wide policies on diversity, gender equality, and support for students in special circumstances are implemented within the program (e.g., self-assessment report, separate document xy)*
- ...

Status

Direct quotations from the self-report must be marked as such.

[Text]

Evaluation: Strengths and Areas for Improvement

[Text]

Proposed Decision

Met / Not met. If not met: Justification and, if applicable, proposal for a condition.

The review panel proposes the following condition(s): [Text]

If applicable: The review panel makes the following recommendations: [Text]

Sub-program 01 Evidence

Which key documents are referenced in the status report and evaluation for this criterion? For example

- *University-wide and, if available, program-specific policies on addressing diversity, gender equity, and supporting students in special circumstances*
- *Section describing how the university-wide policies on diversity, gender equality, and support for students in special circumstances are implemented within the program (e.g., self-assessment report, separate document xy)*
- ...

Status

Direct quotations from the self-report must be marked as such.

[Text]

Evaluation: Strengths and Areas for Improvement

[Text]

Proposed Decision

Met / Not met. *If not met: Justification and, if applicable, proposal for a condition.*

The review panel proposes the following condition(s):

[Text]

If applicable: The review panel makes the following recommendations: [Text]

Sub-program n Evidence

Which key documents are referenced in the status report and evaluation for this criterion? For example

- *University-wide and, where available, program-specific strategies for addressing*

diversity, gender equity, and support for students in special circumstances

- *Location where it is described how the university-wide policies on diversity, gender equality, and support for students in special circumstances are implemented within the program (e.g., self-report, separate document xy)*
- ...

Status

Direct quotations from the self-report must be marked as such.

[Text]

Evaluation: Strengths and Areas for Improvement

[Text]

Proposed Decision

Met / Not met. *If not met: Justification and, if applicable, proposal for a condition.*

The review panel proposes the following condition(s):

[Text]

If applicable: The review panel makes the following recommendations: [Text]

3.8 If applicable: Special provisions for joint programs (Section 16 MRVO)

a) Aspects common to all (sub)programs (if applicable)

Facts and assessments that apply equally to all (sub)programs within the cluster must be documented in this section. Such cross-program aspects should not be repeated in the program-specific assessments; a cross-reference to this section is sufficient there.

Verbatim excerpts from the self-evaluation report must be marked as quotations.

[Text]

b) (Sub)Program-Specific Evaluation of**Combined Program 01****Evidence**

Which key documents are referenced in the status and evaluation for this criterion? For example

- *See the evidence regarding Sections 11, 12(1), 13, and 14 of the MRVO*
- *Study and Examination Regulations for the xy program*
- *Module Handbook for the xy program*
- *Program-specific copy of the Diploma Supplement and Transcript of Records*
- ...

Status

Direct quotations from the self-report must be marked as such.

[Text]

Evaluation: Strengths and Areas for Development

[Text]

Proposed Decision

Met / Not met. If not met: Justification and, if applicable, proposal for a condition.

The review panel proposes the following condition(s):

[Text]

If applicable: The review panel makes the following recommendations: [Text]

Sub-program 01 Evidence

Which key documents are referenced in the status and evaluation of this criterion? For example

- *See the evidence regarding Sections 11, 12(1), 13, and 14 of the MRVO*
- *Study and Examination Regulations for the xy program*
- *Module Handbook for the xy Program*

- *Program-specific copy of the Diploma Supplement and Transcript of Records*
- ...

Status

Direct quotations from the self-evaluation report must be marked as such.

[Text]

Evaluation: Strengths and Areas for Development

[Text]

Proposed Decision

Met / Not met. *If not met: Justification and, if applicable, proposal for a condition.*

The review panel proposes the following condition(s):

[Text]

If applicable: The review panel makes the following recommendations: [Text]

Sub-program n Evidence

Which key documents are referenced in the status and evaluation of this criterion? For example

- *See the evidence regarding Sections 11, 12(1), 13, and 14 of the MRVO*
- *Academic Regulations for the xy Program*
- *Module Handbook for the xy Program*
- *Program-specific copy of the Diploma Supplement and Transcript of Records*
- ...

Status

Direct quotations from the self-evaluation report must be marked as such.

[Text]

Evaluation: Strengths and Areas for Development

[Text]

Proposed Decision

Met / Not met. *If not met: Justification and, if applicable, proposal for a condition.*

The review panel proposes the following condition(s):

[Text]

If applicable: The review panel makes the following recommendations: [Text]

3.9 *If applicable:* Collaborations with non-higher education institutions (Section 19 MRVO)

a) Aspects common to all (sub)programs *(if applicable)*

Facts and assessments that apply equally to all (sub)programs within the bundle must be documented in this section. Such cross-program aspects should not be repeated in the program-specific assessments; a cross-reference to this section is sufficient there.

Verbatim excerpts from the self-evaluation report must be marked as quotations.

[Text]

b) (Sub)Program-Specific Evaluation of

Combined Program 01

Evidence

Which key documents are referenced in the status report and evaluation for this criterion? For example

- *Cooperation agreement between University X and non-university institution Y (specifying whether it has already been signed by both parties)*
- *If applicable, the location where the human and/or physical resources of the non-higher education institution are described (e.g., self-report, separate document xy)*
- ...

Status

Verbatim excerpts from the self-report must be marked as quotations.

[Text]

Evaluation: Strengths and Areas for Improvement

[Text]

Recommended decision

Met / Not met. *If not met: Reason and, if applicable, a proposed condition.*

The review panel proposes the following condition(s):

[Text]

If applicable: The review panel makes the following recommendations: [Text]

Sub-program 01 Evidence

Which key documents are referenced in the status report and evaluation for this criterion? For example

- *Cooperation agreement between University X and non-university institution Y (specifying whether it has already been signed by both parties)*
- *If applicable, the location where the human and/or physical resources of the non-higher education institution are described (e.g., self-report, separate document xy)*
- ...

Status

Verbatim excerpts from the self-report must be marked as quotations.

[Text]

Evaluation: Strengths and Areas for Improvement

[Text]

Proposed Decision

Met / Not met. *If not met: Justification and, if applicable, a proposed condition.*

The review panel proposes the following condition(s):

[Text]

If applicable: The review panel makes the following recommendations: [Text]

Sub-program n Evidence

Which key documents are referenced in the status report and evaluation for this criterion? For example

- *Cooperation agreement between University X and non-university institution Y (specifying whether it has already been signed by both parties)*
- *If applicable, the location where the human and/or physical resources of the non-higher education institution are described (e.g., self-report, separate document xy)*
- ...

Status

Verbatim excerpts from the self-report must be marked as quotations.

[Text]

Evaluation: Strengths and Areas for Improvement

[Text]

Proposed Decision

Met / Not met. *If not met: Justification and, if applicable, proposal for a condition.*

The review panel proposes the following condition(s): [Text]

If applicable: The review panel makes the following recommendations: [Text]

3.10 *If applicable*: University collaborations (Section 20 MRVO)

a) Cross-program aspects (*if applicable*)

Facts and assessments that apply equally to all (sub)programs within the cluster must be documented in this section. Such cross-program aspects should not be repeated in the program-specific assessments; a cross-reference to this section is sufficient there.

Verbatim excerpts from the self-evaluation report must be marked as quotations.

[Text]

b) (Sub)Program-Specific Evaluation of

Combined Program 01

Evidence

Which key documents are referenced in the status report and evaluation for this criterion? For example

- *Cooperation agreement between University X and partner university Y (specifying whether it has already been signed by both parties)*
- *If applicable, the location where the personnel and/or physical resources of the cooperating university are described (e.g., self-report, separate document xy)*
- ...

Status

Verbatim excerpts from the self-report must be marked as quotations.

[Text]

Evaluation: Strengths and Areas for Development

[Text]

Recommended decision

Met / Not met. *If not met: Reason and, if applicable, a proposed condition.*

The review panel proposes the following condition(s): [Text]

If applicable: The review panel makes the following recommendations: [Text]

Sub-program 01 Evidence

Which key documents are referenced in the status report and evaluation for this criterion? For example

- *Cooperation agreement between University X and partner university Y (specifying whether it has already been signed by both parties)*
- *If applicable, the location where the personnel and/or physical resources of the cooperating university are described (e.g., self-report, separate document xy)*
- ...

Status

Verbatim excerpts from the self-report must be marked as quotations.

[Text]

Evaluation: Strengths and Areas for Improvement

[Text]

Proposed Decision

Met / Not met. *If not met: Justification and, if applicable, proposal for a condition.*

The review panel proposes the following condition(s):

[Text]

If applicable: The review panel makes the following recommendations: [Text]

Sub-program n Evidence

Which key documents are referenced in the status report and evaluation for this criterion? For example

- *Cooperation agreement between University X and partner university Y (specifying whether it has already been signed by both parties)*
- *If applicable, the location where the personnel and/or physical resources of the cooperating institution are described (e.g., self-report, separate document xy)*
- ...

Status

Verbatim excerpts from the self-report must be marked as quotations.

[Text]

Evaluation: Strengths and Areas for Improvement

[Text]

Proposed Decision

Met / Not met. *If not met: Justification and, if applicable, proposal for a condition.*

The review panel proposes the following condition(s):

[Text]

If applicable: The review panel makes the following recommendations: [Text]

3.11 *If applicable:* Special criteria for bachelor's degree programs at vocational academies (§ 21 MRVO)

a) Aspects common to all (sub)programs (*if applicable*)

Facts and assessments that apply equally to all (sub)programs within the bundle must be documented in this section. Such cross-program aspects should not be repeated in the program-specific assessments; a cross-reference to this section is sufficient there.

Verbatim excerpts from the self-evaluation report must be marked as quotations.

[Text]

b) (Sub)Program-Specific Evaluation of**Combined Program 01****Evidence**

Which key documents are referenced in the status report and evaluation for this criterion? For example

- *See the evidence regarding Sections 12(2) and (7) of the MRVO*
- ...

Status

Verbatim excerpts from the self-report must be marked as quotations.

[Text]

Evaluation: Strengths and Areas for Development

[Text]

Recommended decision

Met / Not met. If not met: Reason and, if applicable, a proposed condition.

The review panel proposes the following condition(s):

[Text]

If applicable: The review panel makes the following recommendations: [Text]

Sub-program 01 Evidence

Which key documents are referenced in the status report and evaluation for this criterion? For example

- *See the evidence regarding Sections 12(2) and (7) of the MRVO*
- ...

Status

Verbatim excerpts from the self-report must be marked as quotations.

[Text]

Evaluation: Strengths and Areas for Development

[Text]

Proposed Decision

Met / Not met. *If not met: Justification and, if applicable, a proposed condition.*

The review panel proposes the following condition(s):

[Text]

If applicable: The review panel makes the following recommendations: [Text]

Sub-program n Evidence

Which key documents are referenced in the status report and evaluation for this criterion? For example

- *See the evidence regarding Sections 12(2) and (7) of the MRVO*
- ...

Status

Verbatim excerpts from the self-report must be marked as quotations.

[Text]

Evaluation: Strengths and Areas for Development

[Text]

Proposed Decision

Met / Not met. *If not met: Justification and, if applicable, proposal for a condition.*

The review panel proposes the following condition(s): [Text]

If applicable: The review panel makes the following recommendations: [Text]

4 Review Process

4.1 General Information

Approval of the bundle composition by the Accreditation Council (pursuant to § 30(2) MRVO).

If applicable, notes on specific aspects of the procedure, for example

- *Explanation of how the student representative body participated in the preparation of the self-evaluation report (Section 24(2), second sentence, MRVO),*
- *Justification if an on-site visit was waived (Section 24(5) MRVO),*
- *Connection to a procedure concerning the eligibility of a degree program under professional licensing law (Section 35 MRVO),*
- *justified deviations from the prescribed template, for example, if a procedure-specific circumstance requires the addition of a chapter,*
- *Explanation of the reasons for an unusually long duration of the proceedings,*
- *Reference to subject-specific reference systems,*
- *Changes/revisions during the ongoing procedure (notes on the procedure)*
- *References to dissenting opinions and where they can be found (e.g., accreditation report assessment regarding § XY, separate opinion, etc.)*

4.2 Legal Basis

State Treaty on Study Program Accreditation

Insert the state regulation of the university's state of residence here

4.3 Review Panel

- a) University professors Prof. Dr.
Prof. Dr.

- b) Representative from the professional field

c) Student

If applicable:

- Additional reviewers for regulated degree programs (Section 25(1), sentences 3 and 4, MRVO):

[Text]

- Additional external experts in an advisory capacity (Section 35(2) MRVO)

[Text]

5 Data Sheet

5.1 Program Information

5.1.1 Combined Degree Program 01

Erfassung "Abschlussquote"²⁾ und "Studierende nach Geschlecht"

Studiengang:

Angaben für den Zeitraum der vergangenen Akkreditierung³⁾ in Zahlen (Spalten 6, 9 und 12 in Prozent-Angaben)

semesterbezogene Kohorten	StudienanfängerInnen mit Studienbeginn in Semester X		AbsolventInnen in RSZ oder schneller mit Studienbeginn in Semester X			AbsolventInnen in ≤ RSZ + 1 Semester mit Studienbeginn in Semester X			AbsolventInnen in ≤ RSZ + 2 Semester mit Studienbeginn in Semester X		
	insgesamt	davon Frauen	insgesamt	davon Frauen	Abschlussquote in %	insgesamt	davon Frauen	Abschlussquote in %	insgesamt	davon Frauen	Abschlussquote in %
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
SS 2019 ¹⁾					#DIV/0!			#DIV/0!			#DIV/0!
WS 2018/2019					#DIV/0!			#DIV/0!			#DIV/0!
SS 2018					#DIV/0!			#DIV/0!			#DIV/0!
WS 2017/2018					#DIV/0!			#DIV/0!			#DIV/0!
SS 2017					#DIV/0!			#DIV/0!			#DIV/0!
WS 2016/2017					#DIV/0!			#DIV/0!			#DIV/0!
SS 2016					#DIV/0!			#DIV/0!			#DIV/0!
WS 2015/2016					#DIV/0!			#DIV/0!			#DIV/0!
SS 2015					#DIV/0!			#DIV/0!			#DIV/0!
WS 2014/2015					#DIV/0!			#DIV/0!			#DIV/0!
SS 2014					#DIV/0!			#DIV/0!			#DIV/0!
WS 2013/2014					#DIV/0!			#DIV/0!			#DIV/0!
SS 2013					#DIV/0!			#DIV/0!			#DIV/0!
WS 2012/2013					#DIV/0!			#DIV/0!			#DIV/0!
Insgesamt					#DIV/0!			#DIV/0!			#DIV/0!

¹⁾ Geben Sie absteigend die Semester der gültigen Akkreditierung ein, die in Spalte 1 eingegebenen Semesterangaben sind beispielhaft.

²⁾ Definition der kohortenbezogenen Abschlussquote: AbsolventInnen, die ihr Studium in RSZ plus bis zu zwei Semester absolviert haben.

Berechnung: "Absolventen mit Studienbeginn im Semester X" geteilt durch "Studienanfänger mit Studienbeginn im Semester X", d.h. für jedes Semester; hier beispielhaft ausgehend von den AbsolventInnen in RSZ + 2 Semester im WS 2012/2013.

³⁾ Das gilt auch für bereits laufende oder noch nicht akkreditierte Studiengänge.

5.1.2 Sub-program 01

Erfassung "Abschlussquote"²⁾ und "Studierende nach Geschlecht"

Studiengang:

Angaben für den Zeitraum der vergangenen Akkreditierung³⁾ in Zahlen (Spalten 6, 9 und 12 in Prozent-Angaben)

semesterbezogene Kohorten	StudienanfängerInnen mit Studienbeginn in Semester X		AbsolventInnen in RSZ oder schneller mit Studienbeginn in Semester X			AbsolventInnen in ≤ RSZ + 1 Semester mit Studienbeginn in Semester X			AbsolventInnen in ≤ RSZ + 2 Semester mit Studienbeginn in Semester X		
	insgesamt	davon Frauen	insgesamt	davon Frauen	Abschlussquote in %	insgesamt	davon Frauen	Abschlussquote in %	insgesamt	davon Frauen	Abschlussquote in %
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
SS 2019 ¹⁾					#DIV/0!			#DIV/0!			#DIV/0!
WS 2018/2019					#DIV/0!			#DIV/0!			#DIV/0!
SS 2018					#DIV/0!			#DIV/0!			#DIV/0!
WS 2017/2018					#DIV/0!			#DIV/0!			#DIV/0!
SS 2017					#DIV/0!			#DIV/0!			#DIV/0!
WS 2016/2017					#DIV/0!			#DIV/0!			#DIV/0!
SS 2016					#DIV/0!			#DIV/0!			#DIV/0!
WS 2015/2016					#DIV/0!			#DIV/0!			#DIV/0!
SS 2015					#DIV/0!			#DIV/0!			#DIV/0!
WS 2014/2015					#DIV/0!			#DIV/0!			#DIV/0!
SS 2014					#DIV/0!			#DIV/0!			#DIV/0!
WS 2013/2014					#DIV/0!			#DIV/0!			#DIV/0!
SS 2013					#DIV/0!			#DIV/0!			#DIV/0!
WS 2012/2013					#DIV/0!			#DIV/0!			#DIV/0!
Insgesamt					#DIV/0!			#DIV/0!			#DIV/0!

¹⁾ Geben Sie absteigend die Semester der gültigen Akkreditierung ein, die in Spalte 1 eingegebenen Semesterangaben sind beispielhaft.

²⁾ Definition der kohortenbezogenen Abschlussquote: AbsolventInnen, die ihr Studium in RSZ plus bis zu zwei Semester absolviert haben.

Berechnung: "Absolventen mit Studienbeginn im Semester X" geteilt durch "Studienanfänger mit Studienbeginn im Semester X", d.h. für jedes Semester; hier beispielhaft ausgehend von den AbsolventInnen in RSZ + 2 Semester im WS 2012/2013.

³⁾ Das gilt auch für bereits laufende oder noch nicht akkreditierte Studiengänge.

5.1.3 Sub-program n

Erfassung "Abschlussquote"²⁾ und "Studierende nach Geschlecht"

Studiengang:

Angaben für den Zeitraum der vergangenen Akkreditierung³⁾ in Zahlen (Spalten 6, 9 und 12 in Prozent-Angaben)

semesterbezogene Kohorten	StudienanfängerInnen mit Studienbeginn in Semester X		AbsolventInnen in RSZ oder schneller mit Studienbeginn in Semester X			AbsolventInnen in ≤ RSZ + 1 Semester mit Studienbeginn in Semester X			AbsolventInnen in ≤ RSZ + 2 Semester mit Studienbeginn in Semester X		
	insgesamt	davon Frauen	insgesamt	davon Frauen	Abschluss- quote in %	insgesamt	davon Frauen	Abschluss- quote in %	insgesamt	davon Frauen	Abschluss- quote in %
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
SS 2019 ¹⁾					#DIV/0!			#DIV/0!			#DIV/0!
WS 2018/2019					#DIV/0!			#DIV/0!			#DIV/0!
SS 2018					#DIV/0!			#DIV/0!			#DIV/0!
WS 2017/2018					#DIV/0!			#DIV/0!			#DIV/0!
SS 2017					#DIV/0!			#DIV/0!			#DIV/0!
WS 2016/2017					#DIV/0!			#DIV/0!			#DIV/0!
SS 2016					#DIV/0!			#DIV/0!			#DIV/0!
WS 2015/2016					#DIV/0!			#DIV/0!			#DIV/0!
SS 2015					#DIV/0!			#DIV/0!			#DIV/0!
WS 2014/2015					#DIV/0!			#DIV/0!			#DIV/0!
SS 2014					#DIV/0!			#DIV/0!			#DIV/0!
WS 2013/2014					#DIV/0!			#DIV/0!			#DIV/0!
SS 2013					#DIV/0!			#DIV/0!			#DIV/0!
WS 2012/2013					#DIV/0!			#DIV/0!			#DIV/0!
Insgesamt					#DIV/0!			#DIV/0!			#DIV/0!

¹⁾ Geben Sie absteigend die Semester der gültigen Akkreditierung ein, die in Spalte 1 eingegebenen Semesterangaben sind beispielhaft.²⁾ Definition der kohortenbezogenen Abschlussquote: AbsolventInnen, die ihr Studium in RSZ plus bis zu zwei Semester absolviert haben.

Berechnung: "Absolventen mit Studienbeginn im Semester X" geteilt durch "Studienanfänger mit Studienbeginn im Semester X", d.h. für jedes Semester; hier beispielhaft ausgehend von den AbsolventInnen in RSZ + 2 Semester im WS 2012/2013.

³⁾ Das gilt auch für bereits laufende oder noch nicht akkreditierte Studiengänge.

5.2 Accreditation Information

Date of agreement between the university and the agency:	Date
Receipt of self-documentation:	Date
Date of inspection:	Date
Groups of people with whom interviews were conducted:	
The following facilities and equipment were inspected (optional, if relevant):	

Note: If the information requested below regarding previous accreditation periods and agencies applies equally to all degree programs, the data does not need to be entered separately. In such a case, it is sufficient to enter the data once and indicate the data reference accordingly in the heading of the form block.

5.2.1 Combined Degree Program 01

Initially accredited on: Review by agency:	From date to date
Re-accredited (1): Review by agency:	From date to date
Re-accredited (2): Review by agency:	From date to date
Re-accredited (n): Assessment by agency:	From date to date
Extension of deadline, if applicable	From date to date

5.2.2 Sub-program 01

Initially accredited on: Evaluation by agency:	From date to date
--	-------------------

Re-accredited (1): Review by agency:	From date to date
Reaccredited (2): Review by agency:	From date to date
Re-accredited (n): Review by agency:	From date to date
Extension of deadline, if applicable	From date to date

5.2.3 Sub-program n

Initially accredited on: Evaluation by agency:	From date to date
Re-accredited (1): Review by agency:	From date to date
Re-accredited (2): Review by agency:	From date to date
Re-accredited (n): Assessment by agency:	From date to date
Extension of deadline, if applicable	From date to date

6 Glossary

Accreditation report	The accreditation report consists of the evaluation report prepared by the agency (regarding compliance with the formal criteria) and the expert opinion prepared by the panel of experts (regarding compliance with the substantive criteria).
Accreditation Process	The entire process from the institution's submission of the application to the Agency through to the decision by the Accreditation Council (review process + application process)
Application process	Procedure from the submission of the application by the institution to the Accreditation Council until the decision is made by the Accreditation Council
Review process	The process from the institution's submission of an application to an agency until the final accreditation report is completed
Expert opinion	The evaluation report is prepared by the evaluation team and assesses compliance with the academic and content-related criteria
Internal accreditation process	An internal university procedure in which a system-accredited institution verifies compliance with the formal and academic-content criteria at the program level.
MRVO	Model Regulation
Inspection report	The audit report is prepared by the agency and assesses compliance with the formal criteria
Reaccreditation	Renewal of accreditation following a previous initial or reaccreditation.
StAkkStV	State Treaty on Study Program Accreditation