

Accreditation Report:

System Accreditation *Raster*

Version 03.1 – August 1, 2025

[▶ Table of Contents](#)

University	
Additional information, if applicable	
If applicable, academic organizational unit	

Subsystem Accreditation	<input type="checkbox"/>
Initial accreditation	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reaccreditation No. (Number)	
Responsible agency	
Responsible Officer	
Accreditation report dated	Date

Contents

1	Summary	3
1.1	Brief Profile of the University	3
1.2	Overview of the Quality Management System	3
1.3	Summary Quality Assessment.....	3
1.4	The Agency's proposed decision regarding compliance with the formal criteria as per the review report (Section 1)	4
1.5	Proposed decision by the review panel regarding compliance with the technical and content-related criteria as per the review report (Section 2)	4
2	Review report	5
3	Expert opinion: Fulfilment of the technical and content-related criteria	6
3.1	Key areas of the evaluation / Focus of quality development.....	6
3.2	Concept of the quality management system at system-accredited universities (objectives, processes, instruments) (Section 17 MRVO).....	6
3.2.1	Key Educational Objectives for Teaching.....	6
3.2.2	Systematic implementation of the criteria at the program level	7
3.2.3	Decision-making processes, duties, and responsibilities.....	7
3.2.4	Deadlines and bundles	8
3.2.5	Involvement of internal member groups and external expertise.....	9
3.2.6	Independence of Quality Assessments	9
3.2.7	Areas of service and resource allocation	10
3.2.8	Impact and Further Development	10
3.3	Measures for Implementing the Quality Management Concept of System-Accredited Universities (Section 18 MRVO).....	11
3.3.1	Regular evaluation of degree programs	11
3.3.2	Requirements for participation and approval (teacher education, theology, and religion)	11
3.3.3	Data collection	12
3.3.4	Documentation and Publication.....	13
3.4	Cooperation at the program level (Section 20(2) MRVO).....	13
3.5	Results of the random samples	14
4	Review procedure	15
4.1	General Information	15
4.2	Legal Basis	15
4.3	Panel of Experts.....	15
4.4	List of Abbreviations.....	17
5	Data Sheet	18
5.1	Accreditation Information	18
6	Glossary	19

1 Summary

1.1 Brief Profile of the University

(≤ one page)

This section should include information on the following topics/matters:

- *Profile of the university, academic focus, research priorities, etc., with special consideration given to the academic unit responsible for program administration, if applicable*
- *Distinctive features*
- *Number of bachelor's and master's degree programs*
- *Number of faculties / departments*
- *Number of students*
- *Number of faculty members / professors*

1.2 Overview of the Quality Management System

(≤ three pages)

This chapter should address the following topics/issues:

- *Model description of the QM system: central bodies, responsibilities, processes, and procedures;*
- *Granting and revocation of the AR seal: Which bodies decide on the internal accreditation of degree programs, on what grounds, and with what consequences?*
- *Key documents: Which documents are relevant for understanding the QM system, and which specific version forms the basis for the review committee's proposed decision?*

1.3 Summary quality assessment

(≤ three pages)

This chapter should contain assessments on the following topics/issues:

- *Overall impression: Strengths and weaknesses of the QM system, summary of the evaluation*
- *Key findings from the sample*

- *For reaccreditation: Further development during the accreditation period*
- *If applicable, justification for the proposed denial of accreditation*

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

For initial accreditation: Pursuant to Section 23(1)(3) of the MRVO, at least one degree program must have undergone the quality management system.

- The university has provided evidence
- The university has not provided evidence

For reaccreditation: Pursuant to Section 23(1)(4) MRVO, all bachelor's and master's degree programs must have undergone the quality management system at least once.

- The university has provided proof
- The university has not provided proof

1.5 Proposed decision of the review panel regarding fulfillment of the subject-specific criteria as per the report (Section 2)

The subject-specific and content-related 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:

Requirement 1 (Criterion ##): [Text]

Requirement n (Criterion ##): [Text]

If serious deficiencies are identified: The expert panel recommends that the Accreditation Council deny accreditation.

Comment 1 (Criterion ##): [Text]

Comment n (Criterion ##): [Text]

2 Inspection Report

(pursuant to Art. 3(3) StAkkStV and § 23(1)(3) and (4) MRVO¹)

For initial accreditation, it must be demonstrated that at least one degree program has undergone the quality management system.

For reaccreditation, it must be demonstrated that, in principle, all bachelor's and master's degree programs have undergone the quality management system at least once.

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 residence here##** (see also 4.2). 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](#).

3 Expert Opinion: Fulfilment of the Academic and Content-Related Criteria

(pursuant to Art. 3(2), sentence 1, no. 4, in conjunction with Art. 4(3) of the StAkkStV; §§ 17, 18, 20(2), and 31 of the MRVO²)

3.1 Key Areas of Evaluation / Focus of Quality Development

This chapter is particularly important in the context of reaccreditation. Topics that are of particular interest from the perspective of the review panel—whether because the institution has intensively further developed its QM system in a specific area and thus broken new ground, or because problematic aspects have come to light that require more in-depth discussion—may be addressed in greater detail in the accreditation report than those aspects where a well-functioning routine can be observed.

During reaccreditation, the further development of the quality management system is of particular interest. Therefore, the review panel should outline the changes made during the accreditation period, as well as the associated objectives and discussions, and briefly explain any new priorities established in the subsequent report, if applicable. Also of interest in this context is how the recommendations and comments from the previous accreditation were addressed.

3.2 Concept of the quality management system at system-accredited universities (objectives, processes, instruments) (Section 17 MRVO)

3.2.1 Core educational objectives for teaching

§ 17(1) sentences 1 and 2 MRVO: The institution has central educational objectives for teaching that are reflected in the institution's mission statement and in the curricula of the degree programs. The quality management system adheres to the values and standards of the mission statement for teaching and aims to continuously improve the quality of education

Status

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

[Text]

Assessment: Strengths and Areas for Improvement

[Text]

² 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 residence here##** (see also 4.2). 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](#).

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]

3.2.2 Systematic implementation of the criteria at the program level

§ 17(1) Sentence 3 MRVO: The quality management system ensures the systematic implementation of the formal and subject-specific criteria in accordance with Parts 2 and 3 of the MRVO.

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]

Where applicable: The panel of experts makes the following recommendations: [Text]

3.2.3 Decision-making processes, competences, and responsibilities

Section 17(1), Sentence 4 MRVO: The institution has established and published institution-wide the decision-making processes, authorities, and responsibilities for the establishment, review, further development, and discontinuation of degree programs, as well as the institution's own procedures for the accreditation of degree programs within the framework of its quality management system.

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]

3.2.4 Time limits and bundles

Section 17(1), sentences 5–7 MRVO: The university shall establish provisions regarding validity periods and deadlines in accordance with Sections 26 and 27. In doing so, the university may set shorter validity periods and deadlines.

If a quality management system provides for the formation of batches, § 30(1) shall apply *mutatis mutandis* with respect to batch sizes.

Status

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

[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]

3.2.5 Involvement of internal member groups and external expertise

Section 17(2), Sentence 1 MRVO: The quality management system was developed with the participation of the university's member groups and with the involvement of external expertise

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]

3.2.6 Independence of Quality Assessments

Section 17(2), Sentence 2 MRVO: The quality management system ensures the independence of quality assessments and includes procedures for handling internal conflicts at the institution as well as an internal grievance system.

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]

3.2.7 Areas of Activity and Resource Allocation

Section 17(2), Sentence 3 MRVO: The quality management system is based on closed-loop control systems, covers all service areas of the institution that are directly relevant to study and teaching, and is supported by adequate and sustainable resources.

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]

Where applicable: The panel of experts makes the following recommendations: [Text]

3.2.8 Impact and Further Development

§ 17(2) Sentence 4 MRVO: Functionality and effectiveness with regard to the quality of the program are regularly reviewed by the university and continuously improved.

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]

3.3 Measures for implementing the quality management concept of system-accredited institutions of higher education (Section 18 MRVO)

3.3.1 Regular evaluation of degree programs

Section 18(1) MRVO: The quality management system includes regular evaluations of degree programs and of the areas of performance relevant to teaching and studies by students from within and outside the institution, external academic experts, representatives from the professional field, and graduates; the institution may conduct the evaluation of formal criteria independently. If a need for action is identified, the necessary measures are taken and implemented.

Status

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

[Text]

Assessment: 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]

3.3.2 Requirements for Participation and Approval (Teacher Education, Theology, and Religion)

§ 18(2) MRVO: If, on the basis of the university's quality management system, evaluations are also conducted of teacher education programs, teacher education programs with the combined subject of Protestant or Catholic Theology/Religion, Protestant theological programs that qualify for the ministry, and other bachelor's and master's programs with

the combined subject of Protestant or Catholic Theology, the participation and approval requirements pursuant to § 25(1), sentences 3 through 5, MRVO shall apply accordingly.

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]

3.3.3 Data Collection

Section 18(3) MRVO: The data required for the implementation of the quality management system is collected university-wide and on a regular basis.

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]

3.3.4 Documentation and Publication

Section 18(4) MRVO: The institution shall document the evaluation of its degree programs by the internal quality management system, including the opinions of external stakeholders and the measures taken, and shall inform the institution's members, the sponsoring body, and the state in which it is located of this. For the information of the public, it shall make the accreditation decisions and a brief summary of the quality assessment available to the Accreditation Council for publication. Section 29, sentence 2 applies accordingly.

Status

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

[Text]

Assessment: 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 committee makes the following recommendations:

[Text]

3.4 Cooperation at the program level (Section 20(2) MRVO)

If a system-accredited institution of higher education enters into a program-specific cooperation with another institution of higher education, the system-accredited institution may award the program the Accreditation Council's seal in accordance with Section 22(4), sentence 2, provided that it is itself a degree-granting institution and ensures the implementation and quality of the program concept. The nature and scope of the cooperation are described, and the agreements underlying the cooperation are documented.

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]

3.5 Results of the spot checks

(pursuant to § 31 MRVO)

Program sample pursuant to § 31(2)(1) MRVO [Text]

Criterion sample pursuant to § 31(2)(2) MRVO [Text]

If applicable: Teacher training sample pursuant to § 31(3) MRVO [Text]

If applicable: Theology/Religion exam in accordance with § 31(3) MRVO [Text]

If applicable: Regulatory sample pursuant to § 31(3) MRVO [Text]

4 Review Procedure

4.1 General notes

If applicable, justification for limiting the procedure to a subunit of the academic organization pursuant to § 30(3) MRVO

If applicable, notes on special features of the procedure, for example

- *justified deviations from the prescribed framework, e.g., if a procedure-specific feature requires the addition of a chapter,*
- *Explanation of the reasons for an unusually long duration of the procedure,*
- *Changes / revisions during the ongoing procedure (notes on the procedure)*
- *Cooperation at the level of quality management systems in accordance with § 20(3) MRVO*
- *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.
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]

4.4 List of Abbreviations

Alphabetical list of all abbreviations used in the accreditation report

<i>Abbreviation</i>	<i>Meaning</i>

5 Data Sheet

5.1 Accreditation data

Date of contract between the university and the agency:	Date
Receipt of self-documentation:	Date
Date of the first site visit:	Date
Date of the second inspection	Date
Initially accredited on: by agency:	Date
Re-accredited (1): by agency:	From date to date
Re-accredited (2): by agency:	From date to date
Re-accredited (n): by agency	From date to date
Groups of people interviewed:	

6 Glossary

Accreditation Report	The accreditation report consists of the audit report prepared by the agency and the expert opinion prepared by the panel of experts (regarding compliance with the technical and content-related 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 university's submission of an application to an agency through to the completion of the final accreditation report
Expert opinion	The expert report is prepared by the expert panel and evaluates compliance with the academic and content-related criteria
Internal accreditation process	An internal university procedure in which a system-accredited university verifies compliance with the formal and subject-specific criteria at the program level.
MRVO	Model Regulation
Assessment report (in system accreditation)	The audit report is prepared by the agency and assesses whether <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • in the case of an application for system accreditation, at least one degree program has undergone the quality management process; • in the case of an application for system re-accreditation, all degree programs have undergone the quality management system at least once.
Reaccreditation	Re-accreditation following a previous initial or re-accreditation.
StAkkStV	State Treaty on Study Program Accreditation