



Foundation for the Accreditation of Study Programmes in Germany

**Expert Report with Recommendation for a Resolution Regarding the Application for
Re-Accreditation of the Central Evaluation and Accreditation Agency (ZEVA) Issued on**

December 29th 2005

1 Basic Procedure

1.1 Legal Mandate

According to § 2 para. 1 no. 1 of the Act on the Creation of a Foundation 'Foundation for the Accreditation of Study Programmes in Germany,' the Foundation has the mandate to accredit and re-accredit accreditation agencies and thus to grant on a time-limited basis the right to accredit study programmes by awarding the foundation's quality seal.

At its meeting on December 15th, 2005, the Accreditation Council determined "Criteria for the Accreditation of Accreditation Agencies" and thus the basis for the accreditation decision.

At the same meeting, with the resolution "Execution of the Re-Accreditation of the agencies ACQUIN, ASIIN and ZEvA," the Accreditation Council also decided on a procedure in three steps:

- Written Justification of the Application by ZEvA
- Review with site visit by a group of experts (a member of the Accreditation Council, a national expert, an international expert, a student member) and analysis of two documentations of accreditation procedures by the foundation's head office.
- Decision of the Accreditation Council after a hearing

1.2 International Recognition

To further the international recognition of decisions by the accreditation council and the accreditation agencies, by deciding on the Accreditation Criteria the Accreditation Council adopted first of all the *Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area*, as decided by the ministers responsible for higher education at the follow-up conference to Bologna in Bergen, May 2005. By taking these ESG into account, the Accreditation Council on the one hand stressed the central role of accreditation for the realisation of the goals of the Bologna process. On the other hand, it made clear that quality assurance in higher education and especially accreditation can no longer be oriented exclusively at national standards or specifics. Other important sources for the formulation of these criteria were the *Code of Good Practice of the European Consortium for Accreditation*, December 3rd, 2004 and the *Guidelines of Good Practice of the International Network for Quality Assurance Agencies in Higher Education*, April 2005.

2 Procedure

With their letter from December 29th, 2005, the Central Evaluation and Accreditation Agency (ZEVA) has handed in the application for re-accreditation as accreditation agency with the Accreditation Council.

With their letter from February 23rd, 2006, ZEVA handed in their application's justification along with further documents. During the course of the accreditation procedure, ZEVA handed in further documents or clarifications of existing documents on March 28th, March 30th and April 10th, 2006, complying with the experts' request.

By resolution of January 2nd-10th (by circulation procedure) appointed the following experts:

- Professor Dr. Reinhold R. Grimm, University of Jena, member of the Accreditation Council (chairman),
- Professor Dr. Dr. h.c. Alfred Kieser, University of Mannheim, national expert,
- Dr. Harry Brinkmann, University of Amsterdam, international expert,
- Martin Peters, University of Bremen, student member

From the foundation's head office, the peers received support from Managing Director Dr. Achim Hopbach.

The experts' first site visit took place on February 12th and 13th. After a preliminary discussion of the expert group on February 12th, on February 13th, the members participated in the all-day meeting of ZEVA's Standing Accreditation Commission (SAK) at Hanover University's Leibnizhaus. The experts received the relevant documents for the meeting in good time beforehand. After a further discussion on the evening of February 13th, on February 14 the experts visited ZEVA's office and had a discussion with ZEVA's scientific head, Prof. Dr. Rainer Künzel (partly), their managing director Hermann Reuke and the program officers from the accreditation department. Subsequently, the expert group inspected the office and discussed their impressions in an internal meeting.

On March 30th 2006, the expert group (without Professor Dr. Dr. h.c. Alfred Kieser) visited ZEVA's office a second time. On the side of ZEVA, their scientific head, Professor Dr. Rainer Künzel, and their managing director Hermann Reuke participated in this discussion. This second meeting served the purpose of answering still open questions concerning the written justification of the application for re-accreditation.

The Accreditation Council's head office has scrutinised the documentations of two accreditation procedures, handed in on March 14th, 2006.

At its 47th meeting on May 5th, 2006, the Accreditation Council heard the scientific head and the managing director. For the meeting, the Accreditation Council had ZEvA's justification without appendices as well as a preliminary assessment by the experts available.

ZEvA's application for re-accreditation, its justification and the documents handed in later are the basis for the report.

3 The Central Evaluation and Accreditation Agency Hanover (ZEvA)

3.1 Development

The Central Evaluation and Accreditation Agency Hanover has been founded under the name "Central Evaluation Agency of the Institutes of Higher Education in Lower Saxony" by resolutions of the *Landeshochschulkonferenz Niedersachsen* from July 1st, 1994 and March 9th, 1995. Per resolution on September 25th, 1998, a department for accreditation was added to ZEvA. Since 1999, ZEvA is carrying its current name. Per decision on February 4th, 2000, ZEvA was accredited by the Accreditation Council.

3.2 Organisation

ZEvA has the legal form of a dependent body of the University of Hanover. However, it is in its budget independent from the University of Hanover and administers their funds itself. While their activities in evaluation are financed from the central chapter of the Ministry of Culture and Science, ZEvA gains their funds for the execution of accreditations from fees the applying institutes are charged with. The state of Lower Saxony provides aids for liquidity that have to be paid back yearly, so as to assure the functioning of the agency even in case of fluctuations in income.

The accreditation department of ZEvA in its organisation is working independently from the evaluation department. At the head of ZEvA stand the scientific head and the managing director. The latter is attributed to the accreditation department by 40% and by 60% to the evaluation department.

Apart from the scientific head and the managing director, the Standing Accreditation Commission is a further organ of the accreditation department, with the scientific head as its chairman. Its task is to make the final decisions about the applications for accreditation by the institutes of higher education and to develop standards for the execution of accreditation procedures as well as handouts. It currently consists of four representatives of universities in the main areas of study engineering; mathematics and natural sciences; humanities, law,

economics and social sciences; life sciences; fine arts and music. It also consists of three representatives of universities of applied sciences in the main areas of study engineering; architecture and design; economics and social work; natural and biological sciences. Furthermore it consists of two professional representatives and two students.

The members of the Standing Accreditation Commission are elected by the registered association *European Institute for Quality Assurance* (EIQA). The aims of this association, which was founded in 2002 by 28 universities and ZEvA, are to ensure Quality Assurance at institutes of higher education, to further international recognition of education standards in the tertiary education sector, and to cooperate closely with ZEvA. Membership in EIQA is open to Institutes of higher education, professional organisations of academic professions, scientific associations, and accreditation networks in the tertiary education sector. Currently 40 institutes of higher education are members in EIQA.

The connection between ZEvA and EIQA was regulated in a cooperation agreement concluded on December 23rd, 2002. The distribution of tasks between ZEvA and EIQA is described in the cooperation agreement's preamble: specifically all operational tasks that are subject of the Accreditation Council's re-accreditation remain at ZEvA, especially the execution of accreditation procedures. A coincidence of personnel occurs between EIQA and ZEvA because the scientific head of ZEvA is at the same time a "native" board member of EIQA .

Currently ZEvA and the state of Lower Saxony are preparing the agency's conversion into a foundation of public law, whose internal organisation will for the most part resemble ZEvA's current state.

3.3 Resources

The personnel of the accreditation department momentarily consists of one scientific officer as department head, who also participates in accreditation procedures, as well as five full time and four part time employees, one of whom is responsible for the preliminary assessment. Furthermore, an administrator for secretarial tasks and management of financial resources is available to the department.

3.4 Spectrum of Activities

ZEvA accredits study programmes in all subjects and types of institutes of higher education. It works from the premise that first and foremost it is the applying institute's task to define its understanding of quality that takes the common judicial regulations into account but apart

from that eludes external standards. Thus it is not ZEvA's task to define standards but only to evaluate compliance to them.

Since its foundation, ZEvA is also active internationally and engages in international networks and associations for quality assurance, the *European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education* (ENQA), the *European Consortium for Accreditation* (ECA) and the *International Network for Quality Assurance Agencies in Higher Education* (INQAAHE). Their collaboration in the *Joint Quality Initiative* (JQI), which issued the "Dublin Descriptors" in February 2002, deserves special mention.

On the national level, ZEvA also engages in cooperation, on the one hand with the *Validation Organization for Study Programmes Architecture and Planning* (ASAP), on the other hand with ASBau. This cooperation entails the application of standards developed in these organisations, and the recruitment of peers.

4 Assessment

Firstly, it has to be said that the expert group's general impression after participating in a meeting of the Standing Accreditation Commission and after the discussions with the agency was to all means and purposes positive. In problematic cases, the committee's decisions followed thorough, sometimes controversial discussions. The members of the committee displayed good preparation and exact knowledge of accreditation regulations. This holds especially true for the student representatives. The SAK's members are well informed and their work appropriate. This does not mean that there is not room for improvement in the agency's preparation of the meeting. Especially the expert group's international representative drew attention to the fact that accreditation in Germany is still marked by the higher education institutes' need for reform. The procedure and emphasis should be changed fundamentally in a later phase. Then accreditation's core function, namely the assurance of reliable and comprehensive information about the offered study programmes, has to come to the fore. The group was in agreement that cooperation between the agencies in the project of quality assurance is still insufficient.

In the following, the group of experts presents its report to the Accreditation Council. It recommends to the Accreditation Council the re-accreditation of the Central Evaluation and Accreditation agency and combines this recommendation with a number of **recommendations** and **conditions**.

Review Category 1

Understanding of the Accreditation Task

The agency sees its task in assessing the compliance with quality standards in the study programmes accredited by them by use of and adherence to the common legal rules without defining standards or suggesting them itself. To its understanding, the institutes have the task to formulate their own understanding of quality and to draw comprehensible quality standards from that, provided the educational goals of the institute take into account societal requirements. The agency assesses the quality profile of the graduates and the consistent implementation of the educational goals in the study programmes. Its understanding of quality is programme-related (criterion 1.1.a). The agency does not explicitly formulate an ethical self-conception of the accreditation task, but it is implicit in the actions of the office and the Standing Accreditation Commission (criterion 1.1.c). As reason for the abdication from formulating their own standards, the agency states their respect towards the freedom of research and teaching (criterion 1.2). Comments on the building of profile are implicit at the most. Aims of accreditation like quality assurance, quality improvement, and consumer protection are not formulated. In practice, the agency accredits all types of institutes of higher education and all subjects (criterion 1.4). Furthermore, the agency also executes accreditations across institutes. The consequences of these accreditations across institutes for the execution of the accreditation procedure have been discussed in detail by the expert group and during the Accreditation Council's hearing. The agency's understanding of quality and the differences in procedure between single accreditations and accreditations across institutes are not documented. The agency answered verbal inquiries by the expert group with allusion to the agency's accumulating experiences and its non-static understanding of quality. Apart from that the agency referred to publications by its scientific head.

Without questioning the agency's understanding of quality, the group of experts suggests to the Accreditation Council to issue the **condition** towards the agency to demonstrate a compulsory and documented resolution about its understanding of the accreditation tasks and basic procedures until December 31st, 2006.

Review Category 2

Structural Organisation

ZEVA is a joint facility of the institutes of higher education in Lower Saxony and as such a dependent body of Hanover University. Supervision of administration falls to the president of

Hanover University, the subject-related supervision falls to the scientific head who is appointed by the minister of science following a suggestion of the *Landeshochschulkonferenz*. Internal Responsibilities are regulated by the agency's organisation insofar as the tasks of the scientific head, the managing director, and the Standing Accreditation Commission with regard to accreditation are set. The agency has the concrete aim to convert the agency into a foundation of public law in the near future. In the draft of the foundation's charter provided by the agency, no further regulations about assignment of tasks and rules of procedure are to be found. One of the foundation's purposes is to execute accreditations "mainly across institutes of higher education."

The agency finances the expenses of accreditation procedures through fees. The Ministry of Science and Fine Arts de facto grants a deficiency guaranty. In the draft of the foundation's charter, benefit to the public is set as a principle, but the entitlement to being financed by the ministry remains. Regulations for the accreditation department's financial independency are not intended.

In the intended foundational form, it is imperative to reconcile not having a status as a legal entity in its own right as well as the resulting formal determination of internal and external circumstances. The agency agrees with this assessment. The criteria 2.1 to 2.3 can not be seen as fulfilled at the moment. However, this circumstance in practice does not lead to a non-committal or even arbitrary practice of accreditation by the agency. In the experts' discussion with the agency's administration, it was indicated that the foundation's charter will provide for a complete separation of the departments of evaluation and accreditation as well as the independency of the department heads. Basic financing by the state of Lower Saxony will only be continued in the area of evaluation. Decision procedures in accreditation will in no way be touched by this. Based on information provided by the agency, the implementation of the foundation is based on political preconditions and most likely not to be expected in 2006. The expert group was of the opinion that in the near future the agency has to demonstrate the accreditation department's status as legal entity in its own right according to criterion 2.1. The foundation's charter should be developed accordingly. Financial independence and organisational autonomy of the accreditation department within the envisioned foundation are mandatory.

<p>The group of experts suggests to the Accreditation Council to issue the condition towards the agency to demonstrate its status as legal entity in its own right until December 31st, 2007, according to criterion 2.1 of the Criteria for the Accreditation of Accreditation Agencies from December 15th, 2005.</p>

The expert group suggested the implementation of subject committees. However, the agency rejects this with good reason. It wants to avoid narrowing down the accreditation procedures to subject-specific perspectives. The agency weighs the possibility of having more or two-day meetings of its Standing Accreditation Commission.

The members of the Standing Accreditation Commission (SAK) are elected by the association EIQA e.V. according to the cooperation agreement. The Standing Accreditation Commission is comprised of representatives of institutes of higher education coming from different disciplines and institute-types (partly with experience in administration), professional representatives and students, and is responsible for general decisions and accreditation decisions. The operational control lies with the managing director; subject-related supervision falls to the scientific head. The allocation of tasks and composition of organs are functional and adequate, criteria 2.7, 2.8, 2.9, and 2.10 are fulfilled.

Peers are appointed by the Standing Accreditation Commission based on suggestions by the office. How the office recruits peers has been explained in detail during the hearing, but the impression remains that sometimes the agency has to improvise, which is perhaps unavoidable. For all people involved in the accreditation procedures, the agency conducts training courses on an irregular basis and implements workgroups that conceive position papers for current problems. The site visit has shown that subject-wise the Standing Accreditation Commission is working on a high level. The independence concerning directives of the organs (criterion 2.12) is set in its regulations. However, the cooperation agreements with ASAP and ASBau raised doubts, since the application of the standards set by the contractual partners is part of the contractual duties and since they are recommending peers. The experts' questions were answered by an assurance that the agency's independency in nominating peers and applying standards are also warranted in the fields of accreditation concerned.

The group of experts issues the **recommendation** towards the agency to improve the cooperation contracts with ASAP and ASBau in a manner that guarantees without doubt the independence in the nomination of peers and application of quality criteria.

Review Category 3

The Agency's Procedural Organisation

The interaction of the organs is regulated through concrete procedural steps: the peers nominated by the Standing Accreditation Commission on suggestion by the office hand in their report for decision through the office. Together with the scientific head, the office assesses the consistency and conformity with formal regulations of the peers' suggestions. In case of doubt, the office issues its own recommendation to the Standing Accreditation Commission. Since the office plays a central role as a clearing position between the peer groups and the Standing Accreditation Commission, the expert group comes to the conclusion that a consistency of decisions can be assured (criterion 3.1). During the site visit it became apparent that the office's steering does not ensure the correct application of formal regulations in every case, and that in practice the office and the Standing Accreditation Commission have to rectify these defects (criterion 3.2). In the Standing Accreditation Commission, decisions are often made only in principle (accreditation, refusal of accreditation, conditions, recommendations). The formulation is done by the office. Further inquiries showed that these formulations are then adjusted through circulation procedures. The agency justifies their decisions in a notification and a summarised report about the procedure and the peers' votes and thus meets criterion 3.3.

The group of experts suggests to the Accreditation Council to issue a **condition** towards the agency to change the practice of decisions regarding the formulation of conditions in all accreditation procedures opened by contract after July 1st, 2006, and to decide on the basis of formulated decision templates in the responsible organ.

Review Category 4

Accountability

For single accreditations, the agency documents their procedures in their handbook "Quality Assurance through the Accreditation of Study Programmes." After the conclusion of an accreditation procedure, the institutes receive a summarising report of the procedure, the peer report and an excerpt from the minutes of the Standing Accreditation Commission's meeting. Towards the Accreditation council, the agency documents their accreditation procedures by conveying their decisions and through a summarising documentation. The institute's responsible body receives a copy of the notification. In the case of cluster accreditation with a previ-

ous systems assessment, the available documents did not show the consequences of the systems assessment on the execution and outcome of the program accreditation. Further inquiries by the expert group showed that the relation between systems assessment and program accreditation has so far only been explained in publications by the scientific head. However, the inquiries made by the expert group and the hearing at the Accreditation Council showed that the previous systems assessment does not pre-determine the results and conditions in cluster accreditations.

Still, the group of experts suggests to the Accreditation Council to issue the **condition** towards the agency to document the relation between systems assessment and programme accreditation in cluster accreditations and the consequences of the systems assessment on the organisation and execution of as well as the decisions in accreditation procedures.

The agency does not publicise the names of the peers. Apart from that, the criterion 4.1 is fulfilled. In their contract with the institute the agency commits itself to confidentiality and thus fulfils criterion 4.2

The group of experts suggests to the Accreditation Council to issue the **condition** towards the agency to publish the names of the respective peers in their reports about accreditation in all accreditation procedures opened by contract after July 1st, 2006, but at the latest after March 31st, 2007, according to criterion 4.1 of the Criteria for the Accreditation of Accreditation Agencies from December 15th, 2005,.

Review Category 5

Equipment and Sustainability

By participating in a meeting of the Standing Accreditation Commission, the peer group could assure itself of the high level of the discussions and the thoroughness of the deliberations. Qualification, objective competence and comprehensive experience of the scientific head as well as the managing director are unquestionable. Their already long activities in accreditation and the experiences gained therein have a positive influence on the agency's functions. The information provided on the experts' enquiry proves the qualification of the office's employees. For the most part they are employed on a time-limited basis for six years, which is long enough to guarantee work of high quality. The site-visit has shown that the agency's

equipment and facilities are good. On enquiry, the expert group gained enough clarity about the agency's budget. According to the agency, the income is sufficient to pay back the state's subsidy. However, it has not become clear to the experts how the agency could act in case of low income. According to the agency, an economic plan can only be handed in after the envisioned implementation of the foundation. Thus, the information available to the experts does not document the independent and autonomous financing of the accreditation department, particularly since data about the financing of combined evaluation and accreditation procedures is missing. Only through transparent bookkeeping, correct competition with the other agencies can be guaranteed. Still, the expert group takes for granted that the financial accounting of evaluation and accreditation department will be separated in the foundation's charter and that separated economic plans will be devised.

Review Category 6

Internal Quality Management

The agency carries out procedures for quality assurance of the office's activities on a regular basis: the employees discuss central questions and evaluate the supervision of procedures by internally publicised questionnaires. Furthermore, the agency organises the exchange of experiences with other agencies in the area of quality assurance. Employees regularly visit subject-related conferences. Twice a year, the agency carries out training courses for its peers. The agency does not document a systematic acceptance analysis with the institutes. It only considers useful advice about procedures from the institutes' responses. An immediate regular feedback between peers and the Standing Accreditation Commission could not be discerned. The procedure led by Prof. Daniel to assess a two-step evaluation procedure in Lower Saxony of ZEVA and the *Nordverbund* can not be seen as part of the agency's quality assurance, since it is only concerned with evaluation.

<p>The group of experts suggests to the Accreditation Council to issue the condition towards the agency to document the implementation of a formalised internal quality management according to criteria 6.1 to 6.3 of the Criteria for the Accreditation of Accreditation Agencies from December 15th, 2005 until March 31st, 2007.</p>

Review Category 7

Governance of the higher education institution

The agency is of the opinion that program accreditations are insufficient to assess the institute's governance and refers to the procedure of systems assessment developed by the agency. The "Annotations to Accreditation Documents for Peers" contain quantitative specifications that may however limit the institute's autonomy in some points (definition of the percentage of key competences in module contents and size of modules). The scientific head's statements in a recent publication relate the outcome of the systems assessment on the entire system of study programmes or at least on a major part of the courses offered. Such a decision is not envisioned in the Accreditation Council's regulations. However, in the enquiry and the Accreditation Council's hearing, the representatives of the agency admitted that a systems assessment can not be seen as an accreditation. The assessment is only completed after the accreditation has been carried out. It has also been agreed that the Accreditation Council's resolution "Decisions of the Accreditation Agencies: Types and Their Effects" also have to be applied to cluster accreditations.

Review Category 8

Educational Goals of the Degree Programme Concept

The agency expects a documentation of their educational goals and assesses their implementation by the institutes. During the site-visit and in the case analysis, it could be determined that the degree programme concepts are assessed with respect to their educational goals. In its "Annotations for Peers," the agency does not refer to the four educational goals explicitly, but expects well-founded documentations concerning employability. Furthermore, the site-visit has shown that in the peer reports much emphasis is laid on the students' employability. Concerning the educational goals "democratic citizenship" and "personal development" the agency assesses statements of the institute and the students concerning general studies and non-subject-related courses, the furtherance of autonomy and critical thinking, the organisation of the inclusion of students in the development of study programmes and quality assurance. The assessment of programme concepts should be complemented by the educational goals 3 and 4 as goals to be reached independently.

The group of experts suggests to the Accreditation Council to issue the **condition** towards the agency to complement the assessment of programme concepts by the educational goals 3 and 4 as goals to be reached independently.

Review Category 9

Conceptual Classification of the Degree Programme

The agency orientates itself on the Dublin Descriptors. Concerning the national qualification framework, the agency offers seminars for programme designers. For the typological classification of study programmes, the agency has developed general standards for the individual parts of the study programmes as well as for the amount and the manner of teaching key competences. A deviation from these standards is possible but has to be justified factually by the institute. The systems evaluation developed is very much concerned with the conceptual classifications of study programmes. The agency appears to do pioneer work in this area.

Review Category 10

Review and Assessment of the Degree Programme Concept

The aspects of this review category have put the "Annotations for Peers" in the centre of its enquiry. The site-visit has shown that the programme concepts are assessed very intensively and according to effective criteria. For study programmes with special elements of profile, the agency has developed criteria in a workshop. Even after further enquiries, detailed information concerning the assessment of the institute's gender mainstreaming concept is missing.

The group of experts issues the **recommendation** towards the agency to immediately reassess if the institute's regulations for gender equality are considered in the design and execution of their study programmes.

Review Category 11

Implementation of the degree programme

In the self-reports, the agency requires substantial information about personnel and facilities. Overall, the documentation, site-visit and case analysis have shown a very professional and

thorough work in regard to this review category. The agency has given special attention to the so-called "small subjects," but the consequences of this are not described.

Review Category 12

Examination System

The Agency requires approved exam regulations and places special emphasis on the assessment of the examination system. Information about the organisational execution of exams is missing, however.

Review Category 13

Transparency

Through the respective composition of the institutes' reports and special segments during the site-visit, the agency sets great value in information for and supervision of students. They lay a special emphasis on this question in the systems assessment.

Review Category 14

Internal quality assurance system of the Institutes

Especially in re-accreditation procedures and systems assessments, the agency requires from the institutes of higher education comprehensive documentation of the internal quality assurance systems. It was not discernible whether the development of applications for a place at the institute, the behaviour in student intake, and the numbers of students and graduates are subject of the assessment of the quality assurance system.

Review Category 15

Acquisition

The agency has a well-tried practice of counselling the institutes before and during the conclusion of a contract. Based on a treatment and a problem description, counselling is carried out previous to the contract's finalisation. In this, the agency explains the criteria and formal requirements of an accreditation. The agency counsels the institutes during the planning of the study programme. This comprehensive practice of counselling could endanger the

agency's competitive decency. The financing of evaluation procedures by the state of Lower Saxony seems also questionable, since it is possible to combine evaluation and accreditation procedures for institutes in Lower Saxony. Even in the experts' discussion with the agency's administration, these doubts could not be dispelled entirely. It should be taken care that the agency does not gain a competitive advantage by counselling the institutes in the area of programme development by their evaluation department.

Review Category 16

Organisation of the Process

During the initiation of a contract, the agency provides comprehensive documentation to the institute. The inclusion of all stakeholders in the Standing Accreditation Commission is guaranteed, but the peer groups do not always include students. As a reason for this, the agency claims problems in the cooperation with the *studentischer Akkreditierungspool*. The institutes are invited to define subject areas from which the peers are to be recruited by the Standing Accreditation Commission on suggestion by the office. However, they have no veto-right. The agency requires a statement of impartiality from the peers and prepares them in training courses as well as a preliminary meeting on the eve of a site visit. The site visits are carried out according to a proven schema that is known beforehand. The institutes can comment on the peer reports before the Standing Accreditation Commission's decision and have the opportunity to state their case in the meeting of the Standing Accreditation Commission if a negative decision is to be foreseen. The documents provided, the case analysis and the site visit have shown that the procedures are generally carried out according to the criteria. Still, the selection criteria in the recruitment of peers remain unclear. The occasional absence of student peers that has been affirmed after the experts' enquiry is also not to be tolerated. The group of experts takes for granted that from now on the agency will always involve student peers in accreditation procedures.

The group of experts issues the **recommendation** towards the agency to nominate peers in due time before the site visit as to enable them to examine the documentation with the necessary intensity.

The group of experts suggests to the Accreditation Council to issue the **condition** towards the agency to determine transparent and comprehensible criteria for the selection of peers.

Review Category 17

Decision and Reasons for Decisions

The agency justifies negative decisions by giving the essential reasons. Detailed reasons are to be taken from the peer reports.

Review Category 18

Compliance with Conditions

The agency keeps a list to oversee the compliance with conditions and forwards the institute's report about it to the peers. Based on their assessment, the agency makes a final decision.

Review Category 19

Internal Appeals Process

The agency does not provide information about a formalised appeals process.

The group of experts suggests to the Accreditation Council to issue the **condition** towards the agency to implement a formalised appeals process for the institutes until March 31st 2007, according to criteria 19.1 to 19.3 of the Criteria for the Accreditation of Accreditation Agencies from December 15th, 2005.

Review Category 20

Clustered Programme Accreditation

The agency carries out two-step cluster procedures with a previous systems assessment. The connection between decision in the systems assessment and the accreditation of study programmes is not documented.

The group of experts suggests to the Accreditation Council to issue the **condition** towards the agency to determine criteria for the formation of clusters of study programmes, so that a sensible connection for joint accreditation is generated.

Resolution of the Accreditation Council, of 22.06.2006, on the application of the Central Evaluation and Accreditation Agency (ZEVA) of Hanover for re-accreditation, of 29.12.2005

I.

The¹ Foundation for the Accreditation of Study Programmes in Germany ("Foundation") accredits, in accordance with section 2 para. 1 no. 1 of the "Act on the Creation of a Foundation 'Foundation for the Accreditation of Study Programmes in Germany' ", the Central Evaluation and Accreditation Agency (ZEVA) Hanover pursuant to the following provisions, thus granting it the authority to accredit study programmes by awarding the seal of the foundation.

II.

The decision in accordance with the above Item I. takes effect on 1 July 2006, but subject to the resolving, yet non-reactive condition that an agreement with the foundation pursuant to section 3 of the act for creation of a foundation „Foundation for the Accreditation of Study Programmes in Germany“ be signed by 30 September 2006. In addition, the decision is subject to a resolving condition in the event of the invalidity of the above-mentioned agreement as a whole or of specific provisions thereof, with the resolving effect taking place for the period commencing on the day of any such judgement becoming incontestable.

III.

The accreditation and the authority pursuant to the above Item I. are granted for a term of five years, with the right of revocation according to Item V. reserved. According to section 1 para. 1 clause 2 of the resolution „Decisions of the Accreditation Council: Types and Impacts“ of 15.12.2005, the accreditation expires on 30 September 2011. Should ENQA decide by 31.12.2009 that, according to general European standards, accreditation with a longer term than five years is admissible, the accreditation term will then automatically extend to the maximum term admissible according to general European standards, but no longer than by another three years.

¹ In the present text, gender-specific terms apply equally to women and men.

IV.

The Accreditation Council notes that the ZEvA does not meet some quality requirements. Some of these are quality requirements which had no validity during the expired accreditation term but were only introduced as quality criteria by the Accreditation Council in its resolution „Criteria for the Accreditation of Accreditation Agencies“ of 15.12.2005 (cf. Conditions 1, 2, 4, 6, 8).

The quality deficiencies are, according to section 1 para. 3 of the resolution „Decisions of the Accreditation Council: Types and Impacts“ of 15.12.2005, not fundamental. Accreditation is thus granted, yet under the following conditions:

1. The ZEvA proves by 01.01.2007 a binding and documented resolution on its understanding of the accreditation duties and the procedural principles according to criteria 1.1 to 1.3 of the „Criteria for the Accreditation of Accreditation Agencies“ of 15.12.2005.*
2. The ZEvA proves by 01.01.2008 the existence of a legal personality of its own in accordance with criterion 2.1 of the „Criteria for the Accreditation of Accreditation Agencies“ of 15.12.2005.**
3. The ZEvA proves by 01.01.2007 a modification of the agreements with ASAP and ASBau such that the ZevA, regarding the definition of accreditation criteria and the selection of experts, is independent of ASAP and ASBau.*
4. The ZEvA publishes in all accreditation procedures initiated from 01.07.2006 by conclusion of an agreement, but no later than 01.04.2007, in the reports on the accreditations, the names of the involved experts in accordance with criterion 4.1 of the „Criteria for the Accreditation of Accreditation Agencies “ of 15.12.2005.*
5. The ZEvA modifies from 01.07.2006 the resolution practice in the event of conditions and decides in the relevant body on the basis of ready-formulated decision templates.*
6. The ZEvA proves by 01.04.2007 the introduction of a formalised internal quality management in accordance with criterion 6 of the „Criteria for the Accreditation of Accreditation Agencies“ of 15.12.2005.*
7. The ZEvA proves by 01.01.2007 a binding resolution on criteria for the selection of experts which ensures, in accordance with criterion 16.4 of the „Criteria for the Accreditation of Accreditation Agencies “ of 15.12.2005, that representatives of all relevant stakeholders participate in the expert groups. *

8. The ZEvA proves by 01.04.2007 the setting up of a formalised complaints procedure for universities/colleges in accordance with criteria 19.1 to 19.3 of the „Criteria for the Accreditation of Accreditation Agencies“ of 15.12.2005.*
9. The ZEvA proves by 01.07.2007, for the bundled study programme accreditations, which are initiated by conclusion of an agreement after July 1, 2006, that it can use meaningfully defined criteria for the development of study programme bundles in concreto consistently and that an adequate review of each individual study programme of the study programme bundle regarding the substance and validity of the statements of the university/college is conducted, with full application of the “Criteria for the Accreditation of Accreditation Agencies“ of 15.12.2005. This applies particularly for accreditation procedures with preceding so-called system evaluation. The ZEvA documents by 1.10.2007 for bundled study programme accreditations with preceding so-called system evaluation, which are initiated by agreement conclusion after 1.07.2006, the ratio of system evaluation and programme accreditation in bundled study programme accreditations and the impact of the so-called system evaluation on the organisation and implementation as well as on the decisions in accreditation procedures.*
10. The ZEvA proves by 1.01.2008 that the universities/colleges of Lower Saxony, in the accreditation procedures initiated after 1.01.2008, neither indirectly nor directly receive a cost advantage by commissioning the ZEvA.**
11. The ZEvA proves by 1.04.2007, through documentation of the accreditation procedures initiated after 1.07.2006, that the agency, in cases in which it conducts both evaluation and accreditation procedures, will appoint different experts in each case and will not dispense with a separate on-site visit in the accreditation procedure.*

* condition fulfilled

** Period of accreditation has been extended until 01.01.2009

V.

Should the ZEvA not prove compliance with these conditions within the respective term or should such conditions not prove satisfied on expiry of the respective term, the Foundation may revoke the accreditation according to section 7 para. 2 of the resolution „Decisions of the Accreditation Council: Types and Impacts“, of 15.12.2005.

VI. Statement of Reasons

In General:

Based on the expert report, the report on the submitted procedural documentations and the hearing, the Accreditation Council arrived at the opinion that the Central Evaluation- and Accreditation Agency of Hanover (ZEvA) essentially meets the „Criteria for the Accreditation of Accreditation Agencies“, passed on December, 15, 2005.

The ZEvA was able, in the expert procedure, to show plausibly the considerable standard of the implementation of procedures for the accreditation of study programmes, based on long-standing experience. It has a programme-related quality understanding and sees its task in reviewing, while applying and meeting the relevant legal rules, the satisfaction of quality standards in the study programmes to be accredited by it without suggesting or defining standards itself.

For the, on the whole, professional implementation of this task, the ZEvA has the necessary intuitional and personnel resources, quantitatively and qualitatively, and has, in the course of its existence, established and continuously further-developed routines in the implementation of the procedures.

To be specially emphasised here is the phase of the final decision-making. The decisions of the ZEvA in problematic cases were made after thorough, occasionally, even controversial discussion. Members of the standing accreditation commission (SAK) displayed thorough preparation and accurate knowledge of the accreditation specifications. This was particularly true of the student members, incidentally. The members of the SAK are well informed and work properly.

The criteria for the accreditation of study programmes are applied in a well-versed way and, generally, by appropriate interpretation of the set of rules provided by the Standing Conference of Ministers of Education and the Accreditation Council. Above all with respect to the evaluation of the education goals of the study programmes (check-field 8), the conceptual integration of the study programmes (check-field 9), the review and appraisal of the study programme concept (check-field 10) and regarding the implementation of the study programme (check-field 11), the experts and the Accreditation Council were able to satisfy themselves of the well-versed and high-quality work of the ZEvA.

This, on the whole, positive overall judgement does not rule out that defects may be noted in subareas. Attention is invited to the fact that conditions 1, 2, 4, 6 and 8 relate to defects which are not to be ascribed to the procedures employed so far, but result from the „Criteria for the Accreditation of Accreditation Agencies“, decided on December 15, 2005, which, in

part, make an adjustment of the institutional, content and procedural foundations and rules of the accreditation agencies mandatory.

Concerning Condition 1:

According to criteria 1.1 to 1.3 of the „Criteria for the Accreditation of Accreditation Agencies“ of 15.12.2005, the accreditation agencies must bindingly decide on, and document, their understanding of the accreditation tasks and of the procedural principles as they can only by the plausibility of decisions and statements of grounds offer reliable information for universities/colleges and stakeholders, which in turn creates the prerequisites for accountability to their contractual partners. Regarding the individual phases of the experts and decision processes within the frame of an accreditation procedure, the ZEvA meets this criterion through detailed procedure descriptions and further support. Regarding its quality understanding and its understanding of the accreditation task, the ZEvA was able to convince the experts of the admissibility and adequacy of its relevant positions in essential respects. But the quality understanding and the differences in the procedural design for individual accreditation and cross-university/college accreditations have not been decided on bindingly and documented. The relevant utterances of the ZEvA in the self-evaluation report are unsuitable to impart the impression that the quality conception has been clearly understood and the task delimited clearly enough (e.g. with respect to efficiency tests) and/or delimited from consultations.

Concerning Condition 2:

According to criterion 2.1 of the „Criteria for the Accreditation of Accreditation Agencies“ of 15.12.2005, accreditation agencies must have a legal personality of their own since the agency as an institution, as well as the competence of the bodies and actors working in, or for, it in the interest of securing the independence of their work and of the exercise of responsibility must be legally identifiable. This includes, above all, the clear assignment of all competences relevant for the accreditation procedures and decisions and responsibility in the external relationship of the agency. This clear stipulation is the prerequisite for enabling the agency to assume responsibility for its actions. The efforts described by ZEvA to obtain the legal form of a foundation under public law are therefore welcomed by the Accreditation Council. It must, however, insist on a speedy realisation of such a plan.

Concerning Condition 3:

As per criterion 2.12, 2.13 and 3.2 of the „Criteria for the Accreditation of Accreditation Agencies“, of 15.12.2005, the agency must guarantee the implementation of its quality understanding and of the normative standards in the procedures as well as with the experts. These, incidentally, must be allowed to act independently of third parties. This clear determination is the prerequisite for the respective body to assume its task fully, thus enabling the agency as such to assume responsibility for its actions. The criticised cooperation agree-

ments, however, grant third parties a central role in the definition of criteria and selection of experts which is prone to compromise the independence of the agency and thus the assumption of full responsibility in this respect.

Concerning Condition 4:

This requirement follows directly from criterion 4.1 of the „Criteria for the Accreditation of Accreditation Agencies“ of 15.12.2005.

Concerning Condition 5:

According to criterion 2.2 of the „Criteria for the Accreditation of Accreditation Agencies “ of 15.12.2005, competencies and responsibility in the internal relationship of the agency must be assigned unequivocally. This clear determination is the prerequisite for the respective body to assume its task fully, thus enabling the agency as such to assume responsibility for its actions. The decisions of the agency must, particularly if they are positive, but connected with conditions, or, if they are negative, be adequately explained in writing, which the ZEvA is doing, thus satisfying criterion 17.1. However, it is to be criticised that the standing accreditation commission cannot assume its full responsibility for these decisions and, above all, for their consequences if it does not determine the exact wording of the condition to be imposed where appropriate. A subsequent coordination between the office and the experts of the chairman of the expert group is not suited to ensure the clear functional separation between the actors and bodies involved in the decision process.

Concerning Condition 6:

According to criterion 6 of the „Criteria for the Accreditation of Accreditation Agencies “ of 15.12.2005, accreditation agencies must have a formalised internal quality management which permits the review of the daily activities at any time and enables the agency to analyse its own activity and correct it itself if necessary. The experts were able to satisfy themselves of the existence of some procedures of internal quality management in the form of internal feedbacks and accommodation of reactions of the universities/colleges to accreditation procedures. But these efforts do not have the character of a coherent and routinely functioning quality management system.

Concerning Condition 7:

According to criteria 2.10 and 2.11 of the „Criteria for the Accreditation of Accreditation Agencies“ of 15.12.2005, the accreditation agencies must, by defined procedures of expert selection, ensure the application of the accreditation criteria. While on-site visit and hearing do not show defects in this regard, the ZEvA was not in a position to show a formal resolution about criteria for expert selection. In such determination, however, lies an important point of reference for the internal work of the agency.

Concerning Condition 8:

According to criteria 19.1 to 19.3 of „Criteria for the Accreditation of Accreditation Agencies“ of 15.12.2005, the accreditation agencies must have a formalised internal complaints procedure. While the universities/colleges are free to use the administrative court channels, there should however be, in line with general administrative practice, the possibility of a precedent internal objection procedure, which is appropriately formalised and the rules of which are documented.

Concerning Condition 9:

According to criterion 20 of the „Criteria for the Accreditation of Accreditation Agencies“ of 15.12.2005, the bundling must be implemented both conceptually according to technically demonstrated criteria—or if applying them, withheld, if appropriate - and the concept of bundling consequently applied in casu. There is at least reasonable doubt that this is being done with the necessary consistency in practice so that a review pro futuro is indicated.

Concerning Condition 10:

According to criterion 15.4 of the „Criteria for the Accreditation of Accreditation Agencies “ of 15.12.2005, there must be equality of opportunity between the accreditation agencies in the competition for the execution of accreditation procedures. Cost differences procured for the agency by third parties hamper this equality of opportunity.

Concerning Condition 11:

According to criterion 16.2 of the „Criteria for the Accreditation of Accreditation Agencies“ of 15.12.2005, unbiasedness in the accreditation procedure must be minded. Even the suspicion of partiality should be avoided. With this goal it is, as a matter of principle, inconsistent to associate the evaluation, which in part is aimed at consultancy, with all accreditation leading to permissions and proofs of quality by the identity of the decision-preparing and decision-making persons (experts). Furthermore, securing of unbiasedness involves, as a matter of principle, that the experts get their own idea in such a way as if the prior evaluation had not taken place. This does not preclude the uninformed use of files from earlier evaluation procedures on application of the university/college.

Bonn, 23.06.2006

Professor Dr. Jürgen Kohler
Chairman of the Accreditation Council

Amendment to the

**Decision of the Accreditation Council, of 22 February 2006, on the application of the
Zentrale Evaluations- und Akkreditierungsagentur Hannover (ZEVA) for re-
accreditation, of 29 December 2005**

As a result the Accreditation Council confirms that ZEVA complies with the *Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area* except for Sentence 2 of Standard 3.2. ZEVA will fully comply with Standard 3.2 after having fulfilled the remaining last condition 2 of the re-accreditation decision. The parliamentary decision making process regarding the transformation of the agency into a foundation under public law is going on. The Accreditation Council has extended the period granted to fulfil this condition till end of 2008.

Reasons

To facilitate the international recognition of decisions made by the Accreditation Council and the accreditation agencies, the accreditation council primarily applied, for the adoption of their accreditation criteria dated 15 December 2005, the *Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area*, adopted by the competent ministers at the Bologna conference in Bergen in May of 2005. The following overview shows where ESG Standards 3.1 to 3.8 find their equivalent in the Criteria for the Accreditation of Accreditation Agencies:

ESG Standard	Criteria for the Accreditation of Accreditation Agencies (decision dated 12/15/2005, Criteria); "Law establishing a foundation 'Foundation for the Accreditation of Study Courses in Germany'" (ASG)
3.1	Criteria Part I, Criteria Part II
3.2	ASG § 2 Article; 1.1; Criteria 2.1, 2.2
3.3	ASG § 2 Article 1.1 und § 9; Criteria 1
3.4	Criteria 5
3.5	Criteria 1
3.6	Criteria 2.12, 2.13, 16.2
3.7	Criteria Part II; Criteria 3, 4, 15, 16, 2.9, 18.1
3.8	Criteria 4, 6, 17.2, 19.1, 1.1; ASG § 1 Article 1

In particular, the executive summary of the experts' report on the ENQA membership criteria results in the following assessments:

ESG Standard 3.1 (Use of external quality assurance procedures for higher education):

The standards for external quality assurance procedures were implemented in the criteria of the accreditation council for the accreditation of accreditation agencies. As a rule, they are once again addressed in Standards 3.2 through 3.8, with the exception of Standard 2.7 (periodic reviews). The accreditation council, pursuant to its decision of 22 June 2006, requires the agencies to grant accreditations for a limited period of time, so that this decision is not subject to agency discretion.

ESG Standard 3.1 has consequently been met.

ESG Standard 3.2 (Official status):

Pursuant to § 2 Article 1 No. 1 of the “Law establishing a foundation ‘Foundation for the Accreditation of Study Courses in Germany’” it is the responsibility of the Foundation to accredit and re-accredit accreditation agencies. It grants the temporary authorisation to accredit study programmes through the awarding of the Foundation’s seal. Consequently, the foundation is the public entity responsible for the recognition of the agency pursuant to Sentence 1 of Standard 3.2. By accrediting the agency, it meets Standard 3.2 Sentence 1.

Pursuant to Criterion 2.1 the agency must be legally identifiable, i.e. it must be a legal entity. ZEvA was founded in 1995 and has since been in existence as only in legal terms as a corporate body of the University of Hannover. There is no doubt that ZEvA works independent concerning the methods, standards to be used and the decisions on the results of evaluation procedures. In attempting to fulfil condition No. 2 of the Accreditation Council ZEvA has asked the responsible Ministry in Lower Saxony to initiate a decision by the government of Lower Saxony that will transform the agency into a foundation under public law, and by this into an independent legal entity. Since the parliamentary decision making process is still going on, the Accreditation Council has extended the period granted to fulfil this condition till end of 2008. Thus ZEvA doesn’t meet Standard 3.2 Sentence 2 by now.

ESG Standard 3.2 is currently met partly.

ESG Standard 3.3 (Activities):

Pursuant to § 2 Article 1 No. 1 of the “Law establishing a foundation ‘Foundation for the Accreditation of Study Courses in Germany’” and subsequently Criteria 1.1 through 1.4 only such applicants will be accredited who perform study programme accreditation processes. ZEvA has accredited approx. 470 study programmes across various subjects and types of universities.

ESG Standard 3.3 has consequently been met.

ESG Standard 3.4 (Resources):

Pursuant to Criteria 5.1 through 5.4 the agency must verify that it has adequate material and staff resources that are sustainable.

The agency's business office currently engages 14 full-time employees and 9 part-time employees. The agency's workforce consists of a managing director, academic director, 12 instructors, 4 organisational assistant and 3 secretary (10/2007).

The agency's statements regarding the adequate and realistic sustainable resources are plausible and were verified during the onsite visit performed by the accreditation council's group of experts.

ESG Standard 3.4 has consequently been met.

ESG Standard 3.5 (Mission Statement):

Pursuant to Criteria 1.1 through 1.4 the agency is required to evidence its understanding of the accreditation responsibility.

The agency's goals and objectives are publicly available on the website of ZEvA. The agency describes its task as such: ZEvA's aim is to perform accreditation for all types of higher education institutions and taking into account all types of programmes and disciplines. The agency is performing its task based on the assumption that is the prime responsibility of the higher education institutions to develop and maintain quality in higher education. The agency itself is responsible for assessing the institutions' study programmes on the basis of the degree programme profile and performance defined and proposed by the applicant higher education institution itself and by developing quality standards and evaluation criteria.

The expert group stated that the policy of ZEvA reflects the agency's understanding of quality and quality assurance in accordance with the main objects of accreditation. In fulfilling Condition No. 1 ZEvA has published its understanding on goals and objectives on the website.

ESG Standard 3.5 has consequently been met.

ESG Standard 3.6 (Independence):

Pursuant to Criterion 2.12 in combination with 2.13 and 16.2 the agency must prove the independence of its organs and their decision-making processes, in particular that of its experts.

The instruction autonomy of the organs can be derived from the provisions on the status of the precise task assignments. The members of the Standing Accreditation Commission must not participate in the decision-making process concerning the accreditation of study

programmes at their own university. In processing accreditation procedures ZEvA is not subject to any kind of state control, the Standing Accreditation Commission as well as the other organs concerned with the accreditation procedure are not bound by instruction. Criteria 2.12 and 2.13 have been met.

In fulfilling Condition No. 3 ZEvA has modified cooperation agreements with other organisations so that the agency's independence in defining criteria and nominating experts is assured.

In fulfilling Condition No. 8 ZEvA has stipulated an appeal option for the applicant universities to use against the agency's decision in the contracts between the agency and the higher education institutions. Criterion 16.2 of the accreditation council is met.

Consequently, ESG Standard 3.6 has been met.

ESG Standard 3.7 (External quality assurance criteria and processes):

The study programme accreditation criteria to be applied by the agency are defined in Criteria 7 through 14. Pursuant to Criteria 15.1 in combination with 15.2 and 16.1 the agency is required to provide universities with comprehensive information on its process regulations and criteria. Pursuant to Criterion 16.4 the agency is required to involve all relevant stakeholders in the proceedings, whose results have to be published pursuant to Criterion 4.1. Pursuant to Criterion 18.1 the agency must verify the fulfilment of assignments.

The agency does conduct a comprehensive informative meeting with the interested universities, during which the universities are provided with all pertinent information on the execution of an accreditation proceeding. Universities receive all required documents (application form for accreditation, sample contract, "guidelines for the self-documentation" and a set of documents). All documents (disregarding the sample contract) are published on the website of the agency. The sample contract contains a precise and complete description of the service and a fee overview. Criteria 15.1 through 15.3 and 16.1 of the accreditation council have been met.

The agency publishes its decisions and in fulfilling Condition No. 4 also the names of the experts on its website and provides the information to the accreditation council and the university compass. Consequently, Criterion 4.1 of the accreditation council has been fulfilled.

In fulfilling Condition No. 7 ZEvA stipulated regulations for the composition of expert groups which assure the participation of all relevant stakeholders.

As result, ESG Standard 3.7 has been complied with.

ESG Standard 3.8 (Accountability procedures):

Pursuant to Criterion 4 the agency is required to make its processes transparent for the universities. Pursuant to Criterion 6 it is also required to verify that an internal quality assurance system is in place and that same is being documented. Criterion 19.1 commits the agency to set up a formal appeals process. The regular external assessment is binding upon the agency pursuant to § 2 Article 1 No. 1 of the "Law establishing a foundation 'Foundation for the Accreditation of Study Courses in Germany'" and must be performed every 5 years.

Upon completion of the accreditation process, the applicant university receives a detailed, decision-justifying report along with the decision. By publishing short reports on accreditations including the names of experts involved, the agency also meets its reporting obligations to the accreditation council. The short reports are published in the HRK database. Criterion 4.1 of the accreditation council has been met.

All relevant documents concerning the accreditation policy (the understanding of quality and the goals of quality assurance, the procedures underlying the accreditation decision as well as other relevant documentation are publicly available on the agency's website.

In fulfilling condition No. 6 of the Accreditation Council ZEvA by now has a formalised internal quality system in place which includes internal feedback mechanisms. As result, ESG Standard 3.8 has been complied with.

ZEvA also fulfils Conditions No. 5, 9 and 11 which are not directly linked to the ESG. The period granted to fulfil condition No. 10, which is not related to the ESG, ends by December 2008.

LIST OF PUBLISHED REPORTS BY ZEVA

Zusammenfassender Bericht über die **institutionelle Akkreditierung der Privaten Fachhochschule Göttingen, Fachhochschule für die Wirtschaft Hannover, Fachhochschule Ottersberg, Fachhochschule für Wirtschaft und Technik Vechta/Diepholz/Oldenburg**, Schriftenreihe „Lehre an Hochschulen“ 64/2008, hrsg. von der ZEvA, Hannover 2008.

Evaluation von Lehre und Studium im Fach **Rechtswissenschaften an Niedersächsischen Universitäten**, Evaluationsbericht, Schriftenreihe „Lehre an Hochschulen“ 63/2008, hrsg. von der ZEvA, Hannover 2008.

Evaluation von Lehre und Studium im Fach **Kulturwissenschaften an Niedersächsischen Hochschulen (Folgeevaluation)**, Evaluationsbericht, Schriftenreihe „Lehre an Hochschulen“ 62/2007, hrsg. von der ZEvA, Hannover 2007.

Evaluation von Lehre und Studium im Fach **Slavistik an der Universität Göttingen**, Evaluationsbericht, Schriftenreihe „Lehre an Hochschulen“ 61/2007, hrsg. von der ZEvA, Hannover 2007.

Evaluation von Lehre und Studium im Fach **Zahnmedizin an niedersächsischen Hochschulen**, Evaluationsbericht, Schriftenreihe „Lehre an Hochschulen“ 60/2007, hrsg. von der ZEvA, Hannover 2007.

Evaluation von Lehre und Studium im Fach **Informatik an den niedersächsischen Universitäten**, Evaluationsbericht, Schriftenreihe „Lehre an Hochschulen“ 59/2006, hrsg. von der ZEvA, Hannover 2006.

Evaluation von Lehre und Studium im Fach **Informatik an den niedersächsischen Fachhochschulen**, Evaluationsbericht, Schriftenreihe „Lehre an Hochschulen“ 58/2006, hrsg. von der ZEvA, Hannover 2006.

Evaluation von Lehre und Studium im Fach **Pharmazie an der Technischen Universität Braunschweig**, Evaluationsbericht, Schriftenreihe „Lehre an Hochschulen“ 57/2006, hrsg. von der ZEvA, Hannover 2006.

Evaluation von Lehre und Studium im Fach **Wirtschaftswissenschaften an den niedersächsischen Universitäten und Fachhochschulen (Folgeevaluation)**, Evaluationsbericht, Schriftenreihe „Lehre an Hochschulen“ 56/2006, hrsg. von der ZEvA, Hannover 2006.

Evaluation von Lehre und Studium im Fach **Geschichte an den niedersächsischen Universitäten (Folgeevaluation)**, Evaluationsbericht, Schriftenreihe „Lehre an Hochschulen“ 55/2006, hrsg. von der ZEvA, Hannover 2006.

Evaluation von Lehre und Studium im Fach **Bauingenieurwesen an den niedersächsischen Hochschulen und der TU Hamburg-Harburg (Folgeevaluation)**, Evaluationsbericht, Schriftenreihe „Lehre an Hochschulen“ 54/2006, hrsg. von der ZEvA, Hannover 2006.

Evaluation von Lehre und Studium im **Fach Chemie an den niedersächsischen Universitäten 'Folgeevaluation'**, Evaluationsbericht, Schriftenreihe „Lehre an Hochschulen“ 52/2005, hrsg. von der ZEvA, Hannover 2005.

Evaluation von Lehre und Studium im **Fach Geographie an den niedersächsischen Universitäten 'Folgeevaluation'**, Evaluationsbericht, Schriftenreihe „Lehre an Hochschulen“ 51/2005, hrsg. von der ZEvA, Hannover 2005.

Evaluation von Lehre und Studium im **Institut zur Früh-Förderung musikalisch Hochbegabter (IFF)** an der Hochschule für Musik und Theater Hannover, Evaluationsbericht, Schriftenreihe "Lehre an Hochschulen" 50/2005, hrsg. von der ZEvA, Hannover 2005.

Evaluation von Lehre und Studium im Fach **Seefahrt** an der Fachhochschule Oldenburg/Ostfriesland/Wilhelmshaven, Evaluationsbericht, Schriftenreihe „Lehre an Hochschulen“ 49/2004, hrsg. von der ZEvA, Hannover 2004.

Evaluation von Lehre und Studium im Fach **Elektrotechnik** an niedersächsischen Hochschulen (Folgeevaluation), Evaluationsbericht, Schriftenreihe „Lehre an Hochschulen“ 47/2004, hrsg. von der ZEvA, Hannover 2004.

Evaluation von Lehre und Studium im Fach **Romanistik** an niedersächsischen Universitäten (Folgeevaluation), Evaluationsbericht, Schriftenreihe "Lehre an Hochschulen" 46/2004, hrsg. von der ZEvA, Hannover 2004.

Evaluation von Lehre und Studium in den Fächern der **Geowissenschaften** an den niedersächsischen Universitäten (Folgeevaluation), Evaluationsbericht, Schriftenreihe „Lehre an Hochschulen“ 45/2004, hrsg. von der ZEvA, Hannover 2004.

Evaluation von Lehre und Studium an den **privaten Fachhochschulen** in Niedersachsen, Evaluationsbericht, Schriftenreihe „Lehre an Hochschulen“ 44/2004, hrsg. von der ZEvA, Hannover 2004.

Evaluation von Lehre und Studium im Fach **Sozialwesen/Sozialpädagogik** an den niedersächsischen Universitäten und Fachhochschulen (Folgeevaluation), Evaluationsbericht, Schriftenreihe „Lehre an Hochschulen“ 43/2004, hrsg. von der ZEvA, Hannover 2004.

Evaluation von Lehre und Studium in den Fächern **Anglistik und Amerikanistik** an niedersächsischen Universitäten (Folgeevaluation), Evaluationsbericht, Schriftenreihe "Lehre an Hochschulen" 42/2004, hrsg. von der ZEvA, Hannover 2004.

Evaluation von Lehre und Studium im Fachbereich **Versorgungstechnik** an der FH Braunschweig/Wolfenbüttel, Evaluationsbericht, Schriftenreihe "Lehre an Hochschulen" 41/2003, hrsg. von der ZEvA, Hannover 2003.

Evaluation von Lehre und Studium im Fachbereich **Fahrzeug-, Produktions- und Verfahrenstechnik** an der FH Braunschweig/Wolfenbüttel, Evaluationsbericht, Schriftenreihe "Lehre an Hochschulen" 40/2003, hrsg. von der ZEvA, Hannover 2003.

Evaluation von Lehre und Studium in den Studiengängen **Vermessungswesen** und **Geoinformatik** an der FH Oldenburg/Ostfriesland/Wilhelmshaven, Evaluationsbericht, Schriftenreihe "Lehre an Hochschulen" 39/2003, hrsg. von der ZEvA, Hannover 2003.

Evaluation von Lehre und Studium im Fachbereich **Automatisierungstechnik** an der FH Nordostniedersachsen, Evaluationsbericht, Schriftenreihe "Lehre an Hochschulen" 38/2003, hrsg. von der ZEvA, Hannover 2003.

Evaluation von Lehre und Studium im Fach **Philosophie** an den niedersächsischen Universitäten, Evaluationsbericht, Schriftenreihe "Lehre an Hochschulen" 37/2003, hrsg. von der ZEvA, Hannover 2003.

Evaluation von Lehre und Studium im Fach **Religionswissenschaft** an der Universität Hannover, Evaluationsbericht, Schriftenreihe "Lehre an Hochschulen" 36/2003, hrsg. von der ZEvA, Hannover 2003.

Evaluation von Lehre und Studium im Fach **Sportwissenschaften** an der Universität Göttingen, Evaluationsbericht, Schriftenreihe "Lehre an Hochschulen" 35/2003, hrsg. von der ZEvA, Hannover 2003.

Evaluation von Lehre und Studium im Fach **Psychologie** an niedersächsischen Universitäten, Evaluationsbericht, Schriftenreihe "Lehre an Hochschulen" 32/2003, hrsg. von der ZEvA, Hannover 2003.

Evaluation von Lehre und Studium in den Fächern **Agrar- und Forstwissenschaften sowie Landschaftsarchitektur** an den niedersächsischen Hochschulen, Evaluationsbericht, Schriftenreihe "Lehre an Hochschulen" 30/2002, hrsg. von der ZEvA, Hannover 2002.

Evaluation von Lehre und Studium im Fach **Physik** an den niedersächsischen Universitäten, Evaluationsbericht, Schriftenreihe "Lehre an Hochschulen" 29/2002, hrsg. von der ZEvA, Hannover 2002.

Evaluation von Lehre und Studium in den **Grundwissenschaften der Lehramtsausbildung** an den niedersächsischen Universitäten, Evaluationsbericht, Schriftenreihe "Lehre an Hochschulen" 28/2002, hrsg. von der ZEvA, Hannover 2002.

Evaluation von Lehre und Studium in den **Erziehungswissenschaften** an den niedersächsischen Universitäten, Evaluationsbericht, Schriftenreihe "Lehre an Hochschulen" 27/2002, hrsg. von der ZEvA, Hannover 2002.

Evaluation von Lehre und Studium im Fach **Biologie** an niedersächsischen Universitäten, Evaluationsbericht, Schriftenreihe "Lehre an Hochschulen" 26/2001, hrsg. von der ZEvA, Hannover 2001.

Evaluation von Lehre und Studium im Fach **Maschinenbau** an niedersächsischen Hochschulen und der Hochschule Bremen, Evaluationsbericht, Schriftenreihe "Lehre an Hochschulen" 25/2001, hrsg. von der ZEvA, Hannover 2001.

Cross Border Quality Assessment in Physics, Evaluationsbericht, Schriftenreihe "Lehre an Hochschulen" 24/2001, hrsg. von der ZEvA, 160 Seiten, Hannover 2001.

Evaluation von Lehre und Studium im Fach **Architektur** an niedersächsischen Hochschulen und der Hochschule Bremen, Evaluationsbericht, Schriftenreihe "Lehre an Hochschulen" 22/2001, hrsg. von der ZEvA, Hannover 2001.

Evaluation von Lehre und Studium in den Fächern der **Sozialwissenschaften** an niedersächsischen Universitäten, Evaluationsbericht, Schriftenreihe "Lehre an Hochschulen" 21/2000, hrsg. von der ZEvA, Hannover 2000, 190 Seiten.

Evaluation von Lehre und Studium im Fach **Design** an niedersächsischen Hochschulen, Evaluationsbericht, Schriftenreihe "Lehre an Hochschulen" 20/2000, hrsg. von der ZEvA, Hannover 2000.

Evaluation von Lehre und Studium im Fach **Germanistik** an niedersächsischen Universitäten, Evaluationsbericht, Schriftenreihe "Lehre an Hochschulen" 19/2000, hrsg. von der ZEvA, Hannover 2000.

Evaluation von Lehre und Studium im Fach **Mathematik** an niedersächsischen Universitäten, Evaluationsbericht, Schriftenreihe "Lehre an Hochschulen" 18/2000, hrsg. von der ZEvA, Hannover 2000.

Evaluation von Lehre und Studium im Fach **Rechtswissenschaft** an niedersächsischen Universitäten, Evaluationsbericht, Schriftenreihe "Lehre an Hochschulen" 17/2000, hrsg. von der ZEvA, Hannover 2000.

Evaluation von Lehre und Studium in **Kulturpädagogik und Kulturwissenschaften** an den niedersächsischen Universitäten, Evaluationsbericht, Schriftenreihe "Lehre an Hochschulen" 16/99, hrsg. von der ZEvA, Hannover 2000.

Evaluation von Lehre und Studium in den Fächern der **Wirtschaftswissenschaften** an niedersächsischen Hochschulen, Evaluationsbericht, Schriftenreihe "Lehre an Hochschulen" 14/99, hrsg. von der ZEvA, Hannover 1999.

Evaluation von Lehre und Studium in den Fächern **Anglistik und Romanistik** an niedersächsischen Universitäten, Evaluationsbericht, Schriftenreihe "Evaluation der Lehre" 13/99, hrsg. von der ZEvA, Hannover 1999.

Evaluation von Lehre und Studium im Fach **Geografie** an niedersächsischen Universitäten, Evaluationsbericht, Schriftenreihe "Evaluation der Lehre" 11/99, hrsg. von der ZEvA, Hannover 1999.

Evaluation von Lehre und Studium im Fach **Bauingenieurwesen** an den niedersächsischen

Hochschulen, Evaluationsbericht, Schriftenreihe "Evaluation der Lehre" 10/99, hrsg. von der ZEvA, Hannover 1999.

Evaluation von Lehre und Studium im Fach **Sozialwesen/Sozialpädagogik** an den niedersächsischen Fachhochschulen und Universitäten einschl. der Hochschule Bremen, Evaluationsbericht, Schriftenreihe "Evaluation der Lehre" 9/98, hrsg. von der ZEvA, Hannover 1998.

Evaluation von Lehre und Studium im Fach **Elektrotechnik** an den niedersächsischen Universitäten, Evaluationsbericht, Schriftenreihe "Evaluation der Lehre" 8/98, hrsg. von der ZEvA, Hannover 1998.

Evaluation von Lehre und Studium in den Fächern der **Geowissenschaften** an den niedersächsischen Universitäten, Evaluationsbericht, Schriftenreihe "Evaluation der Lehre" 7/98, hrsg. von der ZEvA, Hannover 1998.

Evaluation von Lehre und Studium im Fach **Geschichte** an den niedersächsischen Universitäten, Evaluationsbericht, Schriftenreihe "Evaluation der Lehre" 6/98, hrsg. von der ZEvA, Hannover 1998.

Evaluation von Lehre und Studium im Fach **Chemie** an den niedersächsischen Universitäten, Evaluationsbericht, Schriftenreihe "Evaluation der Lehre" 5/98, hrsg. von der ZEvA, Hannover 1998.

Evaluation von Lehre und Studium im Fach **Elektrotechnik** an den niedersächsischen Fachhochschulen, Evaluationsbericht, Schriftenreihe "Evaluation der Lehre" 4/98, hrsg. von der ZEvA, Hannover 1998.