

Hermann Reuke  
Managing Director  
Central Evaluation and Accreditation Agency Hannover (ZEvA)

Vienna, 27 November 2012

**Subject: ENQA Full membership of ZEvA**

Dear Hermann,

I am pleased to inform you that, at its meeting of 17 October 2012, the Board of ENQA agreed to reconfirm ZEvA's Full membership of ENQA for five years from 17 October 2012.

On the basis of its scrutiny of the final review report, the ENQA Board agreed that ZEvA met the necessary requirements for the reconfirmation of ENQA Full Membership.

Though the ENQA Board concluded that ZEvA is in substantial compliance with the European Standards and Guidelines, it found that there were some areas for development, included in the Annex to this letter. ZEvA should submit a progress report on these areas no later than October 2014. This report will be considered in conjunction with the next external review.

If you have any queries, please do not hesitate to contact me or the ENQA Secretariat.

Please accept my congratulations to ZEvA for being reconfirmed Full Membership in ENQA.

Kind regards,



Achim Hopbach  
President of ENQA

## **Annex: Areas for development**

The Board suggests ZEvA to pay particular attention to the following issues:

### **ENQA Criterion 3 – Resources (ESG 3.4)**

- The personnel and material resources for the evaluation unit are sufficient for the present stage of the procedures. However, disposing of just two staff members limits the possibilities for acquiring procedures nationwide.
  - **Recommendation:** In order to make it possible to intensify the activities in this field, the Agency should consider reinforcing this unit in terms of human resources.

### **ENQA Criterion 6 – External QA criteria and processes used by the members (ESG 3.7)**

- The regulations of the internal complaints procedure are known to the higher education institutions as part of the contracts for the accreditation procedure, but not yet publicly accessible
  - **Recommendation:** ZEvA should publish its internal complaints procedure on its website.
- When dealing with larger clusters of study programmes in programme accreditation, there is imbalance between academic experts on one side and students and representatives of professional practice on the other side. Students and representatives of professional practice have a high personal burden in the performance of their roles.
  - **Recommendation:** when accrediting larger programme clusters, expert groups should include two student representatives and two representatives of professional practice respectively in order to ensure a fair division of work in the procedures.

These other recommendations of the panel also fall into this criterion:

- Only academic teachers are represented in the Review Commission.
  - **Recommendation:** Students and representatives of professional practice should be also represented in the Review Commission.
- Student feedback concerning the proof of fulfilment of the conditions is rarely to be found.
  - **Recommendation:** to modify the processes for proving the fulfilment of the conditions in order to ensure that the student members of expert groups may be more easily contacted for providing feedback.