

CEO

ZEVA - Lilienthalstraße 1 - 30179 Hannover

UNIVERSITY OF KASSEL President Post room	
Receipt:	22 Jan 2015
Ref. II	
File no. 49905	App. 1

To the President of the
University of Kassel
Prof. Dr. Rolf-Dieter Postlep
Mönchebergstraße 19
34109 Kassel

Reference no.
A5-1431-xx-1-2014

Extension
+49 511 54 355 708
claus@zeva.org

Date
19 January 2015

Decision
Request for system evaluation at the University of Kassel

Dear Professor Postlep,

At its 69th meeting on 10/12/2014, the Permanent Accreditation Council (SAK) discussed the aforementioned request and reached the following decision:

The SAK notes the university's statement dated 27/11/2014. It is broadly in agreement with the expert group's system evaluation report.

The SAK confirms the very suitable structural and formal framework for the course concepts of all courses offered by the University of Kassel, with the exception of those not covered by this system evaluation. The latter are courses of study which conclude with state examinations, and artistically oriented courses offered by the semi-autonomous Kunsthochschule Kassel. The SAK also followed the example of the expert group in its decision to exclude continuing education courses from the system evaluation.

The SAK supports the recommendations made by the expert group, and also recommends making this system evaluation the subject of future programme accreditations. Expert groups for future programme accreditations should adopt the statements made in the report as their own unless there is reason for a differing assessment.

The following key points can be determined:

1. Overall, the university's control systems affecting feasibility of study can be described as very well developed. Although no model timeline to avoid overlaps is (yet) available, no practical problems could be identified in this area.
2. The level of organisation (in terms of good quality of study) and the governance structure for designing course programmes can be described as efficient.
3. Safeguarding facilities and the relevant control systems as well as the specialist and general structures of counselling and support services are considered guarantees of appropriate framework conditions for implementing study programmes. A final programme-based assessment must be undertaken from a specialist perspective.
4. The examination system is arranged in a way that complies with accreditation requirements.
5. The university's activities to create equal opportunities and gender equality can be identified in everyday practice.
6. The University of Kassel's overall quality assurance system can be characterised as clearly defined, and factors in all levels which would usually be included in an accreditation procedure. It includes an evaluation of workload.
7. Transparency is fully guaranteed for all documents relating to studies.

The university should demonstrate how it has implemented the following recommendations:

1. To ensure that the course concepts are oriented towards the specialist and generic elements relevant to accreditation, the expert group recommends expanding 'Aptitude for social commitment' and 'Personal development' as a target dimension in the 'Framework for creating a course concept' and 'Catalogue of criteria for a good Bachelor's course' rulebooks. These regulations regarding target-oriented alignment of course programmes should also take into account the desired degree level in each case, by requiring programme directors to establish connections between their course programme and the descriptors used in the Qualifications Framework for German Higher Education Qualifications.
2. For module descriptions, the expert group recommends developing master documents which should be used as mandatory templates for all module descriptions. Two versions can thus be developed in order to meet the requirements for publication in subject examination regulations on the one hand, and transparency and completeness requirements on the other. Alternatively, the SAK suggests setting this information out in an appendix to the examination regulations which can be altered by a faculty decision. The full version should stem from the binding description and reflect it exactly.
3. In order to improve the modularisation concept and increase transparency, the expert group recommends defining the various class and examination types in a general, binding rulebook according to their didactic suitability.

4. *To improve feasibility of studies, the expert group recommends establishing a binding rule regarding the latest point for the decision and publication of the choice of examination type for modules where various examination types can be used.*
5. *To improve feasibility of studies, the expert group recommends delimiting and setting out mandatory specifications for the scope of flexible elements within course programmes.*
6. *To improve the study environment and consistent decision-making practice in questions relating to accreditation, the expert group recommends ensuring that faculties are properly communicated appropriate new provisions within the general regulations. Establishing a decision registry could make future accreditation decisions easier for both students and decision-makers.*

This letter represents your system evaluation report.

The system evaluation has been completed under the reservation that it may be withdrawn at any time in the event that the prerequisites set down in the Accreditation Council decision and report cease to apply.

Information regarding extraordinary legal remedy:

An appeal against this decision may be filed within a month of its being issued. The appeal must be substantiated and filed in writing to ZEvA, audit committee, Lilienthalstraße 1, 30179 Hannover.

Yours sincerely,
On behalf of

Rolf Bohnsack

ZEvA can provide a seal of accreditation in JPEG format for marketing purposes. Please contact us if you are interested in obtaining one.