

Foundation for Accreditation of Study Programmes in Germany

Survey report with decision recommendation as to the application of the Accreditation Agency for Study Programmes in Engineering, Informatics, Natural Sciences and Mathematics [Akkreditierungsagentur für Studiengänge der Ingenieurwissenschaften, der Informatik, der Naturwissenschaften und der Mathematik e. V.] (ASIIN) for re-accreditation dated

21st February 2006

1. Preamble

The re-accreditation of the accreditation agencies ASIIN, ACQUIN and ZEvA grants the opportunity to look at the interim results of the current work. In their applications for re-accreditation, the agencies report on their working results and experiences. They are thus facilitating a dialogue – exceeding the issue of the re-accreditation procedure – about an important part of the quality assurance at German universities.

The dialogue between the accreditation council and the accreditation agencies is an essential condition for sustained introduction of quality assurance procedures at German universities. All participants of the accreditation procedures are still searching for procedures which are scientifically adequate, borne by the universities and their members and accepted by the public: Accreditation as a "learning system".

The dialogue serves the purpose of reporting to those teaching and those studying, of whom additional efforts are demanded upon introduction of the new or the revised courses of studies. They have to learn that the quality of the theory is a part of their professional self-conception, that the quality of the studies is an important part of their study interests and can only be improved by quality assurance measures.

The dialogue also serves the purpose of reporting to governments, parliaments and an ever more interested public. They demand evidence, of universities being able to achieve improvement of the theory and studies in cooperation with the state and social partners, rather than by way of a governmental detail administration.

Thereby, international developments are to be considered. This applies to the development of a common "European University and Research Area" as well as the efforts made by the UNESCO and the OECD in respect of a mutual recognition of study performances by means of continental and global agreements and thereby easing international mobility in the area of sciences.

It is the objective of the re-accreditation procedure to assess the current work of the accreditation agencies, to learn from their experiences and to make suggestions as to the continuation of their work. The group of experts would like to express their thanks for the open and constructive discussions with ASIIN and their representatives.

2. Basic Principles of the Procedure

2.1 Statutory Mandate

According to § 2 section 1 no. 1 of the law regulating the establishment of a foundation “Foundation for Accreditation of Study Programmes in Germany” [“Stiftung zur Akkreditierung von Studiengängen in Deutschland”] it is the foundation’s mandate to accredit and re-accredit accreditation agencies, thereby bestowing the authorisation upon them to accredit courses of studies by awarding the foundation’s seal.

In its meeting of 15th December 2005, the accreditation council adopted “Criteria for the accreditation of accreditation agencies“ providing the basis for accreditation decisions.

2.2 International Recognition

To further the international recognition of the decisions of the accreditation council and the accreditation agencies, the accreditation council included the *Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area (ESG)* in the adopted accreditation criteria. Those criteria were adopted by the ministries and ministers responsible for university education at the Bologna follow-up conference in Bergen in May 2005. Further sources for the wording of the criteria were the *Code of Good Practice* of the European Consortiums for Accreditation of 3rd December 2004 and *Guidelines of Good Practice* of the International Network for Quality Assurance Agencies in Higher Education (INQAAHE) of April 2005.

Furthermore, on 15th December 2005 the accreditation council stipulated the course of the procedure to be carried out in three steps upon the basis of the resolution “Implementation of the Re-accreditation of the Agencies ACQUIN, ASIIN and ZevA“.

- Application with written explanatory statement of ASIIN
- Survey and visit to the location by a group of experts (one member of the accreditation council, one national expert, one international expert, one student member) and survey of two sets of documentation of the procedure by the foundation office
- Decision to be made by the accreditation council after a hearing

3. Course of Procedure

The ASIIN agency [Akkreditierungsagentur für Studiengänge der Ingenieurwissenschaften, der Informatik, der Naturwissenschaften und der Mathematik e. V., ASIIN] submitted the application for re-accreditation as an accreditation agency with their letter of 21st February 2006 to the accreditation council.

In their letter dated 23rd February 2006, ASIIN presented the reasons for their application next to additional documents. Within the course of the procedure, ASIIN subsequently filed further documents or rendered already submitted documents more precisely on 5th April 2006 upon the experts' requests.

On the basis of the accreditation council's resolution dated 2nd – 10th January 2006 (circulating resolution) the following experts were appointed:

Gerd Köhler, Gewerkschaft Erziehung und Wissenschaft [education and science trade union], member of the accreditation council

(Chairman)

Dr. Günther Heitmann, Technical University of Berlin, national expert

Professor Dr. Helmut Konrad, Graz University, international expert

Lars Schewe, Technical University of Darmstadt, student member

On the part of the foundation office, the experts were supported by the managing director Dr. Achim Hopbach.

On 23rd and 24th March, the experts visited the location in Frankfurt a. M. for the first time.

Having held preliminary talks on 23rd March 2006, the group of experts took part in the meeting of the *Accreditation Commission I* on 23rd March 2006 and on the following day in the joint meeting of the *Accreditation Commissions I and II*. The experts had duly received the respective documents prior to the meeting. After the joint meeting of the Accreditation Commissions, a discussion was held with the vice-chairman of the Accreditation Commission I, Professor Dr. Hannemann (on behalf of the chairman who had fallen ill), the chairman of the Accreditation Commission II, Professor Dr. von Hoyningen-Huene and Dr. Iring Wasser, managing director of ASIIN. Afterwards, the impressions gained so far were discussed by the experts, as they did in a meeting in the evening of 23rd March 2006, in an internal dialogue.

On 11th April 2006 another discussion of the group of experts (without Professor Dr. Konrad) with the chairman of ASIIN, Professor Dr. Burkhardt Rauhut as well as Ms Birgit Hanny and Mr Christoph Heumann took place in Bonn. This second discussion served above all the purpose of the clarification of open questions in connection with the written explanatory statement regarding the application for re-accreditation.

The office subjected the documentation relating to two accreditation procedures filed on the 23rd February 2006 to a critical examination. (Annex 3)

Within the framework of its 47th conference on 5th May 2006, the accreditation council heard the chairman of the Accreditation Commission II, Professor Dr. von Hoyningen-Huene, the vice-chairman, Dr. Klockner, and the managing director, Dr. Wasser.

At the time of the conference, the explanatory statement of ASIIN and a preliminary statement of the chairman of the group of experts were available to the accreditation council.

4. The ASIIN agency [Akkreditierungsagentur für Studiengänge der Ingenieurwissenschaften, der Informatik, der Naturwissenschaften und der Mathematik e. V.]

4.1 Development

ASIIN was created on 19th February 2002 on the basis of the fusion of two existing accreditation agencies accredited by the accreditation council, the ASI [Akkreditierungsagentur für Studiengänge der Ingenieurwissenschaften und der Informatik] and the A- CBC [Akkreditierungsagentur für die Studiengänge Chemie, Biochemie und Chemieingenieurwesen an Universitäten und Fachhochschulen]. The merged agency was accredited by the accreditation council with effect from 12th December 2002 to 11th December 2005. On 25th April 2005, the accreditation was extended until 30th June 2006, due to transfer of the accreditation council into a public-law foundation and the accompanying revision of the principles of procedure and criteria of the German accreditation system.

4.2 Organisation

The agency is supported by an autonomous, independent exclusively non-profit association.

The association consists of four member groups:

1. Coordination group of the universities, organised by the Akkreditierungsverbund für Ingenieurstudiengänge e.V. – AVI (voluntary union of 33 national and foreign universities of applied sciences focussing on engineering sciences)
2. Coordination group of the technical colleges within German technical colleges (work group of the general meeting of the technical colleges at the conference of university vice-chancellors)
3. Industrial associations and umbrella associations of the social partners
4. Technical and scientific associations and professional organisations

The bodies of the association comprise the general meeting, the managing committee, the Accreditation Commissions, the Technical Committees and the office.

The general meeting approves of the budget, discharges the management and decides on the charter or rules of internal procedure, respectively.

The managing committee appoints the Accreditation Commission, accepts new members and concludes agreements with other national and international accreditation institutions.

Two Accreditation Commissions share the decision competence as to accreditation matters, one for engineering sciences and informatics, the second for natural sciences and mathematics. The particular responsibilities are as follows:

- Stipulation of the principles of procedure and standards of accreditation
- Taking the necessary measures to ensure international recognition of the accredited final degrees
- Appointment of the auditors under consideration of the suggestions made by the technical committees
- Adopting resolutions as to accreditation applications on the basis of the survey reports of the auditors and the Technical Committees
- Appointment of the Technical Committees

The members of the Accreditation Commissions are appointed by the managing committee and are composed of – according to ASIIN – one third each of representatives of the universities, technical colleges and the industry. Further members of the commissions are international advisors, representatives of students and employees.

In addition, ASIIN has 13 Technical Committees (mechanical engineering/process engineering; electrical engineering/information technology; civil engineering/surveying; informatics; physical technologies, materials and processes; economic engineering; economic informatics; agricultural and nutritional sciences and landscape management; chemistry/technological chemistry, life sciences; geosciences, mathematics, physics).

Responsibilities of the Technical Committees:

- a) Development and revision of standards
- b) Elaboration of the documentation
- c) Instruction of auditors
- d) Proposals of auditors
- e) Taking note of the auditors' reports
- f) Statement on the auditors' report

4.3 Field of Activities

ASIIN accredits interdisciplinary courses of studies of engineering sciences, informatics, natural sciences and mathematics. According to ASIIN, they act on the basis of a technically oriented understanding of quality, in which Input and Outcome interact and are responsible factors for the level of educational quality. The examination approach of ASIIN was based on the stipulation and revision of general technical input and output-oriented quality standards, they claimed. Moreover, the international recognition of the courses of studies accredited by ASIIN had a high priority in the strategic planning of the management of the association, it was said.

5. Assessment

The assessment is based on the criteria for the accreditation of accreditation agencies [„Kriterien für die Akkreditierung von Akkreditierungsagenturen“] adopted by the accreditation council on 15th December 2005, requiring the agencies to issue written statements on a total of 20 revision fields. ASIIN has complied with this request in their application for re-accreditation dated 21st February 2006. After the group of experts forwarded their queries, the statements were specified in the letter dated 5th April and in the discussion with Prof. Dr. Rauhut on 11th April 2006, based on which the group of experts worded the following statement.

Revision Field 1: Understanding of the Task of Accreditation

ASIIN's understanding of quality is expressed in the general criteria and basic principles of procedure [“Allgemeine Kriterien und Verfahrensgrundsätze“] and the Subject-specific Criteria [“Fachspezifisch ergänzenden Hinweisen (FEH)“].

It was “developed and defined in a continuous discussing process by persons within and outside the agency. (1) Participants are the members of the Accreditation Commissions and Technical Committees ... “, all in all around 165 persons coming from the universities, technical colleges, the circle of students and professionals employed with companies and private or public organisations“, according to ASIIN. (2)

In the discussions, the problems of the term “majority-compliant understanding of quality“ were expounded: Who defines it? Which role do professional associations and bodies play? Which chances do “lateral thinkers“ have, who do not share the “majority-compliant understanding of quality“ and therefore do not belong to the “predominant theory“? It is recognised by the experts that ASIIN adopts competence orientation and states “learning outcomes“ in the “General Criteria“. However, they see a need for adjustment with a view

to the “Subject-specific Criteria “ [“Fachspezifische ergänzende Hinweise“], which are far too much characterised by outdated and largely input-oriented “check lists“.

- It must be ensured that creative and innovative positions are fostered in the reform process and that the relevant study programmes can achieve accreditation
- The appointment of panels’ members must be regulated more clearly. The impression that the mainstream is continued by way of self-cooptation must not be created.

In particular in the co-operation with ASAP, it must be safeguarded by means of a transparent appeal procedure that a “dependence on instructions” is not created. The contract concluded with ASAP is not acceptable in its current version.

The same applies to the co-operation with ASBau.

- The “Subject-specific Criteria “ are to be revised by the end of 2006, with the purpose to word the educational objectives in accord with the General Criteria and in relation to the national and international reference framework in the form of “Learning Outcomes“.

Revision Field 2: Organisation

Contrary to the conditions imposed by the accreditation council, ASIIN adhered to the establishment of two Accreditation Commissions. One focuses on study programmes from the fields of engineering sciences and informatics, the other concentrates on study programmes from the fields of natural sciences and mathematics.

ASIIN has both commissions holding joint conferences since 2006, at least temporarily, to accommodate interdisciplinary issues in the accreditation procedure. The coordination committee, set up with the same objective, seems to have a more work-organising function as yet.

The reasons stated for the division of the commissions’ work include, among other things, the workload borne by the Accreditation Commissions, which – in the opinion of the experts only applies to the Accreditation Commission I, who are attending to engineering sciences and informatics. “In respect of the scientific subjects taught at German universities, significantly stronger resistance can be observed against discussions and discussions about the fundamental pros and cons of two-tier structures, the accreditation in itself and the detailed requirements of conferences of ministers for education“, states ASIIN. (3). „It cannot yet be assumed....that there is a large degree of acceptance.“

According to the opinion of the experts, the imperative of cooperation will increase, if more teacher training courses were integrated into the accreditation procedures.

- The experts encourage a joint discussion between the accreditation council and the accreditation agencies with a view to the question how the integration of the scientific areas that up to now are only participating to an under-proportionate degree – in particular the natural sciences – can be improved. ASIIN should prepare a presentation on this topic by the end of 2006.
- The accreditation council has to confer, whether they agree to the exercised division of the commission work of ASIIN.
- ASIIN is requested to submit proposals on the integration of teacher training courses by the end of 2006.

Year-end accounts

Criterion 2.3 of the revision fields of the accreditation council requires that the agency does not operate profit-oriented, however, that it is of “sustained economical capacity“.

The 2004 year-end accounts have been presented to the accreditation council, the 2005 year-end accounts still need to be confirmed by the general meeting to be held on 16th May.

- The experts request ASIIN to forward the year-end accounts in time and prior to the conference of the accreditation council in June.

Revision Field 4: Reporting

Upon completion of the accreditation procedure, the university is to be presented with a report containing a description of the procedure and the survey report

The accreditation council will also be forwarded this report. The names of the auditors will be stated in the accreditation report and thereby will be disclosed to the applicants and the Accreditation Commission (4).

Revision Field 5: Agency Personnel

Next to the managing director, ASIIN employs seven research associates, among whom one fully qualified lawyer. Three of the employments are unlimited, four are limited to two years each.

In addition, there is one person in charge of secretarial work and fund control. Moreover, students are employed.

The seven (as per 1st April 2006) research associates have a minimum of one university degree in biology, geography, veterinary medicine, history, law, regional sciences, politics and economics. It is striking that the courses of studies ASIIN primarily concentrates on are not represented.

The employees participating in the consultations have made competent contributions to the technical discussions and have shown a large degree of commitment.

- As there is a high fluctuation in personnel, the experts recommend improving the working conditions, systematic qualification programmes and additional measures for personnel development for the employees (end of 2006).

Revision Field 6: Quality Management

According to ASIIN, there are no formal requirements for the procedure of self-evaluation of the panels and teams of auditors. Any emerging strengths and weaknesses of the criteria and codes of procedure are processed in direct discussions, writes ASIIN. "With relatively little organisational expense...(one could thus)...(reach) a continuous improvement process, based on proposals put forward by the numerous participating auditors, responsible persons on the part of clients and the members of the panels." (5)

- The experts encourage ASIIN subjecting their work to a regular self-evaluation and documentation of the results.
- The work of the auditors is also to be evaluated by way of interviewing the applicants (universities/faculties/teachers/students). The "Customer Satisfaction Surveys" presented, neither seem to be representative nor particularly meaningful. The statements given by the accredited institutions, with and without having been imposed conditions upon, and those of the rejected ones need to be identifiable.
- Furthermore, the expert recommend introducing a systematic qualification or further education measure, respectively, for the experts by 31st December 2006.

Revision Field 7: System Control of the University

ASIIN states that ... "in relation to structural and formal requirements...(e.g. module structure, awarding of credit points, maximum burden)...(yet) no uniform, joint quality understanding of the applying universities between them and between auditors and universities can be observed (6).

- The experts are of the opinion that the accreditation council and the accreditation agencies must discuss the measures with which the implementation of the new procedures can be improved.
- Teachers, students and the persons responsible for the (self) management of the universities must be better prepared and qualified for the reforms, if they plan to cause sustainable changes.

Revision Field 8: Educational Objectives

In the experts' opinion, it is a particular concern of the Bologna process to raise the topic of the relationships between study period and profession, university and labour market: Against this background, the universities are called upon to state reasons for the introduction of the new courses of studies.

This is virgin soil for most of the universities and many faculties which is proven by the largely differing statements on their educational goals.

The accreditation agencies cannot and ought not predefine positions for the universities neither as to the professional development of the scientific disciplines nor to the development of the labour market, claims ASIIN. However, they are to initiate the examination of such topics and to request a description of the applicants of their position, claims the accreditation council. Many of the university statements read by the experts do not attest to an open debate. They mostly remain formulaic and vague.

- The experts suggest that the accreditation council and the accreditation agencies discuss the question how the discussion on the educational objectives, in particular the professional perspectives of BA and MA graduates, can be intensified. ASIIN is to present a paper on the topic by the end of 2006.
- The same applies to the debate about "learning-outcomes" and the quality levels thusly strived for. The introduction of the "National Qualification Framework" ["Nationaler Qualifikationsrahmen"] and the "European Qualification Frameworks" have not yet got beyond insider circles. The transition to competence orientation is taking place in a very hesitant manner. (vide Revision Field 12)
- As the acceptance of the consecutive study programmes and the new final universities degrees was not universally safeguarded, the respective regulations for the transition from the bachelor to the master courses would have to be precisely defined and well-founded. According to the experts, penetrability would have to be ensured as far as possible, in order to avoid de-qualification vis-à-vis the old study programmes and dead ends with a view to labour market policy.

Revision Field 9/10: Feasibility of the Studies

As there are large differences in the definition of educational objectives, contents and the quality rating of modules from university to university and subject to subject, orientation aids need to be established in the a dialogue between the universities and the accreditation institutions. They are to facilitate the development of study programmes and to safeguard connectivity of the study performances rendered, when changing universities. In this respect the students reported on a number of mobility obstacles.

The examination of feasibility requires empirical studies of the factual study burden, which are so far largely missing. They need to consider the social and financial framework conditions of the students.

- The experts recommend the participation of ASIIN and the other accreditation agencies in the development of an adequate statistic relating to the course of the study programmes, which will be facilitated by the possibility of ex post accreditations in the future.
- In this context, it will be sensible to develop an adequate examination statistic, which will inform about the examination burden of teachers and students in connection with the introduction of modules and credit points.

Duration of the Practical Phase

ASIIN restricts the crediting of industrial placements in six-semester courses to 18 ECTS, with reference to the relevant structural requirements of the conferences of ministers for education.

The accompanying shortening of the current practical semesters is justified with the argument that an alternatively necessary shortening of the theoretical parts must be avoided, so that international recognition is not endangered.

The experts feel it needs to be considered, if it is sensible to reduce the practical orientated parts which are characteristic for German educational programmes in engineering. Especially with a view to the impending changes to the British education programmes in engineering – they are extending the periods of training with reference to the continental institutions to 4 years – new ways ought to be found to avoid putting German graduates at a disadvantage.

Washington Accord

ASIIN has recognised early to what extent Europeanisation and globalisation influence the developments on the national and international labour markets for engineers. Since its establishment, ASIIN has been working on an international level. As one of the founding members, ASIIN helped developing the “European Network for Accreditation of Engineering Education” (ENAE) and contributed to the wording of the quality criteria in the framework conditions for the so-called “European Accredited Engineer” (EUR-ACE), which are to complete the “European Qualification Framework” for engineering education.

A “Memorandum of Understanding” was concluded with the American accreditation agency ABET (Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology), which is to regulate the cooperation in the future (*inter alia* exchange of peers and information).

Moreover, ASIIN is involved with ENQA, the European Association for Quality Assurance in Europe, the ECA, the European Consortium for Accreditation and INQAHE, the International Network for Quality Assurance Agencies in Higher Education. This is added by the relevant international organisations orientated on engineering sciences, amongst them the Washington Accord.

The cooperation with ABET and the Washington Accord is of relevance for the German accreditation discussion in several ways:

- ABET essentially restricts itself to the accreditation of BA courses, has elaborate catalogues of criteria, and long-term experience in accreditation.
- The Washington-Accord is a global, but mainly concentrated on (former) Commonwealth states, union of accreditation agencies, whose decisions are of special importance for access to the relevant national labour markets (function of a chamber/Chartered Engineer/access to the licensing and/or registration as a professional engineer).
- The members of the Washington Accord – one organisation each per state – complement each other by means of cooperation procedures.

The latter met with the opposition of other German accreditation agencies. They feel that the restrictions threaten their international competitiveness. At present, an amicable regulation between the accreditation council, ASIIN and the other agencies could not be found.

- The experts deem necessary a discussion on the relevance of (“professional”) accreditation for the provision of access to the labour markets on a national and international level. It should be prepared by ASIIN. (End of 2006)

- The experts expect that an amicable solution is found by the end of 2006 (alternatively 2007 in the matter “Washington Accord“.

Revision Field 11: Equipment of the Study Programmes

With the purpose to provide the students with more security in the choice of the location of their studies, ASIIN inquires after the personal, factual and financial equipment of the accredited study programmes in its accreditation procedure.

In the random testing of the question according to which criteria the equipment with personnel and the sustainability of the theory are assessed, doubts arose among the experts, which were also addressed in the discussions with the ASIIN panels. It must be ensured that the accreditation of courses offered by state and public universities demands for the same strict criteria and standards.

In the accreditation application for the online study programme “Media-Informatics“ it is said that “due to the new development of the faculty of informatics, the [REDACTED], as a public university, is not in a position to employ professors to the desired extent before the course has enough students. All the more so....since a significantly smaller number of enrolments was registered with 24 students each per semester in the developing phase“ (application dated 13th January 2005, p. 18). Moreover, it is said that “the appointment of tutors is not possible at present“.

It is not clear to the experts, how under such circumstances the shown quality of the courses offered can be safeguarded in such a way that the students can complete their studies with a final examination. The operation of the courses is maintained by one scientist who has (not yet) been awarded a doctorate and 21 assistant lecturers. Owing to the want of tutors, neither advice nor study groups are possible, without which the online locations cannot cope either. The information provided by ASIIN that the Hochschulverbund Virtuelle Fachhochschule (VFH) network guaranteed for the quality of the [REDACTED] course, was not comprehensible for the experts.

The experts expect ASIIN to revise the accreditation decision and to present the criteria for the assessment of the personnel capacities and the safeguarding of a sustained offer of educational theory. Limited/unlimited employments are to be indicated separately.

Revision Field 15: Acquisition – Consulting – Accreditation

The accreditation council imposed the condition on the accreditation agencies not only to separate accreditation and evaluation clearly from each other, but also consulting and coaching on the one hand and the accreditation on the other. It is therefore the objective to ensure the independence of the accreditation procedure.

ASIIN restricts itself accordingly to the conduction of accreditation procedures. No additional consulting services are offered, writes ASIIN (7). The “accompaniment of the applicants“ in the “preparation of the accreditation procedure“ “is restricted to the formal pre-examination of the application documents, to ensure that the self-reports contain all information relevant for the auditors.“

- The experts request ASIIN to report about any possible other business fields (international activities, accreditations without the accreditation council’s seal...) by the June meeting of the Accreditation Commission.
- The experts request ASIIN to render its positions as to the accreditation of doctorate courses. (8)

Revision Field 16: Conduction/Relevant Interested Parties

If – like demanded in criterion 2.9 of the revision fields of the accreditation council, “the interested parties [in particular scientists, students, representatives of professional practice] relevant for fulfilment of performance ... are represented“, is not clearly shown in the updated overview of the members of the panels.

- The collaboration with the students’ accreditation pool [“Studentischer Akkreditierungspool“] has improved considerably compared with the year before. It would be appreciated by the experts, if the sustainability of this cooperation could be safeguarded beyond the re-accreditation phase.
The standing rules of ASIIN provide for four member groups with an equal amount of votes in the general meeting. It remains unclear, who appoints the representatives of the third group “central associations of the industry and social partners“ to the Technical Committees and the audit teams, and how the representation of professional practice is regulated.
- The experts request a clear survey of the representation of the employees, professional practice and the “central associations of social partners“ to be submitted by the June meeting of the Accreditation Commission: Who is a member, suggested by whom, appointed or named by whom.

- The experts call upon ASIIN to identify in the year-end accounts which efforts were made, with which results, to comply with the requirements of gender mainstreaming.

6. Recommendations

A. The experts recommend re-accrediting ASIIN on the following **conditions**:

A.1 The “**Subject-specific Criteria**“ are to be revised by the end of 2006 with the objective to word the “learning outcomes“ in the form of operationalised competences.

A.2 ASIIN is to observe more strictly that the applying faculties and universities render their **statements on the educational objectives and in particular the professional perspectives** of the graduates more precisely and – where possible – substantiate them on the basis of statistics. By means of the documentation of “good practice“, the discussion about the relationship between studies and professional life is to be furthered.

A.3 ASIIN is to conduct **regular self-evaluations** (and document them). On this basis, systematic qualification programmes and sustained personnel development measures for the employees and auditors of ASIIN are to be introduced by 30th June 2007.

A.4 By the end of 2006 ASIIN is to prove that and how the resolutions of the accreditation council on the participation of “**relevant interested parties**“ have been implemented (*inter alia* who appoints the representatives of professional practice and the social partners, participation of the students in Technical Committees and audit date?...). Furthermore, an annual report on the implementation of the **Gender Mainstreaming** Resolution is to be presented.

A.5 ASIIN is requested to revise the accreditation of the online bachelor course “Media Informatics“ offered by the [REDACTED] prior to commencement of the winter semester 2006/2007. In the students’ interest, a scientific offer of theory and a didactically sufficient offer for social learning phases (tutors, consulting,...) must be provided in such a sustainable way that the students can complete the course in an appropriate period of time. The accreditation criterion “Equipment with Personnel” must be rendered more precise.

- A.6 ASIIN is requested to revise the cooperation agreements with ASAP and ASBau in such a way that the independence of the ASIIN panels and expert teams is guaranteed.
- B. In addition, the experts recommend the following:
- B.1 ASIIN should render its positions on the duration and assessment of the **practical phases** more precisely. Also with a view to international developments (*inter alia* United Kingdom) any disadvantages of German universities on the international labour market must be avoided. The advantage of the German practical semesters must not be challenged.
- B.2 The suggestions made by ASIIN as to the structure and development of **study and examination statistics** should be supported and complemented with surveys on stays.
- B.3 As in the area of engineering education “**professional accreditation**” – plays a particularly important role - on a national and an international level - ASIIN should prepare this topic for the German discussion in a comprehensible fashion.
- B.4 The accreditation council expects ASIIN to submit a proposal agreed upon with the relevant accreditation agencies for the German representation in the **Washington Accord** by the end of 2006 [alternatively 2007].
- B.5 The accreditation council supports ASIIN's efforts to win the participation of scientific disciplines which are currently involved to a degree below average.