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**The self assessment report (SAR) as part of the accreditation process**

(Suggestions for writing and structuring the SAR)

The accreditation process is based on a so called self assessment report by the applying institution of higher education.

The preparation of the self assessment report offers the opportunity to use internal quality management systems and self examination processes in order to involve relevant stakeholder groups and to identify possible areas of improvement for the (further) development of a degree programme.

Ideally, the accreditation process will be utilized by the higher education institution as a quality development project and will not be seen as a formal inspection routine.

The self assessment report is created in two steps:

1. **Self assessment:** The higher education institution uses the self assessment report to analyze in an aggregated manner if and how the degree programme/s fulfil/s the accreditation criteria and which particularities have to be taken into account. Variations from the criteria can be explained.

There should be a special focus on evaluation and assessment rather than on mere description, including, for example strengths and weaknesses, challenges and envisaged solutions. The “guiding questions” below are designed to give some assistance in that respect.

The self assessment report is also a guide through the complementary attachments. Typically, a short and concise evaluation of each criterion together with a reference to the relevant attachment will be sufficient.

If the accreditation process includes a “cluster” of similar degree programmes, information that is relevant for all degree programmes should be summarized. At the same time, information that is important for specific degree programmes (e.g. intended learning outcomes, curriculum etc.) should be reported separately.

1. **Evidence:** It is of great importance, that the self assessment is reasonably documented and supported by suitable pieces of evidence. Therefore it is necessary to compile an annex with all pieces of evidence. This annex includes all internal regulations, documents, quantitative and qualitative data and information, etc., that the higher education institution already has in use, for example where they have been generated by internal quality management processes and must not be produced just for the accreditation process. A sample list of possible pieces of evidence is included in this guideline but can and should be altered where applicable.

It is recommended to use this guideline and its structure as a reference model for the self assessment report. The structure correspondences with the accreditation criteria and differentiates between guiding questions for the analysis and suggestions for possibly useful pieces of evidence.

Please make sure that the formal of the report complies with international scientific practice. All pages of the report must be numbered. The evidence must also be numbered and clearly linked to a specific criterion and be listed in a table of content. Please make sure to provide all documents in pdf-compatible format.

Self assessment and evidence can both be provided electronically, depending on the degree of digitalization within the institution´s internal data and document management system, and can include links to specific web pages, data bases or similar.

Depending on the needs of the individual peer panels we may also ask for a printed version of the application documents in specific cases, whereas it is expected to use only electronic documents in the near future.

# About the Accreditation Procedure

## General Data

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Website of the Higher Education Institution** |  |
| Faculty/Department offering the Degree Programme |  |

## Seals applied for

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name of the degree programme (in original language)** | **(Official) English translation of the name** | **Labels applied for [[1]](#footnote-1)** | **Previous accreditation (issuing agency, validity)** | **Involved Technical Committees (TC)[[2]](#footnote-2)**  (will be completed by ASIIN) |
| Degree programme 1 |  | [delete as necessary] ASIIN, GAC, EUR-ACE® Label, Euro-Inf® Label, Eurobachelor® Label, Euromaster® Label | e.g. ASIIN, 01.01.2010 – 01.01.2014 |  |
| Degree programme 2 |  |  |  |  |
| [Add lines as necessary] |  |  |  |  |

# Characteristics of the Degree Programme/s

| a) Name | Final degree (original/English translation) | b) Areas of Specialization | c) Corresponding level of the EQF[[3]](#footnote-3) | d) Mode of Study | e) Double/Joint Degree | f) Duration | g) Credit points/unit | h) Intake rhythm & First time of offer |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Programme 1/ | B.Sc./Eng./ B.A.(Bachelor of Arts, for architecture) |  |  | Full time / part time, dual, sandwich course, e-learning, , etc … | If yes, name partner HEIs | x Semester | xxx ECTS/other CP | /date or term title/ |
| Programme 2/ | M.Sc./Eng./M.A. |  |  | Full time / part time, dual, sandwich course, e-learning, , etc … | If yes, name partner HEIs | x Semester | xxx ECTS/other CP | /date or term title/ |
| [add lines as necessary] |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

# Self-assessment for the ASIIN-Seal[[4]](#footnote-4)

## 1. The Degree Programme: Concept, content & implementation

### Criterion 1.1 Objectives and learning outcomes of a degree programme (intended qualifications profile)

### The objectives and learning outcomes of the degree programme (i.e. the intended qualifications profile) are described in a brief and concise way. They are well-anchored, binding and easily accessible to the public, i.e. to students, teaching staff and anyone else interested.

### The aims and learning outcomes:

### 🡪 reflect the level of academic qualification aimed at, and are equivalent to the learning outcome examples described in the respective ASIIN Subject-Specific Criteria (SSC);

### 🡪 are viable and valid;

### 🡪 are analysed on a regular basis and developed further if necessary.

### The intended qualifications profile allows the students to take up an occupation which corresponds to their qualification (professional classification).

### The relevant stakeholders were included in the process of formulating and further developing the objectives and learning outcomes.

**Guiding Questions**

* How has the intended competence profile of the degree programme been developed (regarding launch of the process, procedure, participants?
* How does the higher education institution correlate the competence profile with the sample learning outcomes from the, in their opinion, (most) relevant Subject-Specific Criteria (SSC)?

(Notice: Please use the attached Objectives-Module-Matrix of the most relevant Subject-Specific Criteria (SSC) for this correlation.

* Where do the responsible persons see possible differences to the relevant Subject-Specific Criteria (SSC)? How can they be explained?
* For interdisciplinary degree programmes: How does the defined competence profile take into account the specifications of the interdisciplinary character?

(Notice: Please use the attached Subject-Specific Criteria (SSC) based Objectives-Module-Matrix that is most relevant for the degree programme; or use the empty Objectives-Module-Matrix.

* Do the defined competence objectives for graduates of the degree programme find the approval of the students and the teaching staff?
* Have the learning outcomes of the degree programme been verified within the last few years? If so, for what reasons were adjustments made?
* How does the intended competence profile comply with specific areas of the profession?
* Are there any peculiarities within in qualitative or quantitative data/information of the higher education institution with regard to the acceptance of the competence profile on the labour market?

**Possible Evidence**

* Documents/other sources where objectives and learning outcomes are written down and published, e.g. regulations, homepage, diploma supplement, student guides
* Internal records that document the participation of the different stakeholders, e.g. standards, process descriptions, results from questionnaires, records of proceedings
* Objectives-Module-Matrix (if subject-specific: based on the Subject-Specific Criteria (SSC) template)
* Module descriptions as they are available to students and the teaching staff

### Criterion 1.2 Name of the degree programme

### The degree programme name reflects the intended aims and learning outcomes as well as, fundamentally, the main course language.

**Guiding Questions**

* What are the reasons for the name of the degree programme?
* Does the name of the degree programme correspond with the terminology used by the subject-specific community?
* Have any misunderstandings or wrong expectations by students or by employers occurred which might be due to the name? If so, how was the reaction?

**Possible Evidence**

* Documents where the language of the degree programme is regulated.
* Documents about possible discussions within the higher education institution about the name of the degree programme (records of proceedings etc.)

### Criterion 1.3 Curriculum

### The curriculum allows the students to achieve the intended learning outcomes in order to obtain the degree.

### The overall objectives and intended learning outcomes for the degree programme are systematically substantiated and updated in its individual modules. It is clear which knowledge, skills and competences students will acquire in each module.

**Guiding Questions**

* From the viewpoint of the responsible persons and participants of the degree programme, how does the curriculum/ how do the single modules contribute towards achieving the intended competence profile?
* In the course of matching the intended competence profile with the curriculum has there been any need for adjustments within the last few years? What were the reasons? What was the reaction?

**Possible Evidence**

* Curricular overview/study plan that informs about the student workload for each module in every semester (possibly with location of publication like homepage, student guides, study and examination regulations)
* Objectives-Module-Matrix
* Module descriptions as they are available to students and the teaching staff
* Possibly relevant results from questionnaires/evaluations

### Criterion 1.4 Admission requirements

### In terms of admission, the requirements and procedures are binding, transparent and the same for all applicants.

### The admission requirements are structured in a way that supports the students in achieving the learning outcomes.

### There are clear rules as to how individual admission requirements that have not been fulfilled can be compensated. A lack of previous knowledge must, however, never be compensated at the expense of degree quality.

**Guiding Questions**

* How do the responsible persons recognize that the (formal and subject-specific) admission requirements promote the achievement of the intended competence profiles?
* If applicable: What was the reaction if the admission requirements did not fulfil this objective from the point of view of those responsible?

**Possible Evidence**

* Study and examination regulations or specific admission regulations
* Information about the admission requirements for the degree programme on websites, in student guides etc.
* Information about the profiles of the applicants and the admitted students

## 2. The Degree Programme: Structures, Methods & Implementation

### Criterion 2.1 Structure and modules

### All degree programmes must be divided into modules. Each module is a sum of teaching and learning whose contents are concerted.

### With its choice of modules, the structure ensures that the learning outcomes can be reached and allows students to define an individual focus and course of study (student mobility, work experience etc.).

### The curriculum is structured in a way to allow students to complete the degree without exceeding the regular course duration.

### The modules have been adapted to the requirements of the degree programme. They ensure that each module objectives helps to reach both the qualification level and the overall intended learning outcomes.

### All working practice intervals or internships are well-integrated into the curriculum, and the higher education institution vouches for their quality in terms of relevance, content and structure.

### There are rules for recognising achievements and competences acquired outside the higher education institution. They render the transition between higher education institutions easier and ensure that the learning outcomes are reached at the level aimed for.

**Guiding Questions**

* How is it ensured that the modules are consistent within themselves, are matched against each other and, where applicable, build upon each other? How do those responsible for the degree programme react if single modules do not fit (anymore) into the general concept of the degree programme?
* How do those responsible for the degree programme recognize that the modules of a degree programme *viewed all together* support the intended academic level?
* In what way do the offered election options within the degree programme promote the achievement of the intended competence profile?
* To what extent are the students able to implement individual windows of mobility? What problems are there? How was the reaction towards them?
* Were there any problems with regard to the intended graduation time during the last few years? If yes, what problems? How were they dealt with?
* Do the possibly necessary working practice intervals of the degree programme fulfil the expectations with regard to the intended learning outcomes? Were there any problems with the organization or the quality of the working practice intervals of the students? If yes, what was done?
* Which principle does the institution of higher education follow with respect to credits acquired externally by the students?

**Possible Evidence**

* Objectives-Module-Matrix (*refer to criterion 1.1*)
* Module descriptions as are available to students and the teaching staff
* Documents where the courses of studies and their organization are regulated
* Student progression statistics
* Documents that inform about the effective regulations about (outgoing) mobility, working practice intervals and the recognition of externally acquired credits
* Possibly statistical data about student (outgoing) mobility and working practice intervals
* Relevant results from internal questionnaires and evaluations

Criterion 2.2 Work load and credits

The estimated time budgets are realistic enough to enable students to complete the degree without exceeding the regular course duration. Structure-related peaks in the work load have been avoided.

A credit point system oriented on the amount of work required from students has been devised[[5]](#footnote-5). The work load comprises both attendance-based learning and self-study. This includes all compulsory elements of the degree.

**Guiding Questions**

* On what basis (of calculation) are credit points allocated to single modules?
* How do those responsible for the degree programme and other stakeholders - including the students - rate the student workload? What problems do occur? What is done to solve them?
* Are all mandatory parts of the degree programme (including working practice intervals) awarded with credits? If not, why?

**Possible Evidence**

* Module descriptions as are available to students and the teaching staff
* Documents where the courses of studies and their organization are regulated
* Student progression statistics
* Documents that regulate the awarding of credit points for the whole higher education institution/ the degree programme
* A conversion formula/ table if no ECTS-credits are awarded originally
* Relevant results from internal surveys and evaluations – possibly statistical data about the student workload

Criterion 2.3 Teaching methodology

The teaching methods and instruments used support the students in achieving the learning outcomes.

The degree programme is designed to be well-balanced between attendance-based learning and self-study.

Familiarising the students with independent academic research and writing plays a vital role in the programme.

**Guiding Questions**

* How do the teaching staff and those responsible for the degree programme recognize that didactical instruments and methods promote the achievement of the intended learning outcomes of the degree programme?
* Are all members of the teaching staff able to apply the didactical instruments and methods most ideal in their opinion? If not, why?
* What elements support the independent scientific work of the students?

**Possible Evidence**

* Documents out of the daily use of the higher education institution that make apparent the existing didactical concept
* Module descriptions as are available to students and the teaching staff
* Relevant results from internal surveys and evaluations

Criterion 2.4 Support and assistance

There are resources available to provide individual assistance, advice and support for all students.

The allocated advice and guidance (both technical and general) on offer assist the students in achieving the learning outcomes and in completing the course within the scheduled time.

**Guiding Questions**

* Which of the existing advice and support on offer for students are deemed by those involved in the degree programme – including students – to be the most effective with respect to the academic success?
* What advice and support on offer for students are missed by the stakeholders including the students? Why are they not put into practice?

**Possible Evidence**

* Documents out of the daily use of the higher education institution that make apparent the existing advice and support concept
* Relevant results from internal surveys and evaluations ( also peculiarities with respect to the effect of possibly existing measures to avoid unequal treatment in the higher education institution)

## 3. Exams: System, Concept & Organisation

Criterion 3 Exams: System, concept and organisation

Exams[[6]](#footnote-6) are devised to individually measure to which extent students have reached the learning outcomes defined. Exams are structured to cover all of the intended learning outcomes (knowledge, skills and competences). Exams are module-related and offer students continuous feedback on their progress in developing competences.

The degree programme comprises a thesis/dissertation or final project which ensures that students work on a set task independently and at the level aimed for.

For each module, a form of assessment (including suitable alternatives, if any) has been defined. There are mechanisms in place which ensure that all students learn the details of what is required in order to pass the module (pre-examination elements, assignments etc.) no later than at the start of the module. Rules have been defined for re-sits, disability compensation measures, illness and other mitigating circumstances etc.

The number and distribution of the exams ensure that both the exam load and preparation times are adequate. All exams are organised in a way which avoids delays to student progression caused by deadlines, exam correction times, re-sits etc.

All exams are marked using transparent criteria. There are mechanisms in place which ensure that exams marked by different examiners are comparable. The higher education institution vouches for the quality in terms of relevance, content and structure of all student assignments completed outside the institution.

**Guiding Questions**

* Which of the used forms of examination are considered by the teaching staff and the people responsible for the degree programme to be particularly suited to verify the achieved learning outcomes?
* Which consequences for the feasibility of the degree programme do the existing regulations on possible re-sits, disability compensation for handicapped students, absence because of illness etc., have?
* Were there any cases where the specific exam management (e.g. date of exam, correction time) had negative effects on the study progress? If yes, what conclusions were drawn?
* How are the assessment criteria made transparent for the students and teaching staff?
* What experiences have been made with student assignments completed outside the institution with respect to quality assurance and level of compliance with the quality expectations?

**Possible Evidence**

* Module descriptions as are available to students and the teaching staff, also for the final paper
* Regulations for exams
* Relevant results from internal surveys and evaluations with respect to exam management and the learning outcome orientation of the exams
* Examples of exam schedules (including the date of the exams)
* Statistical data about the progress of studies, e.g. average grade, failure rate, amount of re-sits

On-site-visit: we ask for the presentation of a meaningful selection of exams/transcripts/projects and other work of students from modules and from final papers/ final projects.

## 4. Resources

Criterion 4.1 Staff

The composition, scientific orientation and qualification of the teaching staff team are suitable for sustaining the degree.

There are sufficient staff resources available for:

🡪 providing assistance and advice to students

🡪 administrative tasks

The research and development activities carried out by the teaching staff are in line with and support the level of academic qualification aimed at.

**Guiding Questions**

* In which way do those responsible for the degree programme recognize that the number and the academic qualification of the teaching staff are sufficient for teaching and supervision?
* How satisfied are those involved in the degree programme with the amount of resources available for teaching, supervision and administration?
* How do those responsible for the degree programme react on occurring problems and bottlenecks?
* What constitutes the quality of possibly employed visiting lecturers and how is this measured?
* In what way do the research and development activities carried out by the teaching staff support the development of the degree programme?

**Possible Evidence**

* Description of the teaching staff (e.g. CVs)
* Document out the daily use of the higher education institution that demonstrates the sufficient amount of teaching resources
* Student numbers
* (Short) Description of research activities related to the degree programme

Criterion 4.2 Staff development

There are offers and support mechanisms available for teaching staff who wish to further develop their professional and teaching skills.

**Guiding Questions**

* Who is responsible for the academic and didactic development of the teaching staff?
* How do the responsible persons recognize that professional development measures are wanted or necessary?

**Possible Evidence**

* Description of didactical training opportunities (possibly link to the webpage) and of measures that support the teaching staff in its use
* Statistical data about further development opportunities, e.g. research semesters, visiting professorships, seminars, conferences, workshops

Criterion 4.3 Funds and equipment

The available funds and equipment form a sound and solid basis for the degree programme including:

🡪 guaranteed funds

🡪 sufficient and high-quality infrastructure

🡪 solid, binding rules for all internal and external cooperations.

**Guiding Questions**

* How satisfied are the participants of the degree programme with its equipment and facilities?
* How do the people responsible for the degree programme react to bottlenecks in equipment and facilities?
* Do the higher education institutions internal and external cooperations work successfully from the point of view of those responsible?

**Possible Evidence**

* Cooperation agreements, regulations for internal and external cooperations
* Documents out the daily use of the higher education institution that describe the equipment and facilities, e.g. laboratory handbooks, inventory lists, financial plans

On-site-visit: Visit of facilities relevant for the degree programme

## 5. Transparency and Documentation

Criterion 5.1 Module descriptions

The module descriptions are accessible to all students and teaching staff and contain the following:

🡪 module identification code

🡪 person(s) responsible for each module

🡪 teaching method(s) and work load

🡪 credit points

🡪 intended learning outcomes

🡪 module content

🡪 planned use/applicability

🡪 admission and examination requirements

🡪 form(s) of assessment and details explaining how the module mark is calculated

🡪 recommended literature

🡪 date of last amendment made

**Guiding Questions**

*n/a*

**Possible Evidence**

* Module description as they are available to students and the teaching staff

**Criterion 5.2 Diploma and Diploma Supplement**

Shortly after graduation, a diploma or degree certificate is issued together with a Diploma Supplement printed in English.

These documents provide information on the student's qualifications profile and individual performance as well as the classification of the degree programme with regard to its applicable education system.

The individual modules and the grading procedure on which the final mark is based are explained in a way which is clear for third parties. In addition to the final mark, statistical data as set forth in the ECTS User's Guide is included to allow readers to categorise the individual result/degree.

**Guiding Questions**

* Have any problems occurred with awarding the graduation certificates and Diploma Supplements to the students? If yes, what was the reaction?

**Possible Evidence**

* Sample graduation certificate for each degree programme
* Sample Diploma Supplement for each degree programme
* Sample transcript of records for each degree programme

Criterion 5.3 Relevant rules

The rights and duties of both the higher education institution and students are clearly defined and binding (guidelines, statutes etc.). All relevant course-related information is available in the language of the degree programme and accessible for anyone involved.

**Guiding Questions**

* How is it ensured that domestic and foreign students know their rights and duties?
* Who is responsible for taking decisions about which documents?

**Possible Evidence**

* Presentation of all relevant regulations with respect to study progress, access, graduation, exams, quality assurance etc., together with information about the level of the binding character
* Link to the place, where the documents are published, e.g. web pages

## 6. Quality Management: Quality Assessment and Development

**Criterion 6 Quality management: quality assessment and development**

The programme is subject to regular internal quality assessment procedures aiming at continuous improvement. All responsibilities and mechanisms defined for the purposes of continued development are binding.

Students and other stakeholders take part in the quality assurance process. The outcomes and all measures derived are made known to anyone involved. All methods employed and data analysed are suitable for the purpose and used to continue improving the degree programme, especially with a view to identifying and resolving weaknesses. To this end, the information they provide includes:

- whether the intended learning outcomes required to obtain the degree have been achieved;

- the academic feasibility of the degree programme;

- student mobility (abroad, where applicable);

- how the qualifications profile is accepted on the labour market;

- the effect of measures in use to avoid unequal treatment at the higher education institution (if any).

**Guiding Questions**

* What measures for the improvement of the quality of the degree programmes have been taken within the last few years?
* Which elements of the internal quality assessment have been especially useful for the continuous improvement of the degree programmes?
* To what extent is the aspect of “learning outcome orientation” taken into consideration in the conception and the practical use of the instruments of quality assurance of a degree programme?
* How do the students evaluate the internal quality assessment and development of their degree programmes with respect to
  + their participation?
  + the consequences on their studies?
* How do the teaching staff and executive level evaluate the internal quality assessment and development of their degree programmes with respect to
  + their participation?
  + the support at solving problems and the improvement of teaching?

**Possible Evidence**

* Internal regulations about quality management (quality assurance regulation etc.)
* Sample information material about the quality management and its results which the higher education institution regularly uses for its internal and external communication (e.g. link to specific web pages, reports, flyer)
* Quantitative and qualitative statistical data from evaluations, study progression statistics, number of graduates, and their distribution etc.

1. [delete as necessary] ASIIN Seal for degree programmes; EUR-ACE® Label: European Label for Engineering Programmes; Euro-Inf®: Label European Label for Informatics; Eurobachelor®/Euromaster® Label: European Chemistry Label [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. TC: Technical Committee for the following subject areas: TC 01 - Mechanical Engineering/Process Engineering; TC 02 - Electrical Engineering/Information Technology; TC 03 - Civil Engineering, Geodesy and Architecture; TC 04 - Informatics/Computer Science; TC 05 - Physical Technologies, Materials and Processes; TC 06 - Industrial Engineering; TC 07 - Business Informatics/Information Systems; TC 08 - Agriculture, Nutritional Sciences and Landscape Architecture; TC 09 - Chemistry; TC 10 - Life Sciences; TC 11 - Geosciences; TC 12 - Mathematics; TC 13 - Physics. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. EQF = The European Qualifications Framework for lifelong learning [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Includes the assessment for the European subject-specific seals, where applicable. When the accreditation process is finalized, possible requirements and/or recommendations and also deadlines apply to the ASIIN seal as well as to the subject-specific seals. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Within the European Higher Education Area, the ECTS Users' Guide is the expected basis for calculating credits. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Exams are all methods of ascertaining to which extent the learning outcomes have been reached as well as any pre-examination elements, assignments etc., as set forth by the higher education institution in question. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)