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Introduction
FH Münster

- University of Applied Sciences
  - 15,000 Students
  - About 100 study programmes
  - 13 faculties

- Quality management system
  - Established about 10 years ago
  - System-accreditation in 2011
  - Re-accredited in 2017 (until 2026)

- Wandelwerk – Center for Quality Development of FH Münster
CORE-Concept
Four steps to quality development

Optimize

- Structures
- Processes

Clarity

- Clarify intended outcomes

Reflect

- Reflect on & react to achieved outcomes

Outcomes

Encourage improvement

University
- Faculty
- Programme
- Course
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Our Goals for Today
Expected Learning Outcomes

After you have attended this workshop, we expect you to be able to …

• to describe which contribution different groups of stakeholders can give within the process of development of a new study programme or the improvement of an existing one;

• to analyse the effects of different options of stakeholder involvement in the process of study programme development,

• to develop suggestions for a better stakeholder involvement – at our and your universities.
Who is here today?
Introduction
Introduction
External Evaluation

Legal basis

The European Standards and Guidelines demand that all study programmes are developed “by involving students and other stakeholders” and that they should “benefit from external expertise”. (ESG, 1.2)

in Germany: “[…] regular evaluations of the study programmes and the relevant performance areas for teaching and studies by internal and external students, external scientific experts, representatives of the industry and graduates" (Musterrechtsverordnung zum 1.1.2018 gem. Art. 4.1-4 Studienakkreditierungsstaatsvertrag, § 18 (1))
§ 9 Principles and types of external evaluation

“(1) The external evaluation aims at **examining** and **giving advice** from the point of view of **independent** experts. Especially the **results of the internal evaluation** and - where appropriate - the **requirements of course development** are discussed.“

Peer-Evaluation
- At least every 7 years

Advisory Board
- At least once a year

Alternative
- With the approval of the Presidium
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External Evaluation - Peer-Evaluation

Procedure:
Usual case: 1.5 days inspection of the expert group on the basis of common information materials (e.g. module manual, examination regulations, key figures) according to usual criteria such as studyability, relevance of the curriculum, personnel and material resources.

Composition:
3 - 5 Reviewers
Potential employers (e.g. Industry actors (some at the same time alumni, research partners), scientific peers, (external) students

Formal:
At least every 7 years, expert opinion also to president’s board and QA-team
Introduction

External Evaluation - Advisory Board

Two options:

- Rule: 1 advisory board for 1 department
- Alternative: 1 advisory board for 1 study programme

Composition:

- 4 -12, mostly 6-7 members
- Potential employers (some at the same time alumni, research partners), Scientific peers, (external) students
- Term of office usually 3 years

Formal:

- Meeting at least 1x yearly, meeting minutes also to president’s board and QA-team
Group Work
Group Work
Peer-Evaluation and Advisory Board

1. Find a group: Each group represents one stakeholder group (students, scientific peers, potential employers).

2. How do you think your group would like to contribute to the development of a new study programme or to the improvement of an existing programme? What would be your main focus of interest, your expertise? What would be your motivation?

3. What difficulties may your group encounter in the two different scenarios – peer-evaluation or advisory board?

4. How could the university facilitate a professional feedback by the different stakeholder groups and thus ensure that the faculty really benefits from the broad expertise?
External Evaluation in Practice
Thank you very much for your attention!
## Conclusion – Experiences

### Opportunities and difficulties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advisory Board</th>
<th>Peer-Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Opportunities</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Current suggestions from practice and science community</td>
<td>- Suggestions from practice and science (longer period)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Continuous support</td>
<td>- Participation possible for experts who could not work for a longer period of time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Trusting relationship, enables more honest exchange and faster understanding</td>
<td>- Several years of &quot;rest&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Workload distributed more evenly over time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Difficulties</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Find and keep dedicated members</td>
<td>- Finding competent and unbiased reviewers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Serious preparation vs. spontaneous expression of opinions</td>
<td>- Very complex process in certain areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Independence: relationship of trust vs. critical distance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>