Amendment to and Re-Announcement of the

Evaluation and Accreditation Regulations for Teaching and Learning (EvAO)

of the University of Bonn

dated May 15, 2025

By virtue of § 2, paragraph 4, sentence 1 in conjunction with § 7, paragraph 2 of the Higher Education Act of North Rhine-Westphalia (*Hochschulgesetz*, HG) of September 16, 2014 (Legal and Regulatory Gazette of North Rhine-Westphalia (GV NRW, p. 574)), as last amended by Article 2 of the Act to Strengthen Bochum as a Higher Education Location in the Field of Health and to Change Additional Higher Education Legal Provisions (*Gesetz zur Stärkung des Hochschulstandorts Bochum im Bereich des Gesundheitswesens und zur Änderung weiterer hochschulrechtlicher Vorschriften*) dated December 19, 2024 (GV NRW, p. 1222), the University of Bonn has adopted the following Regulations:

Contents

Part I: Regulatory scope, principles and quality management system

§ 1
Scope

(1) These Evaluation and Accreditation Regulations for Teaching and Learning (EvAO) apply to all faculties, sections, institutes, departments, central units and bodies of the University of Bonn as well as the Bonn Center for Teacher Education (BZL) (organizational units). It also applies to the degree programs under the purview of the faculties and the Bonn Center for Teacher Education (BZL). For degree programs that are not assigned to a particular faculty, the Rectorate takes the place of the faculty.

(2) The faculties, the BZL and the Rectorate can pass supplementary provisions that do not contradict these Regulations if these Regulations so provide.

§ 2
Principles

These Regulations set down the principles of the quality management system (QMS) for teaching and learning at the University of Bonn. The procedural principles of the QMS are divided into the principles for evaluation (Part II of these Regulations) and the principles for internal accreditation (Part III of these Regulations). The principles for evaluation serve to implement the provisions of § 7, paragraph 2 HG, and the principles for internal accreditation implement the provisions of § 7, paragraph 1 HG.

§ 3
Quality management system

(1) The University of Bonn has devised a QMS for teaching and learning based on the premises of closed operational loops and communication regarding teaching and learning that is designed in a participatory and dialogue-based way.

(2) It is underpinned by values and standards that have been harmonized across the University and that are expressed in its mission statement for teaching and in the Guiding Principles in Studying and Teaching. These are specified and operationalized in the form of profile characteristics that each include certain quality objectives and criteria. Formulated in a collaborative process, these principles give everyone involved in teaching and learning guidance in identifying measures for continued development. The Guiding Principles and the mission statement also provide explicit priorities for developing the University's overarching profile.

(3) According to § 7, paragraph 4 HG, all members and associates of the University are obligated to participate in accreditation and evaluation processes to the extent necessary. All members of the University also have the right to participate appropriately in these processes and to be informed of the results of the procedures. The University strives to include former members and associates according to § 8, paragraph 5 HG; they are to be advised that their information is provided voluntarily.

(4) The quality assurance and quality development tools and procedures that are used in the QMS process (see Part II and Part III of these Regulations) are described in a Quality Management Handbook (QM Handbook) based on these Regulations. The QM Handbook provides a guideline for carrying out quality assurance procedures and for creating transparency and procedural reliability (together with the EvAO) within the University. It is to be continually revised and published by the Studying, Teaching, Academic Planning division with the inclusion of all actors relevant to learning and teaching. If conflicts arise, the Rectorate determines the procedure and places the object of the conflict on the agenda for the following quality conference.

Part II: Evaluations

§ 4
Evaluation goals

(1) Regular evaluations provide a systematic analysis and ensure and improve the quality of teaching and learning in the spirit of a closed operational PDCA ("plan, do, check, act") loop.

In particular, they serve to fulfill the following subgoals:

1. Initiating and ensuring continual quality assurance and quality control in teaching and learning
2. Strengthening internal self-regulation mechanisms
3. Deriving and implementing measures to optimize how studies and examinations are organized
4. Fostering discourse between teachers and learners
5. Identifying strengths and weaknesses in the responsible organizational unit and in the studying conditions
6. Systematically reviewing the measures implemented in terms of the extent to which they have achieved the intended goals

Based on the premises of participatory and dialogue-oriented communication according to § 3, para. 1, the results of the regular evaluations are also to be communicated to all University members (see § 7, paragraph 1).

(2) The information gathered from the evaluation provides internal and external accountability as well as a key foundation for internal (re)accreditation processes for degree programs (see Part III).

§ 5
Responsibility for evaluations

(1) The Rectorate is responsible for quality assurance and quality development at the University of Bonn when it comes to teaching and learning. It ensures that the provisions in these Regulations are implemented and provides tools to support the evaluation procedures defined in these Regulations. It ensures that the University's quality reports according to § 7, paragraph 2 HG are published, aggregating the data from the evaluation reports of the evaluation project groups (EPGs) and the faculties'/BZL's evaluation reports. It ensures both appropriate quality

development according to the teaching mission statement and that closed PDCA loops are gone through using dialogue formats with the faculties and the BZL (referred to as faculty dialogues, see § 7, paragraph 9) that typically take place every two years. It is also responsible for the ongoing development of the QMS with the help of institutionalized quality conferences according to § 6, paragraph 4.

(2) Depending on the organizational assignment of a degree program, either the deans, the chair of the BZL or the Rectorate are responsible for actually carrying out the quality assurance procedure for teaching and learning and for establishing communication and organizational structures according to paragraph 3 in the organizational units assigned to them.

(3) The evaluation officers and the EPGs that support them are the communication and organizational structures both within the organizational unit and between their organizational unit and the participating central units, and in this role they are responsible for carrying out needs-based and regular evaluation procedures in their respective degree programs (see § 7, paragraph 2).

(4) The Center for Evaluation and Methods (ZEM) and the Bonn Center for Higher Education (BZH) as well as the Studying, Teaching, Academic Planning division provide tools and reporting templates for carrying out and documenting quality assurance and quality development procedures in teaching and learning; they continue to develop these tools and templates in cooperation with the organizational units and the Rectorate.

(5) The ZEM is responsible for carrying out the general student survey and, if applicable, the internal graduate survey; it also provides resources for module and course evaluation, including the statistical evaluation of the data collected at the requested aggregation level. In this context, the ZEM advises the organizational units (or the evaluation officers or the EPGs) and the student councils in designing the evaluation procedures. The ZEM only acts upon the request of the evaluation officers, the deans, the BZL chair, the Rectorate or the administration and coordinates its activities with the Studying, Teaching, Academic Planning division and the BZH. The ZEM also supports other evaluation procedures (such as qualitative surveys, interviews) and offers advisory services for specific evaluation processes in the context of quantitative, qualitative or mixed procedures.

(6) As an interfaculty advisory, support and service institution unit in the area of teaching and learning, the BZH provides the organizational units with electronic tools for analyzing their key data; the tools support the units in carrying out evaluations based on study progression data. The BZH also provides electronic tools for organizing and visualizing curricular structures that help with designing and evaluating degree programs based on competences.

(7) According to § 6, paragraph 3, the Studying, Teaching, Academic Planning division provides additional, centrally maintained key data related to teaching and learning; it also provides standardized reporting templates that are necessary for carrying out the evaluations.

§ 6
Evaluation process

(1) At the University of Bonn, evaluations take place on four different levels. This includes the following levels:

1. Courses and modules
2. Degree programs

3. Faculties or teaching units
4. Overall system

(2) A toolkit of various evaluation methods and tools is provided for the evaluations; this toolkit is continually expanded. Each office or unit—including the accreditation committee (see § 11)—charged with an evaluation can select the methods and tools that best suit its needs from this toolkit and can make suggestions for additional methods and tools (see QM Handbook according to § 3, paragraph 4). In particular the following standardized methods and tools are available:

1. Surveys for course evaluations:

   Surveys for course evaluations provide quality assurance and quality development for individual courses to the extent possible when using standardized surveys of students and teachers. The point of time at which the surveys are carried out is set by the evaluation officers in coordination with the teachers participating in the respective course. If more than one teacher is involved in a course, then the survey should also include the contributions of the individual teachers to the course. Relevant aspects are, for example, the individual teachers' didactic methods and content design as well as an overall assessment of the course. The standard questionnaire that is kept by the ZEM and continually developed in discussion with the organizational units can be expanded or adapted according to needs with the approval of the EPG if so requested by the teacher or other participants such as the student councils or institute directors. The questionnaire design is coordinated by the evaluation officers. Surveys at the course level take place regularly, that is, typically each semester or in the rhythm the course regularly takes place but at least every two years in order to fulfill the regular reporting obligations of the evaluation officers vis-á-vis the respective dean or the BZL chair or the Rector according to § 7, paragraphs 4, 7 and 8. The results are announced in an aggregated form to the EPG members, the respective teachers and, with due consideration to data privacy laws, the students (see § 7, paragraph 1 and § 17, paragraphs 5 and 6). They can also be assessed separately by gender and published in this way. Surveys for course evaluations can be carried out online or on paper. Depending on the structure of the degree program, these two survey methods can be combined.

2. Surveys for module evaluations:

   Regular surveys for module evaluations help ensure and improve the quality of teaching and learning. They are carried out according to the quality definitions and any guidelines of the respective discipline or the organizational unit, taking any faculty-wide standards into consideration. The surveys for module evaluations serve to collect data on aspects that are not specific to a certain course. That includes the coordination of content within a module, collecting data on the student workload and reviewing the extent to which the module's teaching content contributes to achieving the set module/learning objectives. For this purpose, the ZEM keeps a questionnaire that is continually developed together with the organizational units. On the part of the organizational units, the questionnaire design is coordinated by the evaluation officers. As in paragraph 2, no. 1, surveys at the module level take place regularly, that is, typically each semester or in the rhythm the module regularly takes place but at least every two years in order to fulfill the regular reporting obligations of the evaluation officers vis-á-vis the respective dean or the BZL chair or the Rector according to § 7, paragraphs 4, 7 and 8. The results are announced in an aggregated form to the EPG members, the respective teachers and, with due consideration to data privacy laws, the students (see § 7, paragraph 1 and § 17, paragraphs 5 and 6). They can also be assessed separately by gender and published in this way.

3. General student survey:

   This annual survey of all students evaluates teaching and learning, equal opportunity and promotion of early-career researchers beyond the scope of individual courses. The focus of the content is on general conditions for studying and learning, and it is possible for each survey to have a different concentration. The results are assessed and published within the University. They are also provided to the evaluation officers and the EPGs.

4. Graduate surveys with the Institute for Applied Statistics (ISTAT):

   University of Bonn graduates are surveyed between 1.5 and 4.5 years after they earn their degree from the University of Bonn; they are asked about their career entry and how they would evaluate their program retrospectively. In the retrospective evaluation of their program, the focus is on whether relevant skills and qualifications were taught. The results are analyzed separately by organizational unit and gender and published within the University.

5. Evaluating study progression:

   All organizational units continually assess study progression data with the support of the BZH. This anonymized data includes in particular the number of students, drop-out rate, cohort development, grade distribution and failures at the module level. The more detailed possibilities for analysis such as by gender or for international students are to be considered within the framework of legal requirements for overarching obligations.

(3) To support the offices responsible for the evaluations, the Studying, Teaching, Academic Planning division bundles additional data according to an internally approved data concept that covers all relevant data for degree program evaluation and development including the figures from the official statistics. They are made available according to the applicable deadlines.

(4) Following the principles of § 3, paragraph 1, a quality conference is held to prepare further development measures for the entire QMS, in particular for the QM Handbook, and at least the deans of studies, the evaluation officers and the students from the EPGs are to be invited. Responsibility for convening the conferences and setting the agenda lies with the Rectorate in consultation with the faculties or, as appropriate, the BZL. Other people with responsibility for teaching and learning, especially representatives from degree program management, the ZEM, the BZH and Central Administration as well as students from the General Students' Committee (AStA) and the student councils conference should be invited to attend where the topics under discussion require and organizational constraints permit. All the data, structures, processes and results garnered from these Regulations can be used as a basis for dialogue. The quality conference is organized regularly but at least once every four years. In preparation for the conference, the Studying, Teaching, Academic Planning division requests topic suggestions and development needs from all named status groups and makes a suggestion for the agenda.

§ 7
Deriving, implementing and reviewing evaluation measures

(1) The procedures described in § 6 collect data on the status quo at the course, module and degree-program level as well as at the level of the teaching unit and faculty/BZL and the QMS for teaching and learning as a whole. Based on the results arising from this, target states are described and specific measures are developed and implemented that appear suitable for achieving these targets. The measures developed or implemented by the EPGs together with the responsible bodies (dean's offices, if applicable the BZL board, Rectorate) are made transparent in a suitable manner; in particular, and under consideration of data privacy regulations, the students are to be informed of the bundled results and measures taken, for example via the student councils according to § 14 of the Ordinance Regulating the Details of Degree Program Accreditation in North Rhine-Westphalia (*Verordnung zur Regelung des Näheren der Studienakkreditierung in Nordrhein-Westfalen*, StudakVO NRW). The objectives of evaluations according to § 4, paragraph 1 (systematic analysis and ensuring and improving the quality of teaching and learning in the spirit of a closed operational PDCA loop) is to be accounted for, meaning that the effectiveness of the measures taken is also systematically reviewed.

(2) At the level of the organizational units, EPGs with the inclusion of members from the group of university professors, members from the group of academic staff, members from the group of students, the evaluation officer and those responsible for degree program management for the respective organizational unit are to be established to discuss the evaluation results, derive measures from the results and discuss possibilities for implementing the measures (see § 5, paragraph 3). The evaluation officers and the EPGs that support them organize as needed the procedures described in § 6 that are to be carried out regularly in their respective degree programs and, together with the people responsible for the organizational units or the relevant body for this, are responsible for ensuring that there is a systematic discussion of the problems and potentials for development identified within the evaluations and that targeted measures are derived (see paragraph 7).

(3) Depending on the assignment of a degree program, either the deans, the BZL chair or the Rectorate are responsible for establishing the EPGs. They nominate an evaluation officer for election to the faculty council, or in the case of the BZL the board or the Rector in the case of degree programs under the responsibility of the Rectorate. The faculty council or the BZL chair or the Rector can vote for someone other than the person nominated. The evaluation officer's term of office is two years; re-election and a constructive vote of no confidence are possible. The term of office for the EPG members from the other status groups is also two years; the term of office for the student member is one year. The responsible dean or the BZL chair or the Rector ensures that a responsible evaluation officer and a responsible EPG is elected for each degree program (or degree program component) offered.

(4) Together with the EPG, the evaluation officers are responsible for implementing the provisions of Part II of these Regulations in their organizational units. They inform those responsible for the organizational unit regularly, at the latest every two years, about an EPG evaluation report and have an advisory role for those responsible for the organizational unit on issues related to evaluations, quality assurance and quality development. In their work, they are supported by the EPG, which can supplement the evaluation report with statements from the different status groups if necessary.

(5) The EPGs are typically made up of one representative from each of the groups named in paragraph 2. The faculty council, the BZL board or the Rector in the case of degree programs for

which the Rectorate is responsible sets the number of members. At least 30% of the members are to be students. The election of the members is carried out for each status group separately by the faculty council, the BZL board or the Rector in the case of degree programs for which the Rectorate is responsible. For each status group, a sufficient number of deputies are elected. The evaluation officer is the chair. The responsible examination boards should be included. The specific make-up of the EPGs must be communicated on the organizational units' web pages. The EPG members and their deputies are subject to absolute confidentiality vis-á-vis third parties. For deputies exercising their duties as a deputy, the same rights and obligations apply as for EPG members.

(6) For their work, the members receive the results of all evaluations related to their organizational unit and relevant key data analyses. The ZEM, the BZH and the Studying, Teaching, Academic Planning division can offer advice in the discussion of the results and specialized additional analyses if necessary. To support the EPGs in their organization, the Rectorate is to develop guidelines in coordination with the accreditation commission; the guidelines are also to include information about the process of requesting any necessary supplementary data from the EPG.

(7) Based on these results and oriented on their own quality understanding or on any quality guidelines, the EPG suggests measures and informs those responsible for the organizational units or the relevant body of these measures. The bodies must acknowledge the findings of the EPG and appropriately ensure that the findings are discussed; in addition, in the spirit of closed operational PDCA loops, the effectiveness of implemented measures is to be evaluated (see paragraph 8). The EPG can request a statement on this, in particular if the results of the course evaluations according to § 6, paragraph 2, no. 1 repeatedly show a need for change or development possibilities. If the EPG recommends measures for courses, modules or the entire degree program, these measures are implemented in close coordination with the relevant body or the affected teachers. The BZH and the ZEM can be consulted and offer advice in deriving and implementing measures. In cases of conflict, the responsible dean, the BZL chair or the Rectorate is to be included. The dean of a faculty or the BZL chair or the Rector for degree programs assigned to the Rectorate has the right, in accordance with § 27, paragraph 1, sentence 2 HG, to verify the findings and measures contained in the evaluation results in cooperation with the EPG responsible for the respective organizational unit.

(8) The evaluation officers regularly, but at least every two years, inform the dean, the BZL chair or the Rector in writing about the results of the organizational units' EPGs. This is done using an EPG evaluation report template provided for this purpose and can be supplemented with copies of the EPG's session minutes. The respective dean, the BZL chair or the Rector is responsible for any development or implementation of measures that is to be discussed or coordinated between multiple organizational units based on the results of the assigned organizational units and is also responsible for regularly informing students about the results and the measures that have been developed and implemented (see paragraph 1). The respective dean, the BZL chair or the Rector also informs the Rectorate at least every two years about the quality assurance activities in teaching and learning that have been undertaken in the faculty or BZL. This is done using a faculty evaluation report template provided for this purpose.

(9) The reports and any submitted minutes from the EPG or the organizational units serve as a basis for data and content preparation for the faculty dialogues with the Rectorate, initiated by the Rectorate, which take place in two-year intervals. The faculty dialogues also include ideas and development perspectives that arise from the mission statement for teaching, for example. The faculty or BZL and the Rectorate conclude general agreements as part of the faculty dialogues and record these in writing. To ensure sufficient follow-up and to close the PCDA loop, the fulfillment of the agreements is also a topic of the following faculty dialogues. Information on this is

aggregated, discussed with the faculties or the BZL and included in the Rectorate's aggregated quality report according to § 7, paragraph 2 HG.

(10) If the overarching needs make it necessary for the Rectorate to obtain information beyond that stated in paragraph 5 and paragraph 6 to write the aggregated quality report according to § 7, paragraph 2 HG, then the deans or the BZL chair provide this information when requested by the Rectorate.

Part III: Accreditation

§ 8
Principles of system accreditation

(1) According to § 7, paragraph 1 HG, starting and maintaining a degree program first requires that the degree program successfully undergo an accreditation procedure; exceptions must be approved by the Ministry. If not otherwise stipulated in these Regulations or by law, accreditation is carried out in an internal accreditation procedure.

(2) The internal accreditation procedure takes place based on the University of Bonn's valid system accreditation by the German Accreditation Council. It includes both the initial accreditation of newly established degree programs and the re-accreditation of established and previously accredited degree programs. If a degree program is successfully accredited in the internal process, the Rectorate presents the degree program with the seal of the German Accreditation Council.

(3) Accredited degree programs need to be re-accredited at least every eight years.

(4) The internal accreditation procedure can be carried out together for degree programs that have a similar structure and/or related content as stated in § 30, paragraph 1 StudakVO.

§ 9
Goals of internal accreditation procedures

(1) Internal accreditation procedures at the University of Bonn are geared toward fostering the quality culture that is actively embraced within it. They also supplement the insights gained from the ongoing evaluation process with the views of external experts. They provide evidence of the fulfillment of requirements set externally, in particular by the provisions of the StudakVO as amended, to identify areas with potential for development and/or to devise measures for optimizing the aspects covered in the relevant procedure. The University of Bonn's internal accreditation procedures thus serve a range of purposes, including demonstrating legitimacy and accountability to the outside world, providing impetus, forging a sense of identification and, if relevant, laying the groundwork internally for ongoing development measures.

(2) The assessments that arise from the internal accreditation procedure provide an important foundation for planning future evaluations of degree programs (see Part II).

§ 10
Responsibilities in internal accreditation procedures

(1) The Rectorate is responsible for commissioning and regularly carrying out internal accreditation and re-accreditation as well as for publishing the results under consideration of § 18, paragraph 4 and § 29 StudadVO. To this end, in coordination with the dean's offices in the faculties and the BZL chair, the Rectorate decides on and monitors an accreditation cycle that sets down the point in time for the internal accreditation procedure according to § 14, paragraph 1 ff. for all degree programs (and degree program components) and that is regularly updated.

(2) The dean of the faculty or the BZL chair are responsible for initiating the procedure and participating in the procedure from the faculty or BZL side for accreditation and re-accreditation according to § 14. In addition, they are responsible for the faculty or BZL appointing individuals who are responsible for implementing any necessary measures that are identified.

(3) The Studying, Teaching, Academic Planning division is responsible for supporting the internal accreditation procedure according to § 14. This includes in particular the following:

1. Carrying out the formal audit according to § 14, paragraph 3 and documenting the results in an audit report
2. Ensuring the external people included in the procedure according to § 13, paragraph 2 are unbiased
3. Supporting the external reviewers in carrying out the expert content review according to § 14, paragraph 4 and in documenting their findings in a review
4. Supporting the accreditation commission in procedural matters when it prepares the (re-)accreditation decision according to § 14, paragraph 5 and when it publishes the results

§ 11
Accreditation commission

(1) Following the principles of § 4, paragraph 1, the Rectorate establishes an accreditation commission. In the procedure for the University of Bonn's internal accreditations, the accreditation commission prepares the accreditation decisions as described in § 7, paragraph 1 HG and gives a recommendation for a decision to the Rectorate; the Rectorate makes the final decision. The accreditation commission is also responsible for clarifying any possible biases in the process of finding external reviewers according to § 13, paragraph 3. With regard to these tasks, the members of the accreditation commission act independently, without prejudice to the outcome and without being bound by instructions, in accordance with § 17, paragraph 2, sentence 2 StudakVO.

(2) The members of the accreditation commission are the following:

1. Each without the right to vote: the Vice Rector for Teaching, Learning and University Development and another vice rector or university professors appointed by the Rectorate who are not members of the Rectorate
2. One university professor from each faculty
3. One representative from the Bonn Center for Teacher Education (BZL) from among the group of university professors

4. Three academic staff members
5. One member of administrative or technical staff
6. Three students

A deputy is to be determined for each member. The term of office for the deputy ends with the term of office of the member for whom they are a deputy. For individual sessions, the accreditation commission can invite additional advising members without the right to vote. In addition, the accreditation commission passes rules of procedures that include provisions on at least the following: the frequency of its sessions, how it will handle conflicts of interest and the publication of decisions made.

(3) The members of the accreditation commission and their deputies are appointed by the Rector and installed by the Rectorate. The appointment of the members according to § 11, paragraph 2, no. 4 is done based on the nomination of the council of academic staff members; the appointment of the members according to § 11, paragraph 2, no. 5 is done based on the nomination of Senate members from the group of administrative and technical staff; the appointment of the members according to § 11, paragraph 2, no. 6 is done based on the nomination of the General Students' Committee (AStA) and the student councils conference.

(4) The terms of office for the members according to § 11, paragraph 2, nos. 1–5 is generally four years starting in the winter semester, although the term of office for members of the Rectorate who are members of the accreditation commission due to their office ends with the end of their term of office in the Rectorate. The term of office for voting members according to § 11, paragraph 2, no. 6 is one year. By way of derogation from sentence 1, the term of office for one of the three members according to § 11, paragraph 2, no. 6 starts in the summer semester to enable knowledge to be suitably transferred in light of the shorter term of office in comparison to the other members according to § 11, paragraph 2, nos. 1–5.

(5) If a member or deputy leaves the commission during their term of office, then according to paragraph 3 the Rector appoints a new member or a new deputy for the remaining term of office. Until the new member or deputy takes office, the member or deputy who is leaving the commission continues their work. If members lose their eligibility to be elected in their group, they must inform the chair of this in writing without delay.

§ 12
Chair and deputy

(1) From the group of members according to § 11, paragraph 2, no. 1, no 2 or no. 3, the accreditation commission elects a chair for the entire term of office.

(2) The chair of the accreditation commission represents the accreditation commission within the University and prepares and leads the sessions. The chair ensures that advising is done quickly and properly; the chair determines when the discussion of an agenda topic or a vote or election begins and when it is complete.

(3) The accreditation commission elects a member from the group of members according to § 11, paragraph 2, nos. 1–6 as a deputy chair in case the chair cannot attend a session.

§ 13
Reviewers

(1) Within the scope of internal accreditation procedures at the University of Bonn, reviewers from outside the University are commissioned to conduct an independent assessment of the matters entrusted to them. They deliver a verdict on the fulfillment of, in particular, the substantive subject-specific criteria in accordance with the StudakVO and on whether the degree programs that they have reviewed qualify for (re-)accreditation. They accept this commission based on their personal and subject-specific skills and not as a representative of organizations or interest groups, even if they were initially put forward by such an organization or group.

(2) To ensure the external reviewers are not biased, they submit declarations to this end. The office that assists with the internal accreditation procedure obligates them to treat the information they are given confidentially.

(3) External reviewers are installed by the Rectorate upon the suggestion of the dean's office for the affected faculty or the BZL chair and, if necessary, in coordination with the accreditation commission. It is to be ensured that external students, representative professional practitioners and external researchers are appropriately included in the reviews of the degree program. For each review, at least one person from the status groups listed is to be included. In addition, the requirements of the Guidelines for Appointing Reviewers and the Make-Up of Reviewer Groups for Accreditation Procedures (*Leitlinien zur Benennung von Gutachterinnen und Gutachtern und der Zusammenstellung von Gutachtergruppen für Akkreditierungsverfahren*) as amended from the German Rectors' Conference is considered in regard to the qualification, selection criteria, reasons for determining bias and make-up of the group.

(4) The external reviewers receive compensation for their time and expertise that is directly linked to carrying out their task as a reviewer. Travel and accommodation expenses are reimbursed according to the Travel Expenses Act of the state of North Rhine-Westphalia (*Landesreisekostengesetz*, LRKG) upon submission of original receipts.

§ 14
Internal accreditation procedure

(1) Each of the University of Bonn's degree programs that must be accredited is to be accredited or re-accredited internally according to the procedure set down in these Regulations. Expenses incurred in conjunction with the internal accreditation procedure are covered by the Rectorate.

(2) The Rectorate commissions the internal accreditation procedure as soon as an occasion arises (a new degree program is established, significant changes are made to already accredited degree programs or the regular re-accreditation based on cyclical deadlines). The internal accreditation procedure includes the following:

1. Auditing formal aspects (paragraph 3)
2. Auditing subject-specific content aspects (paragraph 4)
3. Reaching the accreditation decision (paragraph 5)

(3) Auditing formal aspects ensures the criteria set down in Part 2 StudakVO (§§ 3–10) are met. This audit is carried out by one or more offices within the University. The offices involved in the audit act independently, without prejudice as to the result and without being bound to instructions in regard to their vote on Part 2 StudakVO (§§ 3–10) according to § 17, paragraph 2, sentence 2

StudakVO. The result of the audit is set down in an audit report that does justice to the requirements of § 18, paragraph 4 and § 29 StudakVO (Publication).

(4) Substantive and subject-specific aspects are audited in order to ensure that the criteria set out in Part 3 of the StudakVO (§§ 11–16, 19 and 20) and any other criteria considered relevant University-wide are met insofar as these have been agreed by the Rectorate after being developed together with the dean's offices and have been published in the Official Announcements (e.g. the mission statement for teaching). The audit is conducted with the involvement of several reviewers from outside the University (see § 13). The result of the audit is set out in a review that takes due account of the requirements of § 18, paragraph 4 and § 29 StudakVO (Publication) and that contains a verdict on whether the individual criteria are met and whether the degree program(s) reviewed qualify for (re-)accreditation.

(5) Accreditation decisions are made by the Rectorate based on the recommendation of the accreditation commission (see § 11, paragraph 1) based on the internal audit reports on formal criteria, the external reviews on content criteria and under consideration of any statements from the affected faculty or the BZL.

(6) Degree programs are to be (re-)accredited when all formal and content criteria are fulfilled. (Re-)accreditation is valid for a maximum of eight years. When setting the length of the validity, it should be ensured that the degree programs can be bundled appropriately in the following cycle (see accreditation cycle according to § 10, paragraph 1). If it is a review that is carried out outside of the regular cycle, then typically the validity is set until the next regular cycle of degree programs or degree program bundle with a similar topic.

(7) If it is determined as part of the internal accreditation process that the criteria are in part not fulfilled, then (re-)accreditation can be granted conditionally as described in § 7, paragraph 1, sentence 2 HG. Conditions are measures that, based on the votes, the accreditation commission believes to be suitable for remedying the deficiencies found. The faculty or the BZL is to be given a suitable period of time to fulfill the conditions (typically twelve months). The decision on whether the conditions have been fulfilled is made by the Rectorate based on the recommendation of the accreditation commission. If the conditions are not fulfilled in the period of time given, then (re-)accreditation is revoked. An extension of the deadline can be granted once by the Rectorate upon justified written or electronic request from the dean's office or the BZL chair. This is in particular possible if the faculty or the BZL is not responsible for the reason the conditions have not yet been fulfilled or if there is a conflict (see for example § 16).

(8) If it is found as part of the internal accreditation procedure that the criteria are not fulfilled and there are no apparent measures that would remedy the deficiencies within a maximum period of 18 months, then (re-)accreditation of the degree program is to be denied.

(9) The accreditation commission can also give recommendations. Recommendations are suggestions for further developing quality and pursue the goal of promoting a culture of quality, but the recommendations are not binding in contrast to the measures described in the previous paragraphs. The accreditation decision made by the Rectorate is to be linked with the recommendations made by the accreditation commission.

(10) Subject to a successful system (re-)accreditation of the University of Bonn according to Article 3, paragraph 1, item 1 of the State Agreement on the Organization of a Joint Accreditation System for Quality Assurance in Teaching and Learning at German Universities (*Studienakkreditierungsstaatsvertrag*), positive decisions made according to § 14, paragraph 5 mean that the seal for degree programs from the German Accreditation Council is granted.

§ 15
Special provisions

(1) If internal accreditation is not sought due to external circumstances or an agreement between the faculty or BZL and the Rectorate, then the affected degree program is to undergo program accreditation. The faculty then commissions an accreditation agency approved according to Article 5, paragraph 3, item 5 of the State Agreement on the Organization of a Joint Accreditation System for Quality Assurance in Teaching and Learning at German Universities with creating an accreditation report. The accreditation report is submitted to the German Accreditation Council for a final decision; if applicable, statements are submitted with the report. Expenses incurred are covered by the respective faculty or the BZL.

(2) Degree programs that are not required to be accredited (especially degree programs that are completed with a state examination and doctoral degree programs) can go through the internal accreditation procedure to promote the goals according to § 4, paragraph 1 and § 9, paragraph 1 if the internal accreditation procedure can be applied to the degree program. In this case, no seal from the German Accreditation Council according to § 14, paragraph 10 is awarded.

(3) For combined degree programs as described in § 32 StudakVO, both the entire combined degree program and the degree program components are internally accredited in separate procedures. The duration of the accreditation validity for the combined degree program determines the duration of the accreditation validity for all degree program components. The faculties or the BZL involved in the respective combined degree program coordinate a procedure in which the functionality of the degree program model as a whole is evaluated. Conditions for this are to be considered when determining and updating the accreditation cycle according to § 10, paragraph 1. For combined teaching degree programs, the BZL is to be included not only for the degree program components for which the BZL is directly responsible, but also for the degree program components under the responsibility of the individual faculties to promote appropriate links among the various elements of teaching degree programs.

(4) For internal accreditations of degree programs for regulated professions, the relevant legal regulations must also be taken into account. Representatives from the responsible state and/or church offices are to be included appropriately in the procedure. Depending on the degree program, this could mean they are included as reviewers according to § 13 (especially for teaching and theology degree programs), but at least appropriately informing the responsible office on the progress and results of the internal accreditation procedure. For the regulated professions, the appointment of these representatives is done by the responsible state and/or church offices. Details are regulated in agreements between the state or church office and the University of Bonn. Any participation is to be ensured by the office that assists with the internal accreditation procedures.

(5) The first accreditation of new teaching degree programs—that is, when supplementing other “teaching degree types” offered by the University of Bonn—does not take part as an internal accreditation procedure but must go through program accreditation according to § 15, paragraph 1 of these Regulations based on § 11, paragraph 2, sentence 4 of the Teacher Education for Teaching at Public Schools Act (*Lehrerausbildungsgesetz*, LABG).

(6) If the University of Bonn cooperates with another higher education institution for a degree program, the type and scope of cooperation is to be documented in a suitable manner (e.g. by submitting the cooperation agreement). The inclusion of this cooperation in the QMS, in particular

the responsibility for accreditation, is to be clearly regulated in the agreement. If the University of Bonn is the university that confers the degree, or if it is one of the universities that confers the degrees in consortial cooperation programs, then the internal accreditation procedure according to § 14 can be applied. In this case, the partner universities are to be obligated to provide all information necessary for carrying out the procedure and to participate in the procedural steps where their participation is necessary. If the University of Bonn is not the university that confers the degree, then either program accreditation (see § 15, paragraph 1) is to be planned or, if the cooperation is with another system-accredited university, the program can be included in that university's QMS.

(7) For joint programs that are offered as part of international cooperation between the University of Bonn and another European university in the European Higher Education Area, an accreditation procedure according to the European Approach for Quality Assurance of Joint Programmes can be carried out. In these cases, §§ 10, 16 and 33 StudakVO are to be applied.

(8) If a degree program is wholly or partially carried out in cooperation with non-university institutions, then as part of the internal accreditation procedure the special criteria in § 9 and § 19 StudakVO are to be considered; in addition, appropriate participation of the cooperating non-university institutions is to be ensured. The partner institutions are to be included in the relevant procedural steps according to § 14 of these Regulations, and they are typically allowed to be included when choosing the group of reviewers according to § 13.

§ 16
Clearing procedure and handling complaints

(1) Suggestions and complaints about the procedures in these Regulations or about the decisions made as part of the internal accreditation procedures are to be directed to the Rectorate in writing and must include reasons.

(2) Suggestions or complaints about the functionality and effectiveness of the QMS are appropriately bundled and discussed by the Rectorate as part of a quality conference (see § 6, paragraph 4).

(3) A clearing office is to be established to handle complaints about decisions made as part of internal accreditation procedures. Voting members of the clearing office include two university professors, two academic staff members, two members from the administrative and technical staff, two students and one representative from the Legal Department. The members are appointed by the Rectorate. The Rector heads the clearing office but has no voting rights. If necessary, the Rector can delegate the task of heading the clearing office to a vice rector, but not the vice rector responsible for teaching and learning. Members of the accreditation commission cannot be members of the clearing office. In addition, the regulations on conflicts of interest according to § 20 of the Administrative Procedure Act for the state of North Rhine-Westphalia (*Verwaltungsverfahrensgesetz NRW*, VwVfG NRW) apply accordingly.

(4) The clearing office attempts to find a solution to the conflict with the parties involved. If no mutually satisfactory solution can be found, the clearing office makes a final recommendation for a solution to the parties involved. The Rectorate then remedies the situation in accordance with § 16, paragraph 4 HG with the parties involved.

(5) The final decision by the clearing office can be based on other external perspectives (for example an additional vote by external reviewers who did not participate in the procedure, commissioning an agency to create a complete external review or, if necessary, program accreditation according

to § 15, paragraph 1). The faculties and the BZL have the right to include other external perspectives if the reason for the disagreement results purely from subject-related aspects. In this case, any expenses are covered by the faculty or the BZL that exercises this right.

Part IV: Data protection and final provisions

§ 17
Data protection; type, scope and treatment of the data collected

(1) All members and associates of the University of Bonn who handle personal data as part of the scope of these Regulations are obligated to adhere to data protection provisions according to the EU General Data Protection Regulation (EU-GDPR) and the Data Protection Act for the state of North Rhine-Westphalia (*Datenschutzgesetz Nordrhein-Westfalen*, DSG NRW).

(2) If as part of evaluations according to these Regulations or as a part of internal accreditation procedures personal data is collected, this data may only be used and transferred for the purposes stated in these Regulations. The data processing is to be limited to the amount necessary to fulfill the task. It must be ensured that personal data is only accessible to the people who carry out the tasks of the evaluations or internal accreditation procedures.

(3) To carry out the evaluation procedures, the offices responsible for the evaluations collect and process the following personal data:

a) Contact information for teachers: Name, official email address and official telephone number of the teacher for course evaluations

b) Contact information for graduates: Email addresses of the graduates of the University of Bonn for graduate surveys

c) Contact information for students: Email address of the students for student surveys, course evaluations and module evaluations

(4) The data is to be deleted according to paragraph 3 within the following deadlines:

a) Contact information for teachers: two years after activity stops in the affected account

b) Contact information for graduates: immediately after the last survey or, if applicable, immediately after the graduate informs the University that they do not want to participate in the survey

c) Contact information for students: immediately after each survey

(5) The evaluation procedures according to § 6 are carried out anonymously. Evaluation results are only published in aggregated or generalized form so that no conclusions can be drawn about individual students. It is only permissible to name or refer to people in conjunction with the evaluations according to § 6 and § 7 if the affected person gave their written consent.

(6) As part of the course evaluations, results that allow conclusions to be drawn about the person who responded may be released to the students and the teachers of the affected course and to the responsible EPG by way of derogation from paragraph 5. In advance, the teachers can object

to this information being made known to the affected student group. Students are never to be informed about comments made about the teacher.

(7) As part of the study progression evaluation, Central Administration provides the responsible BZH with the pseudonymized data listed in the Data Sources Annex. Data that would allow for conclusions to be drawn about a particular student are not made available by the BZH. The BZH provides the evaluation officers with the results of its evaluation in aggregated and visualized form in a database that the evaluation officers can access. When transferring the results to the evaluation officers and when publishing the results, it must be guaranteed that the individual students remain anonymous. Study progression data is not published for cohorts with fewer than 10 students. The same applies to cohorts in which a student has a unique characteristic and anonymity can therefore not be guaranteed.

(8) For the purpose of appropriate inclusion, the office responsible for internal accreditation collects the names, professional organizations, official addresses, official telephone numbers and official email addresses of the external reviewers. The office responsible for internal accreditation is to ask for the reviewers' consent that the University of Bonn can collect, process and use the data as part of the internal accreditation procedure. The data is deleted after the end of the validity of the accreditation linked to the respective accreditation procedure, but at the latest after eight years.

§ 18
Entry into force

These Regulations shall enter into force on the day following the date of their publication in the Official Announcements of the University of Bonn.

C. Richter

Chair of the Senate
of the University of Bonn
University Professor Dr. Cornelia Richter

Prepared on the basis of the University of Bonn Senate resolution of May 8, 2025.

Bonn, May 15, 2025

M. Hoch

The Rector
of the University of Bonn
University Professor Dr. Dr. h.c. Michael Hoch