

*This document is translated for understanding only; the German version is the authoritative and valid version.*

### **Senate:**

On 22 January 2025, the Senate adopted the second amendment to the Regulations on the Quality Management System in Teaching and learning and the Evaluation of Teaching at the University of Göttingen (QMO-SL) in the version published on 18 March 2022 (Official Announcements I No. 13/2022 p. 146), last amended by the statutes of 15 August 2023 (Official Announcements I No. 25/2023 p. 755) (§ 41 para.1 sentence 1 in conjunction with § 5 para. 1 sentence 4 NHG in the version published on 26 February 2007 (Nds. GVBl. p. 69). V. m. § 5 para. 1 sentence 4 NHG in the version of the announcement of 26 February 2007 (Nds. GVBl. p. 69), last amended by Article 14 of the Act of 13 December 2024 (Nds. GVBl. p. 118). The new version of the regulations is published below; it enters into force in the new version on the day of its official publication.

## **Regulation on the Quality Management System for Teaching and Learning and the Evaluation of Teaching at the University of Teaching at the University of Göttingen (QMO-SL)**

### ***Part 1 General***

#### **§ 1 Scope and Principles**

(1) <sup>1</sup> The University of Göttingen operates a quality management system to ensure and improve the quality of Teaching and learning and related service areas. <sup>2</sup>These regulations govern the principles, objectives, responsibilities and procedures of this quality management system.

(2) The Quality Management System in teaching and learning (hereinafter: QMS) is based on closed control loops at central and decentralised level as well as in their interaction and ensures the further development of study programmes as well as the assurance and improvement of studyability and student counselling and support

(3) The QMS includes the internal evaluation of teaching within the meaning of § 5 para. 1 NHG. <sup>2</sup>In particular, it includes the regular evaluation of the quality of courses by students and the conditions of teaching by lecturers, the regular evaluation of study programmes and the performance areas relevant to teaching and learning by members of the University with the involvement of external academic experts, students, professional practice representatives and graduates, as well as the systematic handling of complaints.

(4) <sup>1</sup>Insofar as the University is authorised to do so on the basis of the Lower Saxony Study Accreditation Ordinance (Nds. StudAkkVO) as amended, it shall accredit study programmes,

including those of suitable partner universities, in accordance with the provisions of these regulations. <sup>2</sup>Even if study programmes and other study courses are not to be accredited, the essential components of the QMS should be applied to them.

(5) <sup>1</sup>Academic staff recruitment and staff development are central elements in ensuring the quality of teaching and learning. <sup>2</sup>The quality assurance of the appointment and appointment procedures is carried out in accordance with the regulations adopted by the Senate in the currently valid version.

## **§ 2 Objectives and purposes**

(1) <sup>1</sup>The QMS aims to continuously ensure and improve the quality of structures and processes relating to studying, teaching and associated service areas, involving as many University members involved in studying and teaching as possible, as well as external parties. <sup>2</sup>In this way, it should guarantee the quality of the results of the study programmes and promote the development of a university-wide quality culture. <sup>3</sup>At the same time, it should enable specific characteristics of processes that promote teaching and study quality at faculty level. <sup>4</sup>In addition, it contains elements to ensure and improve its own process quality.

(2) The results of the QMS and its individual components should be used for the following purposes in particular:

- a) Promoting continuous dialogue on quality in teaching and learning as well as quality assurance and development measures,
- b) Identification of strengths and challenges in the fulfilment of tasks in teaching and learning and related service areas,
- c) Designing and implementing quality assurance and development measures and reviewing their implementation and effectiveness,
- d) Informing university members and ensuring transparency towards the public about the fulfilment of tasks in teaching and learning and related service areas,
- e) target agreements between the Presidential Board and faculties or central or cross-faculty institutes involved in teaching,
- f) academic staff recruitment and staff development,
- g) accompanying research.

(3) <sup>1</sup>The QMS promotes the realisation of equal opportunities and diversity orientation, protection against discrimination and accessibility in all structures and processes relating to Teaching and learning and associated service areas. <sup>2</sup>It takes into account the special needs

of students with children and/or caring responsibilities, students in special circumstances and students with disabilities or chronic illnesses. <sup>3</sup>In this way, it supports the equal participation of all students.

### **§ 3 Understanding of Quality**

(1) <sup>1</sup>The University's understanding of quality is based on its identity as an internationally visible institution for independent research and research-based teaching in the tradition of the Enlightenment and the active fulfilment of social responsibility. <sup>2</sup>As a foundation-owned university, it also represents autonomy in its internal organisation and self-directed evaluation and improvement of the fulfilment of its tasks. <sup>3</sup>Its ability to progress is based on participation, open, critical and constructive communication, intellectual curiosity and continuous learning with and from each other.

(2) <sup>1</sup>The principles of the understanding of quality according to paragraph 1 are specified by the following contents to be decided by the Senate on the basis of university-wide discussion processes:

- a) the mission statement for teaching and learning, which defines fundamental values and goals with regard to teaching and learning, and
- b) the content criteria for the internal accreditation of study programmes.

<sup>2</sup>The faculties and central institutes at which an Office of the Dean of Studies has been established (hereinafter: faculties) may, following discussion processes generally involving all faculties, make specific additions to the University's understanding of quality for their respective areas of activity by resolution of the Faculty Council or the highest body composed of groups in the case of central institutes (hereinafter: Faculty Council). <sup>3</sup>The matters referred to in sentence 1 shall be evaluated regularly. <sup>4</sup>The Senate shall be given the opportunity to discuss this at least once every six years; the Coordinating Committee for Quality in Student and Academic Services in accordance with § 8 shall prepare the content of the respective consultation process. <sup>5</sup>The criteria according to sentence 1 letter b) must fulfil the requirements of the Lower Saxony Study Accreditation Ordinance as amended.

### **§ 4 Participation**

(1) <sup>1</sup>The QMS is supported by the active participation of university members. <sup>2</sup>Anyone working in teaching or in fields/services related to teaching and learning is obliged to participate in the QMS. <sup>3</sup>Students and visiting students are entitled to participate in the QMS in accordance with the provisions of these regulations or decentralised regulations issued on the basis thereof,

and should be motivated to do so through suitable incentives. <sup>4</sup>Participation in the QMS is deemed to be an activity in self-administration within the meaning of § 34 para. 1, 2 of the official university charter.

(2) Equal opportunities officers and representatives in accordance with § 3 para. 1 sentence 3 NHG are involved in the QMS in accordance with the provisions of these regulations.

(3) <sup>1</sup>Insofar as resolutions are to be passed in the Senate or Faculty Council in accordance with these regulations, these are matters within the meaning of § 37 para.7 of the official university charter. <sup>2</sup>This does not apply to the resolution of regulations and target agreements as well as the matters according to § 3 para. 2 sentence 1 letter a).

(4) <sup>1</sup>The Georg-August University sees itself as an on-campus university. <sup>2</sup>This also applies in principle to the procedures and processes of the QMS. <sup>3</sup>Notwithstanding this, formats, assemblies, meetings and committee meetings provided for in these regulations may also be held in digital or hybrid form.

## **§ 5 External Evaluations**

(1) <sup>1</sup>External evaluations include, in particular, audits, subject or topic-related evaluations and surveys conducted by third parties external to the University. <sup>2</sup>The Presidential Board shall decide on the principles of participation in external evaluations, unless required by law.

(2) External evaluations should only be carried out if they complement the QMS methodologically and conceptually in a meaningful way or if there is a particular university policy interest in participation.

(3) <sup>1</sup>People or institutes commissioned to carry out external evaluations shall be obliged to comply with data protection regulations at least to the same extent as they would apply to internal procedures. <sup>2</sup>Concerns of bias shall be ruled out.

(4) <sup>1</sup>Results of external evaluations may be further utilised within the QMS. <sup>2</sup>The results of the QMS may also be utilised within the framework of external evaluations in accordance with statutory or contractual regulations.

## ***Teil 2 Committees, parties involved und responsibilities***

### **§ 6 Presidential Board**

(1) The Presidential Board bears overall responsibility for the continuous functionality of the QMS, including the allocation of adequate resources at central and decentralised level; it exercises its steering function particularly following discussions on the Strategic Development

of Teaching and Learning within the meaning of § 50 in the context of target agreements pursuant to § 51.

(2) The Presidential Board shall make key decisions in connection with procedures and processes to be regulated uniformly across the University in accordance with the provisions of these regulations, including in particular with regard to

- a) central questionnaires for the evaluation of courses in accordance with § 16 and the survey of graduates in accordance with § 20,
- b) the appointment of an external academic advisory board in accordance with § 12 and external experts in accordance with § 13,
- c) the decision on internal accreditations of (partial) study programmes in accordance with § 36.

(3) If necessary, the Presidential Board shall take measures to ensure the functionality of all procedures and processes regulated in these regulations and to promote the success of the QMS.

### **§ 7 Senate**

(1) <sup>1</sup>The Senate shall decide on the present regulations and their amendments as well as the essential questions of the understanding of quality in accordance with § 3 para. 2. <sup>2</sup>It shall comment on essential decisions in connection with procedures and processes to be regulated uniformly at the University in accordance with the provisions of the present regulations.

(2) Resolutions of the Senate in accordance with these regulations are generally prepared by the Central Senate Committee for Teaching and Studies.

### **§ 8 Coordination Committee for Quality in Student and Academic Services**

(1) <sup>1</sup>The University shall form a Coordination Committee for Quality in Student and Academic Services (hereinafter: KASL) as a joint advisory, coordination, steering and quality assurance body with regard to the QMS. <sup>2</sup>In accordance with the provisions of these regulations, it advises on all essential development processes and on the effectiveness of the QMS in accordance with § 53; with regard to decentralised quality management in accordance with §§ 27 to 30, it is responsible for the respective functionality check.

(2) <sup>1</sup>The KASL has the following members with voting rights:

- a) the member of the Presidential Board with responsibility for Student and Academic Services as chairperson,

- b) three deans of studies appointed by the Deans of Studies Council,
- c) the two members of the Senate for the student group,
- d) the chairperson and the university officer of the AStA,
- e) the chairperson of the Central Senate Committee for Teaching and Studies,
- f) the Equal Opportunities Officer of the University,
- g) three employees of the Department of Student and Academic Services, who are appointed by the department management.

<sup>2</sup>If members are to be appointed in accordance with sentence 1, they shall be appointed for three years in each case; reappointment is possible, but members in accordance with sentence 1 letters b) and c) shall not serve more than two consecutive terms; if appointed members leave the functions on which their appointment is based and continue to be a member of the University, they shall continue their membership of the KASL until a successor is appointed.

<sup>3</sup>The members according to sentence 1 letters b) and c) should belong to different faculties; if the Faculty of Medicine is not represented, the Dean of Studies of University Medical Center Göttingen (UMG) shall be a member of the KASL in an advisory capacity.

<sup>4</sup>For the members according to sentence 1 letters d) and e), it is possible to nominate people from the student body to whom participation in meetings and voting rights are delegated.

(3) The KASL shall meet as often as the business situation requires, but at least once every semester.

## **§ 9 Faculty Councils**

(1) The Faculty Councils make decisions in particular on the design of decentralised quality management in accordance with §§ 27 to 30, on target agreements with the Presidential Board in accordance with § 51 and on the implementation and realisation of measures to improve the quality of the (sub-)study programmes in the area of their other responsibilities.

(2) Resolutions of the Faculty Councils in accordance with these regulations are generally prepared by the Committee of academic commission.

## **§ 10 Committee of academic commission**

<sup>1</sup>The Committees of Academic Commission are the main bodies responsible for decentralised development work involving the teaching staff and student community. <sup>2</sup>They regularly evaluate findings from procedures and processes in accordance with these regulations and derive recommendations for the Faculty Council, in particular regarding the implementation

and realisation of measures to improve the quality of the (partial)study programmes. <sup>3</sup>They also make recommendations for the further development of decentralised quality management in accordance with §§ 27 to 30 as well as opinion statements on central evaluations in accordance with § 34 para. 1.

### **§ 11 Deans of Studies**

(1) <sup>1</sup>In the light of § 45 para. 3 NHG, deans of studies have the main responsibility for ensuring an orderly and quality-assured teaching, study and examination programme. <sup>2</sup>They are obliged to participate intensively in all procedures and measures for quality development in teaching and learning and related services, in particular the processes described in these regulations, and to promote their success. <sup>3</sup>The Dean of Studies and the Office of the Dean of Studies together are referred to as the Office of the Dean of Studies.

(2) The deans of studies shall regularly exchange information on current developments with each other and with the member of the of the Presidential Board with responsibility for Student and Academic Services in accordance with § 53 para. 2 sentence 2 letter c.

### **§ 12 Academic Advisory Council for Teaching and Learning**

(1) <sup>1</sup>The University shall form an Academic advisory council for teaching and learning. <sup>2</sup>This advisory board advises the University of Göttingen on strategic and operational issues relating to teaching and learning; it shall make recommendations to the Presidential Board, the KASL and, if necessary, other members of the University on issues relating to the further development of teaching and learning and related offers/services as well as their quality management, taking into account developments in higher education policy, university didactics, international perspectives and the fields of digitalisation and diversity orientation.

(2) <sup>1</sup>The external academic advisory board has at least seven members, including in particular renowned academics, each with experience in one of the following areas:

- a) Control processes and quality management of teaching and learning from the perspective of a university management,
- b) current developments in higher education didactics,
- c) international perspectives on teaching and learning,
- d) higher education research, particularly with regard to teaching and learning,

including at least one representative with management experience from professional practice and at least one student member.

<sup>2</sup>The members are appointed by the Presidential Board for a term of office of six years, student members on the joint proposal of the two members of the Senate for the student group for a term of office of two years; reappointment is possible. <sup>3</sup>Only people who have not been employed or enrolled at the University within five years prior to their appointment may be appointed. <sup>4</sup>In addition to the expiry of the term of appointment, membership shall also end upon commencement of employment or studies at the University.

(3) <sup>1</sup>The external scientific advisory board shall meet at least once a year. <sup>2</sup>In particular, it should be consulted before significant changes are made to the QMS.

### **§ 13 External Experts**

(1) <sup>1</sup>The University shall involve external experts in the quality assessment and further development of its (partial) study programmes. <sup>2</sup>In particular, these experts have the tasks:

- a) to advise the people involved in the study programme within the decentralised quality management according to §§ 27 to 30, as a rule in a personal dialogue on the (partial) study programme and, bearing in mind the university strategies, mission statements and quality objectives as well as the subject-related content criteria of the Nds. StudAkkVO, to provide impulses for further development,
- b) to participate in the assessment of compliance with the subject-related content criteria of the Nds. StudAkkVO by providing an expert opinion and, if necessary, to name necessary or desirable adjustments, whereby the University ensures in particular that the external experts can comment on the fulfilment of all subject-related content criteria of the Nds. StudAkkVO.

<sup>3</sup>The external experts shall take part in the briefing by the University.

(2) <sup>1</sup>The University shall involve in the assessment of a (partial) study programme or cluster of several (partial) study programmes in accordance with § 28 at least:

- a) a university lecturer from another university who holds a professorship with a denomination appropriate to the (partial) study programme or cluster,
- b) a representative of professional practice in a responsible position from a professional field for which the (partial) study programme or cluster qualifies,
- c) an external student who is studying or has successfully completed a generally closely related (partial) study programme.

<sup>2</sup>The appointment is decided by the Presidential Board. <sup>3</sup>The Office of the Dean of Studies has a non-binding right of nomination with regard to the external assessors according to sentence 1 letters a) and b). <sup>4</sup>Appointment as an external expert is excluded if there are doubts about



the independent and unbiased performance of tasks; the University is guided by the DFG's current rules on bias and the standards customary in the accreditation system (including the exclusion of cross-reviews).

### ***Teil 3 Data collection and survey instruments; students' criticism***

#### **Section a General**

##### **§ 14 Objectives of data collection**

The QMS comprises the systematic collection and processing of data that enables an evaluation of the University's fulfilment of tasks in the areas of Teaching and learning and related areas and services in the light of the understanding of quality in accordance with § 3 para. 2 sentences 1, 2.

#### **Section b Evaluation of the courses**

##### **§ 15 Intended use**

(1) As part of the evaluation of courses, students are surveyed on the quality of teaching, particularly at course and module level, and the results are utilised for the QMS.

(2) <sup>1</sup>The evaluation of courses serves in particular to provide constructive feedback between students and lecturers and, subsequently, the continuous organisational and didactic development of courses and modules, including the planning and implementation of courses, the teaching-learning formats used and the formulation of learning outcomes.

(3) In addition to the feedback function within the meaning of paragraph 2, the evaluation of courses serves to:

- a) to compare the estimated and recorded average student workload (workload),
- b) to stimulate dialogue between university members on good study and teaching conditions,
- c) to identify challenges and development opportunities in specific study programmes, to derive, design and implement quality assurance and enhancement measures,
- d) to stimulate management decisions at Faculty and University level,
- e) internal and external accountability (§ 5 para. 3 NHG),
- f) for the case-related follow-up of significant complaints by the Offices of the Dean of Studies and the central offices in accordance with § 24 para. 2,

g) for the case-related follow-up of circumstances within the scope of the legal mandate of the Equal Opportunities Officer and of officers according to § 3 paragraph 1 sentence 3 NHG as well as the anti-discrimination counselling.

(4) The results of the evaluation of the courses shall be taken into account apart from the purposes set out in paragraphs 2 and 3:

- a) in the context of decisions in accordance with the Regulations for the Appointment of Junior Professorships and Temporary Professorships and Tenure Track Professorships (BaZ-TT-O) and the Directive on the Procedure and Award of Performance Pay for Professors (Performance Pay Directive (excluding University Medical Center Göttingen (UMG))), insofar as performance in teaching is to be evaluated,
- b) to support the decision on the allocation and extension of teaching assignments,
- c) at the request of those evaluated in other personnel evaluation procedures and
- d) where appropriate, in preparation for the awarding of prizes or as part of other public recognition procedures.

## **§ 16 Questionnaire and Questionnaire Development**

(1) <sup>1</sup>The evaluation of courses shall be based on questionnaires. <sup>2</sup>A questionnaire contains standardised university questions on various quality dimensions of the courses/modules. <sup>3</sup>Questionnaires may also contain a supplementary section relating to specific occasions and needs. <sup>4</sup>They must be suitable for ensuring the fulfilment of the evaluation purposes in accordance with §15 para. 2 and para. 3.

(2) <sup>1</sup>The decision on the design of the questionnaire shall be made by the Presidential Board after consideration of a position statement by the Senate. <sup>2</sup>The decision shall be prepared by an academic working group with the involvement of all member groups and internal expertise, unless it concerns adjustments of a minor nature or temporary additions on a small scale. <sup>3</sup>The Executive Board, Senate, Faculty Council and Committee of academic commission shall discuss the initiation of a revision of the questionnaires after six years at the latest. <sup>4</sup>If a revision is carried out; it should nevertheless be ensured that essential findings on the quality of the courses remain comparable over longer periods of time.

(3) Even if a course/module is offered by one faculty for another faculty or several faculties, only one evaluation will take place.

(4) Paragraphs 1 to 3 apply to the University Medical Center Göttingen (UMG) with the proviso that questions that are standardised across the University in accordance with paragraph 1

sentence 2 may be waived; in this respect, the decision on questions in accordance with paragraph 1 sentence 2 is made by the Executive Board after the Faculty Council has given its opinion, in deviation from paragraph 2 sentence 1.

(5) If a questionnaire in accordance with to para. 1 sentence 2 covers special categories of personal data pursuant to Article 9 para. 1 EU GDPR, it must be coordinated with the data protection officer in order to assess the necessity of the questions concerned.

### **§ 17 Evaluation plan**

(1) <sup>1</sup>The evaluation of the courses of each study-organisational unit is made possible each semester; the determination of specific courses is carried out on the basis of evaluation plans. <sup>2</sup>An evaluation plan contains the list of all courses of a faculty or institute to be evaluated in the reference semester and the teacher(s) actually teaching the courses, in the case of University Medical Center Göttingen (UMG) the heads of the courses and module coordinators. <sup>3</sup>The evaluation plan must specify the evaluation period for each course included.

(2) <sup>1</sup>Evaluation plans must be designed in such a way that the entire range of courses offered by a study-organisational unit is evaluated at least every two years. <sup>2</sup>The courses taught by junior professors, temporary professors and lecturers are to be included in the evaluation plan; the courses taught by Researchers in the qualification phase are to be included. <sup>3</sup>The evaluation wishes of other teaching staff should be taken into account.

(3) <sup>1</sup>Evaluation plans shall be decided by the Faculty Council at the suggestion of the Committee of academic commission or, in the case of a centralised institute, by the management of the institute after consultation with the Committee of academic commission or, if a Committee of academic commission has not been established, the Executive Board. <sup>2</sup>If a resolution in accordance with sentence 1 is not reached, all courses of the faculty or institute in the respective semester shall be taken into account in the evaluation.

(4) <sup>1</sup>The Office of the Dean of Studies of each faculty or central institute shall activate the courses to be evaluated in due time in accordance with the selection criteria determined by the Faculty Board; this shall define which of the responsible lecturer(s) will be evaluated in which period; the people to be evaluated shall be informed by the Student and Academic Services Department. <sup>2</sup>Sentence 1 does not apply to the courses offered by the University Medical Center Göttingen (UMG) in the Human Medicine and Dentistry study programmes.

## § 18 Procedure

(1) <sup>1</sup>The student survey shall be conducted in digital form using evaluation software. <sup>2</sup>Students can use their university account to access the questionnaires assigned to the courses/modules they have attended. <sup>3</sup>Participation in the survey is voluntary.

(2) <sup>1</sup>Whoever organises a course included in the current evaluation plan is obliged to enable students to participate in the evaluation of this course using their own end devices within a period of time dedicated to the implementation of this course, usually after approximately two-thirds of the total scheduled course hours have elapsed (online in presence procedure); for this purpose, an appropriate period of time must be kept free from teaching and learning activities and students must be invited to participate in the evaluation. <sup>2</sup>Sentence 1 applies regardless of the number of students present. <sup>3</sup>Sentence 1 shall only apply once to courses organised jointly by several lecturers; the lecturers involved shall agree on the date of the online-in-person procedure.

(3) <sup>1</sup>The results of the survey are summarised by the Student and Academic Services Department and communicated as follows:

- a) Teaching staff receive summarised results for the courses they have taught;
- b) the Dean of Studies, or in the case of a central institute where an Office of the Dean of Studies has not been established, the head of the institute and a maximum of two employees working for the Dean of Studies, shall receive summarised results for all courses within their area of responsibility.

<sup>2</sup>The dean of studies shall also receive aggregated and anonymised key figures on the courses for which they are responsible.

<sup>3</sup>Members of the Committee of academic commission are entitled to inspect results in accordance with sentence 1 letter b) exclusively for the preparation of deliberations of the committee (including those in accordance with paragraph 6); non-anonymised data may not be handed over to them for retention; the Dean of Studies is responsible for organising the inspection; anonymised data may be used in quality rounds in accordance with § 29 para. 1 sentence 1. <sup>4</sup>Non-anonymised results may only be discussed in a confidential meeting and only to the extent that this is absolutely necessary to fulfil an evaluation purpose in accordance with § 15. <sup>5</sup>Sentences 3 and 4 apply accordingly to the members of the Faculty Council insofar as the Committee of academic commission proposes measures concerning individual lecturers. <sup>6</sup>The central offices pursuant to § 24 para. 2 shall receive the results pursuant to sentence 1 letter b), insofar as this is relevant to the investigation of a complaint regarding a specific course, limited to the results for this course; the same applies to equal opportunities

officers and representatives pursuant to § 3 para. 1 sentence 3 NHG and the anti-discrimination counselling centre. <sup>7</sup>The Presidential Board shall receive the results in accordance with sentence 1 insofar as this is necessary to investigate an allegation of misconduct by the lecturer. <sup>8</sup>In the context of proceedings within the meaning of § 15 para. 4 letters a) and d), results in accordance with sentence 1 shall be transmitted by the Student and Academic Services Department at the request of the body conducting the respective proceedings; in the context of proceedings within the meaning of § 15 para. 4 letter d), transmission shall only take place if the results are suitable to support public recognition. <sup>9</sup>Only with the consent of the persons concerned may the faculty publish results in accordance with sentence 1 in whole or in part which contain or enable the identification of individual people involved in teaching.

(4) If fewer than five students have taken part in the evaluation of a course, no independent evaluation of the results for this course shall take place, in deviation from paragraph 3, unless all participating students have simultaneously declared their consent to the evaluation of results with a lower number of participants and the teacher concerned has requested such an evaluation; however, the data collected shall be included in aggregated evaluations (e.g. at the level of a module or (partial) study programme), provided that the same threshold value has been reached at the intended evaluation level.

(5) <sup>1</sup>Teachers are obliged to feedback the main results of the evaluation of a course to the participants of the evaluated course in a suitable manner and to enable a discussion about these and possible approaches to the further development of the course; the offer of discussion should generally be made in a personal conversation and also if the evaluated course has already ended when the results are available. <sup>2</sup>Anyone who provides non-independent teaching is requested to forward the results relating to this teaching in accordance with paragraph 3 sentence 1 letter a) to supervisors authorised to issue instructions and, if applicable, to the holder of the professorship representing the subject area in question.

(6) The responsible Committee of academic commission promptly discusses at least the aggregated and anonymised results of the current evaluation of the courses and prepares a short report for the respective faculty council, if necessary, taking into account further information, which contains the resulting proposals for quality assurance and improvement measures.

(7) If a course is integrated into modules of another faculty or institute, or if a course or module plays a significant role in the curriculum of a (partial) study programme as an agreed teaching import, the faculty or institute offering the course shall transmit the results of the export courses in accordance with paragraph 3 sentence 1 letter b) so that the Dean of Studies and the

Committee of academic commission of the importing institute can deal with them; the institute authorised to issue instructions shall continue to be responsible for any measures derived from this that specifically affect a teacher.

(8) <sup>1</sup>The Dean of Studies, or in the case of a central institution at which an Office of the Dean of Studies has not been established, its management, is authorised to make the results according to paragraph 3 sentence 1 the basis of evaluation discussions with the lecturers concerned, in particular if these results reveal deficiencies in the quality of teaching or are significantly below average among the lecturers of the faculty or institute; the Dean of Studies can also delegate these discussions to those responsible for the study programme; paragraph 3 sentence 4 applies accordingly. <sup>2</sup>These discussions serve to improve the quality of teaching; in particular, they may include the recommendation to implement specific further development measures or to take part in further training in higher education didactics, intervision or supervision. <sup>3</sup>The lecturers concerned may involve a person they trust in evaluation discussions in accordance with this provision. <sup>4</sup>For lecturers within the meaning of paragraph 5 sentence 2, the Dean of Studies/Head of Department shall inform supervisors that an evaluation meeting has taken place.

(9) <sup>1</sup>Teachers are entitled to ask students for further feedback, e.g. on the organisation and progress of teaching and learning processes, beyond the evaluation of the courses, including during the course. <sup>2</sup>Participation is voluntary for students. <sup>3</sup>Paragraph 5 sentence 1 applies accordingly.

(10) <sup>1</sup>The provisions of paragraphs 1 to 9 apply to the University Medical Center Göttingen (UMG) with the proviso that

- a) notwithstanding paragraphs 1 and 2, an evaluation period is defined by the Office of the Dean of Studies for each semester and each course; the survey is conducted online; the Office of the Dean of Studies may determine that multiple participation of students is excluded by means of a PIN/TAN procedure; the procedure must ensure at a technical level that the assignment of survey data to identified natural persons is excluded;
- b) notwithstanding from paragraph 3, the results are processed by the Office of the Dean of Studies and made available to the course leaders or module coordinators.

<sup>2</sup>Further details are regulated by the Office of the Dean of Studies at the University Medical Center Göttingen (UMG).

## **Section c Evaluation of the study programmes by graduates**

### **§ 19 Intended Use**

(1) The University conducts a survey of its graduates, unless they are re-registered for further study programmes, in order to determine the whereabouts of former students and their success on the labour market, to draw conclusions about the quality of the (partial) study programme completed, in particular with regard to the development of students' ability to take up qualified employment and to successfully pursue an academic career, and to take development measures if necessary.

(2) The survey of graduates also pursues the following purposes in particular:

- a) identification of problem and perspective areas at the level of the (partial) study programme, for the derivation, conception and implementation of quality assurance and improvement measures,
- b) preparation of management decisions at Faculty and University level, in particular in the context of designing and profiling new study programmes and further developing and sharpening the profile of existing ones, as well as improving the quality of advisory services or study support services,
- c) internal and external accountability (§ 5 para. 3 NHG).

### **§ 20 Questionnaire and Questionnaire Development**

(1) <sup>1</sup>The survey of graduates is based on a questionnaire. <sup>2</sup>§16 paragraph 2 applies accordingly to the development of the questionnaire and the responsibility for decisions and regular revision. <sup>3</sup>The questionnaire addresses the following topics in particular:

- a) organisation of the transition from studies to a professional activity,
- b) characteristics of the work performed and individual job satisfaction,
- c) satisfaction with the study programme, also taking into account pre-vocational activities during the study programme,
- d) comparison of skills acquired during the study programme and skills expected/applied in the professional activity.

<sup>4</sup>§16 para. 5 applies accordingly.

(2) The questionnaire must be designed in such a way that no conclusions can be drawn about activities that are only carried out by individual members of the university.

## **§ 21 Procedure**

(1) <sup>1</sup>The survey of graduates should take place annually and cover all graduates who have not been re-registered for further study programmes, whose degree was completed at least nine months ago and whose examination cohort has not already been the subject of a previous survey of graduates. <sup>2</sup>The member of the Presidential Board responsible for Student and Academic Services may temporarily determine a different survey mode for good cause.

(2) <sup>1</sup> The Student and Academic Services Department is responsible for conducting the survey. <sup>2</sup>The survey is conducted using an online questionnaire; it must be ensured at a technical level that multiple participation and the assignment of answers to the identity of individual survey participants are excluded. <sup>3</sup>Participation is voluntary.

(3) <sup>1</sup>The results of the survey are summarised by the Student and Academic Services Department and communicated as follows:

- a) The faculties receive prepared results on university-wide and faculty-specific questions regarding all (partial) study programmes in their respective areas of responsibility,
- b) the central scientific institute for teacher education receives prepared results on university-uniform questions regarding the (partial) study programmes related to teaching.

(4) If fewer than five graduates of a (partial) study programme have taken part in the survey of graduates, no independent evaluation of the results for this (partial) study programme will be carried out, but the data collected may be included in aggregated evaluations (e.g. across several examination years or several (partial) study programmes), provided that the same threshold value has been reached at the intended evaluation level.

(5) The responsible Committee of academic commission discusses the results of the current survey of graduates in a timely manner and prepares a short report for the respective faculty council, taking into account further information, if necessary, which contains proposals for quality assurance and improvement measures.

## **§ 22 Supplementary surveys of graduates**

(1) <sup>1</sup>In addition, a survey of graduates may be carried out using qualitative methods at the level of individual (partial) study programmes on their career after graduation, in particular if findings regarding the retention of graduates in this (partial) study programme would otherwise not be obtained due to low response rates. <sup>2</sup>The Office of the Dean of Studies is responsible.

(2)<sup>1</sup>After the KASL has given its opinion, the member of the Presidential Board with responsibility for Student and Academic Services may arrange for a cohort of graduates who



have already been surveyed to be surveyed again about their professional career after a maximum of six years. <sup>2</sup>§§ 20 and 21 apply accordingly to this panel survey.

## **Section d Further surveys**

### **§ 23 Further Surveys**

(1) <sup>1</sup>The University may conduct further surveys of students at central and decentralised level, in particular on study requirements, previous studies or study periods, the organisation of studies or general conditions relating to studies. <sup>2</sup>These may be organised on a regular basis, on specific occasions or as one-off surveys.

(2) <sup>1</sup>The decision to conduct further student surveys shall be made by:

- a) at decentralised level, the Dean of Studies or the head of a central institute at which an Office of the Dean of Studies has not been established, after consultation with the Committee of academic commission or, if no such commission has been established, the Executive Board,
- b) at centralised level, the member of the Presidential Board with responsibility for Student and Academic Services, in the case of regular surveys by mutual agreement, otherwise in consultation with the KASL.

<sup>2</sup>Regular surveys at decentralised level are the subject of the description of decentralised quality management in accordance with § 27 para. 2.

(3) <sup>1</sup>Further student surveys should be conducted online and be based on questionnaires whose development has been scientifically supported in an appropriate manner. <sup>2</sup>In exceptional cases, e.g. when evaluating face-to-face services, handwritten questionnaires may be used.

(4) <sup>1</sup>If a further survey of students achieves a response rate of less than seven respondents, no analysis shall be carried out; in this case, the data collected shall be destroyed immediately.

<sup>2</sup>An evaluation according to personal characteristics of the respondents shall only take place if the respective characteristic is pronounced in no fewer than five students in total and in no fewer than three students in each individually identified sub-characteristic.

(5) § 20 para. 2 applies accordingly.

(6) Paragraphs 1, 2 and 4 apply accordingly to the survey of lecturers on the framework conditions of teaching.

## **Section e Suggestions, Criticism and Complaints from Students**

### **§ 24 Suggestions, Criticism and Complaints from Students**

(1) <sup>1</sup>In order to enable students to make suggestions, criticisms and complaints and to ensure that these are examined and remedial action is taken, if necessary, the University has contact persons and contact points. <sup>2</sup>These shall deal with complaints in a neutral, open-ended and solution-orientated manner. <sup>3</sup>Complaints within the meaning of sentence 1 must relate to matters of study, teaching or related programmes/services within the University's sphere of influence. <sup>4</sup>The contact points in accordance with sentence 1 refer each other to their services and work towards ensuring that the results of the case processing are also utilised beyond the respective individual case in the QMS (in particular in quality rounds); they can make suggestions to the KASL for quality improvement.

(2) <sup>1</sup>The University shall maintain central contact points for suggestions, criticism and complaints from students; these can be utilised independently of the prior use of an offer in accordance with paragraph 3. <sup>2</sup>On the basis of their activities, they can suggest measures for quality development and make recommendations to the relevant institutes, committees or persons responsible; these should comment on these, insofar as they do not adopt the subject of the recommendation as their own.

(3) <sup>1</sup>The faculties shall ensure that students are provided with decentralised contact persons to receive suggestions, criticism and complaints and shall inform the faculty in an appropriate manner about the services offered. <sup>2</sup>The Dean of Studies shall ensure that the concerns brought to their attention in accordance with sentence 1 are followed up to the extent necessary.

(4) <sup>1</sup>In order to protect students and any university members affected by a suspicion of misconduct, the activities of the bodies referred to in paragraphs 1 to 3 shall in principle be confidential. <sup>2</sup>Participants in the proceedings shall be informed of this obligation. <sup>3</sup>The identity of students submitting criticism or complaints, if known, shall only be disclosed to other parties involved in the proceedings with the consent of the student, unless there is a legal obligation to disclose it. <sup>4</sup>Students must not suffer any disadvantage as a result of using the contact persons and contact points in accordance with paragraphs 1 to 3, even if they express suspicion of misconduct.

(5) The central contact points in accordance with paragraph 2 shall aggregate the concerns brought to their attention in advance of a quality review in accordance with § 29; in doing so,

they shall in particular address concerns that indicate structural challenges for the (partial) study programmes concerned.

## **Section f Monitoring of student and examination data**

### **§ 25 Study Programme Monitoring; Study Programme Reports; Statistics Portal**

(1) <sup>1</sup>The University regularly analyses and evaluates the progress of its students, particularly at faculty level, on the basis of the data available in the student and examination administration systems (study programme monitoring). <sup>2</sup>With the help of programme monitoring, information on structural problems in the course of studies is obtained and fed into the control loops of the QMS and students are offered advice and support on the basis of individual study progression.

(2) <sup>1</sup>The Department of Student and Academic Services provides survey and behavioural data from various data sources for each (partial) study programme at least once a year (study programme report). <sup>2</sup>The study programme report contains, in particular, data from the student and examination administration as well as the surveys in accordance with sections b and c. <sup>3</sup>It provides an overview of key issues relating to the performance and quality of the (partial) study programme, in particular demand and capacity utilisation, course progression, course changes and drop-outs, the examination system and student workload. <sup>4</sup>Study programme reports are used in particular within the framework of the respective decentralised quality management in accordance with § 27 to 30 and the central assessment in accordance with § 34 para. 1.

(3) <sup>1</sup> The University operates a statistics portal based on the data available in the student and examination administration systems. <sup>2</sup>It enables students to gain an overview of their performance in relation to other students on the (partial) study programme and deans of studies and programme directors to carry out in-depth analyses of individual issues relating to the performance of a (partial) study programme. <sup>3</sup>Access for university members is based on a rights concept; evaluations are carried out in such a way that individual students cannot be identified unless this is necessary for official reasons for authorised user groups (e.g. in the context of examination administration and student advisory services).

## **Part 4 Quality Assessment of Study Programmes/internal accreditation**

### **Section a Objectives and Assessment Criteria**

#### **§ 26 Objectives and Evaluation Criteria**

(1) The University shall undertake a continuous and comprehensive analysis of its task fulfilment in the provision of its study programmes and, in this context, shall take measures to continuously improve the quality of processes and results.

(2) <sup>1</sup>The University focuses on decentralised responsibility for subject-related quality assurance and improvement, the processes of which are (centrally) quality-assured within the framework opened up in accordance with the following provisions. <sup>2</sup>Centrally controlled assessments by external faculty members take place at longer intervals (centralised assessment). <sup>3</sup>At both levels, as many members of the university as possible are involved in QM processes in order to strengthen the quality awareness of the members and thus promote the sustainable development of the university's quality culture; at the same time, the expertise of those outside the university also plays an important role. <sup>4</sup>The levels are linked by the decision on internal accreditation, if necessary subject to conditions; furthermore, regular outlook discussions and target agreements in accordance with §§ 50, 51 ensure a procedure at decentralised level that goes beyond the level of the study programme and corresponds to university development planning and overall university objectives. <sup>5</sup>All three processes (decentralised procedure; central evaluation; discussions on the Strategic Development of Teaching and Learning /target agreements) are interlinked and are designed as control loops.

(3) <sup>1</sup>The quality assessment of the study programmes takes into account the results of the instruments and procedures according to part 3 as well as other findings, e.g. contributions and/or reports from the Equal Opportunities Officer or the representatives § 3 para. 1 sentence 3 NHG as well as the anti-discrimination advice centre. <sup>2</sup>It ensures that the study programmes as a whole fulfil the formal and subject-related criteria of the Nds. StudAkkVO as amended, specified by the University's own content-related assessment criteria in accordance with § 3 para. 2 sentence 1 letter b) (quality objectives) and that particular strengths are also developed and made transparent (profile objectives).

## **Section b Decentralised quality management**

### **§ 27 Objectives und Procedures**

(1) <sup>1</sup>The faculties are responsible for the (partial) study programmes; they have special responsibility for

- a) the development and further development of study programmes (at the level of courses, modules and (partial) study programmes) in accordance with overall university objectives, mission statements, in particular the mission statement for learning and teaching in accordance with § 3 para. 2 sentence 1 letter a) and the current overall university and faculty development planning,
- b) the academic relevance of the curricula, taking into account research relevance, key skills, personal development and professional integration,
- c) organising teaching and learning as well as advising and supporting students with the aim of providing the best possible study opportunities for a diverse student body,
- d) the creation of a learning atmosphere conducive to intellectual curiosity and enjoyment of studies.

<sup>2</sup>Notwithstanding the statutory responsibilities of committees and officials, which remain unaffected, the faculties shall organise decentralised development work with the involvement of the teaching and student community, in particular in the format of the quality round and in the Committees of Academic Commission.

(2) <sup>1</sup>The faculties shall establish a decentralised quality management system (hereinafter: dQM) in accordance with the following provisions to ensure the sustainable advancement of their study programmes. <sup>2</sup>The dQM describes the control cycle of decentralised further development, taking into account the selected quality round format, the progression and, if necessary, evaluation as well as the controlling of individual measures, the handling of conflicts and accountability. <sup>3</sup>The decision on the dQM and its amendment is made by the Faculty Council at the suggestion of the Committee of academic commission; a regular evaluation of the processes of the dQM is carried out at the latest after every six years following the opinion of the Committee of academic commission. <sup>4</sup>The Dean's Office appoints persons responsible for the dQM, including the Dean of Studies and at least one permanent employee who works full-time in the field of quality management (hereinafter: dQM officer).

## **§ 28 Cluster Formation**

(1) <sup>1</sup>The (partial) study programmes of a faculty are grouped into clusters. <sup>2</sup>Study programmes that are assigned to the same cluster must exhibit a high degree of academic proximity that goes beyond mere affiliation with a common disciplinary culture. <sup>3</sup>No more than ten (partial) study programmes should be assigned to the same cluster.

(2) <sup>1</sup>As a rule, the study programmes in a cluster undergo the dQM and central assessment/internal accreditation together. <sup>2</sup>In particular, the same external experts are usually involved for the study programmes of a cluster.

(3) <sup>1</sup>The formation, disbandment and reorganisation of clusters is carried out in agreement between the Dean of Studies and the Student and Academic Services Department. <sup>2</sup>If no agreement can be reached; the final decision is made by the member of the Presidential Board with responsibility for Student and Academic Services.

(4) The formation of clusters is also possible across faculties; in this case, a lead faculty for the cluster must be determined, whose dQM is decisive for all (partial) study programmes assigned to the cluster.

## **§ 29 Quality Rounds**

(1) <sup>1</sup>The Quality Round is a regular instrument for evaluating the quality of teaching and learning in the study programmes with the participation of all stakeholders:

- a) Evaluation results, performance data and experiences are categorised,
- b) carried out a target/actual comparison with regard to the subject-specific criteria of the Nds. StudAkkVO in the respective valid version, concretised by the university's own content-related evaluation criteria according to § 3 para. 2 sentence 1 letter b), and
- c) developed and issued recommendations for the qualitative further development of studies, teaching and supporting services.

<sup>2</sup>The quality round should take place at least once every two years in a format lasting at least half a day;

- a) for study programmes in small subjects or
- b) a higher standard distance is possible on the basis of a target agreement in accordance with § 51.

<sup>3</sup>The KASL should be consulted on this. <sup>4</sup>In addition, every significant change to a (partial) study programme should be prepared by a quality review. <sup>5</sup>The medium-term planning for the implementation of quality rounds (timetables) and their implementation or non-implementation

must be reported to the Student and Academic Services Department; if the time periods according to sentence 2 or submitted timetables cannot be adhered to, coordination must take place with the Student and Academic Services Department; this also applies to paragraph 3 letter e.

(2) <sup>1</sup>The quality round shall give all students, teaching staff and members of the university involved in supporting offers/services the opportunity to participate in the assessment of a (partial) study programme in which they are enrolled or in the implementation of which they are involved. <sup>2</sup>The format referred to in paragraph 1 sentence 2 can also be carried out on the basis of delegate models; in this case, the delegates of the member groups must be given the opportunity to obtain an overview of the current assessments of the group members on the (partial) study programme in advance, e.g. through meetings or surveys done beforehand. <sup>3</sup>The quality round should be organised in such a way that all participants have the opportunity to present their assessments in an appreciative atmosphere; the moderation should be carried out by people who do not themselves bear significant co-responsibility for the implementation of the (partial) study programme to be assessed.

(3) <sup>1</sup>The following shall further be involved in a quality round:

- a) decentralised equal opportunities officers,
- b) if applicable, representatives according to § 3 para. 1 sentence 3 NHG,
- c) members of the Committee of academic commission on their initiative, insofar as their participation is not otherwise provided for,
- d) Members of the Presidential Board and representatives of the Department of Student and Academic Services at their initiative,
- e) external experts at least once between two internal accreditations, generally close to the end of the current internal accreditation and in good time before the central assessment according to § 34 para. 1 is carried out,
- f) representatives of cooperating higher education institutions at least once between two internal accreditations, insofar as the (partial) study programme provides for the award of joint or combined degree.

<sup>2</sup>Students participating in a quality round must be given the opportunity to have an informative discussion with external experts participating in the same quality round to the exclusion of other participants.

(4) <sup>1</sup>The dQM ensures that all subject-related and content-related criteria of the Nds. StudAkkVO in the respective valid version, concretised by the university's own content-related evaluation criteria according to § 3 para. 2 sentence 1 letter b), are addressed and assessed

at least once between two central assessments according to § 34 para. 1 in the format of the quality round. <sup>2</sup>It also ensures that external reviewers can engage with all of these criteria, even if a thematic focus is planned for the quality round.

(5) <sup>1</sup>The results and recommendations of the quality review must be recorded. <sup>2</sup>The persons responsible for dQM shall ensure that the results and recommendations of the quality review are forwarded to the responsible Committee of academic commission and, if applicable, to other persons responsible for a subject area affected by the recommendations.

(6) <sup>1</sup>Insofar as quality rounds are prepared and followed up with the participation of representatives of the member groups, including students in particular, it can be determined with regard to individual subject-related criteria of the Nds. StudAkkVO or quality objectives assigned to them, but only by mutual agreement, that these are fulfilled and do not require separate consultation within the quality round. Paragraph 5 applies accordingly.

### **§ 30 Further general conditions**

(1) The dQM takes into account the results of the data collection according to Part 3 as well as the opinions of external experts for the further development of (sub-)study programmes. (partial) study programmes.

(2) <sup>1</sup>As a rule, recommendations for the implementation of measures developed within the framework of a quality round are validated by the responsible Committee of academic commission adopting them, if necessary, after further elaboration. <sup>2</sup>In particular in heterogeneous faculties, a different procedure with substantial participation of the student group may be provided for; in this case, it must be ensured that the Committee of academic commission is given the opportunity to comment on the recommendations of the quality round.

(3) <sup>1</sup>For measures taken on the basis of the dQM for the quality development of (partial) study programmes, responsibility for implementation, implementation deadlines and a procedure for evaluating measures must be defined and the status of the implementation of measures must be regularly monitored by those responsible for the dQM. <sup>2</sup>An overview of the measures in accordance with sentence 1 must be made publicly available at least to the faculty; the Committee of academic commission must be informed in detail about the respective implementation status at least once a year. <sup>3</sup>The participants in a quality round should be informed in detail about measures derived from this quality round, insofar as these are not confidential matters. <sup>4</sup>Overviews of measures should be structured according to the substantive evaluation criteria that the measures are primarily aimed at improving and then according to the degree to which the objectives have been achieved.



(4) <sup>1</sup>Documents and results of the dQM shall be made available in the document management system in accordance with §48 at least to the extent required for the proper implementation of the centralised procedure in accordance with §§ 32 to 37. <sup>2</sup>Sentence 1 also applies to the description of the dQM.

(5) <sup>1</sup>The dQM includes procedures for conflict resolution. <sup>2</sup>This applies in particular to matters in which there is disagreement about the fulfilment of a subject-related criterion of the Nds. StudAkkVO or a quality objective assigned to it or in which measures are to be implemented or omitted against the votes of all representatives of a member group in the quality panel or the Committee of academic commission. <sup>3</sup>In the event of disagreement about the fulfilment of a subject-related criterion of the Nds. StudAkkVO or a quality objective assigned to it, the external experts should be asked for a specific statement. <sup>4</sup>Decisions are made by the Faculty Council; if the decision is made against the votes of the members of a status group and it is a matter according to sentence 2, these members can request a discussion with the member of the Presidential Board responsible for Student and Academic Services. <sup>5</sup>If necessary, the member of the Executive Board shall initiate further steps on the basis of this discussion; they may arrange for further consultation and a decision by the Faculty Council in his/her presence.

(6) <sup>1</sup>If a quality improvement measure developed on the basis of the dQM cannot be implemented within the faculty's area of responsibility, the responsible Dean of Studies shall make the necessary arrangements. <sup>2</sup>If these do not lead to success and if the faculty is still convinced that the measure should be implemented, even taking into account any reasons presented to the contrary, the Dean of Studies shall inform the member of the Presidential Board responsible for Student and Academic Services. <sup>3</sup>If necessary, after further consultations, the Presidential Board shall make a final decision on the implementation of the measure and, if necessary, on the bearing of costs.

### **§ 31 Functionality Test**

(1) <sup>1</sup>The dQM is subject to regular functionality testing. <sup>2</sup>The KASL is responsible for this.

(2) <sup>1</sup>The KASL evaluates the dQM after every six years or after a change to the dQM to determine whether it fully fulfils the functions provided for in these regulations. <sup>2</sup>In doing so, it relies in particular on the description of the dQM, the documentation of recent quality rounds and the resulting development measures for (partial) study programmes as well as a hearing of the Dean of Studies and the members of the Committee of academic commission. <sup>3</sup>The KASL can also make recommendations for the further development of the dQM.

(3) <sup>1</sup>If the KASL believes that the functionality of the dQM is only guaranteed to a limited extent, it shall impose conditions for the further development of the dQM in consultation with the Presidential Board. <sup>2</sup>Instead of imposing conditions, the KASL may recommend to the Presidential Board that the further development of the dQM be the subject of an agreement on objectives in accordance with § 51.

## **Section c Centralised assessment and internal accreditation**

### **§ 32 Objectives und Procedures**

(1) <sup>1</sup>The central assessment serves to determine the extent to which a (partial) study programme

- a) fulfils the formal and subject-specific criteria of the Nds. StudAkkVO or the university's own quality objectives assigned to them and
- b) fulfils other university profile objectives, if applicable, and whether
- c) university mission statements and strategies as well as recommendations of the external experts have been taken into account in an appropriate manner in the qualitative further development of the (partial) study programme.

<sup>2</sup>It also serves to provide faculty-external advice on the further development of the (partial) study programme. <sup>3</sup>The results of the central assessment shall be the subject of an assessment report.

(2) The central assessment leads to the decision on the internal accreditation of the (partial) study programme. Internal accreditation serves to provide external accountability for the quality-assured provision of the (partial) study programme.

(3) <sup>1</sup>The central assessment shall generally take place every six years in accordance with the provisions of these regulations. <sup>2</sup>The coordination is the responsibility of the Department of Student and Academic Services.

(4) The procedure promotes the exchange between academics and students from different subject cultures on issues of good study quality by involving university members in quality assessments of non-subject (partial)study programmes.

### **§ 33 Evaluation Pool; Evaluation Commissions**

(1) <sup>1</sup>The University forms an evaluation pool of university members who participate in the central assessment of (partial) study programmes. <sup>2</sup>Admission to the evaluation pool is based on nomination by a body of the University, a faculty or the student body, in the case of students

also after a public call for applications. <sup>3</sup>Anybody who a) is a member of the University or b) is employed by a partner of the Göttingen Campus and is active in teaching at the University may be accepted. <sup>4</sup>Admission is for an indefinite period; it ends when membership of the University or employment ends or when the pool member makes a corresponding personal declaration to the Student and Academic Services Department. <sup>5</sup>The pool members receive a training offer from the Student and Academic Services Department.

(1a) Each faculty should ensure that at least three members of the faculty who are active in teaching, including at least two university lecturers, are always included in the evaluation pool.

(2) <sup>1</sup>Prior to a centralised assessment, an evaluation committee shall be formed from members of the evaluation pool. <sup>2</sup>This committee shall be responsible for carrying out the central assessment, as a rule with regard to several (partial) study programmes assigned to the same cluster or several clusters in accordance with § 28. <sup>3</sup>The evaluation committee shall consist of five members with voting rights, including

- a) three voting members from the group of lecturers, including at least one university lecturer,
- b) two voting members from the group of students.

<sup>4</sup>The Student and Academic Services Department shall assign members of the evaluation pool to an evaluation committee to be formed on the basis of medium-term requirements planning.

<sup>5</sup>The evaluation committee should be formed in such a way that

- a) the gender balance is as balanced as possible and the proportion of women is generally at least 40 per cent,
- b) members are involved who have previously gained experience with centralised assessments, accreditation procedures or comparable assessment procedures, and
- c) members are involved who belong to the respective academic field.

<sup>6</sup>Any person who is enrolled in a (partial) study programme to be assessed, who is involved in its courses or related services or who belongs to its supporting faculty is excluded from participation.

(3) The University's Equal Opportunities Officer may participate in the meetings of the Evaluation Committee in an advisory capacity.

(4) Representatives of the Department of Student and Academic Services participate in the meetings of the evaluation committee without voting rights.

(5) The evaluation commission shall agree on its working methods; it may elect a chairperson from among its voting members.

(6) <sup>1</sup>Members of the evaluation pool who were involved in at least one evaluation commission in the previous observation period (usually one to two years) shall exchange their experiences with the KASL at the end of the observation period. <sup>2</sup>On this basis, the KASL can make recommendations for the implementation of future centralised assessments.

### **§ 34 Evaluation Process**

(1) The evaluation committee carries out the central evaluation for each cluster, usually within four months, and prepares an evaluation report for each (partial) study programme to be evaluated.

(2) <sup>1</sup>The evaluation committee bases its findings on:

- a) the study programme-related regulations and module catalogues in the currently valid version,
- b) the expert opinions of the external experts,
- c) the dQM activities undertaken in the period since the last central assessment, in particular the documentation of quality rounds and development measures derived with regard to the (partial) study programme,
- d) an informational interview with students of the (partial) study programme (in the case of a cluster with students from a meaningful selection of the participating (partial) study programmes), who are nominated by the departmental student representatives of the responsible faculty or drawn by lot from all students of the (partial) study programme,
- e) as a rule, an information meeting with the Dean of Studies and the teaching and/or service staff responsible for the (partial) study programme.

<sup>2</sup>If necessary, the evaluation committee may obtain further expertise, including from the external experts involved.

(3) <sup>1</sup>In particular, the evaluation committee determines for each subject-related criterion of the Nds. StudAkkVO or the university's own quality objectives assigned to it whether it considers these to be fulfilled, partially fulfilled or not fulfilled. <sup>2</sup>If it wishes to deviate from a finding of the external experts, this must be justified. <sup>3</sup>A subject-related content criterion that has been assessed as fulfilled on the basis of a unanimous determination by the external experts does not require any further determination in accordance with sentence 1, notwithstanding the provision in sentence 2.

(4) The evaluation of the fulfilment of the formal criteria of the Nds. StudAkkVO is carried out by the Department of Student and Academic Services and is included in the evaluation report in accordance with paragraph 1.

(5) The evaluation committee also determines the extent to which a (partial) study programme fulfils the university's own profile objectives outside the criteria of the Nds. StudAkkVO, if and insofar as this was reported to the Student and Academic Services Department by the Dean of Studies at the suggestion of the Committee of academic commission before the external experts were involved.

### **§ 35 Accreditation Recommendation and Statements**

(1) <sup>1</sup>The evaluation committee shall make individual recommendations for each assessed (sub-)study programme on the basis of its findings or the expert opinions of the external experts and the assessment in accordance with § 34 para. 4:

- a) internal accreditation without conditions if all formal and subject-related criteria of the Nds. StudAkkVO are fulfilled and the implementation of university mission statements and strategies in the (partial) study programme has taken place in an appropriate manner,
- b) internal accreditation with conditions in accordance with § 37 if individual formal or subject-related criteria of the Nds. StudAkkVO are partially fulfilled or not fulfilled, but an improvement can be achieved within a reasonable period of time in such a way that previously partially fulfilled or unfulfilled criteria can be considered fulfilled, or if, irrespective of the fulfilment of criteria, the implementation of university mission statements and strategies in the (partial) study programme has not yet taken place in an appropriate manner,
- c) the denial of internal accreditation if it identifies deficits with regard to several formal or subject-related criteria of the Nds StudAkkVO that are so severe that a significant improvement in the situation is unlikely to be achieved within a reasonable period of time.

<sup>2</sup>The evaluation committee may also make further recommendations for the further development of the (partial) study programme.

(2) <sup>1</sup>The faculty shall be given the opportunity to comment on the evaluation report and the accreditation recommendation in accordance with paragraph 1, usually within six weeks. <sup>2</sup>The faculty's statement shall be discussed with the members of the Committee of academic commission.

(3) The members of the evaluation commission shall be informed of the opinion pursuant to paragraph 2 and shall have the opportunity to adapt the evaluation report and recommendation

on the basis thereof; such an adaptation shall not require a new opinion pursuant to paragraph 2.

### **§ 36 Internal Accreditation (Decision)**

(1) <sup>1</sup>The Presidential Board shall decide, on the basis of the evaluation report and, if applicable, any statements on this in accordance with § 35 para. 2 sentence 1, on

- a) internal accreditation without conditions,
- b) internal accreditation with conditions in accordance with § 37,
- c) the refusal of internal accreditation.

<sup>2</sup>The Presidential Board shall only deviate from the proposal of the Evaluation Commission if this is necessary in order to correct factually incorrect findings or to avoid significantly different approaches to comparable issues beyond the scope of the (partial) study programmes evaluated by the Evaluation Commission; the deviation must be justified. <sup>3</sup>The mere imposition or omission of a comparable condition is not deemed to be a significantly different approach.

<sup>4</sup>With a decision in accordance with sentence 1 letters a) or b), the award of the seal in accordance with § 22 para. 4 sentence 2 Nds. StudAkkVO shall also take place for a period of six years.

(2) <sup>1</sup>If internal accreditation is denied, the faculty has the option of fulfilling the requirements of § 6 para. 2 NHG by means of programme accreditation at its own expense. <sup>2</sup>The implementation of a programme accreditation does not release the faculty, even in the event of success, from continuing to subject the (partial) study programme concerned to the procedures provided for in these regulations.

(3) The Senate shall be regularly informed of decisions in accordance with paragraph 1.

(4) <sup>1</sup>Any significant change to an internally accredited (partial) study programme must be reported to the Student and Academic Services Department together with the results of the dQM concerning it. <sup>2</sup>The member of the Presidential Board with responsibility for Student and Academic Services shall decide, if necessary, after consulting individual external experts, whether the significant change is covered by the existing accreditation.

### **§ 37 Conditions and Fulfilment of Conditions**

(1) <sup>1</sup>Conditions must relate to a formal or subject-related criterion of the Nds. StudAkkVO, a university mission statement or a university strategy and, if fulfilled, must be suitable for establishing a state corresponding to the criterion, mission statement or strategy. <sup>2</sup>They may not go beyond the requirements of the criterion, mission statement or strategy.

(2) <sup>1</sup>As a rule, a condition must be fulfilled within 12 months of the decision on internal accreditation. <sup>2</sup>The Presidential Board may allow exceptions at the request of the faculty concerned, in particular if a condition is to be fulfilled at the beginning of a new semester and the deadline according to sentence 1 would only be slightly exceeded. <sup>3</sup>An extension of the deadline in accordance with sentence 2 must be applied for in good time before the deadline expires. <sup>4</sup>The Presidential Board may also provide for a shortened deadline for fulfilment, in particular if the condition that requires fulfilment is particularly serious.

(3) The status of fulfilment of the conditions must also be discussed in the perspective meeting in accordance with § 50.

(4) The fulfilment of a condition must be proven by the faculty to the Student and Academic Services Department and will be checked by them.

(5) <sup>1</sup>If a condition is not fulfilled on time or if the evidence submitted is not sufficient to prove fulfilment of the condition, the member of the Presidential Board with responsibility for Student and Academic Services may grant a grace period of no more than three months. <sup>2</sup>If this grace period also expires without success; the Presidential Board shall decide on the withdrawal of internal accreditation. <sup>3</sup>§ 36 para. 2 applies accordingly.

## **Section d Special Cases**

### **§ 38 Introduction of a (part-time) study programme/first accreditation**

(1) <sup>1</sup>In the case of the planned introduction of a new (partial) study programme, the supporting faculty shall develop a detailed study programme concept in the form recommended by the Lower Saxony Ministry of Science and Culture (MWK). <sup>2</sup>The concept development should be preceded by a discussion of the study programme idea between the Dean's Office and the Presidential Board. <sup>3</sup>After the Faculty Council and the Senate have given their opinion the Presidential Board decides on the intended introduction of the (partial) study programme on the basis of the study programme concept and applies for a declaration of compatibility with state university planning.

(2) If the MWK has determined that the programme is compatible with the state higher education planning, the first internal accreditation is carried out in accordance with the following provisions; it should be completed before the start of the study programme, but at the latest within the first academic year of the study programme.

(3) External reviewers are asked for their opinions on the basis of the study programme concept in accordance with paragraph 1 sentence 1 and the draft study programme regulations

and module catalogue as well as a current capacity calculation for the teaching unit offering the course; external reviewers do not visit the University.

(4) The evaluation commission formed in accordance with § 33 para. 2 draws up an evaluation report for the internal initial accreditation; instead of the results of the dQM in accordance with § 34 para. 2 sentence 1 letter c), it takes into account the study programme concept in accordance with para. 1 sentence 1 and always an interview with those responsible for and involved in the study programme in accordance with § 34 para. 2 sentence 1 letter e).

(5) <sup>1</sup>The (partial) study programme is assigned to a cluster at the latest with the decision on the first internal accreditation. <sup>2</sup>The internal initial accreditation is carried out for a limited period of time in accordance with the other (partial) study programmes assigned to the same cluster. <sup>3</sup>If this period ends within 24 months of the decision on internal accreditation, the initial internal accreditation shall be carried out for a period of six years plus the number of months until the end of the period in accordance with sentence 2. <sup>4</sup>The (partial) study programme shall be involved in the regular processes of the dQM in accordance with section b at the latest in the academic year in which a student cohort commences their studies for the second time.

### **§ 39 Accreditation of cooperative study programmes**

(1) <sup>1</sup>If a (partial) study programme is carried out in whole or in part in cooperation with another higher education institution recognised under the legal provisions of its home state or with non-university institutes, the following provisions apply to accreditation. <sup>2</sup>The Student and Academic Services Department shall check whether the (partial) study programme meets the definition of a joint programme according to § 10 Nds. StudAkkVO.

(2) If the (partial) study programme meets the definition of a joint study programme according to § 10 Nds. StudAkkVO, the following procedures can be applied:

a) Internal accreditation according to the European Approach

aa) Decentralised QM (dQM), central assessment and internal accreditation follow the provisions of §§ 27 to 37, whereby the formal and subject-related assessment takes into account the requirements of §§ 10 and 16 Nds StudAkkVO.

ab) Representatives of the partner university are to be involved in the quality rounds within the framework of the dQM.

b) Programme accreditation according to the European Approach

ba) Accreditation can be carried out by an agency listed in the European Quality Assurance Register for Higher Education (EQAR) in accordance with the European Approach.



bb) The Department of Student and Academic Services informs the Accreditation Council before the start of such a procedure and ensures compliance with the requirements according to § 33 StudAkkVO.

bc) This procedure is also possible if the country in which the partner university is based is outside the European Union, but the national authorities accept a procedure in accordance with the rules of the European Approach.

c) Recognition of internal accreditations.

c) Recognition of internal accreditations

ca) The Presidential Board may recognise the result of an internal accreditation at a partner university if the partner university is entitled to carry out such a procedure within its national legal framework and if this procedure meets the requirements of §§ 10, 16, 33 Nds. StudAkkVO.

cb) The Student and Academic Services Department shall draw up a recognition report for this purpose; this shall be published in accordance with § 46 in conjunction with § 18 para. 4 sentence 2 StudAkkVO.

(3) If the (partial) study programme offered jointly with a partner university does not meet the definition of a joint study programme according to § 10 Nds StudAkkVO, the following procedures can be applied:

a) Internal Accreditation

aa) Decentralised QM (dQM), central assessment and internal accreditation follow the provisions of §§ 27 to 37.

ab) The evaluation commission takes particular account of the framework conditions for student mobility and the implementation of the Lisbon Convention.

b) External programme accreditation

c) Recognition of internal accreditations

ca) If the application of the European Approach is permitted at a partner university for the (partial) study programme in question, the Presidential Board may adopt a decision made on its basis in whole or in part.

cb) Criteria that deviate from the German accreditation guidelines or are missing are formally reviewed by the Student and Academic Services Department.

cc) The Presidential Board decides on the basis of the external assessment results according to letter ca) and the supplementary examination according to letter cb).

cd) The time limit of the decision follows the regulations of the external evaluation according to letter ca).

(4) A (partial) study programme that is offered jointly with another system-accredited German higher education institution can also be accredited on the basis of the regulations of the country in which this higher education institution is based (§ 20 para. 2 Nds. StudAkkVO analogous).

(5) <sup>1</sup>(Partial) study programmes are generally involved in the dQM, even if no internal accreditation is to be carried out; a central assessment does not take place. <sup>2</sup>This applies accordingly to (partial) study programmes in accordance with paragraph 4.

(6) For (partial) study programmes that are accredited internally in accordance with paragraphs 2 and 3 or on the basis of a cooperation with a non-university institute, the central assessment is additionally based on the cooperation agreement in accordance with § 20 para. 1 sentence 2 Nds. StudAkkVO and takes into account the implementation of the criteria in accordance with §§ 19, 20 Nds. StudAkkVO.

#### **§ 40 Internal accreditation of combined study programmes**

(1) <sup>1</sup>In the case of a combined study programme within the meaning of § 32 Nds. StudAkkVO, internal accreditation shall be carried out in accordance with § 36, taking into account the following provisions.

(2) <sup>1</sup>If the lead responsibility for the combined study programme is not assigned to a faculty, in particular in the case of the two-subject Bachelor's study programme, the Department of Student and Academic Services and the faculties involved in the combined study programme shall agree on a procedure in which the functionality of the study programme model and the studyability in all possible subject combinations are assessed. <sup>2</sup>The procedure should be based on the decentralised quality rounds in accordance with § 29, in particular with the involvement of the student perspective. <sup>3</sup>It shall be carried out at least once between two central assessments of the combined study programme, usually in the year before the current internal accreditation expires. <sup>4</sup>If no agreement can be reached in accordance with sentence 1, the member of the Presidential Board with responsibility for Student and Academic Services shall make the final decision on the organisation of the procedure.

(3) <sup>1</sup>A central assessment shall be carried out in accordance with § 34 para. 1 with regard to the cross-curricular aspects of the implementation of the combined study programme and the academic feasibility in all possible subject combinations. <sup>2</sup>As a rule, this should be carried out together with the assessment of a cluster to which partial study programmes of the combined study programme are assigned.

(4) <sup>1</sup>The internal accreditation shall take into account those partial study programmes for which central assessments were carried out in the 24-month period prior to the central assessment in accordance with paragraph 3 sentence 1. <sup>2</sup>The internal accreditation of a combined study programme may be supplemented by the inclusion of further partial study programmes, also by extending the internal accreditation in accordance with § 42. <sup>3</sup>The accreditation period of the combined study programme shall not change as a result.

#### **§ 41 Involvement of External Bodies in the Internal Accreditation of State-Regulated Study Programmes**

(1) <sup>1</sup>If legal provisions stipulate that state or church bodies are involved in the accreditation of a (partial) study programme, they shall be enabled to appoint an external expert in accordance with § 13 para. 2 sentence 1 letter b) (professional field representative). <sup>2</sup>In addition to representatives of state or church bodies, at least one further professional field representative shall generally be appointed.

(2) The responsible state or church body may also participate in the evaluation committee in accordance with § 33 para. 2 with or without voting rights at its own request. <sup>2</sup>In the case of participation with voting rights, the evaluation commission shall be expanded by one person each in accordance with § 33 para. 2 sentence 2 letter a and b.

(3) If legal provisions stipulate that the accreditation of a (partial) study programme can only take place with the approval of a competent state or church body, this shall apply accordingly to internal accreditation in accordance with § 36.

(4) The details shall be governed by an agreement between the competent state or ecclesiastical body and the University.

#### **§ 42 Extension of Internal Accreditation; Expiring Internal Accreditation**

(1) <sup>1</sup>The Presidential Board may extend the internal accreditation of a (partial) study programme if the previous accreditation of the (partial) study programme has expired or is about to expire and:

- a) a planned central assessment has not yet been carried out or completed,
- b) the (partial) study programme is already the subject of a dQM and at least one quality round has been carried out, and
- c) no significant formal or subject-related deficiencies have been identified and not rectified.

<sup>2</sup>In this case, the Presidential Board shall decide on the basis of a brief assessment by the Student and Academic Services Department.

(2) The extension of internal accreditation serves in particular to

- a) the adequate distribution of centralised assessments in accordance with § 34 para. 1 over time and the avoidance of peak loads,
- b) to achieve accreditation deadlines that are as uniform as possible for (partial) study programmes assigned to the same cluster,
- c) against the background of letter b), the avoidance of accreditation gaps concerning (partial) study programmes of a combined study programme.

(3) <sup>1</sup>The extension of internal accreditation is limited to a maximum of two years. <sup>2</sup>The period of extension of the internal accreditation shall be counted towards the duration of a subsequent decision in accordance with § 36 para. 1. <sup>3</sup>By way of derogation, the internal (re-)accreditation of the combined study programme shall extend the internal accreditation of those partial study programmes for which an internal accreditation was carried out at least two and at most six years previously; in this case, the accreditation period of a partial study programme shall correspond to that of the combined study programme reduced by the period for which an internal accreditation of this partial study programme was carried out. <sup>4</sup>The University shall thus ensure that the combined study programme and each of its sub-study programmes are subject to internal accreditation at least every six years.

(4) The Presidential Board shall decide on the expiring internal accreditation of a (partial) study programme that is scheduled for closure or is closed and whose previous accreditation has expired or is due to expire shortly, in each case until the end of the expiring supervision of students.

### **§ 43 Internal accreditation of doctoral study programmes**

The provisions of these regulations apply to the internal accreditation of doctoral study programmes with the proviso that the criteria of the Lower Saxony Ministry of Science and Culture regarding the accreditation of doctoral study programmes are decisive instead of the formal and subject-related criteria of the Lower Saxony StudAkkVO.

## **Section e Dissent to the accreditation decision; arbitration**

### **§ 44 Dissent on the Accreditation Decision**

<sup>1</sup>An appeal against an incriminating decision by the Presidential Board on the internal accreditation of a (partial) study programme with conditions or the refusal of internal accreditation may be lodged within six weeks of the announcement of the decision. <sup>2</sup>The appeal shall be lodged by the Faculty Council following a statement by the Committee of academic commission. <sup>3</sup>The grounds cannot be limited to the fact that the Presidential Board deviated from the recommendations of the evaluation commission or the expert opinions of the external experts or did not take into account statements already made in the context of a statement on the evaluation report in accordance with § 35 para. 2 sentence 1. <sup>4</sup>The Presidential Board shall decide whether the complaint can be remedied.

### **§ 45 Arbitration**

(1) If the Presidential Board does not remedy a complaint in accordance with § 44, the Faculty Council may request arbitration proceedings by deciding with a two-thirds majority of its voting members that the interests of the faculty are significantly impaired by the Presidential Board's decision.

(2) <sup>1</sup>The Senate appoints an arbitration committee with at least three voting members, including at least one student and a student representation share of at least 20 percent as well as at least one external member. <sup>2</sup>The term of office of the members is two years, for student members one year; reappointment is possible.

(3) <sup>1</sup>The arbitration committee reviews the results of the central evaluation and hears the Dean's Office and Presidential Board on the matter. <sup>2</sup>In particular, it may recommend:

- a) to adhere to the decision made,
- b) to carry out a further centralised assessment by a new evaluation committee,
- c) to form an exclusively external evaluation committee and to assess the (partial) study programme in accordance with the rules applicable to programme accreditations.

(4) The Presidential Board may also take measures in accordance with paragraph 3 sentence 2 letter b) in advance if, on the basis of an opinion on the evaluation report in accordance with § 35 paragraph 2 sentence 1, a significant conflict is predominantly probable.

## **Section f Publication of evaluation results**

### **§ 46 Publications According to Nds StudAkkVO**

(1) <sup>1</sup>Decisions of the Presidential Board on the internal accreditation of (partial) study programmes are published on the University's website and in the database of accredited study programmes of the Accreditation Council (§ 29 Nds. StudAkkVO). <sup>2</sup>The Department of Student and Academic Services is responsible.

(2) Paragraph 1 shall apply accordingly to the evaluation report of the evaluation commission and to the conditions associated with the decision on internal accreditation.

(3) In particular, the following information shall be published:

- Deadlines for internal accreditation of the (partial) study programme,
- Type of accreditation (initial accreditation, reaccreditation, extension of accreditation, expiring accreditation, other),
- a short profile of the study programme according to the reporting grid of the Accreditation Council,
- a summarised evaluation and a quality report on the fulfilment of accreditation criteria,
- information on the external experts involved and the members of the evaluation commission,
- a description of the internal accreditation process.

### **§ 47-(repleaded)**

## ***Teil 5 Data Management and Data Protection***

### **§ 48 Document Management System**

(1) <sup>1</sup>The University operates a document management system (DMS) to process the documents and data relevant to the QMS and to support individual formats and processes, in particular quality rounds pursuant to § 29 and centralised assessments pursuant to § 34 para. 1. <sup>2</sup>It uses the DMS to provide documents (e.g. study programme regulations, module directories, study programme reports) to members of the University and external parties involved in the QMS, in particular external experts, as well as in the context of controlling processes and fulfilling requirements in accordance with § 37.

(2) Faculties and central institutes are obliged to use the DMS at least to the extent that the implementation of the processes provided for in these regulations is ensured. This includes in particular:

- a) the processing of all results from the dQM that are required for the implementation of centralised assessments in accordance with § 34 para. 1,
- b) the prompt provision of documents in the context of quality rounds and downstream processes (invitations, minutes, overviews of measures, etc.)
- c) proof of the fulfilment of requirements in accordance with § 37.

(3) <sup>1</sup>University members use the DMS with the help of their university or student account.

<sup>2</sup>External users are granted system access limited to the period of their participation in the QMS. <sup>3</sup>Access to individual content is based on a rights concept.

### **§ 49 Data Processing and Data Protection**

(1) <sup>1</sup>The provisions of the General Data Protection Regulation of the European Parliament and the Council of the European Union, the Federal Data Protection Act and the Lower Saxony Data Protection Act, as amended, must be observed. <sup>2</sup>The same applies to the provisions of the Regulations for the Collection and Processing of Personal Data of Applicants, Early Career Students, Students, Examination Candidates, Former University Members (excluding Employees) and Guest Auditors of the University of Göttingen (PersDatO), as amended, insofar as they are not supplemented by the provisions of these Regulations.

(2) Personal data in connection with the QMS (hereinafter: evaluation data) may only be collected insofar as this is absolutely necessary for the implementation and fulfilment of the purpose of the respective procedure.

(3) <sup>1</sup>The University's data protection officers and information security officers shall advise those responsible for the procedure on whether the technical and organisational requirements against unauthorised access, unauthorised copying, unauthorised input, data manipulation, etc. are being met. <sup>2</sup>All necessary documents must be submitted to the data protection officers and information security officers in good time for this purpose. <sup>3</sup>In the case of the processing of students' personal data, the student data protection officers must be consulted in accordance with the PersDatO.

(4) <sup>1</sup>Persons involved in the collection and processing of evaluation data are prohibited from processing or disclosing such data for any purpose other than the fulfilment of their respective tasks. <sup>2</sup>This shall also apply after termination of their activity. <sup>3</sup>If the people referred to in sentence 1 are not employed by the University, they must be obliged to do so before they

begin their involvement in the collection and processing of evaluation data. <sup>4</sup>Sentences 1 to 3 also apply in particular to the discussion of evaluation data in the committees of academic self-administration; this shall take place exclusively in non-public sessions, insofar as it appears possible to assign characteristics to individual people and insofar as not all those affected have agreed to a discussion in a faculty or university public session.

(5) <sup>1</sup>When evaluation data is processed by third parties, an order processing contract must be concluded with them. <sup>2</sup>This contract must be submitted to the data protection officers for review at an early stage, unless the unchanged contract template of the University of Göttingen in the currently valid version is used.

(6) <sup>1</sup>The obligations under paragraph 1 sentence 1 also include, in particular, the inclusion of a further survey in accordance with § 23 in the list of processing activities. <sup>2</sup>The Dean of Studies or the head of the institute conducting the survey is responsible for this. <sup>3</sup>The entry shall be notified to the data protection officers.

(7) <sup>1</sup>If personal data is to be processed within the framework of the QMS beyond the provisions of the PersDatO by people who are not members or affiliates of the University of Göttingen, the consent of the persons concerned is required. <sup>2</sup>The information obligations pursuant to Art. 13 et seq. of the General Data Protection Regulation apply.

(8) <sup>1</sup>Insofar as pseudonymous evaluation data, in particular study programme reports pursuant to § 25 para. 2 or individual evaluations carried out therein, give rise to the possibility, e.g. due to low case numbers, that the inclusion of further information could lead to the individualisation or identification of individual natural persons, the use of this evaluation data shall be restricted in accordance with the following provisions. <sup>2</sup>If the analysis of evaluation data in accordance with sentence 1 is necessary in order to assess the quality of a (partial) study programme, it shall be restricted to:

- a) the dean of studies and the members of the Committee of academic commission or the management of the institute concerned,
- b) small majorities of persons for the professional preparation of quality rounds in accordance with § 29, whereby all member groups should be represented,
- c) external experts in accordance with § 13 and
- d) the participants in the centralised assessment in accordance with § 34 para. 1.

<sup>3</sup>Otherwise, it must be ensured, e.g. by aggregation, that individualisation or identification of individual natural persons is excluded.

(9) <sup>1</sup>Evaluation data may also be used in the context of external evaluation or accreditation procedures and transmitted to third parties for this purpose in accordance with statutory or



contractual regulations. <sup>2</sup>In accordance with a cooperation agreement, they may also be handed over to other universities or non-university institutes to the extent necessary for the implementation of joint study programmes. <sup>3</sup>Third parties must observe the purpose limitation of the data and may also process it exclusively for these purposes; they must be bound to data secrecy. <sup>4</sup>If data is transferred, the origin of the data must be labelled by indicating the source.

(10) <sup>1</sup>Evaluation data may, after at least one pseudonymisation has been carried out to ensure that

- a) personal data can no longer be attributed to a specific data subject without the use of additional information, and
- b) such additional information is kept separately and is subject to technical and organisational measures to ensure that the personal data cannot be attributed to an identified or identifiable natural person by anyone other than the disclosing body,

may also be used for teaching research purposes or to evaluate the University's fulfilment of tasks in other areas of performance and may be passed on within the University and to third parties for this purpose. <sup>2</sup>There is no entitlement to disclosure within the meaning of sentence 1.

(11) <sup>1</sup>The body responsible for conducting and evaluating a survey shall ensure the deletion or anonymisation of the survey data in accordance with the following provisions. <sup>2</sup>Personal data shall be deleted if they are no longer required for the purpose of the respective survey, but no later than six years after collection; anonymised data no later than twelve years after collection. <sup>3</sup>Irrespective of this, a review must be carried out no later than one year after collection to determine whether further processing of the personal data collected is necessary. <sup>4</sup>Archiving regulations remain unaffected.

## ***Part 6 Interaction and Effectiveness Review***

### **§ 50 Discussion on the Strategic Development of Teaching and Learning**

(1) <sup>1</sup>On behalf of the Presidential Board, the member of the Presidential Board responsible for Student and Academic Services shall hold a discussion on the future prospects of teaching and learning at least once every two years with each faculty and each central institute at which a Committee of academic commission has been formed. <sup>2</sup>The purpose of the discussion is the joint exchange particularly with regard to:

- a) the development planning of strategic goals in teaching and learning, in particular the development of teaching and study programmes and student numbers of the utilisation of existing study places,
- b) the implementation and specification of the mission statement for teaching and learning at study programme level,
- c) the structure, progress and results of the respective dQM,
- d) the implementation of target agreements and
- e) current student concerns.

(2) <sup>1</sup>The following must be involved in the discussion on the Strategic Development of Teaching and Learning:

- a) the Dean of Studies,
- b) the dean of studies officer and, if applicable, the dQM officer according to § 27 para. 2 sentence 4,
- c) 2-3 students nominated by the respective departmental student representatives,
- d) the decentralised Equal Opportunities Officer or a member of the Equal Opportunities Team,
- e) representatives of the Student and Academic Services Department.

<sup>2</sup>The dean or the head of the central institute should take part in the discussion on the Strategic Development of Teaching and Learning; other people may be involved at the suggestion of the faculty or central institute or on an ad hoc basis.

(3) <sup>1</sup>The discussion on the Strategic Development of Teaching and Learning shall last at least 90 minutes. <sup>2</sup>It shall be prepared by

- a) a faculty report agreed in the respective Committee of academic commission, which addresses the current status of faculty development planning, current challenges for teaching and learning as well as the activities of the dQM, in particular the measures derived and the status of their implementation,
- b) a data package provided by the central administration on the utilisation of study place capacities and the results of internal accreditation procedures.

(4) <sup>1</sup>The results of the discussion on the Strategic Development of Teaching and Learning shall be recorded. <sup>2</sup>They should be taken into account when updating the faculty's development planning.

## **§ 51 Target Agreements; Performance Targets**

(1) <sup>1</sup>As a rule, the Presidential Board and the faculty or central institute shall derive target agreements at least every two years from the results of the discussions on the Strategic Development of Teaching and Learning pursuant to § 50. <sup>2</sup>These shall be adopted by the Presidential Board and the respective Faculty Council or the highest body of the central institute composed of groups. <sup>3</sup>The Presidential Board shall inform the Senate of the conclusion of a target agreement in accordance with sentence 1.

(2) <sup>1</sup>Insofar as concrete incentives or sanctions are not already the subject of the target agreement in accordance with paragraph 1 sentence 1 and an agreed target has not become irrelevant after both sides have agreed, the Presidential Board is required to promote the achievement of the target through suitable measures. <sup>2</sup>For objectives to be fulfilled on the faculty side, substitute performance and budget deduction in particular may be considered after a reasonable grace period; the faculty must be heard beforehand.

(3) <sup>1</sup>If, in the opinion of the Presidential Board, a faculty has not fulfilled essential obligations under these regulations and this means that the accreditability of a study programme can probably no longer be appropriately assessed in the central procedure, the Presidential Board shall issue a target to the faculty; the faculty must be heard beforehand. <sup>2</sup>If the faculty does not meet the target within a reasonable period of time, the Presidential Board shall decide on the withdrawal of an existing internal accreditation and/or the removal of the study programme concerned from the QMS. <sup>3</sup>A study programme that is subject to the requirement of accreditation according to legal regulations and is not integrated into the QMS shall be closed or externally accredited at the expense of the faculty.

## **§ 52 Inter-Faculty Exchange**

(1) <sup>1</sup>In addition to consultation in committees, the University shall create regular opportunities for inter-faculty exchange on the structure, performance and further development of the QMS and individual elements thereof, in particular with regard to the decentralised systems. <sup>2</sup>These can be organised in particular as workshops or teaching days and should generally be aimed at all member groups.

(2) Faculties that are linked to each other to a considerable extent in teaching and studies through teaching interdependencies shall take this into account through appropriate measures, e.g. mutual participation in individual quality rounds or meetings of the Committees of Academic Commission.

### **§ 53 Effectiveness review and further development**

(1) <sup>1</sup>The University endeavours to regularly further develop the QMS on the basis of analyses of the effectiveness of individual components and their interaction and in accordance with changes in university strategies as well as legal and university policy framework conditions.

<sup>2</sup>In so far as these regulations do not already provide for a development control loop (e.g. dQM, mission statement and quality objectives, evaluation of courses), the procedure is the responsibility of the KASL.

(2) <sup>1</sup>The KASL shall submit recommendations for the further development of the QMS no later than one year before the expiry of an external accreditation or certification of the QMS, but no less frequently than every eight years. <sup>2</sup>It shall base its recommendations in particular on:

- a) the experience gained from the functionality review of the respective dQM in accordance with § 31,
- b) the regular discussions with members of the evaluation pool in accordance with § 33 para. 6,
- c) the results of consultations with the Council of Deans of Studies,
- d) results of any random surveys of external experts, whereby each of the groups of persons pursuant to § 13 para. 2 sentence 1 must be involved, on their experiences with the QMS,
- e) analyses of the results of internal assessments and the conditions imposed in connection with internal accreditations,
- f) analyses of conflict resolution,
- g) if applicable, recommendations of the external scientific advisory board in accordance with § 12,
- h) if applicable, statements by the student body bodies.

(3) If necessary, the KASL shall also ensure that the quality assessment of the (partial) study programmes is carried out according to comparable standards on an ongoing basis by making recommendations to the members of the evaluation pool for carrying out central assessments in accordance with § 34 para. 1.

(4) <sup>1</sup>The Department of Student and Academic Services shall inform the KASL about changes to the legal and higher education policy framework. <sup>2</sup>If necessary, it shall immediately initiate a consultation on this and recommend to the Senate that the QMS be adapted.

## ***Teil 7 Final Provisions***

### **§ 54 Amendments**

(1) <sup>1</sup>The Senate shall decide on amendments to these regulations at the suggestion of the KASL and following the opinion of the Central Senate Committee for Teaching and Studies.

<sup>2</sup>The faculty councils shall be given the opportunity to comment before the resolution is passed.

(2) In order to ensure the continuous revision of the quality management system in Teaching and learning, the Senate shall be given the opportunity to discuss the development of the system after two years.

### **§ 55 Entry Into Force; Expiry; Transitional Provisions**

(1) These regulations come into force on the day after their announcement in the Official Notices I of the University of Göttingen.

(2) At the same time, the Regulations on the Evaluation of Teaching in the version published on 30 May 2006 (Official Announcements No. 5/2006 p. 199) shall cease to be in force.

(3) <sup>1</sup>Questionnaires, evaluation plans and other measures adopted in accordance with the regulations referred to in paragraph 2 shall remain valid until they are replaced in accordance with the provisions of these regulations, insofar as they are also permissible under the provisions of these regulations. <sup>2</sup>Reporting obligations in accordance with the present Code shall include procedures and their results that were carried out or achieved within the respective reporting period in accordance with the provisions of the Code within the meaning of paragraph 2. <sup>3</sup>The provisions of this Code on data storage and data protection shall apply to data collected in accordance with the provisions of the Code within the meaning of paragraph 2 and not yet segregated.