

**Rejection of the Application**  
**by the Association for Evaluation and Accreditation of Engineering**  
**Programs (MÜDEK)**  
**for Inclusion on the Register**

Register Committee

Ref. RC13/2014/07

Ver. 1.0

Date 2014-11-29

Page 0 / 4

<b>Application of:</b>	31/01/2014
<b>External review report of:</b>	August 2013
<b>Review coordinated by:</b>	ENAAE
<b>Review panel members:</b>	Cyril Burkley (Chair), Giuliano Augusti, Susana Teles, Alexis Castro
<b>Decision of:</b>	29 November 2014
<b>Absented themselves from decision-making:</b>	none

1. The application of 31/01/2014 adhered to the requirements of the EQAR Procedures for Applications.
2. The Register Committee considered the external review report of August 2013 on the compliance of MÜDEK with the European Standards and Guidelines (ESG).
3. The Register Committee sought and received clarification from MÜDEK as well as from the chair of the review panel, in order to supplement the findings and analysis presented in the external review report.
4. On 26/05/2014 the Register Committee invited MÜDEK to make additional representation on the reasons for a possible rejection of its application.
5. MÜDEK made additional representation on 25/08/2014. The Register Committee considered the application taking into account the representation.

Analysis:

6. The Register Committee noted from MÜDEK's clarification (11/03/2014) that no accreditations of Master programmes have been undertaken to date. In considering MÜDEK's compliance with the ESG, the Register Committee thus only took into account its accreditation activities with first-cycle programmes.

7. With regard to the specific European Standards and Guidelines, the Register Committee considered the following:

### ESG 2.5 – Reporting

While the review panel found that MÜDEK’s reports were thorough, detailed and provide sufficient information for MÜDEK’s decision-making body and the institution concerned, the self-evaluation report explicitly states that reports are “not disclosed to any parties other than the relevant HEI, except for cases required under relevant law” (p.11).

Despite clarification received from the review panel, the Register Committee was unable to concur with the panel’s conclusion of “fully compliant” given the lack of published reports (see also Practices and Interpretations by the Register Committee, par. 20).

In its representation MÜDEK confirmed that the only public information provided is a list of accredited programmes, including the duration of accreditation. There are, however, no public reports on accredited programmes, neither in full nor summarised.

MÜDEK argued that its accreditations are voluntary and that institutions would be unwilling to disclose information if the reports were public.

The Register Committee underlined that the ESG requirement of a public report is unconditional. The Committee also stressed that there are several agencies in Europe that offer voluntary accreditation and publish full reports. The argument was, therefore, not persuasive.

The Register Committee further noted that MÜDEK does not have any intention to change its practice of not publishing reports. The Committee found that MÜDEK does not comply with the standard.

### ESG 2.8 – System-wide analyses

The self-evaluation report and external review report refer to MÜDEK’s annual activity reports, occasional workshop contributions or publications by individuals. There is, however, no evidence of MÜDEK carrying out specific analyses setting out general findings from across all its reviews of engineering programmes.

In the additional representation MÜDEK clarified the content of its annual reports. The Register Committee considered that these provide mainly statistical, but not analytical information. MÜDEK referred to an internal tabular overview of shortcomings in programmes reviewed as well as presentations and other contributions from individuals working for MÜDEK.

## Register Committee

Ref. RC13/2014/07

Ver. 1.0

Date 2014-11-29

Page 1 / 4

The Register Committee acknowledged MÜDEK's commitment to preparing a separate periodic report analysing the programme evaluation results in the future. The Committee found that, as it stands, MÜDEK complies only partially with the standard.

### **ESG 3.7 – External quality assurance processes and criteria**

The review report referred to MÜDEK's pilot scheme to include student members in its evaluation teams, started in 2013. The report, however, did not address the role of student evaluators or further details.

The Register Committee received clarification from MÜDEK (of 11/04/14) on the details of the pilot scheme, including a translation of its rules governing the work of student evaluators.

In its representation, MÜDEK stated that its Executive Board had made firm decisions to phase in the participation of students in all evaluation teams. MÜDEK further commented on the role of students and stated that the student member was regarded as a full and equal team member.

The Register Committee considered that the information in the representation somewhat contradicted the information in the documents provided by MÜDEK earlier (with the clarification of 11/04/14), which indicate that student evaluators are specifically excluded from meetings with the faculty members and managers of the institutions visited. The documents also stipulate that the work of student evaluators is confined to a sub-set of criteria.

The Register Committee therefore found that the role of student evaluators remained not fully clear after having considered the representation.

The external review report noted that only decisions “not to accredit” can be appealed, while there is no appeal possible against other types of decisions.

In its representation, MÜDEK argued that such decisions do not cause any loss of benefits or privileges for the graduates of the programme concerned.

The Register Committee was not persuaded by that argument, since an accreditation for a limited time clearly has significant consequences for the higher education institution concerned. The reference to “formal consequences” in the ESG cannot be construed as referring only to negative decisions, since also a condition is a formal consequence.

## **Register Committee**

**Ref.** RC13/2014/07

**Ver.** 1.0

**Date** 2014-11-29

**Page** 2 / 4

The Register Committee thus found that MÜDEK did only partially engage with the guideline to this standard.

The Register Committee found that MÜDEK only partially complies with standard 3.7.

## Register Committee

Ref. RC13/2014/07

Ver. 1.0

Date 2014-11-29

Page 3 / 4

### Conclusion:

8. **With regard to ESG 2.5, 2.8 and 3.7 the Register Committee was unable to follow the panel's conclusions:**

**MÜDEK does not comply with the requirement to publish reports (ESG 2.5), which is a key requirement of the ESG. Given that MÜDEK does not publish any information on its accredited programmes (such as a summary report or the name of the evaluators), this is a significant shortcoming.**

**MÜDEK only partially complies with standards 2.8 and 3.7.**

9. **On the basis of the documentation available and the considerations above the Register Committee concluded that MÜDEK does not substantially comply with the ESG.**

**The Register Committee therefore rejected the application.**

10. MÜDEK has the right to appeal this decision of the Register Committee in accordance with the Appeals Procedure (available on the EQAR website at <http://www.eqar.eu/application.html>). Any appeal must reach EQAR within 90 days from receipt of this decision.