

Printed matter AC 33/2017

Decision on the application of the Foundation for International Business Administration Accreditation (FIBAA) dated 23 May 2016 for accreditation

5

Resolution by the Accreditation Council of 7 February 2017

I.

The Foundation for the Accreditation of Study Programmes in Germany (Foundation) accredits the Foundation for International Business Administration Accreditation (FIBAA) pursuant to § 2 Para. 1 No. 1 of the Law establishing a foundation “Foundation for the Accreditation of Study Courses in Germany” in accordance with the following provisions and insofar thereby grants it the authority to accredit study programmes and the internal quality assurance systems of higher education institutions by awarding the seal of the foundation.

10

15

II.

The decision comes into effect pursuant to Article I. above on 7 February 2017. Pursuant to section 5.1.2 clause 2 of the “Rules for the Accreditation of Agencies” dated 8 December 2009 in the version from 23 September 2016, it however shall become void if the agency has not signed an agreement by 31 May 2017 pursuant to § 3 of the Law establishing a foundation “Foundation for the Accreditation of Study Courses in Germany” in the version adopted by the Accreditation Council on 22 June 2016.

20

III.

The accreditation and the authorisation pursuant to Article I. above is granted for a period of five years; the right of revocation pursuant to Article V. below remains reserved.

25

Pursuant to Section 5.2.1 of the resolution “Rules for the Accreditation of Agencies” from 8 December 2009, in the version adopted on 23 September 2016, the accreditation shall expire on 31 March 2022.

30

IV.

The Accreditation Council notes that FIBAA has not fulfilled a few quality requirements; these deficiencies are expected to be remediable within nine months according to Section 5.1.3 of the resolution “Rules for the Accreditation of Agencies” dated 8 December 2009 in the version adopted on 23 September 2016. Accreditation is therefore granted under the following conditions:

Condition 1: The agency shall demonstrate that it has revised the process for database entry in such a way that guarantees immediate and complete entry of a system-accredited higher education institution’s study programmes as soon as they have been accredited according to its rules and the accreditation of the higher education institution has been disclosed, unless the higher education institution has assumed the responsibility of entering them in an agreement with the Accreditation Council (ESG standard 2.6).

Condition 2: The agency shall demonstrate that it has adjusted the “FIBAA manual for the accreditation of study programmes in accordance with the requirements of the Accreditation Council” and the “FIBAA manual for system accreditation in accordance with the requirements of the Accreditation Council” to the resolution of the Accreditation Council (AC Criterion 3.1).

The Accreditation Council explicitly refers to the recommendations contained in the review report.

V.

Pursuant to Section 5.5.2 of the resolution “Rules for the Accreditation of Agencies” from 8 December 2009, in the version adopted on 23 September 2016, the conditions have to be fulfilled within nine months. If FIBAA does not demonstrate that the conditions have been fulfilled within this time, the Foundation shall revoke accreditation pursuant to section 5.5.4 of the resolution.

VI. Rationale

General:

10 Based on the report and taking into consideration the agency’s statement, the Accreditation Council has concluded that the Foundation for International Business Administration Accreditation (FIBAA) substantially fulfils the standards and criteria in sections 2 and 3 of its resolution “Rules for the Accreditation of Agencies” dated 8 December 2009 in the version adopted on 23 September 2016.

15 The conditions no. 4 and 7 as identified by the review panel were summarised and adjusted based on the agency’s statement (see the explanations in the section “On Condition 1” for rationale).

Condition no. 5 (new condition 1) as identified by the review panel was also adjusted based on the agency’s statement (see the explanations in the section “On Condition 2” for rationale).

In the following points the Accreditation Council deviates from the review panel’s recommendations in the review report and issues no condition:

- 25 • With their statement, the agency submitted adopted rules of procedure for the FIBAA accreditation commission for institutional procedures (F-AK INST) and for the board of complaints. This makes condition no. 1 as proposed by the review panel obsolete and therefore cancelled.
- 30 • With their statement, the agency submitted a QA concept adopted by their foundation council on 6 December 2016. The concept shows that consequences are also regularly drawn (alongside evaluations) from the other internal and external feedback mechanisms (jour fixe, complaints, monitoring of the Accreditation Council). This means that according to the concept processes are regularly reviewed and, if necessary, adapted based on the results of the jour fixe. Checklists and tutorials for the employees as well as external manuals and templates are revised according to

changes to processes, new rules, results from the analysed monitoring procedures of the Accreditation Council and complaints procedures. This makes condition no. 2 as proposed by the review panel obsolete and therefore cancelled.

- The agency submits its adopted rules of appointment. This makes condition no. 3 as proposed by the review panel obsolete and therefore cancelled.

- The agency has submitted with its statement a revised resolution of the foundation council “Principles for the separation of assessment and consultancy in assessment procedures within the framework of ESG”, which assumes the principles for programme and system accreditation from the Accreditation Council’s resolution “Standards for Structuring the Relationship between System Accreditation and Consultation Services”. This makes condition no. 6 as identified by the review panel obsolete and therefore cancelled.

On Condition 1: On condition no. 4 as identified by the review panel, the agency has submitted with its statement a revised process for database entry, which shows how the prompt entry of the basic data sets in the Higher Education Compass is to be guaranteed through a system of “escalation steps” (deadline shortened by processor, extension period, reminder by the agency’s management, message to the Accreditation Council). This process may well seem to be suitable for guaranteeing prompt entry of the decisions in programme and system accreditation, however it does not cover the entry of study programmes at system-accredited higher education institutions.

In addition, FIBAA has indeed clarified on its homepage regarding condition no. 7 as identified by the review panel, that study programmes at system-accredited higher education institutions are only accredited if they were established according to the requirements of the accredited system or if they have already been subject to internal quality assurance according to the requirements of the accredited system. However, at the same time it explained that it does not enter study programmes at system-accredited higher education institutions into the database. By taking this approach, the agency is violating § 11 of the agreement between FIBAA and the Accreditation Council, according to which the agency is, on principle, responsible for the database entries. The agencies, despite what was outlined by FIBAA, also have the corresponding access rights. A corresponding composition of the contract with the higher education institution enables the agency to ensure that it receives the information about accredited study programmes.

On Condition 2: The agency submitted with its statement a modified model contract, in

which the review panel's complaints regarding this (see annex 1, p. 63 f.) have been rectified. The documents that were also submitted, the "FIBAA manual for the accreditation of study programmes in accordance with the requirements of the Accreditation Council" and "FIBAA manual for system accreditation in accordance with the requirements of the Accreditation Council", have been modified; the changes however do not yet fully correspond with the requirements of the Accreditation Council.

The information criticised by the review panel (see annex 1, p. 63), according to which the Accreditation Council must be informed of any suspensions, has been removed from the new version of the "FIBAA manual for the accreditation of study programmes in accordance with the requirements of the Accreditation Council". However, the manual now includes a statement (on p. 20) that the report on the suspension of an accreditation procedure must be released to the public. According to the rules of the Accreditation Council, however, this is also not the case.

On p. 9 of the "FIBAA manual for system accreditation in accordance with the requirements of the Accreditation Council", it is now outlined that in the event of a higher education institution offering state-regulated study programmes, programme random sampling is required. This is indeed correct. The correct information previously included, which stated that in such cases the corresponding specifics of the state-regulated study programmes (e.g. regulations shared by the Länder, and if applicable for specific Länder, for the accreditation of teacher training study programmes) join the feature random sample has however now been mistakenly removed.