

Established by the Education Committee on 23 May 2017.  
Last revised by the Director of Academic Affairs in December 2021.

## **Guidelines and procedures for the periodic evaluation and reaccreditation of study programmes**

### **Introduction**

These guidelines and procedures describe how the University of Stavanger must supervise study programmes in accordance with the provisions of the Act relating to Universities and University Colleges, the Regulations concerning Quality Assurance and Quality Development in Higher Education and Tertiary Vocational Education (Ministerial Regulations) and the Regulations concerning Supervision of the Educational Quality in Higher Education (Academic Supervision Regulations).<sup>1</sup>

The purpose of the scheme is to:

- maintain and further develop the quality of the study programmes through continuous and systematic quality development and to detect any decline in quality.
- ensure that the study programmes satisfy the accreditation criteria in the Ministerial Regulations, the Academic Supervision Regulations and the university's own regulations.
- revise the accreditation of the individual study programme.

### **Evaluation and reaccreditation of degree programmes**

The guidelines cover study programmes at bachelor's, master's and PhD levels that lead to a degree. The Education Committee is responsible for ensuring that the University's degree programmes are regularly evaluated and issues guidelines for evaluation and reaccreditation. The Dean can stipulate supplementary guidelines.

The process consists of:

- periodic evaluation
- consideration, comments and a proposed action plan from the Programme Coordinator/Head of Department or Head(s) of Section
- the Study Programme Council's and the Faculty Board's consideration
- the Dean's consideration, recommendation, and stipulation of the action plan
- the Education Committee's consideration

### **Calendar**

Periodic evaluation and reaccreditation must be carried out for each study programme, normally every fifth year. The Education Committee produces, based on the recommendation of the Dean, an annual plan detailing which study programmes will be evaluated. Study programmes not included in the stipulated plan can also be evaluated if a need arises for incident-based evaluation or when the academic environment wants them evaluated. Deviations from the established plan must always be based on a recommendation from the Dean.

### **Periodic evaluation**

The Ministerial Regulations require institutions to carry out periodic evaluations of their study

---

<sup>1</sup> Cf. section 4-1(3) of the Academic Supervision Regulations states: Institutions must systematically ensure that all study programmes meet the requirements set out in sections 3-1 to 3-4 of the Regulations concerning Quality Assurance and Quality Development in Higher Education and Tertiary Vocational Education and chapter 2 of the Regulations concerning Supervision of the Educational Quality in Higher Education, with the comment: This entails that the institution has satisfactory procedures and practices for the accreditation of programmes and the revision of accreditations. In this context, the term 'revision of accreditation' entails a review of whether the programme meets the requirements for accreditation and whether it produces satisfactory results.

programmes.<sup>2</sup> Reaccreditation must always be based on an evaluation in which external parties and students take part.

### **Implementation of the evaluation**

Periodic evaluations must be implemented in a way that ensures they are suitable for checking whether the study programme satisfies the applicable accreditation criteria and is producing satisfactory results. The evaluation must result in an evaluation report that is considered by the study programme's academic leadership, Programme Coordinator and Head of Department/Head(s) of Section.

#### *Evaluation Committee*

A committee must be appointed for the evaluation.

The Committee must be composed of:

- 1-2 academic staff members from the study programme's academic environment
- 1-2 external academic staff members from equivalent or related subject areas
- 1 external representative of employers
- 1-2 students
- 1 representative from the administrative staff

The evaluation committee is appointed by the dean based on suggestions from the Head of Department or Head(s) of Section. The composition of the committee must ensure it has adequate external representation. International participation in the committee may be considered where relevant. The committee's work is normally led by a representative of the study programme's academic environment and is coordinated by a representative of the administrative staff. Student representatives will be appointed in cooperation with the Student Organisation at UiS.

### **Contents of the evaluation**

The study programme being evaluated must be assessed in relation to accreditation criteria issued in NOKUT's Academic Supervision Regulations and the Ministry's Ministerial Regulations, as well as any additional criteria established by UiS. An overall overview of accreditation criteria can be found in the document, Accreditation of Study Programmes at the University of Stavanger. Based on the document, a template and checklist must be produced to aid the Committee's work.

#### *Evaluation report*

The Evaluation Committee makes assessments regarding the accreditation criteria and produces a report regarding the study programme. The Committee must base its assessments on the programme description and course descriptions, available key data and evaluation data. The necessary data must be made available to the Committee.

The Evaluation Committee must:

- To evaluate whether the accreditation criteria of the Academic Supervision Regulations have been satisfactorily met, or in which areas the study programme does not satisfy the accreditation criteria
- To evaluate whether the programme's feasibility and documented results are satisfactory
- To provide evaluations and recommendations of potential use for the further development of the programme

#### *Programme Coordinator's/Head of Department's/Head of Section's consideration*

---

<sup>2</sup> Cf. section 2-1(2) of the Ministerial Regulations: The institutions shall carry out periodic evaluations of their study programmes. Representatives of employers or society at large, students and external experts, who are relevant to the study programme, shall contribute to the evaluations.

The Programme Coordinator and Head of Department/Head(s) of Section considers the evaluation report. They produce a short document that contains:

- Comments on the evaluation committee's assessment of the study programme.
- Measures to bring the study programme into line with the accreditation criteria, if required.
- Measures for further developing the study programme:

## **Reaccreditation of the study programme**

### **Consideration by the faculty**

The report from the evaluation and memo from the programme's academic leadership will provide a basis for assessing whether the study programme satisfies the accreditation criteria. The evaluation report and a proposed action plan must be considered by committees at the faculty, normally by the Study Programme Council and the Faculty Board. The report is finally processed by the Dean at the Faculty, and a recommendation is made regarding the study programme's accreditation. If there is no recommendation to discontinue the study programme, the Dean must always establish an action plan for further development.

If all the accreditation criteria are considered to have been met:

- It is recommended that the study programme's accreditation be continued.

If not all the criteria are considered to have been met, but the restructuring necessary to satisfy the criteria can be carried out within a reasonable period of time:

- It is recommended that the study programme's accreditation be continued with an action plan for satisfying the criteria.

If not all the evaluated criteria are considered to have been met, and the restructuring necessary to satisfy the criteria cannot be carried out within a reasonable period of time:

- It is recommended that admission be temporarily postponed while the development work necessary for the study programme to satisfy the criteria is carried out, or
- Recommendation and plan for discontinuing with transitional arrangements.

The report containing the Dean's evaluation, recommendations and action plan must be sent to the Director of Academic Affairs. These form the basis for the Education Committee's consideration. The Dean must ensure that the action plan is followed up.

### **The Education Committee's consideration**

If the evaluated study programme satisfies the accreditation criteria, the Education Committee must re-accredit the study programme.

If the study programme does not satisfy the accreditation criteria, this must be remedied by a given deadline or the programme must be discontinued. In these circumstances, the Education Committee must make a decision concerning:

- The deadline for making the changes necessary for the study programme to maintain its accreditation.
- Any recommendation to the board regarding discontinuing and transitional arrangements.

## **Evaluation and reaccreditation of other study programmes**

The Dean is responsible for ensuring that the faculty's one-year study programmes and other study programmes, including continuing education, are evaluated when these are not covered by the periodic evaluation of degree programmes. The evaluation and reaccreditation of shorter study programmes must be carried out in line with the pattern of procedures for the degree programmes and based on guidelines and a calendar determined by the Dean. A separate template has been prepared for evaluation of study programmes up to and including 60 credits.

Attachments to these guidelines:      Accreditation of Study Programmes at the University of Stavanger  
Templates for periodic evaluations of study programmes at the  
University of Stavanger

Executive Officer: Kristofer Rossmann Henrichsen, Tel.: +47 51 83 30 10