

Contents

Acknowledgments	5
Abstract	7
Contents	9
List of Figures	15
List of Tables	17
Glossary	19
1 Introduction	21
1.1 Thesis rationale	22
1.2 Research questions	23
1.3 Methodological and theoretical background	25
1.4 Outline of the study	26
1.5 Contribution of the study	27
2 Evaluation and quality in German higher education	29
2.1 The German university and Educational Science contextualised.....	30
2.1.2 Concepts of the university in brief	30
2.2 Educational Science in German higher education.....	33
2.3 Notions of ‘quality’ in higher education	35
2.4 Stakeholders in HE and their attitudes towards accountability	39
2.5 Definitions of evaluation.....	42
2.6 The habitus of the evaluator	45
2.7 Professors within the dichotomy of egalitarianism and elitism.....	47
2.8 The influence of Dutch evaluation methodology in German HE.....	49
2.9 An analysis of the German HE evaluation landscape	50
2.10 Political factors in association with German HE evaluation	52
2.11 The influence of PISA and the Bologna Process on German HE	53
2.12 The evaluation landscape in Germany	54
2.13 Evaluation agencies and the significance of their launch date	56
2.14 The history of the <i>evalag</i> agency in Baden-Württemberg.....	57
2.15 Evalag’s evaluation methodology	58
2.16 The impact of higher education evaluation in Germany 2000-2004	59

2.17	Background to evaluation of <i>Erziehungswissenschaft</i> 2003/2004	60
2.18	Summary	62
3	Theory and Methods.....	63
3.1	Theoretical framework	63
3.1.1	Phenomenology and decision-making theory.....	63
3.2	Using qualitative methods.....	67
3.2.1	Case study method	68
3.2.2	Emic and etic perspectives	69
3.3	Reason for not conducting pilot study.....	69
3.4	Gaining overarching access.....	70
3.5	Archival research	71
3.5.1	Methods.....	72
3.5.2	Limitations	73
3.6	Reason for conducting retrospective analysis	73
3.7	Method of interviewing agency employees	74
3.7.1	Method of interviewing evaluators.....	75
3.7.2	Duration, location, and number of interviews	76
3.7.3	Choice of interview partner / sampling	76
3.7.4	Interviewing elites: culture and the researcher	77
3.7.5	Limitations of participant recall	80
3.7.6	Ethical considerations regarding interviews.....	80
3.7.7	Method of interview data analysis.....	82
3.8	Summary	84
4	The Chronology of the Evaluation	85
4.1	First steps into documentary research	85
4.2	The historical background preceding evaluation 2003/2004.....	87
4.3	Preparing the <i>Erziehungswissenschaft</i> evaluation.....	93
4.4	The Ministry's criteria for selection of experts	97
4.5	The context preceding the constitutional meeting 16 April 2003	99
4.6	The constitutional meeting 16 April 2003.....	102
4.7	The compilation of questionnaires A and B for the self-report.....	106
4.7.1	Professor Phillips's comments on the draft questionnaire of 10 April 2003.....	107
4.8	Interim organisational details	112
4.9	Preparations in advance of the plenary meeting 25 September 2003... ..	114
4.9.1	The plenary meeting 25 September 2003.....	118
4.10	Towards determining evaluation criteria for <i>Erziehungswissenschaft</i>	121

4.11	Interim correspondence and proceedings prior to onsite visits	123
4.12	The Ulm Declaration 2001	125
4.13	The allocation of experts to HEIs for onsite visits	126
4.14	Developing evaluation criteria for judging the quality of research	129
4.15	A typical timetable for HEI visits; onsite reflections	132
4.16	The post-onsite plenary meeting 10-11 December 2003	135
4.17	The sub-committee meeting 16 January 2004	138
4.18	The plenary meeting 27 February 2004	140
4.19	The Achtenhagen/Schelten statement 23 March 2004	143
4.20	The final meeting with HEI representatives 1-2 April 2004	144
4.20.1	Discussions with representatives from PH Weingarten	146
4.21	The editorial meeting 29 April 2004	150
4.22	The agreed general criteria regarding resources for research	152
4.22.1	The scientific quality of research	152
4.22.2	Productivity and the practical relevance of research	152
4.22.3	Research funding	153
4.23	Early career academic support	153
4.24	Cooperation and international networking	154
4.25	Criteria for judging the structures of teaching and learning provision	154
4.26	Summary	155
5	The roles of individuals and their work ethics	159
5.1	Special areas of knowledge, age of experts, and other experience	159
5.2	Role of non-specialist expert	161
5.3	Prior knowledge of <i>evalag</i> and recruitment to evaluation	162
5.4	Familiarity with other colleagues / previous networks	163
5.5	How experts viewed their selection	167
5.6	Reasons for participating in the evaluation	168
5.6.1	Knowledge of institutions	169
5.6.2	Curiosity because of peers	170
5.6.3	Accommodation of evaluation into existing schedules	170
5.6.4	Experience of being evaluated	172
5.7	The significance of the first plenary meeting	173
5.8	The extent of ministerial involvement	175
5.9	Experts' opinions on how HEIs perceived the evaluation	180
5.10	Specific roles within the evaluation commission	182
5.10.1	The foreign experts	182
5.10.2	The chairperson	185
5.10.3	The sub-committee	187

5.10.4 Jürgen Baumert	188
5.11 Summary	189
6 Establishing evaluation criteria: reaching consensus on the notion of quality in German Educational Science.....	191
6.1 Working towards evaluation criteria	191
6.1.1 Frameworks for quality	194
6.1.2 Considerations for ‘first-time’ evaluations.....	197
6.1.3 Camps and hierarchies: consequences for establishing evaluation criteria	198
6.1.4 Influences from The Netherlands	202
6.1.5 Publications and impact factor	205
6.1.6 Research funding and notions of quality	208
6.2 Summary	211
7 Organisational issues and problems: self-concept of evaluators and learning processes	213
7.1 Techniques for working with large amounts of information: the self reports.....	213
7.1.1 Self reports and the art of seeing through façades.....	215
7.2 Attitudes to gaps in the statistics	218
7.3 Numbers of students at the onsite meetings	220
7.4 Compiling reports	222
7.5 Discrepancies between discussions and the final report.....	224
7.6 How the experts thought they were perceived by the HEIs	227
7.6.1 Self-concept of the evaluators	229
7.6.2 Knowledge of the field and publishing experience	230
7.6.3 Empathy with academic staff	231
7.7 Gender issues	233
7.8 Difficulties with HEIs	235
7.9 What the experts learnt from the evaluation	238
7.10 Summary	243
8 Review of the evaluation, critical discussion, and conclusions.....	245
8.1 Ministerial contract, impact on evaluation and appointed experts	246
8.2 Connectivity of experts and differing paradigms	247
8.3 Management of literature and report-writing	249
8.4 Statistical problems	249
8.5 Experiences onsite and strategies for dealing with specific situations.....	250
8.6 Exploiting particular expertise	251

8.7 Problems of size	252
8.8 Attitudes to selection, evaluation experience, and status	253
8.9 Selection of experts and their impact on the evaluation	255
8.9.1 Evaluator types	255
8.10 Evaluatory impact and perception of experts	256
8.11 Conclusions	257
8.12 Limitations of the study	259
8.13 Implications for policy and future research	259
9 Developments in German HE quality assurance since 2004	261
9.1 Introduction of evaluation standards and the ‘Exzellenzinitiative’	261
9.2 Organising quality assurance in HE	263
9.3 Evaluations in Erziehungswissenschaft	264
9.4 Changing role of <i>evalag</i>	265
9.5 A vision for the future?	266
References	267
Appendix	281
A Evaluations of education in Germany until 2004	281
B Questions for evaluators	283
C Interview participants, place, and date of interview	285
D Questionnaire A and B (final version)	287
E The Ulm Declaration	295
F The Schelten / Achtenhagen statement	299