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Introduction

In competence-based higher education the definition of intended competences, which students shall acquire by a study program, is fundamental. Based thereon, continuous monitoring of the teaching process and the students’ competences is also vital. However, evaluation instruments on study program level for competence-based higher education are scarce. Therefore, at the Vetmeduni Vienna, the Competence Check was developed in 2013 [1].

Intended competence levels

The Competence Check is based on the intended competences of the veterinary study. Not only competences were defined but also the competences levels. Levels were defined for two aspects of competence (knowledge and skill) and two cohorts of students (students in the middle and students at the end of studies).

Method

Reported competence levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competence Check</th>
<th>Annually since 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students</th>
<th>On what level is your own competence?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructors</td>
<td>On what level is the student’s competence?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results

The reported competence levels are contrasted with the intended competence levels. These results are widely disseminated at the Vetmeduni Vienna, which is crucial for the utilization of results. Feedback is given to:

- All stakeholders: Competence Check Report
- Students: Individual feedback of reported competence levels (pdf per email)
- Faculty: Presentations face to face, Video at vetmedathek
- University Evaluation Board: Presentation

University Evaluation Board

- heterogeneous group of teachers, students, and vice rectorate of study affairs.
- analyses and interprets the results (in accordance with the stakeholder groups)
- develops recommendations for systematic measures to enhance teaching quality and the students’ competences.

Conclusion

Crucial in implementing such a new procedure (defining, screening, and enhancing competences; see [2, 3]) is making the process transparent to stakeholders. Stakeholders are continually informed about the process and empowered to use the results of the Competence Check.

Further information

See Project IQM-HE which developed a more general quality management procedure based on the Competence Check [3].
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Introduction: In competence-based higher education the definition of intended competences, which students shall acquire by a study program, is fundamental. Based thereon, continuous monitoring of the teaching process and the students’ competences is also vital. However, evaluation instruments on study program level for competence-based higher education are scarce. Therefore, at the Vetmeduni Vienna, the Competence Check was developed in 2013 [1]. The Competence Check is based on the intended competences of the veterinary study. Not only competences were defined but also the competences levels. Levels were defined for two aspects of competence (knowledge and skill) and two cohorts of students (students in the middle and students at the end of studies).

Material: Since 2014, the Competence Check is administered to students (6th and 10th semester), to teachers (in close contact due to lectures with students of the 6th and 10th semester), and to practical instructors of veterinary study every year. Students report the level at which they have acquired each competence, and the level at which it has been taught throughout their studies. Teachers and instructors report the average competence levels of the student cohort. In March 2016, data from N=290 students (6th and 10th semester) and N=110 data sets of teachers were obtained.

Results: The reported competence levels are contrasted with the intended competence levels. These results are widely disseminated at the Vetmeduni Vienna, which is crucial for the utilization of results. Feedback is given to: (1) students regarding their individual ratings for all their acquired competences (pdf per email), and the (2) the faculty, which is invited to presentations on the results. Furthermore (3), a detailed report of the results for all stakeholders is generated. Finally (4), the results are interpreted by the university’s evaluation board, consisting of members of teachers, students, and vice rectorate of study affairs. The board analyses and interprets the results (in accordance with the stakeholder groups) and develops recommendations for systematic measures to enhance teaching quality and the students’ competences.

Conclusions: Crucial in implementing such a new procedure (defining, screening, and enhancing competences; see [2,3]) is making the process transparent to stakeholders. Stakeholders are continually informed about the process and empowered to use the results of the Competence Check.
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