AQAS

AGENTUR FÜR
QUALITÄTSSICHERUNG DURCH
AKKREDITIERUNG VON
STUDIENGÄNGEN E.V.

FINAL REPORT

INSTITUTIONAL ACCREDITATION

EUROPEAN UNIVERSITY OF LEFKE

September 2026

Content

Decision of the Accreditation Commission of AQAS 3
I. Preamble 6
II. Accreditation procedure 6
1. Approach and methodology 6
2. Internal Phase/Basis for the assessment of the panel of experts 7
3. External phase/panel of experts 7

III. National context 8
IV. General Information on the University 8
V. Assessment of the European University of Lefke 9
1. Policy and Procedures for Quality Assurance 9
2. Design, approval and termination of programmes 11
3. On-going monitoring and periodic review of programmes 14
4. Learning, Teaching and Assessment of Students 17
5. Student Admission, Progression, Recognition, and Certification 20
6. Teaching Staff 23
7. Learning Resources and Student Support 26
8. Public Information 28

VI. Recommendation of the panel of experts 31

DECISION OF THE AQAS STANDING COMMISSION ON THE INSTITUTIONAL ACCREDITATION OF EUROPEAN UNIVERSITY OF LEFKE, NORTH CYPRUS

Based on the report of the expert panel, the statement of the university and the discussions of the AQAS Standing Commission in its 30th meeting on 7 September 2026, the AQAS Standing Commission decides:

1. The European University of Lefke, North Cyprus is accredited according to the AQAS Criteria for Institutional Accreditation.

   The accreditation is conditional.
   The university essentially complies with the requirements defined by the criteria and thus the Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area (ESG) and the European Qualifications Framework (EQF) in their current version. The required adjustments can be implemented within a time period of twelve months.

2. The condition has to be fulfilled. The fulfilment of the condition has to be documented and reported to AQAS no later than **30. September 2027.**

3. The accreditation is given for the period of **six years** and is valid until **30 September 2032**, provided that the conditions listed below are fully met. Otherwise, the accreditation may be withdrawn.

Condition:

1. EUL must ensure that formal complaint and appeal procedures - including the applicable routes, responsibilities and timelines - are clearly defined, readily accessible and transparently communicated.

The following **recommendations** are given for further improvement of the institution:

1. EUL should improve the user-oriented organisation, accessibility and consistency of programme-related public information and assign clear responsibilities for its regular review and updating. University-wide information should be provided centrally, while accreditation information should specify the accrediting body, scope, status and validity period.
2. EUL should complement its effective decentralised and informal feedback arrangements with systematic documentation and institutional mechanisms that ensure continuity and facilitate closed quality loops and shared learning across faculties.
3. EUL should further develop the communication of quality assurance results and resulting follow-up measures. Communication should explain why information was collected, how the results were interpreted and which measures were subsequently taken.
4. EUL should establish a systematic institutional approach to the quality assurance of internships, covering their intended purpose and learning outcomes, the achievement of these outcomes and the consistency of implementation across departments and cooperating organisations.
5. EUL should further develop flexible and learner-centred approaches to course design and assessment within the applicable regulatory framework. Its quality assurance system should systematically evaluate

whether assessment methods provide valid evidence of student learning and achievement of the intended learning outcomes.

6. EUL should systematically monitor the relationship between increasing research expectations and the comparatively high teaching load to ensure that staff have sufficient capacity for teaching, research and quality enhancement.

With regard to the reasons for this decision, the Standing Commission refers to the attached expert report.

EXPERTS' REPORT
ON THE INSTITUTIONAL ACCREDITATION
OF THE EUROPEAN UNIVERSITY OF LEFKE, NORTH CYPRUS

Visit to the university: 14.-16. April 2026 (virtual) and 7.-10 July 2026 on site

Panel of experts:

Prof. Dr. Carsten Wolff	University of Applied Sciences Dortmund, Professor of Informatics and Technical Informatics, former Vice-Rector for Teaching, Studies and International Affairs, Germany
Prof. Arda Ozturkcan, PhD.	Istanbul Gelisim University, Vice Rector for Research, Quality and Accreditation
Nadja Legrum-Khaled	Karlsruhe Institute of Technology, Head of Quality Management, Germany (representative of the labour market)
Julian Wiedermann	Student at the University of Freiburg (student expert)

Coordinator:

Ronny Heintze	AQAS, Cologne, Germany

I. Preamble

AQAS – Agency for Quality Assurance through Accreditation of Study Programmes – is an independent non-profit organisation supported by nearly 90 universities, universities of applied sciences, and academic associations. Since 2002, the agency has been recognised by the German Accreditation Council (GAC). It is, therefore, a notified body for the accreditation of higher education institutions and programmes in Germany.

AQAS is a full member of ENQA and also listed in the European Quality Assurance Register for Higher Education (EQAR) which confirms that our procedures comply with the Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area (ESG), on which all Bologna countries agreed as a basis for internal and external quality assurance.

AQAS is an institution founded by and working for higher education institutions and academic associations. The agency is devoted to quality assurance and quality development of academic studies and higher education institutions' teaching. In line with AQAS' mission statement, the official bodies in Germany and Europe (GAC and EQAR) approved that the activities of AQAS in accreditation are neither limited to specific academic disciplines or degrees nor a particular type of higher education institution.

II. Accreditation procedure

This report results from the external institutional review of the European University of Lefke, North Cyprus.

1. Approach and methodology

Within the institutional accreditation procedure by AQAS, the quality assurance system of a university, faculty, or college is assessed against the AQAS criteria for institutional accreditation, which are aligned with the European Standards and Guidelines (ESG, version 2015). The ESG are a set of standards and guidelines for internal and external quality assurance in higher education. The ESG are non-prescriptive while providing guidance and covering the vital areas for the successful quality provision and learning environments in higher education.

In line with the ESG the AQAS criteria for institutional accreditation are based on the following four principles for quality assurance:

- Higher education institutions have primary responsibility for the quality of their provision and its assurance,
- Quality assurance responds to the diversity of higher education systems, institutions, programmes and students,
- Quality assurance supports the development of a quality culture,
- Quality assurance considers the needs and expectations of students and all other stakeholders and society.

AQAS developed a set of criteria and indicators relevant for institutional accreditations. Based on these accreditation criteria, AQAS also provided the university with guidelines for writing a self-evaluation report (SER). AQAS follows the core idea that it should be assessed if the mechanisms the institution chose to secure the quality of its study programmes are appropriate within an external assessment. Therefore, AQAS focuses on the overarching mechanisms to secure an adequate level of the learning process of Higher Education Institutions. Beyond this, the aims formulated by the university in the SER have an impact on the assessment of the panel of experts as applications need to be seen in the light of the strategic goals of the institution. In the accreditation procedures, AQAS follows the peer-review principle. Based on AQAS' long-lasting experience

with external quality assurance procedures and its involvement in international networks when working with experts, AQAS acts according to the ECA Principles for the Selection of Experts.

2. Internal Phase/Basis for the assessment of the panel of experts

The European University of Lefke delivered a SER describing the main characteristics of the institution. The SER explained how the quality management system works and how learning and teaching are organised. Additionally, the university sent appendices and integrated different links into the SER to provide more detailed material, give evidence to the self-report statements, and demonstrate how procedures are organised and put into practice.

The appendix included documents such as student retention rates, educational offers, undergraduate teaching and undergraduate admission regulations, quality assurance policies and mechanisms, information on graduate profiles, or procedures for drafting and updating study plans.

AQAS scrutinised the application originally received in November 2025 regarding completeness, comprehensibility, and transparency. The accreditation procedure was officially initialised by a decision of the AQAS Standing Commission on 1. December 2025. The final version of the SER was handed in in March 2026.

3. External phase/panel of experts

Following the AQAS principles for institutional accreditation, the composition followed the basic principle that the panel consists of one professor coming from the area of quality management of universities, one professor from one of the disciplines, one practitioner of quality assurance who served as representative from the labour market and one student. At least one panel member has experience in the region.

The Standing Commission nominated the aforementioned expert panel in March 2026. AQAS informed the university about the expert panel members, and the European University of Lefke had no objections.

Within the institutional accreditation procedure, the study programme "Computer Engineering" was chosen to be reviewed and serve as a programme sample for the institutional review. Additional documents provided the necessary information on the programme sample following the guidelines for AQAS programme reviews.

The experts reviewed the application and submitted a short preliminary statement, including open questions and potential needs for additional information. AQAS forwarded these preliminary statements to the university and the other panel members to increase transparency in the process and the discussions during the site visit.

A virtual site visit took place from 14 to 16 April 2026 following which additional documentation was requested. The site visit then took place on site from 7 to10 July 2026. During the site visit, discussions were held with the university management, the QA unit, the deans of the faculties, teaching staff, labour market representatives and students. At the end of the site visit, the experts presented short feedback on the main findings to representatives of the university.

In July 2026, the expert panel drafted the assessment report, including a recommendation to the Standing Commission of AQAS. AQAS forwarded the report to the university in August 2026, providing the opportunity to comment on the report.

Based upon the expert panel's report and the University's statement, the AQAS Commission decided in its meeting on 7 September 2026 about the institutional accreditation. AQAS forwarded the decision to the University. The University had the right to appeal the decision.

In October 2026, AQAS published the report, the result of the accreditation as well as the names of the panel members.

III. National context

Higher education in North Cyprus is organised within a multi-layered regulatory framework involving authorities in Northern Cyprus and, for specific aspects of recognition and equivalency, Türkiye. The main national bodies referred to in the documentation are the Ministry of National Education of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus (MEB), the Higher Education Planning, Evaluation, Accreditation and Coordination Council (YÖDAK), and the Higher Education Council of Türkiye (YÖK).

At the level of Northern Cyprus, the Ministry of National Education and YÖDAK are described as the principal regulatory authorities for higher education. Their responsibilities include the licensing of higher education institutions, the oversight of academic standards, and the monitoring of compliance with the relevant legal and regulatory framework. The legal basis referred to in the SER includes the Constitution of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus and local laws and regulations governing higher education. Within this framework, YÖDAK has a role in the planning, evaluation, accreditation and coordination of higher education and is therefore relevant for the external regulation and quality assurance of universities in Northern Cyprus.

YÖK has an additional role in relation to the broader Turkish higher education framework. According to the documentation, this role concerns in particular the recognition and equivalency of universities and diplomas from Northern Cyprus within Türkiye's higher education system. YÖK is also relevant for certain aspects of programme structures, degree equivalency and, where applicable, the allocation of student quotas from Türkiye. The system therefore combines local regulation in Northern Cyprus with additional recognition-related interfaces to the Turkish higher education system.

The establishment and operation of higher education institutions in this context are connected to institutional legal acts and the applicable regulatory framework. In the case of the European University of Lefke, the SER describes the University as a non-profit state-foundation university established by foundation deed and operating under a Foundation Bylaw. This bylaw forms part of the institution-specific legal basis under which the University operates. At the same time, the University is subject to the external requirements and procedures of MEB, YÖDAK and, where relevant, YÖK.

The programme approval process described in the SER reflects this multi-level context. Internally, programme proposals pass through university bodies before external steps are initiated. Externally, new programmes may require involvement of the Ministry of National Education, YÖDAK and YÖK, depending on the purpose of approval, recognition, commencement of teaching activities, and student quota arrangements. This means that institutional programme development takes place within a combination of internal academic governance and external regulatory procedures.

IV. General Information on the University

The European University of Lefke (EUL) is located in North Cyprus and was established in 1990 under the Cyprus Science Foundation. According to the SER, EUL is a non-profit state-foundation university. The University offers study programmes across a range of academic and professional fields and reports more than 11,000 students from over 80 countries. Since its establishment, EUL has had more than 27,000 graduates. As of the 2024/25 academic year, 32 study programmes are reported as accredited by external accreditation bodies. The University also states that it is a member of several international organisations and a signatory to the Magna Charta Universitatum 2020.

EUL's academic structure comprises twelve faculties, seven schools and vocational schools, and one graduate institute. The University operates across three campuses: the Main Campus in Lefke, the Güzelyurt Campus, and the Lefkoşa Campus. The Main Campus hosts most university activities, while the Lefkoşa Campus is described as a venue for postgraduate courses and seminars. The Güzelyurt Campus includes lecture halls, offices, research laboratories and practical training areas and hosts programmes in the Faculty of Agricultural Sciences and Technologies.

The University's governance and administrative structure includes the Board of Trustees of the Cyprus Science Foundation, the Rector, the Senate, the University Executive Board, faculty and school boards, deans, directors, department chairs and department boards. The Board of Trustees is described as the highest governing body and is responsible for the overall management, administration and control of the University's property, revenue, business and affairs. The Rector is responsible for the implementation of academic policies, strategic plans and administrative operations. The Senate and University Executive Board have responsibilities related to academic policy, institutional planning and the organisation of university activities.

In terms of teaching and research profile, the SER presents EUL as an institution offering programmes across different faculties and schools, including undergraduate, graduate and vocational provision. Research activity is organised partly through research centres, and the University's strategic plan refers to research and innovation as one of its institutional components. The SER also refers to teaching, research, student success, community engagement, governance and institutional sustainability as elements of the University's strategic planning framework.

V. Assessment of the European University of Lefke

1. Policy and Procedures for Quality Assurance

The institution has a policy for quality assurance that is publicly available and forms part of their strategic management. Internal stakeholders should develop and implement this policy through appropriate structures and processes, while involving external stakeholders. [ESG, 1.1]

Description

According to the documentation, EUL has established a Quality Assurance Framework that is supported by a set of institutional policies, procedures, guidelines, bylaws and regulations. The SER refers, among others, to policies on governance, academic integrity, continuous enhancement, stakeholder engagement, monitoring and review, and strategic alignment. These documents are presented as the institutional basis for organising quality assurance across academic, administrative and support functions.

The central body for coordinating quality assurance is the Quality Assurance Committee. It is chaired by a vice-rector appointed by the Rector and includes four faculty members, a graduate representative and a student representative. The Committee is described as responsible for developing and updating quality-related regulations and guidelines, identifying quality indicators, accessing relevant information for monitoring purposes, providing feedback for improvement, and preparing or coordinating internal and external quality assurance procedures. The Quality Support Unit supports the Committee and acts as a link between the Committee, academic and administrative units, and stakeholders. In addition, the SER describes an Internal Audit Function, headed by a senior audit executive, which reviews risk management, control and governance processes across academic, administrative and support areas.

The internal quality assurance system is described as based on cycles of planning, implementation, evaluation and enhancement. According to the SER, these cycles include departmental self-assessment, student and employer feedback, peer review elements, performance monitoring and the use of key performance indicators. Programme monitoring and review procedures provide a further framework for collecting and analysing information on programme delivery and outcomes. The documentation refers to data from the Student Information System, digital learning environments, quality assurance reports, financial and resource data, staff data, student surveys, course evaluations, graduate exit surveys, alumni feedback and employer feedback. These sources are intended to support monitoring of student admission and enrolment, progression, retention and completion, student satisfaction, employability, teaching and assessment practices, workload, learning resources and related support structures.

The SER also describes the involvement of internal and external stakeholders in quality assurance. Students are involved through the Student Council, student representatives, student clubs and societies, the Dean of Students Office, surveys and other feedback channels. Academic staff are involved through departments, faculties, schools, boards and review processes. External stakeholders mentioned in the documentation include employers, alumni, professional bodies, industry representatives, regulatory authorities and community representatives. Their input is described as relevant for curriculum development, programme review and strategic planning. The use of these institutional arrangements in practice was examined during the virtual and on-site visits.

The QA framework is also linked to institutional planning and programme development. The SER states that monitoring and review results may lead to curriculum revision, resource-related decisions, changes in teaching and assessment practices, student support measures, or programme-related follow-up actions. The Quality Assurance Committee and relevant academic bodies are described as having roles in reviewing reports and monitoring action plans. The framework is therefore intended to connect evidence collection, analysis, decision-making and follow-up; the implementation and closure of these cycles were examined by the panel during the site visits.

Academic integrity is addressed in the documentation through specific policies and regulations, including references to academic integrity and plagiarism prevention. The SER also refers to equality, diversity and inclusion arrangements, including an Office for Equality, Diversity and Inclusion. These elements are relevant for the QA framework insofar as they relate to fair academic practice, equal opportunities, and the protection of students and staff against discrimination. The documentation further indicates that learning resources, learning environments and student support services are included in monitoring and evaluation processes, for example through student feedback, satisfaction surveys, resource data and support service review mechanisms

Experts' evaluation

Based on the documentation provided and the discussions held during the virtual and on-site visits, it was clearly shown that EUL has a strategic approach to quality management. The details given in the SER and additional sources were confirmed during the site visits.

EUL has developed a strategically aligned Quality Assurance Framework, extending from its strategic and quality goals to procedures, measurements and defined Key Performance Indicators (KPIs). The framework and supporting information are publicly available and subject to regular documentation. The relevant procedures, instruments and responsibilities are described clearly and linked to the Strategic Plan. Besides its focus on teaching and learning, the QA framework also includes regular assessment of learning environments, support services and support structures. It is supported by a wide range of policies, including policies addressing academic integrity, plagiarism, anti-discrimination and anti-harassment.

Quality assurance processes are data-driven and take both qualitative and quantitative data into account, including data from internal databases, assessments and survey results. EUL uses a Student Information System to collect student-related data at institutional and course level, including data used for the assurance of learning outcomes. These formal sources are complemented by numerous informal channels through which internal and external stakeholders provide feedback.

The collected information is used in a structured way and contributes to the strategic approach, as illustrated by the Strategic Plan. EUL provided examples of how the loop had been closed for individual KPIs in line with the PDCA cycle, including the assessment of data, the application of benchmarks and the measures taken. During the interviews, teaching staff could explain how assessment planning, the achievement of learning outcomes, course evaluation results and departmental discussions influence teaching practice. The panel also saw credible examples of closed quality loops, including the introduction of additional electives following regulatory and stakeholder discussions and changes to course-level assessment where the defined benchmark for learning-outcome achievement had not been reached. These examples demonstrate that EUL understands quality management and quality assurance as processes of continuous improvement that are linked to its strategy.

The panel particularly appreciated EUL's clearly recognisable commitment to quality assurance and continuous enhancement. The interviews showed that quality assurance is not only a central administrative exercise but reaches the level of teaching and learning. Staff were able to explain the processes and their own responsibilities, while students participate through representation in relevant committees and through different feedback channels. External stakeholders confirmed close links with faculties and described how their perspectives inform curriculum development and other university activities. The particularly strong sense of belonging expressed by the alumni who participated in the on-site visit was also remarkable.

At the same time, the interviews showed that a significant part of stakeholder feedback is decentralised and informal. This direct exchange is effective in addressing issues promptly and is a strength of EUL's quality culture. However, the documentation of such feedback and its transfer into cross-faculty learning are not yet equally systematic in all areas. General survey results are published and students provided examples of reports being made available on the student platform, but the context in which information was collected, the interpretation of results and the resulting follow-up measures are not always communicated with the same visibility. These limitations do not detract from the strategic foundation of the QA framework, but they identify areas in its operational implementation that are considered further under ongoing monitoring and periodic review.

Conclusion

The criterion is fulfilled.

2. Design, approval and termination of programmes

The Institution has processes for the design, approval and termination of its programmes. The Institution ensures the involvement of stakeholders in these processes. The programmes are designed to meet the objectives set for them, including the intended learning outcomes. The qualification resulting from a programme is clearly specified and communicated and refers to the correct level of the Framework for Qualifications of the European Higher Education Area (EQF), and, consequently, when aligned, to the national qualifications framework for higher education.

[ESG, 1.2]

Description

According to the documentation, EUL has established policies and procedures for the design, approval, modification and termination of academic programmes. The SER refers in particular to the Programme Design and Approval Policy and to monitoring and review procedures and guidelines. These documents describe the principles, procedural steps, responsibilities and documentation requirements that are to be followed when new programmes are developed or existing programmes are revised.

Programme proposals are initiated at the level of academic departments, faculties or schools. The proposing academic unit is responsible for developing the academic rationale, curriculum structure, intended learning outcomes and supporting documentation. Department, faculty or school boards review the academic relevance and coherence of the proposal before it is submitted to central university bodies. The SER describes a role for the Curriculum Committee and the Senate in the further academic review and approval of new programmes. Quality assurance-related input is provided through the Quality Support Unit and quality assurance procedures, particularly with regard to academic coherence, regulatory alignment and consistency with institutional policies. Where required, proposals are also considered in relation to staffing, infrastructure, financial feasibility and projected student demand.

The design process is described as being linked to the University's mission, vision and strategic planning framework. New programme proposals are expected to include information on labour market relevance, benchmarking against national and international programmes, strategic fit, and the availability of resources. The documentation also refers to the involvement of internal and external stakeholders. Academic staff are involved in developing programme content and learning outcomes. Student feedback, alumni input, employer perspectives and, where relevant, professional or sectoral expectations may be used during the proposal and curriculum development process. The SER indicates that stakeholder input is collected at an early stage of programme development and may inform the formulation of programme objectives, curriculum content, practical components and intended learning outcomes.

The documentation states that programme learning outcomes and course learning outcomes are defined as part of programme design. These outcomes are intended to describe the knowledge, skills and competences students are expected to acquire. The SER further refers to broader graduate attributes, including critical thinking, communication, teamwork, problem-solving, ethical awareness, digital literacy, professional responsibility and lifelong learning. Discipline-specific competences are described as being included where relevant to the academic field and labour market context. The SER also states that programme-level learning outcomes are aligned with the relevant level of the European Qualifications Framework. Course-level mapping matrices are used to link learning outcomes to course components and assessment methods.

Curriculum design is described as taking account of programme duration, local credit values, ECTS credits, course sequencing and prerequisites. According to the SER, associate degree programmes comprise 120 ECTS credits, bachelor's programmes generally comprise 240 ECTS credits, master's programmes with thesis comprise 120 ECTS credits, and doctoral programmes comprise 240 ECTS credits. The local credit system is based on theoretical, practical and laboratory hours, while ECTS credits are used to reflect student workload. The SER also describes a sequencing logic in which introductory and foundational courses are normally placed in earlier semesters, while more specialised and integrative components are offered later in the curriculum. Prerequisites may be used in selected programmes, particularly in scientific, technological, engineering and health-related fields.

After internal approval, external regulatory steps may be required. The SER describes the involvement of the Ministry of National Education, YÖDAK and, where relevant, YÖK in relation to permission, recognition, authorisation to commence teaching activities and student quota arrangements. This means that programme approval combines internal academic governance with external regulatory procedures. The precise sequence

and relevance of these external steps may depend on the type of programme and the applicable recognition requirements.

The documentation also contains procedures for the termination of programmes. Programme termination may be considered in cases such as low enrolment or graduation rates, loss of labour market relevance, inability to meet updated academic or professional requirements, institutional restructuring, external regulatory or accreditation decisions, financial non-viability, or insufficient academic staffing. The SER describes a process that may be initiated by a faculty board, Senate sub-committee, the Quality Assurance Committee, the Rectorate or an external regulatory body. A programme closure impact report is to assess academic, financial, administrative and student-related consequences. Internal and external stakeholders, including students, alumni, academic staff and industry partners, may be consulted before a final decision is taken.

According to the SER, termination decisions involve the Senate and the Board of Trustees, followed by notification of external bodies such as YÖK, YÖDAK and the Ministry of National Education where required. The documentation also refers to measures intended to protect students' rights during programme termination. These include teach-out arrangements, academic advising, transfer or equivalency options, formal communication with affected students and continued validity of degrees awarded under terminated programmes.

Experts' evaluation

From the experts' point of view, the policies and processes for the design, approval and termination of programmes are adequate and well documented. This assessment is supported by the available documentation and by the explanations and discussions during the site visit. EUL provides information on its study programmes through its website in English for English-language programmes and in Turkish for Turkish-language programmes. The programme descriptions, curricula and course syllabi are derived from defined programme objectives, graduate profiles and learning outcomes, including transversal and overarching learning outcomes. The experts consider this approach to be in line with the expectations of the ESG and the relevant EQF level descriptors. The course syllabi are detailed and refer to programme-level learning outcomes. Workload and level descriptors are documented, and the curricula cover subject-specific and cross-subject knowledge as well as methodological and general skills. The discussions with students, both across faculties and within the Computer Engineering programme, provided further evidence that appropriate workload and coherent learning paths are considered in programme design.

At the same time, from the experts' point of view, the programme information available on the website does not consistently provide the same level of documentation across programmes. The logic of dividing information between the Programme Catalogue, Programme Handbook and Course Catalogue is not always sufficiently clear or applied consistently, and the three sources contain overlapping information. As these documents are extensive and not always self-explanatory, their current structure may make it difficult for students and applicants to identify and compare the information most relevant to them. More coherent and centrally structured student-facing information would increase transparency and reduce dependence on the structure and presentation chosen by individual programmes. Social media and other channels may usefully complement this information, but essential academic and organisational information should remain consistently available through authoritative institutional sources. Therefore, EUL should improve the user-oriented organisation, accessibility and consistency of programme-related public information and assign clear responsibilities for its regular review and updating. University-wide information should be provided centrally, while accreditation information should specify the accrediting body, scope, status and validity period. **(Finding 1)**

YÖK and YÖDAK formulate detailed requirements for programme design and course syllabi, including requirements concerning actual contact hours. From the experts' point of view, these requirements may limit the scope for further developing didactic concepts and formats in the context of digital transformation and artificial intelligence, for example self-directed learning supported by AI tools or project-based learning. The experts

acknowledge that EUL must operate within the applicable regulatory framework. Continued dialogue with the relevant accreditation and regulatory bodies may nevertheless help to explore options for more flexible course and programme structures while maintaining transparent workload expectations and the achievement of intended learning outcomes.

The policies for programme development clearly define roles and responsibilities. From the experts' point of view, stakeholders are sufficiently involved, particularly through continuous feedback on graduate profiles and changing labour-market requirements. The strong connections between EUL, its alumni and the local labour market were demonstrated convincingly during the site visit and are a clear strength that should be maintained. External stakeholders interact with faculties, provide curriculum feedback, support internships and regard EUL as a relevant partner for regional and professional development. Their continued involvement contributes to keeping learning outcomes current and relevant. The experts particularly appreciate this close collaboration in light of the size and structure of the higher education environment in North Cyprus.

The experts consider the approval and termination procedures to involve the relevant academic stakeholders and institutional decision-makers. The responsibilities and decision-making steps are defined, and the documented arrangements provide for the protection of students' rights if a programme is terminated, particularly through measures enabling enrolled students to complete their studies or pursue appropriate alternatives.

Conclusion

The criterion is fulfilled.

3. On-going monitoring and periodic review of programmes

Institutions monitor and periodically review their programmes to ensure that the programmes achieve the objectives set for them and respond to the needs of students and society. These reviews lead to continuous improvement of the programmes. Any action planned or taken as a result are communicated to all those concerned. [ESG, 1.9]

Description

According to the documentation, EUL has established procedures for the ongoing monitoring and periodic review of its academic programmes. The SER refers to a Programme Review and Monitoring Policy and to monitoring and review procedures and guidelines, which are intended to provide a common framework for the regular evaluation of programmes across the institution. These procedures are described as part of the internal quality assurance system and are linked to the broader institutional QA framework coordinated by the Quality Assurance Committee.

The documentation distinguishes between ongoing monitoring and periodic programme review. Ongoing monitoring is described as an annual process based on the collection and analysis of programme-related data. This includes information on student admission and enrolment, progression, retention and completion, student workload, student feedback, course evaluations, initial graduate employability data, and other indicators relevant to programme delivery. Departments are described as responsible for gathering and analysing data, reflecting on programme performance and preparing annual reports. These reports are submitted to the relevant faculty or school and to the Quality Assurance Committee for further review and aggregation.

Periodic programme reviews are described as more comprehensive evaluations conducted in defined cycles. According to the SER, these cycles differ by programme type: three years for associate degree and master's programmes, five years for bachelor's and PhD programmes, and seven years for dentistry and medical

programmes. Periodic reviews involve the preparation of a self-evaluation report at programme level. The review may consider curriculum design, intended learning outcomes, teaching and assessment methods, student progression, resources, stakeholder feedback, research integration and the broader learning environment. The SER also refers to review panels that examine the documentation, meet relevant groups and prepare reports with findings and recommendations.

The roles of institutional bodies are described at several levels. Departments collect data, prepare self-evaluation documents and develop action plans. Faculties and schools are responsible for implementing monitoring procedures in their respective areas, overseeing departmental activities and forwarding relevant recommendations. The Quality Assurance Committee reviews programme reports for consistency, completeness and alignment with institutional quality expectations, and monitors follow-up. The Rectorate and Senate are described as responsible for strategic oversight, decisions on major curriculum revisions, resource allocation and the approval of relevant institutional policies.

The monitoring and review procedures draw on both quantitative and qualitative sources. The SER refers to the Student Information System, digital learning environments, quality assurance reports, financial and resource data, staff data, course syllabi, course files, student surveys, student satisfaction and instructor evaluation surveys, graduate exit surveys, alumni surveys and employer feedback. These sources are intended to support the analysis of student progression, success and drop-out patterns, workload, student satisfaction, graduate outcomes, teaching and assessment practices, learning resources and support structures. The documentation also indicates that stakeholder expectations are considered through student representation, student surveys, alumni feedback, employer engagement and, where relevant, input from external professional or academic bodies.

The procedures described in the SER include follow-up mechanisms. Review outcomes may lead to curriculum revisions, changes in teaching or assessment practices, additional student support measures, resource-related proposals, adjustments to recruitment or marketing activities, or further development of research integration within programmes. Departments are expected to prepare action plans in response to recommendations, while the Quality Assurance Committee monitors implementation. The documentation therefore presents monitoring and periodic review as a cycle connecting data collection, analysis, reporting, decision-making and follow-up. The extent to which these cycles are consistently closed in practice was examined through the additional documentation and site-visit discussions.

The SER further links programme monitoring to the evaluation of the learning environment and support arrangements. Learning resources, digital learning environments, student support services and resource-related data are included among the areas considered in monitoring and review. The documentation also refers to workload calculation and ECTS as elements of curriculum design and programme review.

Experts' evaluation

Based on the SER, the additional documentation and the discussions during the on-site visit, the experts consider that EUL has established clear and transparent procedures for the ongoing monitoring and periodic review of programmes. The evidence provided showed how programmes are monitored, reviewed and further developed. The procedures are linked to the assessment of the internal quality assurance system and the EUL Quality Principles and include the adjustment of goals, benchmarks and programme content at both strategic and operational levels. This framework is aligned with EUL's stated student-centred focus. Learning outcomes are defined for all programmes and their achievement is assessed regularly.

From the experts' point of view, EUL follows a holistic understanding of student-centred learning. In addition to providing support structures for students' daily lives, the University supports their individual learning paths through flexible learning arrangements, mentoring, tutoring for all students and expanded services for students

with disabilities. The experts particularly appreciate these arrangements, especially in view of EUL's international and diverse student body.

Within its quality assurance framework and the self-assessment of its internal quality management system, EUL has defined KPIs grouped according to different perspectives. On this basis, processes and measures are monitored and reviewed regularly using the PDCA cycle. From the experts' point of view, this provides a credible basis for assessing institutional and programme performance and for initiating improvements. The approach includes:

- collecting external feedback and input on current developments in society, industry, higher education and politics;
- collecting feedback on the expectations, needs and satisfaction of relevant internal and external stakeholders through formal and informal channels; and
- complementing structured feedback mechanisms, including assessments, data, surveys and meetings, with informal exchange through networks and EUL's open culture of communication.

The experts recognised a strong culture of decentralised stakeholder feedback, through which issues can be addressed promptly and problems can often be solved directly. They appreciate EUL's use of both formal and informal feedback and consider the accessibility of staff and the close interaction with stakeholders to be a strength. At the same time, informal feedback is not always documented systematically and can depend on the engagement and availability of individual stakeholders. This limits the extent to which feedback can be traced over time, transferred beyond the immediate organisational unit and used for cross-faculty quality assurance and institutional learning. From the experts' point of view, more systematic arrangements are therefore needed to preserve the benefits of direct exchange while ensuring continuity and closing quality loops across the University.

EUL should complement its effective decentralised and informal feedback arrangements with systematic documentation and institutional mechanisms that ensure continuity and facilitate closed quality loops and shared learning across faculties. **(Finding 2)**

The collected data and feedback are considered within EUL's continuous improvement approach at different institutional levels. They may inform revisions of the Strategic Plan and KPIs, the evaluation of learning-outcome achievement, the restructuring of existing programmes and the development of new programmes. During the site visit, the experts received credible examples of data- and feedback-informed change, including closer monitoring and targeted action where learning outcomes were not achieved as intended, changes to assessment methods and the inclusion of additional software applications in response to graduate and labour-market feedback. From the experts' point of view, these examples demonstrate that the monitoring system can lead to concrete improvement measures.

EUL documents the analyses, results and measures arising from its quality assurance processes and instruments. Results and insights relating to quality management and strategic planning are made available to stakeholders and addressed in the relevant committees. General survey results are published, and students described examples of reports being made available through the student platform. From the experts' point of view, communication of quality assurance results is therefore established. However, the information communicated does not always provide sufficient context on why the information was collected, which benchmarks were applied, how the results were interpreted and which measures were taken or planned. Making these links more visible would demonstrate the relevance of the results to different stakeholder groups, provide feedback to those who contributed and further strengthen engagement with and acceptance of quality assurance processes.

EUL should further develop the communication of quality assurance results and resulting follow-up measures. Communication should explain why information was collected, how the results were interpreted and which measures were subsequently taken**. (Finding 3)**

The experts also found that EUL provides a supportive and effective learning environment consistent with its student-centred approach. A range of policies and service structures contributes to creating and maintaining this environment. Considering that students come from many different countries, the experts regard these arrangements as particularly important for helping students feel welcome and achieve their academic goals.

All programmes at EUL use ECTS to reflect total student workload. In addition, a local credit system is used to represent the weekly distribution of workload. Official transcripts and the Diploma Supplement provide information on both ECTS and local credits. From the experts' point of view, the use of ECTS supports international comparability, transparency of qualifications and student mobility. Both workload systems are reviewed regularly and recalculated where necessary, and students are informed of changes through the relevant institutional channels.

EUL uses surveys and other instruments to obtain feedback from different stakeholder groups. The experts consider it important that the scope and design of these instruments are reviewed regularly so that they remain suitable for emerging information needs. With regard to internships, EUL already collects feedback through a supervisor survey, which provides a useful basis for monitoring. However, from the experts' point of view, the existing approach does not yet provide sufficiently systematic qualitative reflection on the purpose of internships, their intended learning outcomes and the extent to which these outcomes are achieved. A more comprehensive institutional approach would support consistent practice across departments and cooperating organisations and facilitate the sharing of good practice. EUL should establish a systematic institutional approach to the quality assurance of internships, covering their intended purpose and learning outcomes, the achievement of these outcomes and the consistency of implementation across departments and cooperating organisations. **(Finding 4)**

Conclusion

The criterion is fulfilled.

4. Learning, Teaching and Assessment of Students

Institutions ensure that the programmes are delivered in a way that encourages students to take an active role in creating the learning process, and that the assessment of students reflects this approach. [ESG, 1.3]

Description

According to the documentation, EUL has established a Student-Centred Teaching and Learning Policy and uses a range of teaching and learning methods across its programmes. The SER refers to lectures, flipped classroom models, group projects, collaborative learning, problem-based learning, practical training, internships and graduation projects. It also describes the use of blended, online and hybrid learning formats supported by digital platforms such as Moodle and Microsoft Teams. These arrangements are presented as part of the University's approach to providing different modes of delivery and supporting different learning paths.

The documentation states that students may exercise choice through elective courses, internships and graduation projects, subject to the relevant academic regulations and approval procedures. Student feedback is collected through course evaluations, student surveys, curriculum feedback and other channels, and the SER

provides examples where such feedback has informed teaching and learning arrangements. Academic guidance is described as being provided through lecturers, academic advisors and relevant student support offices. The extent to which student feedback systematically leads to changes in teaching and learning was considered during the interviews.

The SER also refers to interdisciplinary and cross-disciplinary learning opportunities, including elective courses, interdisciplinary programmes, workshops and seminars. Support for diverse learning needs is described through flexible learning arrangements, academic advising, the Dean of Students Office, disability-related support mechanisms and the Office for Equality, Diversity and Inclusion. Academic skill development is supported through library resources, access to electronic databases and workshops intended to strengthen areas such as information literacy, research skills and broader academic competencies.

Assessment is regulated through institutional policies and examination regulations. According to the documentation, assessment criteria, methods and weightings are communicated through course descriptions, syllabi and digital course platforms. The SER refers to different assessment formats, including written exams, assignments, presentations, projects, laboratory work, internships and graduation projects. Both formative and summative assessment methods are described. Regulations also provide for make-up and re-sit examinations in cases such as illness, absence or other mitigating circumstances.

The documentation states that assessment methods are aligned with course and programme learning outcomes. Course-level mapping is used to link learning outcomes, teaching activities and assessment tasks. Feedback to students is described as taking place through review of exam performance, answer keys, office hours and digital publication of results. The SER also refers to professional development activities for teaching staff and assessors, as well as cases in which more than one assessor may be involved, for example in graduation projects, jury evaluations and internship assessment committees.

Several mechanisms are described for supporting consistency and fairness in assessment. These include published regulations, grading criteria, answer keys, course files, examples of graded work and internal review of course files by responsible academic units. Academic integrity is addressed through plagiarism-related policies and the use of originality-checking tools. Student complaints and requests for re-evaluation are handled through procedures involving the Dean of Students Office and relevant academic or administrative units. The documentation indicates that grade-related appeals may be reviewed by a faculty-level committee.

Experts' evaluation

The discussions during the site visit confirmed, from the experts' point of view, that the University has implemented a student-centred approach to teaching and learning beyond the formal regulations described in the SER. The experts observed that academic staff are encouraged to reflect continuously on and further develop their teaching methods. Where appropriate, different pedagogical approaches, including theoretical and practical components, digital learning environments and laboratory-based teaching, are used to support the intended learning outcomes.

The experts gained the impression that teaching staff actively contribute to the further development of teaching and learning. Changes in teaching methods can be triggered by feedback from students, through surveys and informal channels, as well as by graduates, the labour market and proposals initiated by teaching staff themselves. Examples presented during the discussions included the integration of additional software applications into engineering education following feedback from graduates and exit surveys. Besides formal quality assurance procedures, lecturers exchange experiences and discuss new teaching approaches in faculty-level meetings. From the experts' point of view, the lecturers' interest in more modern teaching methods, including

simulation-based learning and other innovative formats, demonstrates a clear motivation to improve their didactical practice.

From the experts' point of view, EUL has established an appropriate regulatory and procedural basis for transparent and fair assessment. Assessment methods, criteria and weightings are communicated in advance, and the regulations provide for make-up and re-sit examinations in relevant circumstances. Feedback is provided through the review of examination performance, answer keys, office hours and digital publication of results. Internal review of course files, examples of graded work, professional development for assessors and the involvement of more than one assessor in appropriate cases contribute to consistency. The documented routes for grade-related re-evaluation provide an additional safeguard for students.

At the same time, EUL's effective culture of direct communication does not replace the need for a clearly identifiable formal route for students who cannot or prefer not to raise a concern personally. The documentation and discussions did not establish with comparable clarity how formal complaints and appeals beyond grade-related re-evaluation are initiated, which bodies are responsible and which timelines apply. The experts therefore consider that these procedures should be made readily accessible and transparently communicated while preserving the benefits of EUL's personalised approach. EUL should ensure that formal complaint and appeal procedures—including the applicable routes, responsibilities and timelines—are clearly defined, readily accessible and transparently communicated. (**Finding 5)**

While the experts clearly observed the University's and the teaching staff's commitment to the further development of teaching, they also noted that many programmes continue to rely predominantly on traditional teaching and, in particular, assessment methods. The experts acknowledge that some regulatory requirements limit the flexibility for introducing alternative assessment formats. Nevertheless, the evidence did not yet demonstrate that EUL systematically evaluates across all programmes whether the assessment methods used provide valid evidence of actual student learning and of the achievement of the different intended learning outcomes. The formal mapping of learning outcomes, teaching activities and assessment tasks provides an important basis for constructive alignment, but does not by itself establish the validity and effectiveness of the assessment formats applied. From the experts' point of view, this is a substantive limitation in the otherwise well-developed student-centred approach and requires more systematic institutional attention.

EUL should further develop flexible and learner-centred approaches to course design and assessment within the applicable regulatory framework. Its quality assurance system should systematically evaluate whether assessment methods provide valid evidence of student learning and achievement of the intended learning outcomes**. (Finding 6)**

The experts also noted positively that the institution provides students with guidance beyond classroom teaching. Academic advisors offer regular office hours and support students with both academic and non-academic questions. From the experts' point of view, students can find support for potential problems on campus either through the formal support infrastructure, such as the Dean of Students Office, or by approaching a trusted contact person. Students confirmed that teaching staff are readily approachable and that communication channels are short, facilitating responsive support whenever difficulties arise. The experts consider these arrangements particularly appropriate for EUL's diverse and international student body and as supporting learner autonomy without leaving students without guidance.

The discussions with students further demonstrated that student feedback is considered within quality assurance processes. Student representatives participate in relevant committees, while all students have opportunities to provide feedback through surveys and informal communication channels. The experts found evidence that student suggestions have resulted in concrete adjustments, for example regarding examination scheduling and programme-related improvements. From the experts' point of view, this confirms that students can influence their learning environment. Students also emphasised that studying at EUL contributes to their personal

development beyond disciplinary knowledge. In particular, they highlighted the multicultural learning environment as an important element in developing intercultural and interpersonal competences.

The experts positively noted that many programmes combine theoretical instruction with practical learning elements such as laboratory work, internships and other application-oriented teaching formats. From the experts' point of view, these practical components enable students to apply academic knowledge, contribute to the development of professional and transferable competences and strengthen the relevance of the programmes for future employment. The facilities, equipment and other resources available for practical learning were also positively assessed.

EUL's curricula include valuable practical components that enable students to apply their knowledge and develop professionally relevant competences. The facilities, equipment and resources supporting practical learning are particularly appreciated.

Labour-market representatives confirmed that graduates demonstrate a solid academic foundation and are able to adapt quickly to professional environments. From the experts' point of view, this external perspective supports the assessment that the University's teaching approach equips students with competences relevant for further academic study as well as employment.

Conclusion

The criterion is partially fulfilled.

5. Student Admission, Progression, Recognition, and Certification

Institutions consistently apply pre-defined and published regulations covering all phases of the student "life cycle", e.g. student admission, progression, recognition and certification. [ESG, 1.4]

Description

According to the SER, EUL distinguishes between three groups of applicants: local students from the TRNC, students from Türkiye, and international students from other countries. Local students are admitted on the basis of EUL entrance examinations or recognised school-leaving qualifications. Students from Türkiye are admitted through the central Turkish university entrance and placement system. International applicants are required to have completed secondary education or an equivalent qualification and must meet the country-specific minimum admission criteria referred to in the higher education regulations of the TRNC. The SER states that information on programmes, application procedures and admission requirements is made available through the University website, online application tools, the University catalogue and related public information channels.

Following admission, students are registered through the relevant administrative processes and receive access to institutional systems and services, including a student ID, IT account, student portal, university email, Moodle, Microsoft Teams, the Student Information System and library resources. The documentation also refers to orientation arrangements for new students, including an orientation guide, orientation activities and support provided through the International Support Centre or student hub. These arrangements are described as covering academic, administrative and practical aspects of the transition into university study.

Student progression is managed primarily through the Registrar's Office in cooperation with academic departments and advisors. The documentation refers to progression rules based on credit accumulation, GPA requirements, prerequisites and programme-specific regulations. Academic advisors use manual and digital tools, including curriculum progress sheets and the Student Information System, to monitor student progress.

The SER also refers to mechanisms such as attendance checks, office hours, re-sit and make-up examinations, academic probation and personalised support for students considered at risk of academic failure. The implementation of these mechanisms, including the identification and support of students at risk, was addressed during the site visit.

The SER also refers to equal opportunity and accessibility arrangements, including the Office for Equality, Diversity and Inclusion and disability-related support services. These elements are relevant for admission and progression insofar as they relate to the support of a diverse student population and to students facing specific circumstances. The documentation indicates that student support and progression data are considered in monitoring processes; the implementation of the associated support and accessibility arrangements was also discussed during the site visit.

Recognition of prior learning is addressed through an institutional RPL policy. The SER describes recognition procedures for transfer students from the TRNC, Türkiye and other countries, including assessment of previous studies, course equivalence, ECTS or local credit values and departmental review. Recognition may also be relevant in the context of student mobility. The documentation does not provide detailed information in this section on the recognition of non-formal and informal learning.

Certification is managed by the Registrar's Office. According to the SER, the Office verifies completion requirements, conducts degree audits and issues formal documentation, including diplomas, transcripts and Diploma Supplements. The documentation also refers to course contents being provided upon request, to QR-based diploma verification and to the recording of degrees in the relevant YÖK/YÖKSIS system. The transparency and accessibility of these issuing arrangements were also addressed during the site visit.

Experts' evaluation

The experts confirm that EUL applies pre-defined and published regulations across all phases of the student life cycle, with clearly assigned institutional ownership: the Registrar's Office for admission, academic records, progression monitoring and certification; academic departments and advisors for academic guidance; and the Dean of Students Office for non-academic support. From the experts' point of view, the regulatory basis is coherent and consistent with the applicable national requirements.

Admission

Information on programmes, entry requirements, application procedures and deadlines is published through the EUL website, the programme finder, the course catalogue, the online application portal and the academic calendar in both Turkish and English, which appropriately reflects the international composition of the student body. The three admission routes are procedurally distinct and externally regulated, which supports the consistent application of admission criteria.

The experts consider the introduction offer for new students—the mandatory Orientation Week, the orientation guide, academic and IT inductions, the International Support Centre and the continuing student help provision—to be comprehensive and well conceived. The arrangements provide support beyond students' initial registration and cover the academic, administrative, social and practical aspects of the transition into university study. From the experts' point of view, their breadth and continuity are a particular strength, especially given the international composition of EUL's student body.

The experts note that some programme-specific details, particularly language-proficiency requirements and postgraduate admission criteria, could be presented more consistently across the Turkish and English versions. This observation might also be connected to the above listed reflections leading to Finding 1 on programme-related public information. While the externally regulated admission routes provide a stable

framework, information on students' subsequent progression and success could provide a useful additional basis for future institutional reflection on the continuing relevance of admission criteria.

Progression

Progression is governed by transparent rules on credit accumulation, grade point averages and prerequisites, and is monitored through the Student Information System, curriculum progress sheets and semester-based academic review. The experts welcome the recent migration to the upgraded information system and the development of automated progress tracking. Supportive mechanisms—attendance monitoring, the institution-wide provision of extended office hours, re-sit and make-up examinations, academic probation with defined conditions, and proactive advisor outreach—are in place and were confirmed during the site visit. The equal opportunities framework, coordinated by the Office for Equality, Diversity and Inclusion, is supported by anti-discrimination provisions, disability support services, accessibility measures and a multi-layered scholarship and stipend scheme.

From the experts' point of view, these arrangements demonstrate that EUL actively monitors individual student progress and provides several accessible forms of support. The close involvement of academic advisors and the developing digital infrastructure provide a sound basis for identifying difficulties and responding to students' needs.

Progression, retention and completion data are available and analysed within programmes and organisational units. The experts see scope to strengthen the aggregation of these data at institutional level against common indicators and targets. Likewise, building on the existing mechanisms for supporting students experiencing academic difficulties, a shared institutional reference framework for early identification, responsibilities and follow-up could further support consistency across departments and the evaluation of support measures.

Recognition

Recognition of prior learning is governed by an institutional policy and operationalised through three differentiated, regulation-based routes. Academic evaluation of content, workload and credit equivalence is carried out by the receiving department, with formal recording by the Registrar's Office, which provides a traceable and workable process. Student mobility is supported through the International Office and an established network of institutional partnerships.

While the recognition process appears workable and traceable, the experts note that the substantive criteria applied in departmental recognition decisions could be made more readily accessible. Periodic central review of recognition practice could also help EUL confirm that comparable cases are treated consistently across departments. Similarly, clearer institutional documentation of mobility arrangements, including credit recognition, and a more systematic analysis of mobility data could support the further development of these activities. The experts also note that the application of the RPL policy to non-formal and informal learning is not yet described in detail and could be clarified as the policy develops.

Certification

The experts regard certification as a particular strength. Graduates receive official transcripts and a Diploma Supplement; diplomas incorporate security features and QR-code verification through a dedicated institutional portal; and awards are registered in the national YÖKSİS system. Degree audit and clearance procedures are defined and published, and results are made available online through the upgraded information system.

All Registrar's Office processes fall within the scope of the Internal Audit Function. From the experts' point of view, this systematic inclusion provides an additional level of assurance concerning the reliability and consistent implementation of admission, records-management, progression and certification processes. The

combination of defined procedures, digital verification and integration with the national database constitutes a mature and transparent certification framework.

Overall, EUL has established coherent regulations and clearly assigned responsibilities covering all principal phases of the student lifecycle. Its orientation arrangements, individual progression support and certification processes are particularly well developed. The experts nevertheless see scope to strengthen the institution-wide analysis of progression data and support for students at risk, improve the transparency and central review of recognition practice, and clarify how non-formal and informal learning is addressed within the RPL framework. These developmental observations do not call into question the coherent and functioning arrangements demonstrated under this criterion.

Conclusion

The criterion is fulfilled.

6. Teaching Staff

Institutions ensure themselves of the competence of their academic staff. They should apply fair and transparent processes for the recruitment and development of the staff. [ESG, 1.5]

Description

The submitted documentation presents teaching staff as one of the institutional elements linked to EUL's strategic planning, academic provision and quality assurance arrangements. The SER relates academic staffing to the University's strategic plan, in particular to academic excellence, student-centred learning, research activity and institutional development. The role of teaching staff is described as covering teaching, assessment, curriculum development, student advising, research and participation in institutional processes.

Academic staff recruitment is described as being based on institutional regulations and national requirements. The SER refers to recruitment procedures involving the Board of Trustees, the Rectorate and Human Resources, and to academic appointment regulations. Academic vacancies are reportedly announced publicly, and applications are assessed in relation to academic qualifications, teaching competence and research performance. Promotion and career progression are described as being governed by EUL regulations and by requirements linked to YÖK and YÖDAK. The documentation therefore presents teaching competence as an explicit consideration in recruitment alongside academic qualifications and research performance, while career progression is embedded in the applicable institutional and external regulatory frameworks.

The documentation states that newly appointed academic staff participate in an induction or orientation process covering teaching standards, assessment practices and student-centred learning approaches. In addition, the SER refers to mentoring arrangements, workshops, seminars and professional development activities. These activities are presented as covering pedagogical development, assessment methods, digital teaching and academic practice. Full-time academic staff are also required to submit annual academic performance reports, which include information on teaching, publications and other academic activities.

EUL's documentation links teaching staff development to both teaching and research. Academic staff are encouraged to participate in research projects, conferences, academic meetings and collaboration with other universities. The SER also refers to internal and external funding sources for scholarly activity, including the EUL Scientific Research Fund and other national or international funding opportunities. In relation to teaching, the documentation refers to research-informed teaching, student research opportunities and the integration of research and innovation within programmes.

Support for inclusive teaching is addressed in the SER through references to diverse student needs, accessibility requirements, flexible teaching methods, differentiated assessment and inclusive curricula. The documentation also refers to support services such as academic advising and counselling, which may assist both students and teaching staff in responding to individual learning needs. These arrangements are relevant for assessing how teaching staff are prepared to work with a diverse student population.

The SER also describes support for assessment-related responsibilities. Teaching staff are expected to define course-specific assessment criteria, use institutional course management systems and align assessment with course and programme learning outcomes. Digital platforms are described as supporting the documentation of teaching activities, assessment tasks, learning-outcome measurement and feedback to students. The documentation further refers to professional development related to assessment and to institutional mechanisms such as course files, assessment criteria, answer keys and examples of graded work. These mechanisms are relevant for reviewing consistency and transparency in assessment practice.

Digital teaching resources are described as part of the institutional teaching environment. The SER refers to the use of Moodle, Microsoft Teams, electronic resources, computer labs and related digital systems for teaching, communication, course management and access to learning materials. Teaching staff are described as having access to technological resources and training.

The evaluation of teaching and learning practices is described through student feedback surveys, course evaluations, self-assessment and reporting procedures. The SER states that feedback is reviewed by academic units and may inform professional development, teaching methods and curriculum-related decisions.

Experts' evaluation

Throughout the accreditation process and the site visit, EUL was represented by a highly competent and committed team of academics. The quality and commitment of both academic and administrative staff were recognised by the experts as a major institutional strength. The EUL team demonstrates a clearly recognisable commitment to quality assurance and continuous enhancement. Staff understand the University's quality assurance arrangements and expectations, can explain them and demonstrate that they apply them in their daily work. The quality culture is a strength of EUL and should be continued and encouraged in the future. It is clearly evident that teaching staff want EUL to be a high-quality university and are willing to make an additional effort to achieve that goal.

Teaching staff demonstrated a reflective quality culture at the level of teaching and learning. Staff could explain how assessment planning, learning-outcome achievement, course-evaluation results and departmental discussions influence teaching practice. This gives credibility to the claim that quality assurance is not only a central administrative exercise but also reaches the level of teaching and learning.

The documentation and the site visit confirmed that EUL has sufficient staff capacity and competent academic staff. Teachers confirmed that their workload is high but manageable. Furthermore, they confirmed that they are well supported by the university management. Teachers described fair and transparent processes for recruitment and staff development. The evidence provided was consistent with the documented recruitment framework, under which teaching competence, academic qualifications and research performance are considered. The mission, vision and strategic objectives of EUL, including the goal of becoming "an internationally prominent university", support the focus on recruiting qualified staff and investing in staff development.

This includes opportunities for the continuous professional development of teaching staff. Teachers confirmed that they have time for their individual development, although additional time would naturally be welcomed. EUL places particular emphasis on developing scientific and research capabilities, including with the aim of

competing in international university rankings. This requires sustained research activity and the further development of the academic staff's scientific profile. Staff confirmed that they receive support and time for research and have access to research funding and specific programmes.

These arrangements also strengthen the integration between teaching and research within academic programmes, which was demonstrated particularly for master's and doctoral programmes. The Computer Engineering programme provided a concrete example of how research, disciplinary developments and engagement with the professional field inform programme content and teaching. The academic staff involved demonstrated that they are competent and up to date with respect to the rapid development of the field.

The experts further found that teaching staff receive institutional support for their responsibilities relating to assessment, inclusive teaching and the use of digital technologies. Staff could explain how assessment is planned in relation to learning outcomes, how achievement is evaluated and how results are discussed within departments. Examples were provided in which assessment arrangements were adjusted when the defined learning-outcome benchmark was not achieved. Moodle, Microsoft Teams, the Course Management Platform and the Student Information System support course delivery, communication, assessment documentation and the analysis of learning outcomes.

Given EUL's diverse and international student population, the experts particularly appreciate the institutional arrangements supporting inclusive teaching and individual student needs. Teaching staff demonstrated awareness of the different academic, linguistic and personal circumstances of students and are supported by academic advising, counselling, accessibility arrangements and the relevant central services. Student feedback and course evaluations provide an additional basis for reflecting on teaching practice and identifying development needs.

EUL sees staff as an important resource and offers staff development opportunities. The experts encourage the University to maintain its focus on developing its own academic staff, providing opportunities for early-career academics and combining scientific excellence with excellence in teaching. Nevertheless, the growing emphasis on research may make the relatively high teaching load an area requiring continued attention. Although staff described their current workload as manageable and the University provides workload reductions for certain research and administrative responsibilities, the combination of teaching, research, quality assurance and other institutional duties may become increasingly demanding as EUL's research ambitions develop.

EUL should systematically monitor whether teaching workloads and the growing expectations relating to research, quality assurance and institutional responsibilities remain sustainably balanced. It should take appropriate action where necessary to ensure that these expectations do not compromise teaching quality, professional development or the development of early-career academic staff. **(Finding 7)**

EUL encourages collaboration and networking among teaching staff, both within the institution and with external educational institutions, as well as with the local community and the professional environment. EUL is a highly relevant actor in Lefke and the wider region. Given the University's significance in relation to the size of Lefke, the experts encourage EUL to continue using this position to strengthen collaboration with regional stakeholders. The agility and openness to innovation demonstrated by the academic staff were perceived by the experts as promising foundations for the University's dynamic development and its embeddedness in the regional community. The relationship between EUL, Lefke and the wider region constitutes a particular strength that is supported by the motivation and external engagement of the staff.

Both the regular evaluations and the feedback provided by students during the site visit confirmed that students are satisfied with the quality and commitment of the staff. In particular, the accessibility and open-door policy of the academic staff were mentioned as a clear strength of the University.

Overall, the experts conclude that EUL has competent and committed academic staff, sufficient staff capacity, fair and transparent recruitment and development arrangements, and effective support for teaching, assessment, research, digital delivery and engagement with a diverse student population. The University should nevertheless monitor the balance between its increasing research ambitions and the teaching and institutional responsibilities of its staff. As the current workload was described as manageable and the evidence demonstrates that the principal requirements of the criterion are met, the criterion is assessed as fulfilled.

Conclusion

The criterion is fulfilled.

7. Learning Resources and Student Support

Institutions have appropriate funding for learning and teaching activities and ensure that adequate and readily accessible learning resources and student support are provided. [ESG, 1.6]

Description

EUL describes learning resources and student support as part of the institutional conditions for programme delivery and student progression. The documentation refers to physical, digital and academic resources, as well as to advisory and support services available to students across the University.

In relation to learning resources, the SER refers to classrooms, laboratories, digital learning environments, library services, online databases, e-books, e-journals, physical collections and subject-specific equipment. The University Library is described as providing access to electronic and printed resources, study rooms, a seminar room, a computer lab, printing facilities and quiet study spaces. The documentation also refers to the Library's participation in national or regional library and database systems. Digital resources are supported through the IT Centre and learning platforms such as Moodle and Microsoft Teams, which are used for access to course materials, communication and online learning activities.

The SER states that the allocation and monitoring of learning resources are linked to institutional indicators and reporting processes. Indicators mentioned in the documentation include student numbers, student-to-staff ratios, student satisfaction, teaching evaluations, publication and citation data, research funding, industry partnerships and accreditation-related information. Resource-related information is also described as being considered through strategic planning, faculty or school activity reports, quality assurance reports, internal audit procedures and external accreditation processes. The documentation therefore presents a framework in which information on resource needs and use is connected with institutional planning, reporting and decision-making.

The documentation also refers to procedures for allocating rooms and facilities for teaching and learning. Buildings, classrooms and laboratories are described as being considered in relation to student numbers, equipment, space and programme needs. The SER further indicates that students with special needs are taken into account in resource and space allocation. Accessibility requirements are therefore included in the documented procedures governing the allocation and use of institutional facilities.

Student support is described as covering academic, administrative, health-related, psychological, career-related and international student services. The SER refers to academic advising, the Dean of Students Office, the Counselling and Guidance Centre, the Health and Wellness Centre, disability support, the Career Centre, the International Office, the Student Help Hub, student advisor services, student societies and clubs, and facilities for social, cultural and religious activities. Students are reportedly informed about support services through the University website, social media channels, orientation materials and the Student Handbook.

Support for a diverse student population is addressed through references to the Office for Equality, Diversity and Inclusion, disability-related support arrangements and services for international students. The documentation also refers to equal opportunity principles and support for students facing particular circumstances. Together with the Dean of Students Office as a central advisory structure, these arrangements are intended to provide accessible support for different student groups and students facing specific needs or circumstances.

The SER states that the effectiveness of learning resources and student support services is monitored through feedback mechanisms, surveys and institutional reporting. Student feedback, satisfaction data and information from teaching staff may be used to identify needs for improvement. The documentation therefore presents student support and learning resources as areas included in the University's quality assurance arrangements. Examples of how identified needs can lead to requests for additional resources and adjustments to the learning environment were discussed during the site visit.

Experts' evaluation

The discussions during the site visit demonstrated that student support is characterised by a highly accessible and personalised approach. Students are able to approach academic staff, the Dean of Students Office and other institutional support structures with academic as well as personal concerns. The experts gained the impression that support is organised pragmatically and focuses on finding solutions adapted to the individual circumstances of students.

Given the University's strongly international student body, the experts appreciate that the institution explicitly considers the challenges associated with studying abroad. During the discussions, it became apparent that student support extends beyond academic matters and also addresses social and personal aspects relevant to international students' successful integration and well-being. The International Office, International Support Centre, Dean of Students Office and other specialised services provide a broad support environment covering academic, administrative, health-related, psychological and practical needs.

Across the different discussion panels, the experts consistently observed a culture of direct communication and approachable academic staff. This low-threshold interaction facilitates timely support for students and contributes positively to the overall learning environment. Students confirmed that they are generally able to approach academic and administrative staff directly and that their concerns are addressed in a constructive and solution-oriented manner.

The experts clearly appreciate this open and direct communication culture, which appears to work well for the majority of students. At the same time, they encourage EUL to complement this personalised approach with clearly identifiable contact persons and alternative access routes for students who cannot or prefer not to seek support through direct personal dialogue. These routes should enable students to access appropriate support without depending solely on their own initiative or an existing relationship with an individual member of staff. The transparency and accessibility of formal complaint and appeal procedures are considered under the corresponding criteria of this report.

During the site visit, the experts experienced a well-equipped campus that provides adequate resources for teaching and learning. The University has several laboratories and practice facilities, including the Faculty of Dentistry Practice Clinic, which is also open to the public. These facilities allow students to gain practical experience at different stages of their studies and support the achievement of programme learning outcomes.

The experts also take positive note of the University's library and digital learning provision. Printed and electronic literature, databases, digital learning platforms and subject-specific software provide students and teaching staff with appropriate access to learning materials. Moodle, Microsoft Teams and related institutional

systems support course delivery, communication and access to academic content, while the IT Centre provides the necessary technological infrastructure and support.

Teaching staff confirmed that requests for additional software and teaching-related equipment can be addressed through established communication channels involving department and faculty leadership. The experts gained the impression that the University generally seeks to provide the resources required for implementing agreed improvements in teaching. One example discussed during the site visit concerned the introduction of additional software and technical content in Engineering following feedback obtained from graduates and exit surveys.

The experts further take note of the institutional arrangements for monitoring and developing learning resources and support services. Resource needs are considered through strategic planning, institutional indicators, faculty and school reporting, quality assurance processes and established procurement channels. Student surveys and other feedback mechanisms provide information on the accessibility and effectiveness of resources and support provision. Together with the examples discussed during the site visit, these arrangements provide an appropriate basis for identifying development needs and translating them into resource-related decisions and improvements.

Overall, the experts conclude that EUL provides adequate and readily accessible learning resources and student support. The physical and digital learning environment, library provision, laboratories and programme-specific facilities provide appropriate conditions for teaching and learning. Students benefit from a broad range of academic, administrative, health-related, psychological, career-related and international support services, complemented by a highly accessible and personalised communication culture. The University's particular attention to the academic, social and personal needs of its international student population is positively acknowledged. Although EUL is encouraged to make alternative access routes to support particularly visible for students who cannot rely on direct personal dialogue, this developmental consideration does not call into question the overall adequacy and accessibility of the support system.

Conclusion

The criterion is fulfilled.

8. Public Information

Institutions ensure that they collect, analyse and use relevant information for the effective management of their programmes and other activities. [ESG, 1.7]

Institutions publish information about their activities, including programmes, which is clear, accurate, objective, up-to date and readily accessible. [ESG, 1.8]

Description

Public information at EUL is presented through several institutional channels, including the University website, social media platforms, newsletters, orientation materials and programme-related publications. The SER identifies the Corporate Communications Office as the unit responsible for coordinating the public presentation of institutional information, including official announcements, news items, promotional material and digital content. The documentation states that this work is carried out in coordination with academic and administrative units.

The University website provides information for prospective and current students, staff and the wider public. According to the documentation, publicly available information includes the University's vision, mission and

values, strategic plan, admission information, research-related information, student support services and accreditation information. Programme-related information is made available through tools such as the Programme Finder and Programme Handbook. The SER also refers to the publication of an orientation guide, an accreditation catalogue and a newsletter. Information is reportedly available in Turkish and English, which is relevant in view of the University's international student population and external stakeholders.

The documentation indicates that public information covers academic programmes, admission procedures, student life, support services and facilities. This includes information relevant to applicants as well as enrolled students, such as application procedures, orientation arrangements, academic and administrative support, international student services, scholarships, counselling, career services and other student facilities. Programme information is structured primarily according to the University's faculties and departments and is supplemented by information distributed through social media and the mobile application integrated into the Student Information System.

Information on accreditation is described as being available through the University website and a dedicated accreditation catalogue. The published information identifies accredited programmes and their accreditation status, although the documentation available to the experts did not consistently specify the responsible accreditation body, the precise scope of the accreditation and its period of validity.

The SER states that public information is updated regularly. The Corporate Communications Office manages the University website and social media accounts and coordinates with academic and administrative units. The submitted documentation does not describe in comparable detail a common workflow defining how responsibilities for checking, approving and updating programme information are distributed between academic departments, the Registrar's Office, admissions, quality assurance structures and the Corporate Communications Office, or how consistency between different sources and language versions is systematically assured.

EUL also describes institutional arrangements for collecting, analysing and using information for the management of its programmes and other activities. Data are collected through the Student Information System, the Human Resources Management System, external sources such as YÖK Atlas and the University's quality assurance processes. The documentation refers to student progression and achievement data, student and graduate feedback, stakeholder information, staff performance, research activity, financial and infrastructure data and information on programme demand. These data are described as informing strategic planning, programme development, recruitment, resource allocation and quality enhancement. Data security and continuity are supported through restricted access, encrypted storage, regular backups and a disaster-recovery framework.

Experts' evaluation

The experts confirm that EUL makes the principal information required under this criterion publicly available. Information on study programmes, admission, study-related procedures, student support, institutional activities and accreditations is provided through the University website and additional communication channels. Programme information is structured according to the faculty and departmental organisation of the University and is available in Turkish and English, appropriately reflecting the international composition of the student body.

The information published on programmes and qualifications is generally adequate, objective and consistent with the applicable qualifications framework. The website is primarily descriptive rather than promotional, which does not compromise the impartiality of the information. However, its organisation assumes to some extent that applicants already know which programme they wish to study and can locate it within the institutional structure. A more user-oriented presentation could assist prospective students in comparing programmes and identifying options corresponding to their interests and intended qualifications.

The experts further observed that information is not always fully consistent across the different sources. This concerns, in particular, the comparability of programme handbooks and the alignment of information provided through programme pages, curricula, syllabi and student guidance. Given the number of programmes and the decentralised contribution of academic units, a clearly defined institutional process for reviewing and updating published information would help ensure that prospective and current students receive consistent information irrespective of the programme or communication channel used.

EUL's use of Turkish and English is positively acknowledged. Nevertheless, the experts refer to the observations made under the admission criterion regarding the completeness and consistency of certain programme-specific entry requirements in both languages. These observations reinforce the importance of systematically checking the correspondence of the different language versions and sources rather than relying solely on updates by individual units.

Accreditation information is published through the website and a dedicated catalogue. This demonstrates EUL's commitment to transparency regarding external quality assurance. To enable applicants and other stakeholders to interpret an accreditation correctly, the published information should consistently identify the accrediting body, the programme or institutional scope, the current status and the period of validity. Information concerning the present institutional accreditation should accordingly be added once the procedure has been concluded.

The experts therefore consider that the observations under the present criterion reinforce Finding 1 on programme-related public information. That finding incorporates the need for a coherent and user-oriented structure, clear responsibilities for regular review and updating, consistency across different sources and language versions, and complete accreditation information.

During their studies, students have access to further information channels beyond the website and published programme documents. Communication between EUL and its students is intensive and regular, and no general information deficits were raised during the site visit. Students referred particularly positively to the accessibility of academic staff and the services of the Dean of Students Office. Social media and the mobile application integrated into the Student Information System are also used to reach students through channels corresponding to their communication habits.

The experts appreciate that EUL's communication arrangements respond to the academic, social and personal information needs of its strongly international student population. The transparency and accessibility of formal complaint and appeal procedures, including clearly defined routes and timelines for students who cannot rely on direct personal dialogue, are assessed under the student-centred learning criterion and are therefore not counted again in the assessment of the present criterion.

With regard to the collection and use of information, the experts confirm that EUL gathers relevant institutional data through its student and human resources systems, quality assurance processes and external sources. The site-visit discussions provided examples of these data informing strategic planning, programme development, recruitment, curriculum decisions and institutional improvement. The University also has arrangements for data protection, backup and continuity of operations. The evidence therefore demonstrates functioning institutional information-management arrangements. Opportunities for strengthening the systematic aggregation, documentation and cross-institutional analysis of particular data are addressed under the corresponding quality assurance and student-progression criteria.

Overall, EUL publishes a broad range of relevant, objective and readily accessible information and uses several channels to address prospective students, current students and external stakeholders. The bilingual provision, extensive information on student support and intensive communication with students are positively acknowledged. Institutional systems also support the collection and use of relevant data for programme

management and decision-making. Although the consistency, user orientation and governance of published programme and accreditation information should be further strengthened, the principal requirements of the criterion are met.

Conclusion

The criterion is fulfilled.

VI. Recommendation of the panel of experts

The panel of experts recommends accrediting the European University of Lefke without conditions.

Commendation:

The panel particularly commends EUL for the competence, commitment and accessibility of its academic and administrative staff. Throughout the review, staff demonstrated a strong understanding of their respective responsibilities and a willingness to contribute beyond their immediate roles to the development of the University and its programmes. Their openness to reflection, cooperation across institutional units and responsiveness to students provide a particularly strong foundation for the effective delivery and continued development of EUL's academic provision.

The panel also highlights EUL's highly accessible and personalised approach to student support, which responds particularly well to the academic, social and personal needs of its diverse international student body. Students benefit from approachable staff and a broad range of specialised services that enable concerns to be addressed promptly and with attention to individual circumstances. EUL's practice-oriented and increasingly research-informed learning environment is another notable strength: laboratories, practical learning opportunities, internships and engagement with alumni, employers and regional stakeholders support both academic development and the professional relevance of its programmes. Finally, EUL's digitally supported, secure and internally audited certification processes provide students and graduates with reliable and transparent academic records and contribute to the integrity of academic administration.

Findings:

1. EUL should improve the user-oriented organisation, accessibility and consistency of programme-related public information and assign clear responsibilities for its regular review and updating. University-wide information should be provided centrally, while accreditation information should specify the accrediting body, scope, status and validity period.
2. EUL should complement its effective decentralised and informal feedback arrangements with systematic documentation and institutional mechanisms that ensure continuity and facilitate closed quality loops and shared learning across faculties.
3. EUL should further develop the communication of quality assurance results and resulting follow-up measures. Communication should explain why information was collected, how the results were interpreted and which measures were subsequently taken.
4. EUL should establish a systematic institutional approach to the quality assurance of internships, covering their intended purpose and learning outcomes, the achievement of these outcomes and the consistency of implementation across departments and cooperating organisations.
5. EUL should ensure that formal complaint and appeal procedures—including the applicable routes, responsibilities and timelines—are clearly defined, readily accessible and transparently communicated.

6. EUL should further develop flexible and learner-centred approaches to course design and assessment within the applicable regulatory framework. Its quality assurance system should systematically evaluate whether assessment methods provide valid evidence of student learning and achievement of the intended learning outcomes.
7. EUL should systematically monitor the relationship between increasing research expectations and the comparatively high teaching load to ensure that staff have sufficient capacity for teaching, research and quality enhancement.