ASIIN Seal & EUR-ACE® Label

Accreditation Report

Bachelor's and Master's Degree Programme
Civil Engineering

Provided by
Near East University

Version: 23.03.2018

Table of Content

A About the Accreditation Process 3

B Characteristics of the Degree Programmes 5

C Peer Report for the ASIIN Seal 8

1. The Degree Programme: Concept, content & implementation 8
2. The degree programme: structures, methods and implementation 12
3. Exams: System, concept and organisation 16
4. Resources 18
5. Transparency and documentation 20
6. Quality management: quality assessment and development 22

D Additional Documents 23

E Comment of the Higher Education Institution 24

F Summary: Peer recommendations 25

G Comment of the Technical Committee 26

H Decision of the Accreditation Commission (09.12.2016) 27

I Fulfilment of Requirements (23.03.2018) 28

Appendix: Programme Learning Outcomes and Curricula 31

A About the Accreditation Process

Name of the degree programme (in original language)	(Official) English translation of the name	Labels applied for [1]	Previous accreditation (issuing agency, validity)	Involved Technical Committees (TC)[2]
Ba Civil Engineering		ASIIN, EUR-ACE® Label	--	TC 03
Ma Civil Engineering		ASIIN, EUR-ACE® Label	--	TC 03
Date of the contract: 20.11.2014 **Submission of the final version of the self-assessment report:** 10.08.2015 **Date of the onsite visit:** 17.03.2016 **at:** Nicosia / Lefkoşa				
Peer panel: Prof. Dr. Manfred Krafczy, Technical University Braunschweig; Dipl.-Ing. Rüdiger Lexau, Bavarian Ministry of Environment; Prof. Dr. Tim Ricken, Technical University Dortmund; Prof. Dr. Günter Schmidt-Gönner, University of Applied Sciences Saarland; Aliye Dalci (Student), East Mediterranean University				
Representative of the ASIIN headquarter: Dr. Michael Meyer				
Responsible decision-making committee: Accreditation Commission for Degree Programmes				
Criteria used:				

[1] ASIIN Seal for degree programmes; EUR-ACE® Label: European Label for Engineering Programmes

[2] TC: Technical Committee for the following subject areas: TC 01 – Mechanical Engineering/Process Engineering; TC 02 – Electrical Engineering/Information Technology); TC 03 – Civil Engineering, Surveying and Architecture; TC 04 – Informatics/Computer Science); TC 05 – Physical Technologies, Materials and Processes); TC 06 – Industrial Engineering; TC 07 – Business Informatics/Information Systems; TC 08 – Agronomy, Nutritional Sciences and Landscape Architecture; TC 09 – Chemistry; TC 10 – Life Sciences; TC 11 – Geosciences; TC 12 – Mathematics; TC 13 – Physics.

European Standards and Guidelines as of 15.05.2015 ASIIN General Criteria as of 28.03.2014 Subject-Specific Criteria of Technical Committee 03 – civil Engineering as of 09.12.2011	

In order to facilitate the legibility of this document, only masculine noun forms will be used hereinafter. Any gender-specific terms used in this document apply to both women and men.

B Characteristics of the Degree Programmes

a) Name	Final degree (original/English translation)	b) Areas of Specialization	c) Corresponding level of the EQF[3]	d) Mode of Study	e) Double/Joint Degree	f) Duration	g) Credit points/unit	h) Intake rhythm & First time of offer
Civil Enginering	B.Sc. in Civil Engineering		Level 6	Full time	--	8 Semester	240 ECTS	Fall semester / Spring semester 1992/93
Civil Engineering	M.Sc. in Civil Engineering		Level 7	Full time	--	4 Semester	120 ECTS	Fall semester / Spring semester 1994/95

According to the self report the following objectives and learning outcomes (intended qualifications profile) shall be achieved by the Bachelor degree programme:

The objective of the Civil Engineering Undergraduate Program is to convey the academic knowledge and professional experience to students, providing them the ability and insight to use the required analytical skills to solve engineering problems by making fast and efficient decisions through good use of resources with an absolute respect to ethics.

The Civil Engineering Undergraduate Program also aims to train high-qualified civil engineers whose talents, skills, abilities and knowledge meet the requirements and needs of the state and private institutions, and support development as well as contributing advancements in the civil engineering field, and carry out research facilities to bring new insight into the academic bases of this field

The list of intended learning outcomes of the BSc. program is as the following:

1. Ability to relate and apply fundamental sciences to learning the essential civil engineering concepts and theories of different branches.

2. Ability to understand the derivation of these concepts and theories by relating them to the real-life engineering cases within the related civil engineering branch.

[3] EQF = The European Qualifications Framework for lifelong learning

3. Ability to define clearly and analyze the engineering problems by applying the introduced civil engineering concepts and theories of the related branch.

4. Ability to use decision-making skills and perform design calculations correctly for the solution of the defined problem/project by applying the introduced theories of the related civil engineering branch.

5. Ability to understand and carry out the practical applications of learned civil engineering concepts and theories on site and/or laboratory.

6. Ability to use software packages for the analysis and/or the design of the defined civil engineering problems/projects.

7. Ability to manage time and resources effectively and efficiently while carrying out civil engineering projects.

8. Ability to participate in team-works in a harmonized manner for the solution of the targeted problem.

9. Ability to write technical reports and/or to carry out presentations on the studied engineering project using the modern techniques and facilities.

10. Ability to carry out and finalize a civil engineering study/project by showing professional ethics.

According to the self report the following objectives and learning outcomes (intended qualifications profile) shall be achieved by the Master's degree programme:

The MSc. Program in Civil Engineering aims to train specialized civil engineers at master's level who are capable of understanding problems stated in different fields of Civil Engineering effectively and having the background and needed skills to carry out high-quality research with aim of solving these problems.

The list of intended learning outcomes of the MSc. program is as the following:

1. Ability to use advanced level of fundamental science knowledge as an effective tool for the analysis and/or the design of specified civil engineering problems/projects.

2. Ability to use advanced level engineering theories on the analysis and/or the design of specified civil engineering problems/projects.

3. Ability to correlate advanced level civil engineering concepts and theories within each other, as well as with the basic level engineering background received in BSc. degree education.

4. Ability to design an efficient research methodology and to carry out advanced level of research on a specific civil engineering topic.

5. Ability to carry out team-work activities with other specialized civil engineers or participating in team-work activities of multi-disciplinary nature for the solution of the targeted problem.

6. Ability to produce innovative and efficient solutions to specific civil engineering problems.

7. Ability to write advanced level of technical reports, articles as well as graduate studies thesis and/or to carry out presentations on the studied engineering projects.

8. Ability to update background information with continuous efforts in following recent developments in different branches of civil engineering.

C Peer Report for the ASIIN Seal[4]

1. The Degree Programme: Concept, content & implementation

Criterion 1.1 Objectives and learning outcomes of a degree programme (intended qualifications profile)

Evidence:

- Self-assessment report
- Study guide
- Discussions with representatives of NEU management, programme coordinators, lecturers, business representatives, students

Preliminary assessment and analysis of the peers:
The peers noticed that the objectives and learning outcomes of both programmes are described in concise way. They are well-published in the student handbook and on the webpages of the programmes.

Comparing to the ASIIN Subject-Specific Criteria for Civil Engineering the peers saw for the bachelor's degree programme that students should get well-founded knowledge in the fields of mathematics and natural science, as well as in subject-specific fundamentals. Additionally students should deepened, expanded and apply their subject-specific skills in the different fields of civil engineering in order to identify and analyse problems in structural engineering, carrying structures, infrastructure measures, flood protection measures or construction procedures. Also the peers noticed that students should become able to develop methods for proof and forecast as well as concepts and plans.

Economic and legal knowledge of the students are not formulated explicit by the university but for the peers such knowledge is implicated in the aims to prepare students to manage time and resources effectively and efficiently while carrying out civil engineering projects.

[4] This part of the report applies also for the assessment for the European subject-specific labels. After the conclusion of the procedure, the stated requirements and/or recommendations and the deadlines are equally valid for the ASIIN seal as well as for the sought subject-specific label.

Regarding to personal skills of the students the peers saw that they should be able to use research methods to identify, interpret and integrate technical literature and data bases and to establish and interpret empirical data sets. Additionally students should be able to communicate with professional colleagues and individuals of a wider public and should be able to work in teams.

Concluding the objective of the programme the peers assessed that students on the one hand should be professionally qualified for professional careers and on the other hand for advanced scientific degree programmes or additional degree programmes other than civil engineering. They saw that the graduates of the programme should be able to accomplish key activities in civil engineering largely autonomously and partly on their own responsibility.

For the master's degree programme the peers saw that students should expanse and deepen their knowledge out of the bachelor studies in order to be able to identify and analyse complex problems in the field of civil engineering. To solve such problems they should be able to provide novel and complex designs, constructions and developments and to develop new, challenging and innovative methods in the different fields of civil engineering. Additional they are able to create plans and concepts independently and to face complex projects. Furthermore students should be prepared for different research activities. Whereas the peers got the impression that the university focussed on the professional skills of the students more than on research activities due to the structure of the student clients.

The peers assessed that both programmes met in general the ASIIN subject specific criteria for civil engineering. Additional they saw adequate formulated objectives regarding the knowledge and understanding, engineering analysis, engineering design, investigation and assessment, engineering practice and transferable skills to meet the standards of the EUR ACE framework.

The peers learned that representatives from industry were involved in the further development of the objectives. From the view of the peers the objectives reflect the level of academic qualification aimed at for both programmes and offer good chances for the graduates on the labor market.

Criterion 1.2 Name of the degree programme

Evidence:

- The name of the study programme is published in the specific regulation, the study guide an on the webpage.

Preliminary assessment and analysis of the peers:
The title of the programme is published on the subject specific webpage. The auditors confirmed that the names of the degree programmes properly reflected the intended aims and learning outcomes.

Criterion 1.3 Curriculum

Evidence:

- The study regulations define the curriculum and the single modules.
- The module descriptions inform about the aims and content of the single modules.
- Objective-Matrices provided in the Self-Assessment Report, Appendix 5
- Discussions with representatives of NEU management, programme coordinators, lecturers, business representatives, students

Preliminary assessment and analysis of the peers:
During the first year in the bachelor's degree programme the fundamentals in calculus, physics, chemistry and geology are treated. Additionally students improve their English language skills in two modules and get basics in computer programming and technical drawing. The second year broadens the mathematical knowledge of the students in advanced calculus, linear algebra, statistical methods, statistics and dynamics. Also first specific fundamentals are treated like material science and strength of materials and students got basic knowledge of engineering economics. In the third year students deepen their mathematical knowledge with regard to numerical methods and got specific fundamentals in soil and fluid mechanics, hydromechanics and structural analysis. First applications of the fundamentals follow in the field of engineering hydrology and transportation engineering as well as computer application in civil engineering. The last year contents further applications in construction engineering and management, foundation engineering, water resources engineering, reinforced concrete theory, design steel structures and structural design. Additional during the last two years two periods of summer practice are included into the curriculum. For their individual interests students have the opportunity to choose two technical und two non technical elective courses.

Although the curriculum included a wide area of mathematical aspects the peers follows the intention of the faculty to give the programme an application oriented profile due to the study client. Most of the graduates who go back to their home countries will not work in academic fields but for companies or governmental institutions. Taking into account this profile the peers wondered about the content of the modules for natural sciences. These

modules are not oriented on specific needs of civil engineers but treat general fundamentals of natural sciences. For example knowledge of electromagnetic seems not to be useful for civil engineering. From the view of the peers an alignment would be wishful.

In some fundamental modules the peers doubt whether the content and the foreseen time fit together. For example in fluid mechanics or numerical methods the module descriptions suggest a depth of knowledge about a broad content which never could be reached by the students during the foreseen time. The university confirmed that in those modules the named contents only are treated basically. From the view of the peers such basics would be sufficient for the bachelor programme but the saw the necessity to change the module descriptions.

The peers wonder that students only have the opportunity to get absolute basic competences in programming. Matlabs could be used to make students more familiar with programming. The introduction of modeling simulation framework could make students acquainted with basic concepts in computational engineering. Furthermore the peers could not find aspects of building information modeling (BIM) or new aspects of sustainability of materials in the curriculum. From their view these points would modernize the programme which seems to be more traditionally up to now.

The master's degree programme content seven elective courses, a project work and the master thesis. Students elect up to 4 courses out of their field of specialization and do the project work and the master thesis in this specialization. The faculty offers specialization opportunities in structural engineering, materials of construction, geotechnical engineering, hydraulics engineering, transportation engineering and construction management. The other three modules must be elected out of other fields of civil engineering to ensure broadness for the student profile.

The peers recognized that the contents of the single modules are not very specialized in order to be interested also for students out of other specializations. From their view this structure of the curriculum does not ensure that the intended profile of the programme is reached by all students. This could be ensured by defining some compulsory modules for each specialisation. In these modules certain field of the specialisation could be treated more intensively.

Criterion 1.4 Admission requirements

Evidence:

- Joint Self-Assessment Report,
- Admision requirements of the Near east University

Preliminary assessment and analysis of the peers:

For the admission in the bachelor's degree programme the university ask in general for a high school grade and defined additionally special requirements for the school grades for different countries the main parts of the students come from (i.e. Syria). For the Master's degree programme the university asks for a bachelor grade in civil engineering.

The auditors confirmed that the requirements and procedures for admission are transparent and clear. All applicants are treated according to the same standards and regulations. For both programmes there are defined rules how admission requirements that have not been fulfilled can be compensated by individual students.

Final assessment of the peers after the comment of the Higher Education Institution regarding criterion 1:

Because the university abstain from a comment the peers confirmed their preliminary assessment. For the Master's degree programme they saw the criterion partly fulfilled and suggested a requirement to ensure that the intended profile is reached by all students. For the bachelor's degree programme they saw the criterion fulfilled in general but they suggested recommendations to orient the content of the fundamentals modules in natural sciences on field specific aspects of civil engineering, to introduce aspects of programming and software engineering in order to get acquainted with basic concepts in computational engineering, to consider the introduction of modeling simulation framework and o involve more modern aspects of civil engineering like building information modeling (BIM) or new aspects of sustainability of materials.

2. The degree programme: structures, methods and implementation

Criterion 2.1 Structure and modules

Evidence:

- Module descriptions
- Study plan
- Discussions with representatives of NEU management, programme coordinators, lecturers, business representatives, students

Preliminary assessment and analysis of the peers:

Both programmes are divided into modules which are accredited with ECTS credit points. Their structure is clearly outlined on the programme specific website. The programmes consist of modules which comprise a sum of teaching and learning whose contents are concerted. The module descriptions are also published on the subject specific website in English and can be downloaded. Based on the analysis of the sequence of modules and the respective module descriptions the peers concluded that the structure of the degree programmes ensures that the learning outcomes can be reached. The programmes also offer a number of elective courses which allows the students to define an individual focus. Based on the analysis of the curriculum and the module descriptions the peers confirmed that the module objectives and the respective content help to reach both the qualification level and the overall intended learning outcomes.

In both programmes students have the opportunity to chose modules in order to define an individual focus and course of study. In the master's degree programme the opportunities for students to take individual choices are even to extensive to ensure that all students reach the defined profile of the programme (see criteria 1.3). Elective courses will be realised in the bachelor programme for a minimum of 10 students and in the master programme for at least 3-4 students. Although relatively a high number of elective courses are offered by the faculty the peers learned that in the past only a few students could not visit courses they wished to do.

When looking at international exchange programmes NEU explained that the university maintains a number of exchange programmes with many universities. As outlined in the Self-Assessment Report the peers could study the list of university co-operations. The programme coordinators added that there are also particular programmes on the level of faculties.

Regarding the recognition of credit points, NEU explained that there exist a number of agreements with specific universities and students could arrange learning agreements with the supervisor to make sure credit points are easily recognized. But even if learning agreements have not been drafted beforehand, students can get credit points accredited if the modules were not mainly different to the objectives of the corresponding modules at NEU. This needs to be approved by the supervisor. The peers understood that student mobility was practically taking place and the "Guidelines for Credit Earning and Credit Transfer provided a clear regulation of recognition of credit points.

Criterion 2.2 Work load and credits

Evidence:

- Self Assessment Report
- Module descriptions:
- Discussions with representatives of ITB management, programme coordinators, lecturers, business representatives, students

Preliminary assessment and analysis of the peers:
Beside the national credit point system the faculty established ECTS credit points while one ECTS point is based on 30 h student workload. The peers understood that the work load comprises both attendance-based learning and self-study which includes all compulsory elements of the degree. The modules descriptions are published on the website and can be accessed by interested stakeholders. The peers positively noted that the module handbook describes consistently in all modules the credit points and the workload distinguishing between contact time and time of self-study

Comparing to the objectives and the content the workload defined for the single modules seems to be realistic for the peers and they saw that structure-related peaks in the work load have been avoided. This impression was confirmed by the students.

Criterion 2.3 Teaching methodology

Evidence:

- Self Assessment Report
- Module descriptions:
- Discussions with representatives of NEU management, programme coordinators, lecturers, business representatives, students

Preliminary assessment and analysis of the peers:
Both Programmes are full-time programme with classroom, structured, and self-study activities. The staff members apply various teaching and learning methods (such as lectures, computer training and classroom and lab exercises, individual and group assignments, seminars and projects). Structured activities include tutorial, homework, assignment and practical activities. Group project assignments are also given in some courses to develop students' skill in teamwork, discussion, and coordination. The peers concluded also with reference to the remarks of the students that the teaching methods and instruments used supported the students in achieving the learning outcomes.

As formulated in the study objectives the teaching methods focussed on practical application. In most modules several laboratory exercises are included and there are also some excursions implemented in the programme.

The project is conducted independently under guidance of a supervisor and consists of literature study, empirical research (including experimentation/observation), or simulation. The peers confirmed that independent academic research and writing are properly implemented in both curricula especially in the master programme.

But the peers noticed that students do not have the opportunity to get basic knowledge in presentation techniques and project management before they have to apply those techniques during the project work. From the view of the peers it would be helpful for students to get theoretical basic knowledge before the application. Regarding to these personal skills the faculty used the “learning by doing” as didactical method.

Criterion 2.4 Support and assistance

Evidence:

- Self Assessment
- Discussions with representatives of NEU management, programme coordinators, lecturers, business representatives, students

Preliminary assessment and analysis of the peers:
The peers welcomed the concept of an academic advisor. The programme coordinators explain that as students commence their studies in the Common First Year programme, an academic advisor is appointed for each of them. One academic advisor is responsible for supervising about 20 students. Usually, the academic advisor is available for any consultation a student may need, even for problems beyond academic matters. Academic data of the students are monitored and recorded at the university level through the academic information system. At the beginning of each semester, based on the student’s prior performance, the academic advisor gives considerations concerning the courses a student should take. The students confirm that the academic advisors normally try to be very supportive to students and if a student’s performance is becoming worse or the work ethics of a student is not as it should be, the academic advisors contact the parents or friends to take influence in the respective student.

The peers noticed that an “Undergraduate Handbook” was published on the website which contained a lot of information on additional support services like the “Counselling Center”

where students can get consultation about academic or non-academic problems. Depending on the kind of problem, also psychological services were offered. If students felt under severe pressure they could also turn to the Dean. The Agency for Students managed all types of scholarships and provided respective support for students who were eligible. ITB's health centre offered health services for students and faculty members. The ITB Career Development Centre (ITB CDC) maintained an on-line job application and career opportunity information system for all ITB students. ITB also maintained a Language Centre which offers courses for ITB students and staff particularly pre-departure courses like "TOEFL Preparation Courses" and "Courses in English for Specific Purposes" especially in science and technology. The auditors concluded that there were adequate resources available to provide individual assistance, advice and support for all students. The peers underlined that the allocated advice and guidance, namely the academic advisor assisted the students in achieving the learning outcomes and in completing the course within the scheduled time.

Besides this very comprehensive advisory system the peers noticed some difficulties regarding the mobility of students. In case students want to go abroad they reported about financial problems to realise a study abroad. The normal tuition fee for ITB students, which enrolled in the academic year of 2014/2015, is IDR 10,000,000 or equal to US$ 760 for one semester. This fee can be lowered to up to 25% (IDR 2,500,000). This reduction is based upon student's parents earnings (US$ 1 =IDR 13,000). Grants for the normal fees are available for 20% of the students. But there seems to be no grants or other financial supports for a study abroad. Additionally the students reported that the institutional advisory system for international affairs does not work very well and that they are dependent on the personal support of single professors. The peers recommended to improve the (financial) opportunities for students to complete a period of vocational practice or a stay at a different higher education institution abroad.

Final assessment of the peers after the comment of the Higher Education Institution regarding criterion 2:

Because the university abstain from a comment the peers confirmed their preliminary assessment. For both programmes they saw the criterion fulfilled in general. But they suggest a recommendation to give the students opportunities to get knowledge in presentation techniques and project management which could be applied in the project works of the technical modules.

3. Exams: System, concept and organisation

Criterion 3 Exams: System, concept and organisation

Evidence:

- Self Assessment Report of the Faculty of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering, chapter 4
- Module descriptions:
- Inspection of examples of written exams, project work and final theses during the onside visit
- Discussions with representatives of NEU management, programme coordinators, lecturers, business representatives, students

Preliminary assessment and analysis of the peers:
For each module students have to absolve at least a midterm and a final exams. In some modules are involved several midterm exams or quizzes homework projects and laboratory reports. In case students fail one of the exams they could repeat the final exam of the module two weeks later. If they fail again they have to repeat the module before the next attempt. Students are allowed to repeat failed exams as often as they like but they have to pay fees for the repetition of the modules.

Out of their inspection of exams the peers got the impression that not in all cases examinations correspond with the intended learning outcomes of the modules either with regard to their form or their demands. The level of exams seems to be very low and the questions seem not really fit in all cases with the described learning outcomes of the modules. Indeed all contents of the modules were proved but in some cases in a very easy way while the duration of the exams give students a long time to solve the tasks. Therefore it is necessary to change to strengthen the requirements for the module examinations.

The final theses ensure that students work on a set task independently and at the level aimed for. Normally they are not connected to industrial partners. While the theses in the bachelor's degree programme seems to be comparable to European standards with regard to the results and the defined duration the peers recognised that the master theses just fit the results in European countries although the time to work it out is much longer (54 ECTS points). They assessed that the master students fit the requirements for grades at level 7 of the European Quality Framework but need much more time for their final theses.

The number and distribution of the exams ensure that students get adequate time for preparation. All exams are organised in a way which avoids delays to student progression caused by deadlines, exam correction times etc.

Final assessment of the peers after the comment of the Higher Education Institution regarding criterion 3:

Because the university abstain from a comment the peers confirmed their preliminary assessment. For both programmes they saw the criterion mostly fulfilled. They suggest a requirement to ensure that the standards of all module examinations correspond with the intended learning outcomes and the qualification level of the programmes.

4. Resources

Criterion 4.1 Staff

Evidence:

- Self Assessment Report
- Staff handbook for all degree programmes under review
- Discussions with representatives of NEU management, programme coordinators, lecturers, business representatives, students

Preliminary assessment and analysis of the peers:

From the view of the peers the quantity of the teaching staff with three full professors, 2 associated and 2 assistant professors, two additional full time lecturers and 10 half time lecturers seemed to be sufficient for the necessary teaching capacity and to provide assistance and advice for the students as well. But the peers doubt that there will be sufficient time for the professors to engage parallel intensively in research activities. They learned that the defined minimum of staff members for a faculty will only be increased in case of increasing student numbers. With this strategy there will be never better conditions for the teaching staff to engage in research because the additional capacity by new lecturers will be absorbed by increasing numbers of students.

During the visit the peers learned that NEU differs in teaching and in research staff. . Comparing to European systems where professors have to teach and to do research parallel this separation has the disadvantage that new research results will not influence the teaching directly. Especially for the support of master theses the separation of teaching and research is very unfavourable because the students could not be integrated in actual research projects during their master theses.

The peers found the research activities at the faculty comparing to other European universities to be relatively light. Due to the lack of time the teachers focussed their activities on

the summer vocation and do not have the chance to work on research projects continuously. So the panel got the impression that most research of the professors is done with regard to the supervising of master theses or PhD theses.

The peers welcomed that it is a requirement from the faculty for new professors to be research oriented. But they doubt that the teaching workload will allow any remarkable grow in research and they could not see that research activities carried out by the teaching staff support well the level of academic qualification aimed at. From their view a binding and sustainable concept is needed how to improve staff resources in order to facilitate intensified research activities.

Criterion 4.2 Staff development

Evidence:

- Self Assessment
- Discussions with representatives of NEU management, programme coordinators, lecturers, business representatives, students

Preliminary assessment and analysis of the peers:

Preliminary assessment and analysis of the peers:
The teaching staff seems to be very motivated, communicative in the exchange with students and engaged in many activities. Their teaching load is three courses (around 12 hours) per semester (professors: 8 hours, service course teachers: 15 hours), which lecturers consider adequate but raise concerns about the limited amount of remaining time available for research. Academic staff states that usually the summer vacation period is used to do research and to write papers. The HEI explains that it encourages lecturers to attend external seminars and conferences in order to renew and broaden their technical knowledge. But the panel finds that there is no record of lecturers conducting research elsewhere on the basis of a sabbatical leave. Lecturers state that none of the staff from this department has taken an academic leave as for a sabbatical – while there are some examples within the faculty as a whole. The university provides financial assistance to those who wish to present papers abroad, supporting and financially rewarding international publications through the newly founded Centre of Excellence. Analyzing the publication lists of the teaching staff the panel concludes that the research and development activities carried out by the teaching staff could be intensified to support the level of academic qualification aimed at.

Criterion 4.3 Funds and equipment

Evidence:

- Respective chapter in the two SAR
- Laboratory room sizes and capacities
- Audit discussion

Preliminary assessment and analysis of the peers:
Overall, the departments have convincingly demonstrated in the SAR and also during the on-site inspection of laboratories and other facilities that the physical resources form a sustainable basis to achieve the intended learning outcomes by the time the degree is completed. The laboratories the peers inspected during their visit at Near East University overall offer a sound basis for the university's teaching. On the other hand the peers assessed that the equipment of the laboratories do not allow research activities at an international standard. Even for research activities of students during their master thesis the equipments seemed to be partly not adequate. Therefore the peers asked as well for a binding and sustainable concept how to improve laboratory equipment in order to facilitate intensified research activities.

Final assessment of the peers after the comment of the Higher Education Institution regarding criterion 4:

Because the university abstain from a comment the peers confirmed their preliminary assessment. For both programmes they saw the criterion not fulfilled completely. They suggest a requirement to describe a binding and sustainable concept how to improve staff resources and equipment of the laboratories in order to facilitate intensified research activities.

5. Transparency and documentation

Criterion 5.1 Module descriptions

Evidence:

- Module handbook
- Audit discussions with representatives from the Rectorate, programme coordinators, lecturers and students

Preliminary assessment and analysis of the peers:
The peers positively noted that the full set of modules descriptions is published for every degree programme under review. They analysed the module descriptions and noticed that for the master's degree programme crucial information like module coordinators/responsible persons and a description of the thesis module are missing and that for some modules the descriptions of the learning outcomes and the contents are very rudimentary. Here the peers saw the need of a revision of the module descriptions.

Criterion 5.2 Diploma and Diploma Supplement

Evidence:

- Diploma Supplements for each Degree Programme

Preliminary assessment and analysis of the peers:
Diploma Supplements of the respective degree programmes have been taken note of. The Diploma Supplements provide sufficient information with regard to the level, the content and the status of the studies, the success of graduates as well as about the composition of the final grade.

But neither do they include information about the study objectives and the learning outcomes nor statistical data in addition to the final mark according to the ECTS Users' Guide so as to allow for a categorization of the individual. Consequently, it might be commendable to adjust the Diploma Supplement accordingly.

Criterion 5.3 Relevant rules

- Academic Regulations for Undergraduate Studies:
- Graduate Education Regulations:
- Regulations For Departmental Academic Organization and Operations:
- Regulation of Student Admission Affairs:
- Ordinance of Transfer Regulations at BA and Associate Levels Near East University:

Preliminary assessment and analysis of the peers:
The panel acknowledged that all rules and regulations governing the student life cycle, i.e. admission, progression and graduation were transparently published on the university website.

Final assessment of the peers after the comment of the Higher Education Institution regarding criterion 5:

Because the university abstain from a comment the peers confirmed their preliminary assessment. For both programmes they saw the criterion partly fulfilled. They suggest two requirements to update the module descriptions according to the indications in the accreditation report (learning outcomes, contents, module coordinators/responsible persons, missing description of the Master Thesis). The second requirement mentioned the diploma supplement: Make sure that programme-specific learning outcomes - as have been defined and publicly communicated - are included into the Diploma Supplement accordingly. Provide statistical data according to the ECTS Users' Guide in addition to the final grade in the Diploma Supplement.

6. Quality management: quality assessment and development

Criterion 6 Quality management: quality assessment and development

Evidence:

- Self Assessment Report
- Audit discussions with representatives from the Rectorate, programme coordinators, lecturers and students

Preliminary assessment and analysis of the peers:

The panel understood that the responsibility for operating the quality management is implemented mostly on the faculty level. Quality assurance of the department and faculty are primarily carried out through departmental and faculty meetings. All departmental chairpersons are required to attend the faculty meetings whereas all members of teaching staff have to attend the departmental meetings. The aim of the departmental meetings is to take corrective actions in order to improve the quality assurance, and to develop plans to improve the quality of teaching. However, a quality assurance policy or any other binding regulations concerning quality assurances are not available at the moment and the faculty has no clear definition of the "quality" it wants to reach. The programme coordinators reported that the quality assurance framework of the department at present consists of collecting key figures about students like, for instance, intake records, examination records, and graduation records in combination with the assessment of the syllabuses, the assessment of the teaching staff, the assessment of students and the assessment of teaching material. However, the available statistical data lack significance in terms of study progress

and study success. Moreover, the presented data give hardly any clue which conclusions have been drawn from the data collection. By the same token, the peers gained the impression that most of the mentioned quality processes have been introduced only recently, and thus are not yet responsive in terms of building a reliable benchmark for substantially checking whether the intended objectives have been achieved. To this end, feedback loops still need to be closed, as programme coordinators conceded. In particular, the discussion with students showed that the results of course evaluations, which seem to be conducted on a regular basis, were not effectively communicated to them and discussed with the lecturers. But the students exemplified that they had once complained about the way of teaching of a specific lecturer and observed actual changes. They explained that they can address lecturers directly if they are dissatisfied and can make supportive recommendations. The peers welcomed the good communication with most of the lecturers but summarised that a systematic and sustainable involvement of relevant stakeholders (students, graduates, employers etc.) in the process of defining and monitoring the quality objectives of the degree programmes, still needs to be further established. The auditors advise the faculty and the university to further implement and develop the quality assurance system in terms of closing feedback loops, sustainably and systematically consulting relevant stakeholders (students, teaching staff, and employer) as well as collecting and transparently using student data.

Alumni is in progress to be established but on university level → remark that this could be helpful to give a feedback of the labor market relevance of the programmes

Final assessment of the peers after the comment of the Higher Education Institution regarding criterion 6:

Because the university abstain from a comment the peers confirmed their preliminary assessment. For both programmes they saw the criterion fulfilled in general. But they suggest a recommendation to further develop the quality assurance system. Thereby, feedback loops with students should be established. The workload of students should be thoroughly monitored in order to enable and execute appropriate measures, if needed. Statistical data on academic progress and dropout rates should be documented and utilized for the further development of the degree programmes.

D Additional Documents

No additional documents needed.

E Comment of the Higher Education Institution

The university abstain from a comment.

F Summary: Peer recommendations

The peers summarize their analysis and final assessment for the award of the seals as follows:

Degree Programme	ASIIN seal	Subject-specific Label	Maximum duration of accreditation
Ba Civil Engineering	With requirements for one year	EUR-ACE®	30.09.2022
Ma Civil Engineering	With requirements for one year	EUR-ACE®	30.09.2022

Requirements

A 1. (ASIIN 3) Ensure that the standards of all module examinations correspond with the intended learning outcomes and the qualification level of the programmes.

A 2. (ASIIN 4.1, 4.3) Describe a binding and sustainable concept how to improve staff resources and equipment of the laboratories in order to facilitate intensified research activities.

A 3. (ASIIN 5.1) Update the module descriptions according to the indications in the accreditation report (learning outcomes, contents, module coordinators/responsible persons, missing description of the Master Thesis)

A 4. (ASIIN 5.2) Make sure that programme-specific learning outcomes - as have been defined and publicly communicated - are included into the Diploma Supplement accordingly. Provide statistical data according to the ECTS Users' Guide in addition to the final grade in the Diploma Supplement.

For the Master

A 5. (ASIIN 1.3) Ensure that the intended profile is reached by all students (e.g. by a defined structure with a minimum amount of compulsory modules for each specialization)

Recommendations

E 1. (ASIIN 2.3) It is recommended to give the students opportunities to get knowledge in presentation techniques and project management which could be applied in the project works of the technical modules.

E 2. (ASIIN 6) It is recommended to further develop the quality assurance system. Thereby, feedback loops with students should be established. The workload of students should be thoroughly monitored in order to enable and execute appropriate measures, if needed. Statistical data on academic progress and dropout rates should be documented and utilized for the further development of the degree programmes.

For the Bachelor

E 3. (ASIIN 1.3) It is recommended to orient the content of the fundamentals modules in natural sciences on field specific aspects of civil engineering.

E 4. (ASIIN 1.3) It is recommended to introduce aspects of programming and software engineering in order to get acquainted with basic concepts in computational engineering.

E 5. (ASIIN 1.3) It is recommended to consider the introduction of modeling simulation framework (e.g. matlab).

E 6. (ASIIN 1.3) It is recommended to involve more modern aspects of civil engineering like building information modeling (BIM) or new aspects of sustainability of materials.

G Comment of the Technical Committee

The Technical Committee followed the assessment of the peers without any changes.

The Technical Committee 03 – Civil Engineering recommended for the award of the seals as follows:

Degree Programme	ASIIN seal	Subject-specific Label	Maximum duration of accreditation
Ba Civil Engineering	With requirements for one year	EUR-ACE®	30.09.2022
Ma Civil Engineering	With requirements for one year	EUR-ACE®	30.09.2022

H Decision of the Accreditation Commission (09.12.2016)

Analyse and assessment for the ASIIN Label

The Accreditation Commission discussed the report. It changed the requirement about staff resources and equipment into a recommendation. In all other points it followed the assessment of the peers and the Technical Committee without any changes.

Analyse and assessment for the EUR-ACE® Label:

The Accreditation Commission followed the assessment of the peers and the Technical Committee that the learning outcomes of the programmes correspond with the subject specific criteria of the Technical Committee 03 – Civil Engineering, Survey and Architecture

The Accreditation Commission for Degree Programmes decided to award the following seals:

Degree Programme	ASIIN seal	Subject-specific Label	Maximum duration of accreditation
Ba Civil Engineering	With requirements for one year	EUR-ACE®	30.09.2022
Ma Civil Engineering	With requirements for one year	EUR-ACE®	30.09.2022

Requirements

A 1. (ASIIN 3) Ensure that the standards of all module examinations correspond with the intended learning outcomes and the qualification level of the programmes.

A 2. (ASIIN 5.1) Update the module descriptions according to the indications in the accreditation report (learning outcomes, contents, module coordinators/responsible persons, missing description of the Master Thesis)

A 3. (ASIIN 5.2) Make sure that programme-specific learning outcomes - as have been defined and publicly communicated - are included into the Diploma Supplement accordingly. Provide statistical data according to the ECTS Users' Guide in addition to the final grade in the Diploma Supplement.

For the Master

A 4. (ASIIN 1.3) Ensure that the intended qualification profile is reached by all students (e.g. by a defined structure with a minimum amount of compulsory modules for each specialization).

Recommendations

E 1. (ASIIN 2.3) It is recommended to give the students opportunities to get knowledge in presentation techniques and project management which could be applied in the project works of the technical modules.

E 2. (ASIIN 6) It is recommended to further develop the quality assurance system. Thereby, feedback loops with students should be established. The workload of students should be thoroughly monitored in order to enable and execute appropriate measures, if needed. Statistical data on academic progress and dropout rates should be documented and utilized for the further development of the degree programmes.

For the Bachelor

E 3. (ASIIN 1.3) It is recommended to orient the content of the fundamentals modules in natural sciences on field specific aspects of civil engineering.

E 4. (ASIIN 1.3) It is recommended to introduce aspects of programming and software engineering in order to get acquainted with basic concepts in computational engineering.

E 5. (ASIIN 1.3) It is recommended to consider the introduction of modeling simulation framework (e.g. matlab).

E 6. (ASIIN 1.3) It is recommended to involve more modern aspects of civil engineering like building information modeling (BIM) or new aspects of sustainability of materials.

E 7. (ASIIN 4.1, 4.3) It is recommended to enable the teaching staff taking part in actual research activities and discussions.

I Fulfilment of Requirements (23.03.2018)

Requirements

For all degree programmes

A 5. (ASIIN 3) Ensure that the standards of all module examinations correspond with the intended learning outcomes and the qualification level of the programmes.

Initial Treatment	
	The university did not send any documents for the fulfilment of the requirements.
Secondary Treatment	
Peers	fulfilled unanimous Justification: The university defined for several modules new examinations to avoid multiple-choice exams. The new requirements for the exams correspond with the qualification level of the programmes.
TC 03	fulfilled Vote: unanimous Justification: The Technical Committee followed the assessment of the peers without any changes.

A 6. (ASIIN 5.1) Update the module descriptions according to the indications in the accreditation report (learning outcomes, contents, module coordinators/responsible persons, missing description of the Master Thesis)

Initial Treatment	
	The university did not send any documents for the fulfilment of the requirements.
Secondary Treatment	
Peers	fulfilled unanimous Justification: The new module descriptions content all asked information.
TC 03	fulfilled Vote: unanimous Justification: The Technical Committee followed the assessment of the peers without any changes.

A 7. (ASIIN 5.2) Make sure that programme-specific learning outcomes - as have been defined and publicly communicated - are included into the Diploma Supplement accordingly. Provide statistical data according to the ECTS Users' Guide in addition to the final grade in the Diploma Supplement.

Initial Treatment	
	The university did not send any documents for the fulfilment of the requirements.
Secondary Treatment	
Peers	fulfilled unanimous Justification: The new Diploma Supplement informs about the published learning outcomes.
TC 03	fulfilled Vote: unanimous Justification: The Technical Committee followed the assessment of the peers without any changes.

For the Master Programme

A 8. (ASIIN 1.3) Ensure that the intended qualification profile is reached by all students (e.g. by a defined structure with a minimum amount of compulsory modules for each specialization).

Initial Treatment	
	The university did not send any documents for the fulfilment of the requirements.
Secondary Treatment	
Peers	fulfilled unanimous Justification: The university defined a new study plan that ensures that all students have to complete a certain number of compulsory courses in order to ensure a common profile of the students.
TC 03	fulfilled Vote: unanimous Justification: The Technical Committee followed the assessment of the peers without any changes.

Decision of the Accreditation Commission on 23.03.2018:

Degree programme	ASIIN-label	Subject-specific label	Accreditation until max.
Ba Civil Engineering	All requirements fulfilled	EUR-ACE®	30.09.2022
Ma Civil Engineering	All requirements fulfilled	EUR-ACE®	30.09.2022

Appendix: Programme Learning Outcomes and Curricula

The following **curricula** are presented:

Bachelor:

Sub.Code		Subject Name	*Local Cr.*	*ECTS*
ENG-101		English I.	3	**4**
MAT-101		Calculus I.	4	**6**
PHY-101		General Physics I.	4	**6**
CHM-101		General Chemistry	4	**6**
COM-101		Computer Programming	3	**6**
			18	**28**
ENG-102		English II.	3	**4**
MAT-102		Calculus II.	4	**6**
PHY-102		General Physics II.	4	**6**
GEO-102		Geology for Civil Engineering	3	**5**
TD - 102		Technical Drawing	3	**6**
			17	**27**
MAT-201		Diff. Eq. and Lın. algebra	3	**6**
MAT-203		Statistical Methods for C.E.	3	**5**
CE - 221		Statics	4	**6**
CE - 231		Engineering Economy	3	**6**
CE - 241		Materials Science	4	**5**
NTE			3	**4**
			20	**32**
MAT-202		Advanced Calculus	3	**5**
CE - 204		Surveying and Engineering	4	**6**
CE - 222		Dynamics	3	**5**
CE - 224		Strength of Materials I.	4	**6**
CE - 244		Materials of Construction	4	**6**
NTE			3	**4**
			21	**32**
MAT-305		Numerical Methods in Eng.	3	**6**
CE - 351		Transportation Engineering I.	3	**5**
CE - 361		Soil Mechanics I.	4	**6**
CE - 371		Fluid Mechanics	4	**5**
CE - 381		Structural Analysis I.	4	**6**
CE - 300		Summer Practice I.(30 days)		**4**
			18	**32**
CE - 306		Computer Applic.in CE	3	**6**
CE - 362		Soil Mechanics II.	4	**6**
CE - 372		Hydromechanics	4	**5**
CE - 382		Structural Analysis II.	4	**6**
CE - 374		Engineering Hydrology	3	**5**
			18	**28**
CE - 431		Constr. Eng. and Manag.	4	**6**
CE - 461		Foundation Engineering	3	**5**
CE - 471		Water Res.Eng. I.	4	**6**
CE - 481		Reinforced Concrete Theory	4	**5**
CE - 400		Summer Practice II.(30 days		**4**
TE			3	**6**
			18	**32**
CE - 472		Water Res.Eng. II.	4	**5**
CE - 484		Design Steel Structures	4	**6**

Master:

	Subject	Local Credit	ECTS CREDIT
SEMESTER 1	Course 1	3	8
	Course 2	3	8
	Course 3	3	8
SEMESTER 2	Course 4	3	8
	Course 5	3	8
SEMESTER 3	Course 6	3	8
	Course 7	3	8
	Seminar		10
SEMESTER 4	Thesis		54