«АККРЕДИТТЕУ ЖӘНЕ РЕЙТИНГТІҢ ТӘУЕЛСІЗ АГЕНТТІГІ» КЕМ

НУ «НЕЗАВИСИМОЕ АГЕНТСТВО АККРЕДИТАЦИИ И РЕЙТИНГА»

INDEPENDENT AGENCY FOR ACCREDITATION AND RATING

Report

on the results of the External Expert Commission’s work for assessing compliance with the requirements of the standards of international accreditation of educational programs (based on ESG)

6006020 Chemical Engineering (level: bachelor's degree)

6006028 Mechanical Engineering (level: bachelor's degree)

6006008 Electrical and Electronic Engineering (level: bachelor's degree)

Baku Engineering University (Republic of Azerbaijan)

from October 6 to October 8, 2025

INDEPENDENT AGENCY FOR ACCREDITATION AND RATING
External Expert Commission

Addressed to IAAR Accreditation Council

«АККРЕДИТТЕУ ЖӘНЕ РЕЙТИНГТІҢ ТӘУЕЛСІЗ АГЕНТТІГІ» КЕМ
НУ «НЕЗАВИСИМОЕ АГЕНТСТВО АККРЕДИТАЦИИ И РЕЙТИНГА»
INDEPENDENT AGENCY FOR ACCREDITATION AND RATING

REPORT

on the results of the External Expert Commission's work for assessing compliance with the requirements of the standards of international accreditation of educational programs (based on ESG)

6006020 Chemical Engineering (level: bachelor's degree)
6006028 Mechanical Engineering (level: bachelor's degree)
6006008 Electrical and Electronic Engineering (level: bachelor's degree)

Baku Engineering University (Republic of Azerbaijan)

from October 6 to October 8, 2025

2025

CONTENT

(I) LIST OF SYMBOLS AND ABBREVIATIONS

BEU - Baku Engineering University
IAAR - Independent Agency for Accreditation and Rating
NQF - National Qualifications Framework
QF-EHEA - Framework for Qualifications of the European Higher Education Area
ECTS - European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System
EEC - External Expert Commission
EP - Educational Programs

(II) INTRODUCTION

In accordance with order No. 151-25-ОД from 10.09.2025г. of the Independent Agency for Accreditation and Rating (IAAR), from October 6 to October 8, 2025, an External Expert Commission assessed the conformity of educational programs: 6006020 Chemical Engineering (level: bachelor's degree), 6006028 Mechanical Engineering (level: bachelor's degree), 6006008 Electrical and Electronic Engineering (level: bachelor's degree) at Baku Engineering University (Republic of Azerbaijan) with the standards of international accreditation of the IAAR (approved by order No. 68-18/1-OD dated 05/25/2018).

The report of the External Expert Commission (EEC) contains an evaluation of the submitted educational programs against the international standards of the IAAR, as well as recommendations of the EEC for further improvement of educational programs and assessment parameters.

EEC includes:

- Chairman of the IAAR EEC - **Vladimir Sergeyevich Kiyan**, PhD, Associate Professor, Head of Laboratory, National Center for Biotechnology, IAAR Category 1 Expert (Astana, Republic of Kazakhstan);
- IAAR Expert - **Aliya Kairatovna Aldungarova**, PhD, Associate Professor, International Educational Corporation, IAAR Category 1 Expert (Almaty, Republic of Kazakhstan);
- IAAR Expert - **Didar Yedilkhan**, PhD, Associate Professor, Director of the Smart City Research Center, Astana IT University (Astana, Republic of Kazakhstan);
- IAAR Expert, Employer - **Natig Latif oglu Aliyev**, Candidate of Physical and Mathematical Sciences, Department Director, State Examination Center (Baku, Republic of Azerbaijan);
- IAAR Expert - **Monika Kulisz**, Doctor of Technical Sciences, Lublin University of Technology (Lublin, Poland);
- IAAR Expert - **Maris Klavins**, Dr. habil. chem., Professor, University of Latvia (Riga, Latvia);
- IAAR Expert, student - **Ganira Mammadzada**, doctoral student, Ganja State University; Shahin, Head of Strategy Planning Department, Azerbaijan University of Architecture and Construction;
- IAAR Expert, student - **Kamilla Alibekova**, 3rd-year doctoral student, Palacký University (Olomouc, Czech Republic).
- Coordinator of the IAAR EEC - **Gulfiya Rivkatovna Nazyrova**, Candidate of Economic Sciences, Project Manager for Institutional and Specialized Accreditation of Universities;
- Coordinator of the IAAR EEC - **Temirlan Bakhytzhanovich Tursynbayev**, Chief Specialist of the International Cooperation Project;

(III) PRESENTATION OF THE EDUCATIONAL ORGANIZATION

Baku Engineering University (BEU) is a state-funded higher education institution operating under the supervision of the Ministry of Education of the Republic of Azerbaijan. The university is situated in Khirdalan City, in the Absheron region, on a campus covering approximately twenty hectares with a total building area of about thirty thousand square meters. BEU was established by Presidential Order on 8 November 2016, and its charter as a public legal entity was approved on 21 February 2017.

The founding purpose of BEU is to advance the teaching of engineering and technology in Azerbaijan and to prepare highly qualified specialists for the country’s industrial and technological sectors. In line with this mission, the university provides education at the Bachelor’s, Master’s, and Doctoral levels in engineering and related disciplines and carries out both fundamental and applied research. The university aims to foster innovation, strengthen the link between education and production, and align its activities with the strategic needs of Azerbaijan’s economy.

BEU operates within a modern governance framework that ensures transparency and accountability. Its structure includes the Board of Trustees, the Scientific Council, and the Audit Committee. Quality assurance and continuous improvement are integral to its management system. The university has adopted a documented Quality Policy approved by the Rector and implemented through the Department of Strategy and Quality Assurance. This policy is supported by a comprehensive Electronic Information System, officially branded as AZIMUS, which enables agile management, transparent governance, and real-time monitoring of academic and administrative processes. The system also facilitates data-driven decision-making and supports a variety of feedback and evaluation procedures across the institution.

The rectorate of Baku Engineering University (BEU) is led by the Rector, who serves as the university's chief executive officer, represents the institution in state and international forums, and oversees its academic, scientific, international and administrative functions. The Vice-Rectors of Baku Engineering University are responsible for coordinating the university's core operational areas, including academic affairs, research and innovation, international relations, social and student affairs, and general administrative management, ensuring effective implementation of institutional policies and strategic goals.

The academic structure of BEU consists of several faculties, including the Faculty of Information and Computer Technologies, the Faculty of Engineering, the Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences, and the Faculty of Architecture and Construction. Programs are offered in both Azerbaijani and English and are designed in accordance with national legislation as well as international frameworks such as the National Qualifications Framework (NQF) and the Framework for Qualifications of the European Higher Education Area (QF-EHEA).

Faculties are educational, scientific and administrative units that conduct bachelor's and master's training, direct research and are governed by a Faculty Scientific Council. Departments serve as the principal educational-scientific units of faculties, undertaking teaching, methodical work, research and additional training in one or more subject areas. In addition to faculties and departments, BEU hosts a broad range of administrative and support units which report directly to central management. Each unit is headed by a named director (or equivalent) and is integrated into the University's organizational hierarchy.

BEU places strong emphasis on practical training and student engagement. Industrial internships form an integral part of the curriculum, particularly in the final year of study. The assessment of student performance follows a point-based system that converts into letter grades compatible with the European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System (ECTS) and the Bologna Process. Students gain hands-on experience at leading enterprises, banks, and government institutions, including Kapital Bank, Azerconnect, and the Ministry of Digital Development and Transport. The university systematically collects student feedback through electronic surveys such as the Educational Process Evaluation Survey, the Student Satisfaction Survey, and the Internship Experience Evaluation Survey. The results of these surveys are used to inform decision-making and to drive continuous quality enhancement.

The physical infrastructure of the university comprises five educational buildings and a range of modern facilities that support teaching, learning, and research. Classrooms are equipped with projectors, smart boards, and high-speed connectivity, while laboratories are fitted with up-to-date scientific and technological equipment. The university has also established digital laboratories and a Technopark to promote innovation, entrepreneurship, and collaboration with industry partners. Continuous renewal of resources is a key institutional priority, and several laboratories and learning spaces have been modernized with the financial and technical support of partner organizations.

BEU's commitment to sustainable development is reflected in its Sustainability Plan for 2023-2030, which outlines measures for enhancing campus energy efficiency, promoting renewable energy, reducing waste, and encouraging environmentally responsible practices. The university also provides students with access to dormitories, sports and recreation facilities, student clubs, and social support services, contributing to a vibrant and inclusive academic environment.

Internationalization is another important pillar of BEU's strategic development. The university actively participates in academic mobility programs such as Erasmus+ and Mevlana, offering students and staff opportunities to study and conduct research at partner institutions, including the University of Turin and Sorbonne University. BEU has established cooperative relationships with numerous international universities and is involved in European Union-funded projects such as PROMIG, PAWER, NIZAMI, CRENG, and MAGNUS. It also participates in the preparation of proposals under the Horizon 2020 framework. Many of BEU's programs are offered in English to strengthen international cooperation and attract foreign students.

The university has been granted institutional accreditation for a five-year period by the Quality Assurance Agency in Education, effective from early 2024. As of the latest data, BEU serves approximately 7,450 students. It continues to expand its academic profile and physical infrastructure while maintaining its focus on quality, innovation, and international engagement.

Baku Engineering University thus represents a dynamic, modern institution that combines strong national relevance with growing international visibility. Through its quality-driven management, innovative teaching methods, research initiatives, and close collaboration with industry, BEU plays a significant role in training the next generation of engineers, technologists, and professionals who will contribute to the sustainable development of Azerbaijan and beyond.

(IV) DESCRIPTION OF THE PREVIOUS ACCREDITATION PROCEDURE

Educational programs 6006020 Chemical Engineering (level: bachelor's degree), 6006028 Mechanical Engineering (level: bachelor's degree), 6006008 Electrical and Electronic Engineering (level: bachelor's degree) of the Department of Mechanical Engineering, Department of Chemical Engineering, Department of Automation, Telecommunications, and Energy at Baku Engineering University are internationally accredited by the IAAR for the very first time.

(V) DESCRIPTION OF THE EEC VISIT

The work of the EEC was carried out based on the approved program of the visit of the Expert Commission for the international accreditation of educational programs at Baku Engineering University from October 6 to October 8, 2025.

In order to coordinate the work of the EEC, on October 3, 2025, an online kick-off meeting was held among the members of the commission, the schedule of the visit was clarified, and agreement was reached on the choice of examination methods.

To obtain objective information about the quality of the educational program and the entire infrastructure of the university, to clarify the content of the self-assessment report, meetings were held with the rector, vice-rectors of the university in areas of activity, heads of structural divisions, heads of departments, teachers, students, graduates, employers. A total of 88 representatives took part in the meetings (Table 1).

Participant category	Number
Rector	1
Vice-rector	5
Heads of structural divisions	8
Heads of departments and heads of EP	7
Teachers	24
Students	18
Graduates	23
Employers	2
Total	**88**

During the visit, the External Expert Commission (EEC) members inspected the material and technical resources supporting the accredited educational programs (EP). A subsequent meeting between the EEC and university stakeholders (target groups) was held to clarify the mechanisms for implementing the university's policies and to confirm specific data presented in the institution's self-assessment report.

In accordance with the accreditation procedure, a survey of 58 teachers, 58 students, including junior and senior students, was conducted.

The external examination involved a comprehensive analysis of the institute's working documentation to substantiate the claims made in the Self-Assessment Report. This review was supplemented by an assessment of the institution's digital profile via its official website (https://beu.edu.az/en). Following this thorough examination, the EEC developed and formally presented its recommendations for improving the accredited programs to the university management at a meeting held on October 8, 2025.

(VI) COMPLIANCE WITH INTERNATIONAL ACCREDITATION STANDARDS

6.1. Standard 1. QUALITY ASSURANCE POLICY.

Standard:
The educational organization should have a published quality assurance policy which is part of its strategic management. Internal stakeholders should develop and implement this policy through appropriate structures and processes with the involvement of external stakeholders.

Recommendations:
The policy and mechanisms for its implementation are the basis of a logically built and consistent system for ensuring the quality of the organization of education. The system is a cycle of continuous improvement and contributes to the accountability of the educational organization. It supports the development of a culture of quality in which all stakeholders take responsibility for quality at all levels of the functioning of the educational organization. To strengthen it, the policy and mechanisms for its implementation have an official status and are available to the general public.

The strategy and mechanisms for its implementation are the basis of a logically built and consistent system for ensuring the quality of the organization of education. The system is a cycle of continuous improvement and contributes to the accountability of the educational organization. It supports the development of a culture of quality in which all stakeholders take responsibility for quality at all levels of the functioning of the educational organization. To strengthen it, the policy and mechanisms for its implementation have an official status and are available to the general public.

A quality assurance policy is more effective if it reflects the relationship between research, teaching and learning and takes into account the contexts, both national, in which the NGO operates, and intra-university. This policy supports:
- organization of a quality assurance system;
- departments, schools, faculties and other departments, as well as the management of the educational - organization, employees and students fulfilling their duties of quality assurance;
- academic honesty and freedom, as well as intolerance to manifestations of various kinds of academic dishonesty;
- processes to prevent intolerance of any kind or discrimination against students and faculty;
- involvement of external stakeholders in quality assurance.

The policy is embodied in activities that provide for a variety of processes and procedures for internal quality assurance, which involve the participation of all departments of the educational organization. The degree of implementation of the policy is regulated, monitored and reviewed at the level of the educational organization itself.

The quality assurance policy also applies to any activity carried out by subcontractors or partners.

Evidence

Baku Engineering University (BEU) has developed a comprehensive Strategic Development Plan for the short- and medium-term periods. The plan was submitted to the Ministry of Science and Education for approval in accordance with the decision of the Academic Council of the University (Meeting No. BMU-15000-000/014 of May 29, 2018). It also provides for the establishment of a commission responsible for preparing the university's self-assessment report.

Focusing on the period 2020-2023, the strategic program seeks to align the activities of BEU with national and international trends in science and education. As a relatively young educational institution, the university aims to define its key goals, objectives, and development directions for the future. This contributes to strengthening its competitiveness in the national education market and transforming it into a modern, progressive institution.

The strategic program emphasizes several priority areas, including analysis of internal and external environmental factors to identify the main determinants of development in science and education; definition and justification of key performance indicators linked to the strategic goals of the university; identification of targets; and continuous monitoring of implementation progress. The first two phases of the strategy focus on defining and substantiating strategic goals, while the third and fourth phases cover operational activities designed to implement BEU's mission in accordance with its chosen strategy.

The highest governing structure of the university is the Board of Trustees. The activities of the Academic Council are regulated by the Charter of the University and the "Regulations on Academic

Councils of Higher Education Institutions" approved by the Ministry of Science and Education of the Republic of Azerbaijan on November 10, 1997 (No. 792). The primary mission of BEU is to train qualified specialists for institutions and organizations throughout the Republic of Azerbaijan.

The management system at BEU is organized in line with modern principles of higher education governance, focusing on improving institutional efficiency and ensuring high quality in teaching and research. The administrative structure includes bodies at various levels that play key roles in strategic decision-making, quality control, and the rational allocation of resources.

Quality management at BEU is based on a systematic and well-documented approach. The university's quality policy, developed and approved by the administration, has been communicated to the entire university community. This policy reflects the university's strategic goals, main directions, and priorities in education and research and is built upon the principle of continuous improvement. Quality objectives are formulated by the relevant departments and implemented through flexible but effective management mechanisms.

The university's management prioritizes meeting the expectations and requirements of key stakeholders, including students, academic staff, and administrative employees, within the framework of current legislation. Internal educational programs are implemented to raise awareness among staff, and regular meetings are held to evaluate the effectiveness of the management system, assess processes, and identify opportunities for improvement. Ensuring the availability and efficient use of resources is an important component of the management model.

The governance structure of BEU includes several strategically important bodies: the Academic Council, the Board of Trustees, and the Audit Committee. The Academic Council determines the academic and research policy of the university and defines the directions of educational programs and projects. The Board of Trustees participates in decision-making related to strategic planning, institutional development, and financial sustainability. The Audit Committee is responsible for internal control, accountability, and the monitoring of financial operations.

Overall, BEU's management model aligns with international standards of higher education and is based on the principles of transparency, participation, and quality. The university's quality policy is a formally documented and strategically verified framework designed to ensure operational efficiency and continuous improvement in educational and research activities. It provides a foundation for defining and achieving quality objectives in line with the university's mission.

The quality policy, developed by the management in accordance with BEU's general strategic goals and approved by the rector, serves as the basis for setting quality objectives and planning expected outcomes. The Strategy and Quality Assurance Department is responsible for its implementation.

The key strategic principles of the quality policy include continuous improvement through effective management of educational processes; consideration of the expectations of students, parents, staff, employers, professional organizations, and society; emphasis on human values and the strengthening of national and ethical principles; expansion of university-industry cooperation to train qualified professionals for the labor market; promotion of research aimed at addressing economic, cultural, and social issues; development of distance and lifelong learning systems; active participation in international cooperation and student exchange programs; and adaptation to the Bologna Process and integration into the European Higher Education Area.

BEU, as a public legal entity, has approved this regulatory document (BEU-ES-007-AZ dated September 28, 2021).

The university effectively integrates digital management and information technologies in accordance with modern requirements. Its Electronic Information System (EIS) supports flexible, efficient, and transparent management, ensuring systematic implementation of the quality policy. The system enables real-time monitoring, analytics, and data-driven decision-making across educational, administrative, and quality processes, contributing to the achievement of the university's strategic goals and the continuous improvement of quality.

The electronic platform, officially registered as AZIMUS and approved by the Ministry of Justice, operates under the supervision of the Strategy and Quality Assurance Department. It is

designed to optimize the work of students, teachers, and staff in accordance with clearly defined regulations and protocols. The university administration ensures the security and transparency of the platform, and all electronic transactions are carried out in compliance with the law.

Through the information system, employees receive timely updates on new developments, decisions, and projects, fostering openness and collective participation in management processes. The Quality Handbook, developed by the Strategy and Quality Assurance Department and made available through the information system, is a key strategic document that provides comprehensive information about the university's policies and procedures in the field of quality management. It reflects the fundamental principles of the university's activities and regulates their implementation.

The information system includes several modules that facilitate staff engagement in quality processes and ensure regular communication of changes. One of the most important is the "Surveys" module, which collects feedback from students, faculty, and administrative staff on the university's activities and quality policy. These surveys help build a strong culture of quality across the institution.

Employees can also submit comments or suggestions for quality improvement through the system. After careful review by the Strategy and Quality Assurance Department, validated proposals are implemented. This mechanism demonstrates a participatory and development-oriented management approach that supports the planning, execution, and monitoring of educational and administrative processes, contributing to sustainable institutional development and continuous improvement. This management model ensures transparency, flexibility, and efficiency and serves as an example of good practice in higher education.

The university administration is responsible for ensuring the effective implementation of the quality policy across all structural divisions and for creating the necessary conditions for its success. The quality policy is supported by the entire university community in both educational and administrative spheres, and responsibility for maintaining quality standards rests with every employee.

In line with BEU's strategic goals, several initiatives have been undertaken to improve the university's infrastructure. The Department of Strategy and Quality Assurance organizes training programs for department heads, administrative leaders, laboratory staff, and faculty in various thematic areas. One of the key objectives of BEU's Strategic Plan is to align internal operations, services, and processes with ISO standards, including the application of quality management systems and the improvement of existing processes.

During the 2021-2022 academic year, training sessions were held to prepare for the implementation of the ISO 9001:2015 standard, aimed at increasing the efficiency of the educational process and enhancing student satisfaction.

In the field of education quality improvement, academic programs are regularly updated in accordance with international best practices. The Department of Strategy and Quality Assurance conducts faculty evaluation surveys among students each semester to assess teaching performance. Students evaluate instructors anonymously through the university's electronic system, responding to ten questions for each course. The collected data are archived and accessible to instructors at any time. Based on the results, the department compiles a summary report and submits it to the university administration for review and further action.

Analytical part

Baku Engineering University applies a systematic and strategically structured approach to quality management in education, based on the principles of transparency, participation, and continuous improvement. The university's activities include a comprehensive internal quality assurance system, an approved Quality Policy, and the active use of digital tools, particularly the AZIMUS electronic information system, which enables real-time monitoring, analysis, and management decision-making. This approach reflects the university's commitment to effective functioning, flexibility, and modern management practices.

At the same time, the analysis has identified several important shortcomings that require attention to further develop the quality system and bring it into full alignment with international standards. The first issue concerns the accessibility of the Quality Policy. Although the policy has been developed,

approved, and implemented within the university, it is not publicly available on the official BEU website. The absence of public access to this key document reduces the transparency of the quality management system and limits awareness and trust among external stakeholders, including students, prospective applicants, employers, and the wider community.

In accordance with modern requirements for quality assurance in higher education, such a document should be publicly accessible. Openness serves as a guarantee of institutional accountability and demonstrates the university's willingness to engage in dialogue with society.

Another aspect that requires improvement is the limited involvement of external stakeholders in the development and implementation of the Quality Policy. While the university's documentation emphasizes the participation of students, academic staff, and administrative personnel, the engagement of employers, professional associations, alumni, and other external partners remains largely declarative. The absence of clearly defined mechanisms for such interaction-such as advisory councils, expert committees, or regular external evaluations-reduces the degree of integration between the university and the professional community. This, in turn, may affect the relevance of educational programs to the needs of the labor market.

To address these issues, it would be appropriate to make the Quality Policy publicly available on the university's official website, accompanied by an explanation of its key principles and objectives. In addition, transparent procedures should be developed to ensure the effective participation of external stakeholders in the formulation, review, and implementation of the policy. The inclusion of representatives from employers, alumni, and public organizations in advisory and expert structures would enhance trust, strengthen partnerships, and make the university's quality management system more open, accountable, and responsive to societal needs.

Overall, the quality assurance system at Baku Engineering University demonstrates a high level of organization and technological advancement. However, its further development should focus on reinforcing the principles of openness, transparency, and external stakeholder engagement. Strengthening these areas will enable the university not only to maintain but also to enhance its position as a modern higher education institution that meets international standards of quality and accountability.

In the Self-Assessment Report (SAR) substantial attention is devoted to the governance of teaching and research, and, in general, compliance with the requirements of this Standard is achieved. The University operates an approved Quality Assurance Policy and a functioning EMS that supports document control, surveys and routine monitoring; on this basis the QA system appears coherent and serviceable. Risk analysis is addressed in the SAR: key risks are identified and mitigation actions are reported, which is a positive practice. The SAR also evidences activities to enhance staff qualifications and to support research, including measures integrated in management plans. It seems that, in developing and implementing management policy, the views of students and staff are considered through established fora and meetings, and this contributes to the relevance of decisions.

At the same time, several aspects require attention to align more closely with ESG expectations on transparency and completeness. Although a public link to the Quality Handbook exists, there is no clear evidence that the full text of the QA Policy itself is publicly available (signed, versioned, EN/AZ). Evidence of co-design with external stakeholders was mentioned during meetings, but documentary proof of how such input shaped policies (e.g., minutes with tracked changes and rationales) is limited. In addition, in the development of University management plans, greater emphasis on documenting the internal discussion, the sequence of development, and the control over performance would strengthen traceability and accountability.

Overall, the impression is that the QA system functions well, with roles and processes defined and data flowing through the EMS. However, to reach a stronger level of compliance the University should: publish the full QA Policy text, adopt rules for external services; and formalise the documentation of stakeholder co-design in policy reviews.

Existence of an approved QA Policy and an operational EMS; strategic planning and management plans compliant with national requirements; active participation of internal stakeholders in programme management and content development.

Strengths/best practice in 6006020 Chemical Engineering (level: bachelor's degree), 6006028 Mechanical Engineering (level: bachelor's degree), 6006008 Electrical and Electronic Engineering (level: bachelor's degree):

Not visible

Recommendations for 6006020 Chemical Engineering (level: bachelor's degree), 6006028 Mechanical Engineering (level: bachelor's degree), 6006008 Electrical and Electronic Engineering (level: bachelor's degree):

1. Ensuring public availability and transparent monitoring of the Quality Policy: It is recommended to publish the approved Quality Policy in open access on the official website of Baku Engineering University (in the section on the quality management system or strategic management), accompanied by a brief explanatory note outlining its objectives, main principles, and key implementation areas. The quality assurance unit should systematically disseminate information about the Quality Policy and related procedures via the website, social media, and information displays to increase the transparency of the university's activities, raise awareness among students, staff, and partners, and strengthen the culture of quality. At the same time, it is necessary to introduce a mechanism for the regular evaluation of transparency and the level of external stakeholder involvement in quality assurance processes, and to publish the monitoring results in the public domain, thereby confirming the university's commitment to openness, accountability, and continuous improvement.

Implementation period: Publication of the document and explanatory note - 2025; information dissemination and evaluation with publication of results - on a permanent basis starting from 2025.

2. Formalizing participation and regulatory frameworks for external stakeholders in quality assurance: The university administration should formalize the participation of external stakeholders - employers, representatives of professional associations, alumni, and public organizations - in the processes of developing, monitoring, and revising the Quality Policy. To this end, it is recommended to establish an advisory or expert council on education quality with the participation of external partners. The mechanism should include regular public discussions and expert reviews of key quality assurance documents, as well as the use of surveys and focus groups involving employers and graduates to ensure that their opinions are considered when adjusting the university's strategic priorities. In parallel, it is recommended that the university administration introduce amendments to the Quality Manual and other internal regulatory documents to define clear procedures for the university's interaction with external stakeholders. These documents should specify the functions, rights, and responsibilities of external participants in evaluating the effectiveness of the quality assurance system and contributing to strategic decision-making.

Implementation period: Establishment of mechanisms for stakeholder participation - starting from 2025, on an annual basis; amendments to the Quality Manual and other regulatory documents – 2025-2026 academic year.

Conclusions of the EEC according to the criteria:

According to the standard "Quality Assurance Policy" for the educational programs 6006020 Chemical Engineering (level: bachelor's degree), 6006028 Mechanical Engineering (level: bachelor's degree), 6006008 Electrical and Electronic Engineering (level: bachelor's degree)»: strong parameters - 0, satisfactory - 1, requiring improvement - 0.

6.2. Standard 2. DEVELOPMENT AND APPROVAL OF THE PROGRAM

Standard:
An educational organization must have mechanisms for the development and approval of its programs. Programs should be designed in accordance with established objectives, including intended learning outcomes. The qualifications resulting from the completion of the program must be clearly defined as well as explained and must correspond to a certain level of the national qualifications framework in higher education and, therefore, the framework of qualifications in the European Higher Education Area.

Recommendations:
Educational programs are the basis for the formation of the educational mission of a higher educational institution. They provide students with both academic knowledge and necessary competencies, including transferable ones, that can have an impact on their personal development and can be applied in their future careers.

When developing their programs, educational organizations should ensure:
- alignment of program objectives with institutional strategy and clearly defined expected learning outcomes;
- participation of students and other stakeholders in the development of the program;
- carrying out external expertise and availability of reference and information resources;
- achieving the four goals of higher education defined by the Council of Europe (see Scope and concepts);
- unimpeded advancement of the student in the process of mastering the program;
- determination of the expected workload of students (for example, in ECTS);
- providing opportunities for internships (where necessary);
- the formal approval process for the program at the institutional level.

Evidence

Baku Engineering University (BEU) develops its undergraduate educational programs in accordance with the current regulatory framework of the higher education system of the Republic of Azerbaijan. Program development is carried out based on the standard requirements of the Ministry of Science and Education, followed by internal review and final approval at the state level.

The content of the educational programs meets modern requirements for the professional preparation of highly qualified specialists and is aligned with international standards. In the process of developing curricula and syllabi, BEU takes into account the curricula and methodological materials of foreign universities that train specialists in computer engineering, information technology, and information security. This comparative approach promotes academic mobility, compatibility, and integration into the European Higher Education Area. Training in a number of specialties is conducted in English, which expands opportunities for students and faculty to participate in international projects and exchange programs and enhances the competitiveness of graduates in the global labor market.

Each educational program is supported by a complete set of accompanying documentation. This includes the educational program itself, which defines the training objectives, expected learning outcomes, competencies to be developed, and requirements for the program's structure and workload. Curricula and working curricula outline the sequence of courses, the distribution of teaching loads, the types of learning activities, and the semester schedule. Syllabi describe course objectives, topics, content, teaching methods, assessment tools, and grading criteria. In addition, local regulations and assessment standards establish the rules for interim and final student evaluations, while the diploma supplement is issued in accordance with the requirements of the Bologna Process.

Curricula and working curricula are published on the official website of the university, ensuring openness and accessibility for students, employers, and external experts. Program updates are initiated by departments and faculties when necessary and are subsequently discussed and approved at meetings of the Academic Council. To support the learning process, instructors provide consultations, supplementary classes, and individual meetings with students.

Student performance assessment is carried out in accordance with the European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System (ECTS) and uses a four-component model for monitoring competency development, based on a 100-point scale. All data on current academic progress, interim and final grades are recorded in the university's electronic learning management system, which is accessible to students and academic staff in real time. To ensure transparency and protect students' rights, an appeal commission operates within the university.

According to the Career Center, the employment rate among graduates of the Information Technology, Computer Engineering, and Information Security programs exceeds 70 percent. This outcome demonstrates the relevance of the educational programs and their alignment with labor market demands. Many graduates are successfully employed in both public institutions and private companies, including international organizations.

The process of designing and revising programs is primarily internal. Although representatives of industry organizations and employers are engaged at the final stages, the participation of external experts in the conceptual design phase has not yet become systematic. This limits opportunities for independent evaluation and benchmarking of the programs against leading international and industry practices.

Procedures for the regular review and revision of programs have not yet been institutionalized in the form of a fixed cycle. Revisions are currently made on an as-needed basis rather than following a predefined schedule, such as every three years. In addition, the mechanism for documenting and analyzing feedback from students, graduates, and employers requires further enhancement to ensure a consistent and evidence-based approach to program improvement.

The university's quality policy plays a significant role in the effective development and approval of educational programs, ensuring their alignment with the strategic goals of the institution and the expectations of stakeholders. The emphasis on continuous improvement and collaboration with industry contributes to the relevance of programs to labor market needs and to their compliance with international standards, including those of the Bologna Process.

Overall, Baku Engineering University demonstrates a stable and modern system for the design and management of educational programs. However, to achieve a higher level of international maturity and to strengthen its position in national and global rankings, it is recommended that the university further enhance external expertise, institutionalize systematic monitoring, and establish more detailed and structured procedures for updating the content of educational programs.

Analytical part

The university's strategy provides for the systematic improvement of the quality of education through the introduction of modern teaching methods, the pursuit of international accreditation, and the development of continuing education. These initiatives directly influence the process of developing and approving educational programs. The emphasis on international standards and responsiveness to labor market needs ensures the creation of relevant, innovative, and competitive academic programs. The inclusion of goals related to the integration of artificial intelligence technologies, digital transformation, and dual-degree programs demonstrates the university's strategic commitment to continuously updating the content and structure of its programs in line with the Bologna Process and international professional standards.

The educational programs of Baku Engineering University (BEU) have a structured design that complies with state standards and corresponds to the level of bachelor's degree qualifications. Each program clearly defines its educational objectives, the list of competencies to be developed, the expected learning outcomes, and the system of assessment and evaluation. This structured approach ensures transparency, predictability, and clarity in the educational process for both students and instructors.

The section of the Self-Assessment Report devoted to programme design and approval is well developed and sufficiently detailed. In developing study programmes, the University takes into account the needs of the local labour market, social partners and students. In line with ESG expectations, programmes are articulated through explicit aims and intended learning outcomes, refer to student workload in ECTS, and are subject to formal institutional approval. Stakeholder involvement and the use of external reference points should be evidenced more consistently in the documentation (e.g., minutes demonstrating how feedback shaped programme changes, external expert reviews). The programme files confirm 240 ECTS structures at bachelor level and reference to the national qualifications framework level (NQE), which supports the correct placement of qualifications within the QF-EHEA. Overall, the evidence indicates that processes for design and approval are in place and

functioning, that programmes meet their stated objectives and are correctly referenced to national and European frameworks. To strengthen transparency and alignment with ESG, programme syllabi should uniformly include: module aims and ILOs mapped to programme ILOs; weekly topics and required readings; software/lab resources; assessment methods with rubrics and weightings; academic integrity and safety requirements (where applicable); office hours and communication channels; and an accessibility statement. Publishing syllabi in stable, downloadable formats (AZ/EN) would also support external verification and student planning.

Strengths/best practice in 6006020 Chemical Engineering (level: bachelor's degree), 6006028 Mechanical Engineering (level: bachelor's degree), 6006008 Electrical and Electronic Engineering (level: bachelor's degree):

Compliance with national requirements; clear orientation toward competence-based education and regular curricular updating.

Recommendations for 6006020 Chemical Engineering (level: bachelor's degree), 6006028 Mechanical Engineering (level: bachelor's degree), 6006008 Electrical and Electronic Engineering (level: bachelor's degree):

1. The university should strengthen the design, revision, and practical relevance of its educational programs by approving a Regulation on the Development, Approval, and Revision of Educational Programs that clearly defines all stages (initiation, design, discussion, external review, approval, implementation, monitoring), responsible persons, and a regular review cycle (e.g., every three years), with systematic involvement of employers, professional associations, alumni, and foreign partner universities in working groups for program development and updating. Within this framework, the content of the programs Information Technology (050616), Information Security (050615), and Computer Engineering (050620) should be reviewed to eliminate overlap and clearly differentiate their focus (information systems design and management; data protection, risk management, and cybersecurity; hardware and software systems design and operation, respectively), while enhancing interdisciplinarity and flexibility through an expanded set of electives (e.g., innovative entrepreneurship, digital communications, artificial intelligence, project management). In parallel, the university should establish a centralized system for regular (annual) monitoring of graduates' employment, professional achievements, and career progression to evaluate the effectiveness and labor market relevance of its programs.

Implementation period: 2025–2026 academic year for regulatory framework, program revision, and curriculum enhancement; graduate career monitoring – starting from 2025, on an annual basis.

2. Graduate career tracking system: The university should establish a centralized system for regular (annual) monitoring of graduates' employment, professional achievements, and career progression in order to evaluate the effectiveness and labor market relevance of its educational programs.

Implementation period: Starting from 2025, on an annual basis.

Conclusions of the EEC according to the criteria:

According to the standard "Development and approval of the program" for the educational programs 6006020 Chemical Engineering (level: bachelor's degree), 6006028 Mechanical Engineering (level: bachelor's degree), 6006008 Electrical and Electronic Engineering (level: bachelor's degree): strong parameters - 1, satisfactory - 0, requiring improvement - 0.

6.3. Standard 3. STUDENT-CENTERED TRAINING AND ASSESSMENT

Standard:
The educational organization must ensure that the program is implemented in such a way as to encourage students to take an active role in the joint construction of the educational process, and that student assessment reflects this approach.

Recommendations:
Student-centered learning plays an important role in increasing students' motivation, self-reflection and involvement in the learning process. For the organization of education, the introduction of student-centered learning requires a balanced approach to the development and implementation of the educational program and the assessment of learning outcomes.

Implementing the principle of student-centered learning, the organization of education must ensure:
- respect and attention to different groups of students and their needs, providing flexible learning paths;
- using different teaching methods (where appropriate);
- flexible use of a variety of pedagogical methods;
- regular feedback on the techniques and methods used to evaluate and correct pedagogical methods;
- support for learner autonomy with appropriate guidance and assistance from the teacher;
- strengthening mutual respect between teacher and student;
- the existence of appropriate procedures for responding to student complaints.

Given the importance of student assessment for their future careers, quality assurance mechanisms for assessment should consider the following:
- Assessors must be familiar with the methods of testing and testing students' knowledge and improve their own competence in this area;
- Criteria and methods of assessment should be published in advance;
- Assessment should allow students to demonstrate the level of achievement of the planned learning outcome. The student should receive feedback and, if necessary, advice on the learning process;
- The examination should be conducted by more than one examiner, where possible;
- Evaluation rules should include consideration of extenuating circumstances;
- Evaluation must be consistent, objective in relation to all students and carried out in accordance with established rules;
- There must be a formal appeal process.

Evidence

Baku Engineering University (BEU) demonstrates consistent and sustainable implementation of the principles of student-centered education, as reflected in the structure of the educational process, the assessment system, teaching methodologies, and the active involvement of students in shaping the learning environment.

According to internal regulatory documents, the university applies a system of current and intermediate assessments in accordance with the Regulation “On Assessing the Knowledge of Students Studying under the Credit System.” The assessment system is based on a 100-point scale, subsequently converted into letter grades (A-F), which corresponds to the standards of the European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System (ECTS) and aligns with the principles of the Bologna Process.

The educational process integrates traditional, interactive, and digital teaching methods, enabling students to take an active role in learning. Individual and group activities, project-based learning, simulation of real-life professional situations, laboratory work, participation in hackathons, case competitions, and programming contests are all part of the learning experience. This diverse range of methods allows students to develop not only professional skills but also communication, research, and management competencies.

Student assessment is conducted based on the principles of transparency, objectivity, and feedback. Within the framework of current assessment, attendance (10 points), independent work (10 points), two mid-semester activities (30 points), and the final exam (50 points) are taken into account. Examinations are mainly conducted in written form, using open-ended questions and test assignments. Students who disagree with their results may submit an appeal, which is reviewed by a specially established Appeals Commission, ensuring objectivity, transparency, and protection of students’ rights.

A significant focus is placed on the development of independent learning skills through individual and group project work. In coordination with instructors, students select topics for

independent projects and present their results in the form of reports, presentations, or defenses. This process fosters self-reflection and the ability to critically analyze one's own achievements.

The university actively employs information and communication technologies in the learning process. Each student is provided with a corporate email account, and all courses are supported through the Google Classroom learning management system, where instructional materials, assignments, and assessment results are uploaded. The official electronic information system, AZIMUS, automates all stages of the educational process-from registration to examinations and appeals-allowing students to receive real-time feedback and access up-to-date information about their academic performance.

Special attention is given to inclusivity. The university has adopted a policy to support students with special educational needs, ensuring equal access to educational opportunities and resources. Adapted assignments and individual consultations are provided to meet their specific learning requirements.

BEU also maintains a strong practice-oriented approach to education. Students complete internships in leading Azerbaijani companies, major banks, government ministries, and IT firms, where they apply their theoretical knowledge in real-world settings and gain valuable professional experience.

The university's quality policy prioritizes student satisfaction and active engagement in the educational process. This promotes a student-centered environment in which academic and administrative practices are organized around the individual needs of learners, supporting their competence development and encouraging active participation in the learning process.

In summary, Baku Engineering University systematically builds its educational process around the concept of the student as an active participant rather than a passive recipient of knowledge. Assessment is regarded not merely as a control mechanism, but as a developmental tool that supports continuous learning and personal growth.

Analytical part

The Strategy places particular emphasis on increasing student satisfaction and creating a modern learning environment based on the principles of flexibility, digitalization, and practical orientation. Planned measures such as the establishment of virtual laboratories, the integration of artificial intelligence into the educational process, and the enhancement of student-university communication are aimed at supporting the implementation of individual learning trajectories. The strategic targets of achieving 95 percent student satisfaction and 75 percent graduate employment demonstrate a clear focus on learning outcomes, competency development, and the professional success of students. In this regard, the strategy highlights a student-centered approach, where teaching and assessment are organized in response to students' educational needs and feedback.

The student-centered approach at Baku Engineering University (BEU) has a solid institutional foundation and is integrated into the university's internal quality assurance system. The university adheres to the key principles of the European Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area (ESG), including the individualization of learning pathways, academic freedom, and equal access to education.

The structure of the educational process ensures a clear connection between program objectives, teaching methods, and the assessment system. Faculty members employ diverse teaching methods, including lectures with interactive elements, project- and case-based learning, group discussions, online modules, and laboratory experiments. These approaches promote student engagement in active learning and contribute to the development of critical and analytical thinking skills.

Flexibility in educational trajectories is of particular importance. At the end of each semester, students independently develop their individual study plans for the following term through an electronic system that allows them to select elective courses. This practice accommodates students' interests, pace, and abilities, fully aligning with the principles of student-centered education.

The assessment system combines objectivity, transparency, and opportunities for self-assessment. Each component carries a predetermined weight, and assessment criteria and methods are published in advance in course syllabi. The presence of an appeal procedure and the digital recording

of all assessment results in the Google Classroom and AZIMUS systems enhance students' confidence in the learning and evaluation process.

A notable strength of BEU is the high level of digitalization of its educational process. The use of electronic systems not only simplifies learning management but also enables students to participate actively in quality assurance. Regular internal surveys assessing student and teacher satisfaction influence, to some extent, the revision of programs and the adjustment of teaching workloads.

The orientation of the cluster toward student-centred learning is evident and can be regarded as a key feature of the programmes. Curricula combine fundamental engineering content with selected advanced elements that foster problem-solving and independent learning. Observed teaching sessions were conducted in an appropriate manner (clear structure, time management, and activation of students), while assessment procedures described in the SAR indicate transparent rules and functioning academic-appeal mechanisms. Equally, the SAR, interview confirms that a conflict-resolution system is in place and appears to operate effectively.

With respect to student participation and feedback use, the University collects student opinions on courses and programmes on a regular basis and analyses the results to improve delivery; evidence from meetings suggests that student feedback is taken into account when updating syllabi and teaching methods. To strengthen this area further and to align with good practice in student partnership, the University should formalise students' direct involvement in programme improvement by ensuring their representation (with voting rights) in collegial bodies responsible for the design, monitoring and periodic review of programmes (e.g., Programme/Methodological Committees, Faculty Councils). Moreover, the outcomes of student evaluations should be more visibly translated into actions, preferably through brief "you said – we did" summaries and by documenting, in minutes and review reports, how specific student suggestions informed concrete changes (including assessment rubrics and feedback practices). Observed teaching sessions (by the undersigned).

1. Machine Manufacturing Technology — instructor Eliyev B.; 18 students; lecture with multimedia presentation, Q&A. Delivery was structured; questioning elicited participation and checked understanding.
2. Catalysis and Catalytic Processes — instructor Babayeva T.; 24 students; exercise class at the board with problem solving by students. Active engagement was observed; tasks were aligned with course aims.
3. General Chemistry — instructor Balakisiyeva Q.; 20 students; problem-solving session with continuous questioning and feedback; 3–4 students contributed verbally throughout. The format supported step-by-step reasoning and peer learning.

Compliance with national standards; appropriate conduct of teaching; functioning conflict-resolution and appeals arrangements; regular collection and consideration of student feedback.

Strengths/best practice in 6006020 Chemical Engineering (level: bachelor's degree), 6006028 Mechanical Engineering (level: bachelor's degree), 6006008 Electrical and Electronic Engineering (level: bachelor's degree):

Not visible

Recommendations for 6006020 Chemical Engineering (level: bachelor's degree), 6006028 Mechanical Engineering (level: bachelor's degree), 6006008 Electrical and Electronic Engineering (level: bachelor's degree):

1. Institutionalizing student-centered, reflective teaching and feedback use: The university should further institutionalize student-centered education as an independent strategic direction by approving a normative document that clearly defines its principles, objectives, and implementation mechanisms (teaching methods, assessment practices, feedback systems) to ensure consistency across faculties and departments. At the same time, the university should foster a culture of pedagogical reflection focused on analyzing teaching effectiveness, sharing best practices between departments, and promoting active participation of faculty in professional and methodological communities. It is also recommended to strengthen the collection and analysis of student feedback and to systematically use the results to

improve teaching and learning, while increasing transparency by demonstrating to students the concrete outcomes of their feedback (e.g., program adjustments, methodological improvements, improved learning conditions). This will enhance student trust and engagement in quality management processes.

Implementation period: 2025–2026 academic year for the framework and feedback enhancement; pedagogical reflection – on a permanent basis.

2. Developing individualized support for students:

The university is advised to further strengthen the individualization of the educational process by expanding tutoring, academic advising, and psychological support systems, with particular attention to first-year and international students who require additional assistance and adaptation to the learning environment. Strengthening these support structures will contribute to higher student satisfaction and academic success.

Implementation period: 2025–2026 academic year.

Conclusions of the EEC according to the criteria:

According to the standard “Student-centered training and assessment” for the educational programs 6006020 Chemical Engineering (level: bachelor's degree), 6006028 Mechanical Engineering (level: bachelor's degree), 6006008 Electrical and Electronic Engineering (level: bachelor's degree): strong parameters - 0, satisfactory - 1, requiring improvement - 0.

6.4. Standard 4. ADMISSION, ACCESS, RECOGNITION AND CERTIFICATION OF STUDENTS

Standard:
The educational organization must have predetermined, published and consistently applied rules governing all periods of the student's "life cycle," i.e. admission, performance, recognition and certification.

Recommendations:
Providing the conditions and support students need to develop academic careers for the benefit of individual students, programs, educational institutions and systems. Appropriate admission, recognition and graduation procedures play an important role in this process, especially when there is student mobility within higher education systems.

It is important that access policies, processes and student admission criteria are implemented consistently and transparently. Familiarity with the organization of education and the program must be ensured.

The educational organization must have mechanisms and tools in place to collect, monitor and follow up on information about the academic achievements of students.

Objective recognition of higher education qualifications, periods of study and prior education, including recognition of non-formal education, is an integral component of student achievement in the learning process and promotes mobility. In order to guarantee proper recognition procedures, an educational organization should:
- ensure that the actions of the educational organization are in line with the Lisbon Recognition Convention;
- Collaborate with other educational organizations and national ENIC/NARIC centers to ensure comparable recognition of qualifications in the country.

Graduation represents the culmination of a student's period of study. Educational organizations should provide students with documents confirming the qualifications received, including the learning outcomes achieved, as well as the context, content and status of the education received, and evidence of its completion.

Evidence

Baku Engineering University (BEU) has established, published, and consistently applies unified regulations governing all stages of a student's educational trajectory-from admission and academic performance monitoring to the recognition of learning outcomes and final certification. At the end of each academic year, the university develops admission proposals for the following academic year for each educational program and submits them to the Ministry of Science and Education. Planning is carried out with consideration of workforce needs, labor market forecasts, and trends in industrial development.

Admission to engineering programs at BEU is conducted on two bases. The first is through the state order system, under which selection is carried out by the government in accordance with the needs of public institutions for qualified specialists, and training is financed from the state budget. This category includes applicants with the highest competitive scores. The second is through tuition-based admission, where students finance their own studies.

Admission to BEU follows the general admission procedures established by the State Examination Centre. The university does not impose any additional requirements beyond those stipulated by current regulations. Applicants may list up to fifteen educational programs in their application forms, after which a centralized competitive selection process is conducted. Engineering programs fall within the first group of specialties, and applicants are required to take entrance examinations in Azerbaijani and English languages, mathematics, physics, and chemistry. The distribution of admitted applicants among universities is managed by the Ministry of Science and Education of the Republic of Azerbaijan. Admission of foreign students is conducted in accordance with applicable legislation through the national portal, under the supervision of the Ministry.

All regulatory legal acts governing educational activities, as well as internal university documents, are available for review through students' personal accounts and are explained by BEU's academic and administrative departments.

Recognition of previously completed disciplines and credits for admitted, transferred, or reinstated students is carried out in compliance with current legislation. The process begins at the

dean's office and concludes with approval by the Vice-Rector for Academic Affairs, based on recommendations from the relevant academic departments. These departments conduct a comparative analysis of curricula, course content, workload, and credit volume. When equivalence is established, previously earned credits are officially recognized and recorded in the university's electronic information system. Throughout the entire period of study, correlations between students' entrance scores and academic performance are monitored, and any discrepancies identified are analyzed by the appropriate university units.

BEU provides students with the opportunity to choose elective courses, supporting academic flexibility and individual learning paths. For adaptation and academic support, the university maintains specialized divisions, including the Vice-Rectorate for Social Affairs and Public Relations, the Department of Strategy and Quality Assurance, international relations offices, and the Career Center. Academic advisors and student organizations also play an active role in supporting the learning process. Twice a year, student surveys are conducted to evaluate satisfaction with academic and campus life. The results are analyzed to inform improvements to the educational environment and are submitted to the university administration for consideration. The Career Center regularly informs students about opportunities for professional development and employment.

The university recognizes academic credits earned by students at partner institutions in strict accordance with national legislation and the principles of the Lisbon Recognition Convention. The process involves pre-approval of study plans, official referrals for study, and recognition of successfully completed courses upon students' return.

To facilitate appeals and suggestions, BEU provides multiple communication channels, including regular meetings with the university administration, anonymous surveys, online feedback services, and appeals commissions operating during examination sessions. The electronic information system (EIS) also includes a feature that allows students to evaluate instructors. The results are reviewed and taken into account when determining faculty teaching loads.

Students are assigned academic advisors (tutors) through the dean's offices. These advisors possess appropriate qualifications and provide ongoing guidance on academic planning and problem-solving throughout the course of study. Communication between advisors and students is maintained through official electronic channels.

BEU ensures access to education for students from socially disadvantaged backgrounds in accordance with applicable regulations. The university offers financial assistance through benefits, installment plans, and preferential loan programs, including an educational loan scheme with an annual interest rate of 2 percent. Upon completion of the educational program and fulfillment of graduation requirements, students are awarded a state-recognized diploma and an academic transcript.

Analytical part

Baku Engineering University (BEU) has established a normatively transparent and procedurally stable system for managing the student life cycle, encompassing all stages from admission to graduation and final certification. The procedures fully comply with national regulations and reflect a high level of institutional maturity, characterized by the existence of uniform rules, their public accessibility, and the reproducibility of administrative practices.

The admission process is fully integrated into the national examination system, which ensures impartiality and strengthens confidence in the fairness of student selection. The availability of two financial regimes-state-funded and tuition-based-enables the university to simultaneously meet national workforce needs and maintain financial sustainability.

BEU has developed a clearly defined and normatively verified procedure for academic recognition that includes multi-level expert review involving the dean's offices, academic departments, the Vice-Rector for Academic Affairs, and subsequent registration in the electronic information system (EIS). The university systematically monitors the alignment between students' entry qualifications and their academic performance, demonstrating a commitment to evidence-based quality management.

An extensive infrastructure of academic support has been established, including academic advisors, specialized departments, regular surveys, and the Career Center. This structure transforms

the educational model from a traditional, transmission-based approach to one that emphasizes continuous academic and personal support. The university has also developed an effective feedback mechanism that influences managerial decisions, including the distribution of teaching loads, indicating the institution's responsiveness and adaptability.

BEU provides social inclusion through financial benefits and educational loan programs and adheres to international recognition standards, including the Lisbon Convention and external academic mobility programs with subsequent credit recognition.

Taken together, these practices correspond to the expectations of a mature, accredited higher education institution. They demonstrate regulatory consistency, operational reproducibility, procedural continuity, and a functional link between feedback mechanisms and managerial decision-making.

At the same time, the External Evaluation Commission (EEC) notes that while the university's procedures for admission, academic support, and credit recognition are systematically organized and compliant with regulatory requirements, the current model does not yet fully utilize the available data for evidence-based management. Regular public analytical reports comparing students' entry levels with their subsequent academic performance are not published, which limits opportunities for early identification of learning challenges and the prediction of academic risks.

Although student feedback is collected on a regular basis, the absence of publicly available information about resulting management decisions reduces students' trust in the feedback system and diminishes its impact. Academic mobility is available as an option but has not been institutionalized as a measurable performance indicator, which limits incentives for faculties to expand the international dimension of education. Engagement with employers occurs sporadically and has not yet been systematically integrated into the process of shaping educational programs through formalized industry partnerships.

Support for students at academic risk is primarily reactive, focusing on intervention after academic difficulties arise rather than implementing preventive measures. In addition, decisions related to quality management are not yet published as public annual reports, which affects management transparency and limits external accountability.

These gaps - between the existence of mechanisms and their practical application in evidence-based decision-making-have formed the basis for the development of targeted and measurable recommendations aimed at enhancing the efficiency and transparency of BEU's student life cycle management system.

Strengths/best practice in 6006020 Chemical Engineering (level: bachelor's degree), 6006028 Mechanical Engineering (level: bachelor's degree), 6006008 Electrical and Electronic Engineering (level: bachelor's degree):

Not visible

Recommendations for 6006020 Chemical Engineering (level: bachelor's degree), 6006028 Mechanical Engineering (level: bachelor's degree), 6006008 Electrical and Electronic Engineering (level: bachelor's degree):

1. Data-driven quality monitoring and transparency: The Academic Department, the Department of Strategy and Quality Assurance, and the Rector's Office should jointly establish an integrated system of analytical and public reporting on education quality. This includes: (a) an annual analytical report, "Admission Scores and Average Academic Performance for the Year," for each educational program, submitted to the Vice-Rector for Academic Affairs to monitor the relationship between entrance scores and final learning outcomes; (b) concise reports for students summarizing changes implemented based on student survey results, published within 30 days after each survey cycle; and (c) an open Annual Report on the Quality of Education presenting key data and management decisions for the academic year, published no later than 30 days after its conclusion, to strengthen accountability and transparency.

Implementation period: Annually, with reports issued within the specified 30-day timeframes.

2. Internationalization and employer engagement: Faculty deans and the Career Center should enhance the international and practical orientation of educational programs by ensuring that at least five percent of students from each program participate in exchange programs every academic year and by maintaining open statistics on this indicator. They should also organize at least two formal meetings with employers per program per year and document employer recommendations for improving training content. These measures will promote academic mobility, strengthen the international dimension of education, and align curricula with current labor market needs.

Implementation period: Annually.

3. Targeted support for students with low academic performance:

Academic advisors should annually identify students with low academic performance (GPA below 71) and hold at least one individual consultation with each of them to provide timely intervention and personalized support. The aim is to prevent persistent underperformance and reduce the risk of withdrawal or expulsion through early guidance and continuous monitoring.

Implementation period: Annually.

Conclusions of the EEC according to the criteria:

According to the standard “Admission, access, recognition and certification of students” for the educational programs 6006020 Chemical Engineering (level: bachelor's degree), 6006028 Mechanical Engineering (level: bachelor's degree), 6006008 Electrical and Electronic Engineering (level: bachelor's degree): strong parameters - 0, satisfactory - 1, requiring improvement - 0.

6.5. Standard 5. TEACHING STAFF

Standard:
The educational organization must have objective and transparent processes for the recruitment, professional development and development of all staff, which allow them to ensure the competence of their teachers.

Recommendations:
The role of the teacher is central to quality learning and the acquisition of knowledge, competencies and skills. Diversification of the student population and a strong focus on learning outcomes require a student-centered approach and, consequently, a change in the role of the teacher (see standard 1.3).

Educational organizations bear the main responsibility for the quality of their employees and the provision of favorable conditions for their effective work. Therefore, educational institutions should:
- Recognizing the importance of teaching, develop clear, transparent and objective criteria for staff recruitment, appointment, promotion, dismissal and follow them in their activities;
- Provide opportunities for career growth and professional development of teachers;
- Encourage scientific activity to strengthen the link between education and research;
- Encourage innovative teaching methods and the use of advanced technologies.

Evidence

Baku Engineering University (BEU) demonstrates a highly organized and transparent human resources management system founded on the principles of academic integrity, equal opportunity, and professional growth. The university's policy regarding its teaching staff is focused on maintaining a high level of faculty competence and building a strong academic community that meets international standards in engineering and information technology education.

The procedures governing the recruitment and appointment of teaching staff are regulated by internal documents and comply with the requirements of the Ministry of Science and Education of the Republic of Azerbaijan. Vacant academic positions are publicly announced on the university's official website and in national publications, with detailed information on job requirements and qualification criteria. Following the review of applications, candidates are discussed at departmental meetings, where an open vote is held. The selected candidates are then presented to the faculty's Academic Council, which makes its decision through a secret ballot. Upon approval, the Rector issues an official order of appointment. This multi-stage process ensures transparency, collegiality, and fairness in academic hiring.

The allocation of teaching workloads is carried out in accordance with state standards. For full-time academic staff, the annual teaching load ranges between 550 and 600 hours, of which at least 60 percent consists of classroom instruction. The remaining time is devoted to research, methodological development, and academic consulting activities.

Significant attention is given to the professional development of the teaching staff. BEU regularly organizes training programs and seminars focused on modern pedagogical technologies, digital tools, instructional design, and blended learning methodologies. The university also actively supports faculty participation in international conferences, scientific projects, and grant initiatives, thereby fostering continuous professional and academic growth.

To encourage high performance and innovation, BEU has implemented a differentiated remuneration system based on the results of scientific, pedagogical, and social activities. When determining incentives, factors such as publications in high-impact peer-reviewed journals, participation in international projects, authorship of textbooks and teaching materials, introduction of innovative teaching practices, and engagement in student-oriented initiatives are taken into account.

The university's quality policy emphasizes the development of human capital and the reinforcement of professional and ethical values. This approach directly contributes to the motivation and professional growth of academic staff, their active participation in scientific research, and collaboration with industry. As a result, it strengthens the overall competence of the faculty and enhances the quality of teaching.

Overall, BEU's human resources policy is guided by the principles of fairness, transparency, and commitment to quality. Faculty members not only perform teaching functions but are also actively

engaged in research, innovation, and international collaboration. This integrated approach to academic and professional development is one of the university's key strengths and a defining feature of its institutional excellence.

Analytical part

In the Strategy 2025-2030, one of the key priorities is the strengthening of human resources through the implementation of professional development programs (a total of 50 planned), the stimulation of research activity, and the expansion of international cooperation. The strategy also emphasizes the development of professional ethics, academic freedom, and an innovative teaching culture. Supporting academic growth and engaging faculty in international projects serve to enhance qualifications and, consequently, improve the overall quality of the educational process.

The human resources management system at Baku Engineering University (BEU) demonstrates a high level of maturity, coherence, and resilience. The university has developed a well-structured and integrated model of human resource management, in which the recruitment, professional development, and evaluation of academic staff are unified within a comprehensive quality strategy. Within this framework, a teacher is regarded not merely as a transmitter of knowledge but as a central element of the academic ecosystem-one that ensures both the quality of education and the advancement of scientific research at the university.

The staffing profile of the cluster demonstrates commitment to teaching and supervision, with regular qualification enhancement and acceptable levels of staff mobility. A structural challenge is succession: parts of the academic body are ageing, so clearer pathways for early-career lecturers and researchers (promotion tracks, onboarding to research groups, supervision shadowing, and conference funding) are recommended.

As supporting evidence on research performance in the three undergraduate programmes (Chemical, Mechanical, Electrical & Electronic), the Azerbaijan National H-index (Scopus) listing for Baku Engineering University shows several staff with h-index > 5 within Cluster 2: Namiq Q. Shikhaliyev (Chemical Engineering, h=15), Ravan A. Rahimov (Chemical Engineering, h=13), Mahir M. Bashirov (Chemical Engineering, Material Science h=8), Islam Islamov (Electrical & Electronic/Automation, h=10). To strengthen evidence and transparency, the Faculty should publish an official roster of academic staff per programme with links to their Scopus Author IDs and periodically verified indicators (h-index, citations, last update).

Strengths/best practice in 6006020 Chemical Engineering (level: bachelor's degree), 6006028 Mechanical Engineering (level: bachelor's degree), 6006008 Electrical and Electronic Engineering (level: bachelor's degree):

Not visible

Recommendations for 6006020 Chemical Engineering (level: bachelor's degree), 6006028 Mechanical Engineering (level: bachelor's degree), 6006008 Electrical and Electronic Engineering (level: bachelor's degree):

1. Integrated professional development and mentoring system: The university is advised to develop and institutionalize a comprehensive professional development program for academic staff that combines internal and external capacity-building with a structured pedagogical mentoring system. The program should include internships at foreign partner universities, advanced pedagogical training courses, instruction in blended learning methodologies and modern digital tools, and institutional support for designing and delivering online courses. Within this framework, experienced faculty members with high professional ratings and significant research achievements should serve as mentors for early-career colleagues, supporting their development in academic culture, modern teaching practices, and research methodologies. This integrated approach will enhance teaching quality, ensure intergenerational knowledge transfer, and align faculty competencies with international standards.

Implementation period: 2025–2026 academic year.

2. Strengthening international academic mobility and collaboration: The university is encouraged to further expand and systematize international academic mobility opportunities for faculty by developing long-term academic exchange programs and joint research projects with foreign partner universities. These activities will enhance the university's international visibility, enrich educational content, and promote sustained cross-cultural academic collaboration.

Implementation period: On a permanent basis.

Conclusions of the EEC according to the criteria:

According to the standard "Teaching staff" for the educational programs 6006020 Chemical Engineering (level: bachelor's degree), 6006028 Mechanical Engineering (level: bachelor's degree), 6006008 Electrical and Electronic Engineering (level: bachelor's degree): strong parameters - 0, satisfactory - 1, requiring improvement - 0.

6.6. Standard 6. EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES AND STUDENT SUPPORT SYSTEM

Standard:
The educational organization must ensure that there are sufficient, accessible and appropriate learning resources and student support services.

Recommendations:
During the training, students need educational resources, which can be both material (libraries or computers) and human (mentors, curators and other consultants). The role of support services is especially important in stimulating student mobility both within the educational system and between different higher education systems. When allocating, planning and providing educational resources, support services should take into account the needs of different groups of students (adults, working, part-time students, international students, as well as students with disabilities) and take into account trends in student-centered training. Support services and their activities should be organized taking into account the situation of a particular educational institution. However, the internal quality system ensures that all resources are available and fit for learning purposes, as well as informing students about available services. When providing support services, the key role belongs to the administration and specialized services, so the educational organization must ensure the professionalism of employees and opportunities for the development of their competencies.

Evidence

Baku Engineering University (BEU) possesses a well-developed material, technical, and organizational infrastructure that fully supports the educational process and reflects the institution's focus on engineering and technological education, as well as the preparation of highly qualified specialists for modern sectors of the economy.

The university operates five academic buildings equipped with classrooms, laboratories, computer rooms, a library, a medical center, canteens, and recreation areas. Most classrooms are fitted with projectors, interactive whiteboards, and high-speed Internet access. Specialized laboratories and computer facilities are actively used in technical disciplines, enabling the conduct of practical training sessions and applied research activities.

The university's educational resources are regularly updated through funding from the state budget and revenues generated by tuition fees. Additionally, a portion of the technical infrastructure is developed through partnerships with private sector organizations such as BP, SINAM, Azerconnect, and other companies that contribute to laboratory equipment and organize student internships.

The university library contains educational and scientific literature in both Azerbaijani and English, along with a growing collection of electronic resources. The collection in areas such as modern digital technologies, programming, and information systems requires continuous updating and expansion to meet current academic and research needs. The electronic library, integrated within the AZIMUS information system, provides students and faculty with online access to teaching materials, manuals, and electronic versions of textbooks.

The system of extracurricular support for students includes academic advising, tutoring, psychological counseling, and a vibrant network of student organizations. The university currently hosts forty-nine active student clubs, uniting more than three thousand participants and promoting social engagement, leadership development, sports, and cultural activities. Although BEU does not have its own sports complex, physical education and sports classes are conducted at the Absheron Olympic Center under a cooperation agreement.

The learning environment provides the essential infrastructure for programme delivery (teaching rooms, baseline laboratories, library and IT services) and these are underpinned by system used for communication, assessment and student advising, on this basis, core support is in place and functions. At the same time, the quality of student working conditions requires improvement: several laboratories operate at a basic level in terms of equipment, automation/DAQ and specialist software, which constrains the depth of experimentation and alignment with current industrial practice, and key teaching/lab areas lack air conditioning, affecting thermal comfort, concentration and, at times, equipment reliability during warmer periods. The University hosts a Technopark, but its operating model is oriented primarily toward staff and research teams rather than students; consequently, access for capstone groups and student start-ups is limited and learning opportunities in innovation and

commercialisation (IP awareness, prototype-to-market pathways, mentoring by industry) are not yet fully embedded in the student experience.

Evidence — laboratories visited (site walk-through).

Electrical & Electronic Engineering Department

1. Lab № 109 – Electrical Engineering
2. Lab № 108 – Computer Class
3. Lab № 210 – Electronic Engineering
4. Lab № 212 – Microprocessor Engineering
5. Lab № 214 – Measuring Engineering
6. Lab № 001 – Telecommunications Center
7. Lab № 003 – Power Engineering and Automation Engineering
8. Room № 7101; 9) Room № 7103; 10) Room № 7106; 11) Room № 7115

Mechanical Engineering Department

1. Lab № 3104 – Automatic Control / Mechanisms & Machine Dynamics
2. Lab № 3106 – Internal Combustion Engines & Automobile / Mechanical Vibration & Sound Control
3. Lab № 3108 – Processing Methods
4. Lab № 3113 – Materials & Metallography / Materials Strength
5. Lab № 3115 – Aerodynamics & Fluid Mechanics
6. Lab № 3117 – Thermal Sciences & Thermal Conductivity
7. Lab № 107 – Design & Adequate Modelling
8. Lab № 212 – Computer Room

Chemical Engineering Department

1. Lab № 1304 – Analytical Chemistry
2. Lab № 1339 – General Chemistry
3. Lab № 1104 – Chemical Engineering
4. Lab № 1105 – Organic Chemistry (Technopark 3100)

The university also provides psychological services for both students and staff, offering individual consultations and organizing workshops on emotional well-being, stress management, and motivation.

In alignment with its quality policy, BEU continues to expand opportunities for distance education and lifelong learning. These initiatives contribute to the modernization of the university's infrastructure and the diversification of student support systems, thereby creating an inclusive, flexible, and technology-oriented learning environment that provides access to high-quality educational materials and services.

Overall, BEU possesses sufficient infrastructure and digital tools to ensure the effective organization of the educational process. However, certain resources-particularly laboratory equipment and library collections-require further enhancement and regular updating to sustain alignment with modern academic and technological standards.

Analytical part

The Strategy 2025-2030 places significant emphasis on infrastructure development and digital transformation, both of which directly influence the quality of educational resources and the level of student support. The strategy envisions the renovation of 30 percent of classrooms and laboratories, the creation of ten virtual laboratories and three centers for continuing education, as well as the improvement of social infrastructure, including dormitories, an inclusive environment, and digital student services. These initiatives are aimed at creating a comfortable, technologically advanced, and accessible learning environment that fosters student engagement, independent learning, and personal development. The integration of electronic management systems, career services, and inclusion initiatives forms a comprehensive system of student support that aligns with modern international standards.

The material, technical, and resource base of Baku Engineering University (BEU) generally meets contemporary requirements for an engineering and technological institution; however, its development remains uneven across structural units. The university demonstrates particular strengths in the areas of digitalization and academic infrastructure, yet faces certain challenges related to the aging of physical equipment and the limited integration of student support services within the broader quality management system.

BEU's high level of digital integration is one of its defining advantages. The use of the AZIMUS and Google Classroom electronic platforms ensures transparency in academic and administrative management, provides ready access to information, and enhances the flexibility of the learning process. These systems enable students to independently monitor their academic progress, communicate effectively with faculty, and build personalized learning trajectories.

The university also maintains a well-developed system of practice-oriented education. Its cooperation with leading companies in Azerbaijan provides real opportunities for linking theoretical instruction with professional practice. Through internships, joint projects, and cooperative education initiatives, students gain practical experience that enhances their employability and competitiveness in the labor market.

Nevertheless, analysis indicates that the material infrastructure across faculties is being updated inconsistently. While laboratory facilities are adequate for fundamental instruction, they are not always equipped to support research activities at the level expected of contemporary engineering standards. This limits opportunities for advanced experimentation and applied innovation.

Library resources likewise remain an area requiring further development. Although the electronic library is functional, the current collection of modern digital and English-language sources is insufficient. This constrains both students and academic staff in conducting research and accessing up-to-date international publications.

During the visit, several labs presented baseline capability (equipment, DAQ, software). For learning conditions, lack of air conditioning was noted in key areas; addressing HVAC and staged lab modernisation will materially improve student working conditions and practice readiness.

Overall, Baku Engineering University possesses a robust organizational framework and a highly developed digital infrastructure. However, in order to move from a "satisfactory" level of compliance toward a sustainable "strong" standard, it is necessary to strategically enhance the material and technical base, modernize laboratory facilities, expand library resources, and institutionalize the system of student support. These improvements will contribute to greater learning comfort, increased academic quality, and stronger alignment with international standards of higher education.

Strengths/best practice in 6006020 Chemical Engineering (level: bachelor's degree), 6006028 Mechanical Engineering (level: bachelor's degree), 6006008 Electrical and Electronic Engineering (level: bachelor's degree):

Not visible

Recommendations for 6006020 Chemical Engineering (level: bachelor's degree), 6006028 Mechanical Engineering (level: bachelor's degree), 6006008 Electrical and Electronic Engineering (level: bachelor's degree):

1. Modernizing academic infrastructure and resources: The university is advised to develop a 1. Modernizing academic infrastructure and resources: The university is advised to develop a comprehensive strategy for the systematic renewal and modernization of its educational infrastructure, including a scheduled plan for replacing outdated laboratory equipment, establishing new specialized laboratories in emerging fields such as artificial intelligence, the Internet of Things, and robotics, and further digitalizing teaching and learning spaces. In parallel, the university should continuously expand its library and electronic resources by activating institutional subscriptions to leading international databases (such as Springer, IEEE, and ScienceDirect) and providing students and faculty with up-to-date English-language literature in computer science, information security, and engineering, thereby

supporting academic and research excellence and ensuring alignment with current technological and academic standards.

Implementation period: 2025–2026 academic year.

Conclusions of the EEC according to the criteria:

According to the standard “Educational resources and student support system” for the educational programs 6006020 Chemical Engineering (level: bachelor's degree), 6006028 Mechanical Engineering (level: bachelor's degree), 6006008 Electrical and Electronic Engineering (level: bachelor's degree): strong parameters - 0, satisfactory - 1, requiring improvement - 0.

6.7. Standard 7. INFORMATION MANAGEMENT

Standard:
The educational organization must ensure that it collects, analyzes and uses relevant information to effectively manage its activities and its educational programs.

Recommendations:
Providing reliable information is a necessary condition for making a decision. Educational organizations should use this information to know what is working well and what needs to be improved. It is necessary to be sure that the educational organization has mechanisms for collecting and analyzing information about its activities, its educational programs and uses the information received in the work of the internal quality assurance system.

Exactly what information is collected depends to some extent on the type and mission of the TOE. When collecting information, the TOE should consider the following:
- key performance indicators;
- information about the contingent of students;
- level of academic achievement, student achievement and dropout;
- satisfaction of students with the implementation of programs;
- availability of educational resources and student support services;
- employment of graduates.

Various methods of collecting information can be used. It is important that students and staff are involved in collecting and analyzing information and planning follow-up procedures.

Evidence

At Baku Engineering University (BEU), the management of information related to educational activities-from student admission planning to graduate employment data-constitutes a central component of institutional governance and quality assurance. The systematic collection, analysis, dissemination, and application of data serve as fundamental tools for ensuring the efficiency and effectiveness of both academic and administrative operations.

Each academic year begins with the collection of key educational information, which is subsequently reviewed at multiple organizational levels-university, faculty, and department. These discussions inform evidence-based decisions aimed at enhancing academic performance, coordinating administrative efforts, and improving student outcomes. Within the quality assurance framework, particular attention is given to monitoring the performance of academic departments, the academic achievement of students, and graduate employment indicators. These activities are grounded in continuous monitoring and the use of analytical data for informed decision-making. Key performance indicators (KPIs) reflecting academic and administrative effectiveness are tracked within a continuous improvement model, which enables the early identification of risks and the implementation of timely preventive or corrective actions.

The internal reporting structure at BEU follows a clear and hierarchical chain of accountability. Faculty members report to department heads; departments report to the Academic Councils of faculties; faculties report to the Academic Council of the university; and Vice-Rectors present their reports to the Rectorate. This structured reporting vertical ensures effective communication, transparency, and a feedback loop across all levels of governance. Information flows from teaching staff to university management are institutionalized, allowing for systematic planning, implementation, and evaluation of educational programs.

To support these processes, the university employs a comprehensive electronic management system that guarantees the secure processing, storage, and confidentiality of academic data. This system also provides access to analytical dashboards used for institutional planning and decision-making. BEU's digital infrastructure thus supports both academic governance and institutional research, ensuring transparency, accuracy, and operational efficiency.

As part of its continuous improvement strategy, the Department of Strategy and Quality Assurance regularly conducts surveys among students, staff, and alumni to evaluate the quality of education, the adequacy of infrastructure, the effectiveness of institutional management, and the quality of student support services. These surveys constitute a key mechanism for collecting stakeholder

feedback and developing data-driven improvement measures. The results are systematically stored and analyzed within the university's electronic information system, particularly in the Survey module, which provides real-time access to historical and current data, trend analyses, and benchmarking capabilities. Over time, the scope, frequency, and participation in surveys have steadily increased, reinforcing an institutional culture grounded in evidence-based management and student-centered improvement.

Since the 2017-2018 academic year, BEU has conducted a recurring "Assessment of the Educational Process" survey across all disciplines at the end of each semester. The objective of this survey is to ensure continuous improvement in teaching quality and student satisfaction through direct feedback. Participation levels have varied by year, reflecting changes in student enrollment and engagement: 1,863 respondents (2017-2018), 3,504 (2018-2019), 2,278 (2019-2020), 2,647 (2021-2022), 5,961 (2022-2023), and 2,280 (2023-2024). Data for 2020-2021 were not collected, likely due to the COVID-19 pandemic. Satisfaction levels have demonstrated a consistent upward trend-from 86.16% in 2017-2018 to 90.42% in 2023-2024-reflecting students' growing confidence in the quality of instruction and the responsiveness of the university to their feedback.

Beginning in the 2022-2023 academic year, the university introduced a separate Student Satisfaction Survey, aimed at assessing overall satisfaction with academic and support services. Participation reached 3,577 students (72.45%) in 2022-2023, 2,290 (70.23%) in 2023-2024, and 321 (69%) in 2024-2025. Although the satisfaction rate has slightly decreased, further analysis is planned to identify the underlying causes and implement corrective measures. In the same year, BEU also launched an Internship Experience Survey to assess the alignment between academic preparation and professional practice. In both 2022-2023 and 2023-2024, internship satisfaction remained stable at 84%.

Graduate tracking surveys are also conducted regularly to maintain communication with alumni, monitor career trajectories, and gather feedback on the relevance of their university training. In 2022-2023, BEU implemented several alumni surveys: Graduate Satisfaction (81 participants), Data Update (351 participants), and No Graduate Without a Job! (142 participants). In 2023-2024, contact was established with approximately 1,900 graduates, including over 600 phone interviews, 260 responses via the Electronic Data Update Survey, and 149 responses through the Unemployed Graduate Survey. All data are integrated into the electronic graduate database, ensuring the accuracy, relevance, and continuity of alumni engagement.

The systematic collection and analysis of student and alumni feedback are coordinated by the Department of Strategy and Quality. All surveys are administered electronically, ensuring anonymity and accessibility through both internal and external digital platforms. The results are archived and made available for analytical review and management decision-making.

In the 2023-2024 academic year, the Educational Process Survey demonstrated an average satisfaction level of 90%, while the Student Satisfaction Survey showed 70%, the Staff Satisfaction Survey 71%, and the Internship Satisfaction Survey 84%. In the 2024-2025 academic year, 2,536 students participated in the updated surveys. The outcomes of these studies are actively applied to improve curricula, enhance staff development, upgrade student services, and adjust internship programs. As a result, feedback mechanisms at BEU function as effective tools for evidence-based decision-making and the continuous enhancement of educational quality.

Analytical part

At Baku Engineering University (BEU), information management is fully integrated into the quality assurance cycle and encompasses the entire continuum of educational activities-from student admission to the monitoring of graduate employment outcomes. Data is systematically collected, analyzed, and utilized at the university, faculty, and departmental levels, ensuring that decisions related to academic organization, student performance improvement, and administrative optimization are grounded in evidence.

A stable reporting hierarchy has been established, supported by a comprehensive digital infrastructure that guarantees data security, transparency of processes, and access to analytical

dashboards for institutional planning. The university's data culture is further strengthened through regular surveys of students and alumni, the results of which are stored within the electronic information system. This enables longitudinal analysis of key trends and serves as a foundation for continuous refinement of curricula, teaching methodologies, and student support services.

Long-term dynamics indicate a consistent increase in satisfaction with the educational process, sustained stability in internship evaluation scores, and an expansion of engagement with alumni-reflecting the growing influence of stakeholder feedback on institutional improvement. Collectively, these elements demonstrate that information management at BEU functions not merely as a data-recording mechanism, but as an active tool for shaping and advancing the educational process. This approach ensures the evidence-based nature of management decisions and contributes to the continuous enhancement of educational quality.

At the same time, analysis reveals an important area for further development. Despite the maturity of BEU's data collection and monitoring mechanisms, there remains an absence of a formalized and obligatory procedure for translating analytical results into management decisions related to program content and pedagogical practices. In the current model, data is primarily collected, analyzed, and reported, yet not consistently utilized to initiate systematic or mandatory revisions of educational programs. This gap limits the full potential of the university's established information management system as a driver of continuous academic and organizational improvement.

Minutes and annual reviews seldom show a clear trail from issue identification to remedial action, responsible owner and deadline, and subsequent cycles rarely verify whether the intervention improved outcomes. Public communication is also partial: high-level figures may be available, but detailed "you said—we did" updates are not consistently published, which reduces transparency and the motivational effect of participation. Overall, the information system functions and analysis is performed, yet the use of evidence to drive change is underdeveloped. To align with good practice the University should formalise a data-to-decision workflow at programme and faculty levels, require that each survey or KPI review results in an action log with owners and timelines, revisit the outcomes in the next cycle, and publish concise summaries of actions taken so that students can see how their input shaped improvements.

Strengths/best practice in 6006020 Chemical Engineering (level: bachelor's degree), 6006028 Mechanical Engineering (level: bachelor's degree), 6006008 Electrical and Electronic Engineering (level: bachelor's degree):

Not visible

Recommendations for 6006020 Chemical Engineering (level: bachelor's degree), 6006028 Mechanical Engineering (level: bachelor's degree), 6006008 Electrical and Electronic Engineering (level: bachelor's degree):

1. It is recommended that the educational program committees (dean's offices in collaboration with 1. Institutionalizing data-driven management of educational programs: The university should establish a mandatory data-based improvement cycle for all educational programs. Educational program committees (dean's offices together with departments) must conduct at least one formal annual review of each program using survey results, academic performance indicators, and graduate employment data, resulting in at least two specific, documented adjustments (e.g., course content changes, redistribution of practical hours, or revisions to assessment methods). Academic departments should formally record in meeting minutes at least two decisions per semester based on student performance data or feedback, while the Department of Strategy and Quality conducts an independent audit of at least 20 percent of programs each year to verify that data have led to measurable changes, with findings presented to the Academic Council. The Vice-Rector for Academic Affairs should also set an annual performance target requiring that at least 60 percent of educational programs demonstrate at least one documented modification based on data analysis, ensuring a shift toward an active, data-driven system of program enhancement.

Implementation period: Annually; departmental decisions – at the end of each semester.

2. Ensuring transparency of data-based changes in educational programs: The Rector’s Office should approve and publicly release an annual report titled “Changes in Educational Programs Based on Monitoring Data,” providing 1–2 pages for each faculty and summarizing key program adjustments resulting from data analysis. This measure will strengthen transparency, accountability, and the evidence base of institutional decision-making, and will complement the internal data-driven improvement mechanisms described above.

Implementation period: Annually.

Conclusions of the EEC according to the criteria:

According to the standard “Information management” for the educational programs 6006020 Chemical Engineering (level: bachelor's degree), 6006028 Mechanical Engineering (level: bachelor's degree), 6006008 Electrical and Electronic Engineering (level: bachelor's degree): strong parameters - 0, satisfactory - 1, requiring improvement -0.

6.8. Standard 8. PUBLIC INFORMATION

Standard:
The educational organization must inform the public about its activities (including programs). Information must be clear, reliable, objective, relevant and accessible.

Recommendations:
Information about the activities of the educational organization is useful both for applicants and students, as well as for graduates, other stakeholders and the general public.

Therefore, an educational organization should provide information about its activities, including the programs being implemented, the expected learning outcomes for these programs, the qualifications awarded, teaching, learning, assessment procedures, passing scores and learning opportunities provided to students, as well as information about employment opportunities for graduates.

Evidence

Baku Engineering University (BEU), as a state higher education institution, ensures the provision of complete, accurate, and up-to-date information to the public in accordance with its statutory obligations. Transparency in management and openness to stakeholders form integral components of the university's governance culture and quality assurance system.

Comprehensive information on the university's management structure, organizational units, academic and administrative personnel, student body, material and technical infrastructure, socio-cultural facilities, educational programs, and their stages of implementation is made publicly available. Details regarding admission procedures, minimum passing scores, tuition fees, educational process organization, assessment regulations, graduate employment opportunities, scientific research activities, and significant institutional events at the international, national, and university levels are regularly disseminated through multiple communication channels.

This information is published on the official website of the university, in national and international media outlets, on official social media pages, in scientific journals, and during public events such as career fairs, academic Olympiads, educational exhibitions, and meetings with applicants and parents. Such a multidimensional communication system ensures wide public access to complete and verified institutional information both domestically and abroad.

The official website of BEU functions in Azerbaijani and English. Its software infrastructure complies with state regulations on information security and electronic governance. The site is designed in line with modern web standards, providing a high level of technical capability and user functionality. The posted information is comprehensive, clearly structured, and regularly updated, thereby enhancing institutional transparency and public awareness. Dedicated sections such as "Rector's Contact Information," "Information System for Staff," and "Information System for Students" facilitate open communication and access to administrative and academic data.

In addition to the website, BEU maintains an active presence on social media platforms to expand communication and strengthen stakeholder engagement. Over the past year, audience growth has been observed across all platforms: Facebook traffic increased by 43.9%, the number of likes by 67%, subscribers on platform X (formerly Twitter) grew by 19.5%, Instagram followers by 52%, and YouTube viewers by 11.3%. A new Telegram channel has also been launched.

The university operates its own media outlet-BMU TV-which produces news broadcasts, promotional videos about academic programs, and interviews with successful students and faculty members. Cooperation with mass media has been significantly expanded: formal agreements have been concluded with five major publications, broadening the university's communication reach and strengthening its public visibility.

BEU also conducts systematic outreach to secondary schools, lyceums, and gymnasiums, organizing annual informational visits for pupils and parents to familiarize them with the university's programs and infrastructure. To coordinate and professionalize external communication, a Public Relations Department has been established on the basis of the former press service. The department operates under a rectorate-approved plan and manages all official communication channels.

The university's social media platforms are designed as open communication spaces where stakeholders can submit inquiries, provide feedback, express opinions, and offer suggestions directly to the administration. In addition, regular thematic discussions are held with partner media organizations to enhance information dissemination and public engagement.

Each year, the responsible vice-rectorate, in collaboration with the Public Relations Department, conducts a comprehensive analysis of the university's information and communication activities. The results are presented to the Academic Council for consideration. Based on feedback received from structural divisions, the media, public organizations, applicants, students, and parents, adjustments are made to communication strategies and content. This cyclical process ensures that BEU's public information policy remains transparent, responsive, and aligned with both institutional goals and societal expectations.

Analytical part

The public information system of Baku Engineering University (BEU) demonstrates a high level of institutional openness. Comprehensive information on the university's governance structure, educational programs, admission procedures, assessment systems, research activities, and major academic and public events is readily available through the official website, mass media, social networks, scientific publications, and outreach events for applicants and alumni.

The university's web resources are maintained in two languages and are systematically updated, ensuring accessibility for both national and international audiences. The active use of media platforms and the operation of *BMU TV* have significantly expanded the university's communication reach, enhanced its visibility, and contributed to the formation of a stable and recognizable public image.

At the same time, analytical review indicates that the current model of public communication remains primarily informational and descriptive in nature. While it successfully conveys activities and achievements, it does not yet fully ensure transparency regarding the outcomes of quality management processes. In particular, there is an absence of regular, structured public reports presenting the results of monitoring activities-such as survey analyses, graduate employment statistics, and academic performance data-as well as information on changes made to educational programs and internal processes based on these findings.

Therefore, despite BEU's well-developed system of public presence and communication, the *Public Information* standard requires further enhancement. Specifically, it should move beyond activity-based reporting toward a results-oriented communication model that publicly reflects the evidence and impact of management decisions. Strengthening this aspect will bring the university's information transparency practices closer to the principles of mature quality systems as defined by the ESG (European Standards and Guidelines) and IAAR (Independent Agency for Accreditation and Rating) frameworks.

Strengths/best practice in 6006020 Chemical Engineering (level: bachelor's degree), 6006028 Mechanical Engineering (level: bachelor's degree), 6006008 Electrical and Electronic Engineering (level: bachelor's degree):

Not visible

Recommendations for 6006020 Chemical Engineering (level: bachelor's degree), 6006028 Mechanical Engineering (level: bachelor's degree), 6006008 Electrical and Electronic Engineering (level: bachelor's degree):

1. It is recommended that the Public Relations Department, in cooperation with the Department of Strategy and Quality, prepare and publish on the official website at least one open report for each educational program on an annual basis. Each report should include: (1) the results of surveys and monitoring activities, (2) the key issues identified through analysis, and (3) the specific changes and improvements implemented as a result of these findings. This measure will allow the university to transition from purely descriptive public communication to an evidence-based model that demonstrates

managerial accountability and the transparency of quality-related decisions. Implementation period: annually.

Conclusions of the EEC according to the criteria:

According to the standard “Public information” for the educational programs 6006020 Chemical Engineering (level: bachelor's degree), 6006028 Mechanical Engineering (level: bachelor's degree), 6006008 Electrical and Electronic Engineering (level: bachelor's degree): strong parameters - 0, satisfactory - 1, requiring improvement - 0.

6.9. Standard 9. CONTINIOUS MONITORING AND PERIODIC PROGRAM EVALUATION.

Standard:
The educational organization should monitor and periodically evaluate programs in order to ensure that they achieve their purpose and meet the needs of students and society. The results of these processes should lead to continuous program improvement. All stakeholders should be informed of any planned or undertaken actions in relation to these programs.

Recommendations:
Constant monitoring, periodic evaluation and revision of educational programs are aimed at ensuring their effective implementation and creating a favorable environment for student learning. This includes an assessment:
- the content of the programs, taking into account the latest achievements of science in a particular discipline to ensure the relevance of the taught discipline;
- the changing needs of society;
- workload, performance and graduation of students;
- effectiveness of student assessment procedures;
- expectations, needs and satisfaction of students with the program;
- the educational environment and support services and their relevance to the goals of the program.

Programs are regularly evaluated and reviewed with the involvement of students and other stakeholders. The collected information is analyzed and the program is brought into line with modern requirements. The changes made are published.

Evidence

Baku Engineering University (BEU) has established a sustainable internal quality assurance system that includes regular monitoring and periodic review of educational programs to ensure their relevance, effectiveness, and alignment with the needs of students, employers, and society.

Monitoring of educational programs is conducted in accordance with the Strategy and Action Plan for Quality Control of Education, approved by the Academic Council of the University. The Department of Strategy and Quality Assurance serves as the primary body responsible for implementing these procedures and coordinating quality-related activities.

The monitoring process operates across several levels, including:

- analysis of the compliance of curricula with national educational standards and qualification frameworks;

- annual evaluation of academic disciplines and methodological materials at the departmental level;

- analysis of data on student academic performance, internship outcomes, and graduate employment;

- systematic collection and processing of feedback from students, faculty, and employers.

Periodic program review is carried out every four years in the form of a comprehensive evaluation. This process involves department heads, faculty deans, representatives of industry, alumni, and students. The results of monitoring and proposed improvements to the content of programs, teaching formats, and assessment methods are discussed at departmental meetings and reviewed by the Academic Council.

The university has institutionalized the practice of preparing annual self-assessment reports for each educational program. These reports contain analyses of academic performance, the achievement of learning outcomes, feedback from students and employers, and proposals for revising course content and assessment forms.

Since 2020, BEU has implemented educational programs approved by the Ministry of Science and Education of the Republic of Azerbaijan. In the 2023-2024 academic year, the university completed the first full implementation cycle of these programs, which enabled a comprehensive review. Based on the collected data and feedback from students and employers, specific updates were introduced to the content of several disciplines and practical modules.

The university conducts regular surveys of student and alumni satisfaction, the results of which are systematically analyzed and used to adjust program content and improve teaching quality. In the

2023-2024 academic year, survey results indicated an overall satisfaction level exceeding 90 percent across key indicators, confirming the effectiveness of the university's continuous improvement efforts.

The commitment to continuous enhancement embedded in BEU's quality policy provides a structured framework for monitoring and evaluating educational programs. Clearly defined principles for stakeholder feedback and satisfaction analysis enable timely and evidence-based program adjustments, maintaining their relevance, quality, and responsiveness to evolving academic and professional demands.

Overall, BEU demonstrates a systematic, data-driven approach to internal monitoring and improvement of educational programs, ensuring their consistent alignment with the university's strategic objectives and with the modern requirements of higher education and the labor market.

Analytical part

The Strategic Plan of Baku Engineering University (BEU) provides for a clearly defined mechanism for regular monitoring and reporting. Annual action plans developed by structural units are reviewed by the University's Scientific Council, while progress on implementation is evaluated by the respective responsible units. This approach ensures systematic control over the realization of strategic priorities, including the quality of educational programs and scientific activities. Continuous monitoring-supported by feedback from students, faculty members, and employers-enables timely adjustments to academic programs and management decisions. As a result, BEU has established a closed quality assurance cycle that promotes sustainable institutional development and enhances the competitiveness of its educational services at both national and international levels.

The program monitoring and periodic review system at BEU represents a mature and integrated mechanism embedded within the broader internal quality assurance framework. The university demonstrates a clear understanding that program monitoring is not a formal compliance exercise, but a key instrument for the continuous improvement of the educational process.

Monitoring activities are implemented across all levels of academic governance-from departments to faculties and up to the rectorate. The process is cyclical and analytical in nature: monitoring results form the basis for concrete management decisions, which are communicated to all relevant stakeholders. This consistency allows the university to respond promptly to changes in educational standards, technological developments, and labor market needs.

A notable strength of BEU's approach is the wide involvement of stakeholders in the evaluation process. Representatives of employers, IT companies, and the banking sector regularly participate in discussions on program content, while the results of student and alumni surveys serve as important inputs for curriculum adjustments. This participatory practice enhances transparency, accountability, and trust in the university's educational policy.

A significant achievement of the university is the systematic use of survey data and analytical indicators-such as academic performance, attendance, course grades, and employment rates-in institutional decision-making. These indicators are recorded and processed through the *AZIMUS* electronic system, ensuring data objectivity, accessibility, and reliability for analytical purposes.

However, the analysis also indicates that the existing monitoring system is not yet fully formalized as a complete management cycle. Although regular reports and meetings are conducted, the sequence of key stages-goal setting, performance indicator definition, data collection, analysis, decision-making, and evaluation of the outcomes-is not always clearly structured or documented. To enhance overall effectiveness, it is recommended that BEU formalize this process in the form of a unified regulation or procedural framework.

The University runs annual and in-cycle reviews supported by the EMS (course reports, programme reviews, survey summaries, committee minutes), so the mechanism exists and operates. However, its communication and evidencing of improvements is weak. In practice, changes are being made, but they are not systematically explained to stakeholders—there is no concise, public "what changed, why, and with what effect" narrative. To align with good practice and to turn monitoring into a visible driver of quality, the University should adopt a marketing-minded disclosure of improvements: for every material change (curriculum content, assessment, lab equipment/software,

student support), publish a short Change Note on the programme page stating (1) What was changed, (2) Why (student/employer feedback, KPI, external benchmark), (3) Evidence (baseline data), (4) Owner & date, and (5) Early results/next review. Overall, the monitoring system is functioning at a procedural level; by showcasing improvements explicitly and persuasively—what changed, why it mattered, and how it helped— the University will strengthen accountability, motivate participation in surveys, and demonstrate that enhancements are made proactively for programme quality, not only when necessity arises.

Overall, BEU demonstrates a developed and functional system for the analysis and periodic updating of educational programs. Nonetheless, achieving a fully continuous improvement model requires the further institutionalization of procedures, consistent documentation of all stages of the monitoring cycle, and the strengthening of systematic stakeholder feedback mechanisms.

Strengths/best practice in 6006020 Chemical Engineering (level: bachelor's degree), 6006028 Mechanical Engineering (level: bachelor's degree), 6006008 Electrical and Electronic Engineering (level: bachelor's degree):

Not visible

Recommendations for 6006020 Chemical Engineering (level: bachelor's degree), 6006028 Mechanical Engineering (level: bachelor's degree), 6006008 Electrical and Electronic Engineering (level: bachelor's degree):

1. It is recommended that the university strengthen the participation of students, employers, and other external stakeholders in the program revision cycle. The establishment of permanent advisory councils within faculties-comprising representatives of industry, employers, and alumni-would facilitate the systematic inclusion of expert opinions and labor market perspectives in the process of updating and improving program content. Implementation period**:** 2025-2026 academic year.

2. The university is advised to develop and publish annual public reports on the improvement of educational programs. These reports should include concrete results such as the introduction of new disciplines, the modernization of teaching and assessment methods, and updated data on graduate employment. Regular publication of such outcomes will enhance stakeholder confidence and reinforce the university’s image as a transparent, open, and progressively developing academic institution. Implementation period**:** annually.

Conclusions of the EEC according to the criteria:

According to the standard “Continuous monitoring and periodic program evaluation” for the educational programs 6006020 Chemical Engineering (level: bachelor's degree), 6006028 Mechanical Engineering (level: bachelor's degree), 6006008 Electrical and Electronic Engineering (level: bachelor's degree): strong parameters - 0, satisfactory - 1, requiring improvement - 0.

6.10. Standard 10. PERIODIC PROCEDURES FOR EXTERNAL QUALITY ASSURANCE.

Standard:
The educational organization must pass external quality assurance procedures in accordance with the European Standards and Recommendations (ESG) on a regular basis.

Recommendations:
External quality assurance procedures in various forms make it possible to evaluate the effectiveness of quality assurance processes within the educational organization. They are catalysts for the development and realization of new opportunities. They also provide information on the quality of the education organization's activities to the public.

Evidence

Baku Engineering University (BEU) has established the foundation for transitioning to a cyclical external quality assurance framework and has initiated systematic efforts to develop external evaluation processes in accordance with ESG principles. The university has prepared comprehensive self-assessment materials, successfully undergone an initial external evaluation, and received a detailed report containing conclusions and recommendations. These outcomes serve as the starting point for building a regular cycle of external quality reviews. The results of the initial evaluation are to be examined at the management level, communicated to relevant structural units, and incorporated into corrective action plans-demonstrating that the university applies external feedback in a practical, improvement-oriented manner rather than as a formal requirement.

At the same time, BEU remains in the formative stage of establishing a stable and recurring mechanism for external quality assurance. While a regular periodic cycle has not yet been historically fixed, the steps already undertaken provide a strong managerial and methodological foundation for the institutionalization of this process. The implementation of external quality assessment as a continuous and recurring practice represents a strategically significant initiative that enhances the university's alignment with international standards, strengthens external confidence, and enables the ongoing adjustment of educational and managerial processes based on independent expertise.

Overall, at the current stage of development, BEU does not yet demonstrate a fully established and recurring cycle of external quality review. However, the university is clearly positioned on a trajectory toward achieving this objective. The progress made evidences a positive institutional trend and lays a solid foundation for the sustainable development and long-term maturity of the internal quality assurance system in the coming years.

Analytical part

Baku Engineering University (BEU) has initiated the transition toward a regular and systematic external quality assessment process. The institution has successfully undergone its first external review, prepared and submitted a comprehensive self-assessment report, and received an official external evaluation report, which now serves as a working document for planning and implementing improvement measures.

Although the university has not yet completed a full historical cycle of repeated external evaluations, an organizational and methodological framework has already been established to ensure that such reviews become a permanent and integral component of the institutional quality assurance system. The ongoing shift from one-time participation in external assessment to the institutionalization of regular, cyclical external evaluation represents a clear indicator of the increasing maturity of BEU's quality assurance system. This evolution marks an important step toward the sustainable development of quality culture and the strengthening of the university's alignment with international quality standards.

Strengths/best practice in 6006020 Chemical Engineering (level: bachelor's degree), 6006028 Mechanical Engineering (level: bachelor's degree), 6006008 Electrical and Electronic Engineering (level: bachelor's degree):

Not visible

Recommendations for 6006020 Chemical Engineering (level: bachelor's degree), 6006028 Mechanical Engineering (level: bachelor's degree), 6006008 Electrical and Electronic Engineering (level: bachelor's degree):

1. It is recommended that the Rectorate, in cooperation with the Strategy and Quality Department, develop and formally approve a schedule for regular external quality assessments with a defined periodicity of at least once every five years. This schedule should be established during the upcoming calendar year. In addition, the university should publish an annual brief report on the implementation status of the recommendations provided by external experts. These measures will ensure the transition from one-time participation in external evaluations to a sustainable, cyclical system of external quality assurance and will enhance the transparency and accountability of management decisions.

Conclusions of the EEC according to the criteria:

According to the standard “Periodic procedures for external quality assurance” for the educational programs 6006020 Chemical Engineering (level: bachelor's degree), 6006028 Mechanical Engineering (level: bachelor's degree), 6006008 Electrical and Electronic Engineering (level: bachelor's degree): strong parameters - 0, satisfactory - 1, requiring improvement - 0.

(VII) OVERVIEW OF STRENGTHS / BEST PRACTICES

Standard 1. QUALITY ASSURANCE POLICY
Not visible

Standard 2. DEVELOPMENT AND APPROVAL OF THE PROGRAM
Compliance with national requirements; clear orientation toward competence-based education and regular curricular updating.

Standard 3. STUDENT-CENTERED TRAINING AND ASSESSMENT
Not visible

Standard 4. ADDMISSION, ACCESS, RECOGNITION AND CERTIFICATION OF STUDENTS
Not visible

Standard 5. TEACHING STAFF
Not visible

Standard 6. EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES AND STUDENT SUPPORT SYSTEM
Not visible

Standard 7. INFORMATION MANAGEMENT
Not visible

Standard 8. PUBLIC INFORMATION
Not visible

Standard 9. CONTINUIOUS MONITORING AND PERIODIC PROGRAM EVALUATION
Not visible

Standard 10. PERIODIC PROCEDURES FOR EXTERNAL QUALITY ASSURANCE.
Not visible

(VIII) OVERVIEW OF RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPROVING QUALITY

Standard 1. QUALITY ASSURANCE POLICY

1. Ensuring public availability and transparent monitoring of the Quality Policy: It is recommended to publish the approved "Quality Policy" in open access on the official website of Baku Engineering University (in the section on the quality management system or strategic management), accompanied by a brief explanatory note outlining its objectives, main principles, and key implementation areas. The quality assurance unit should systematically disseminate information about the Quality Policy and related procedures via the website, social media, and information displays to increase the transparency of the university's activities, raise awareness among students, staff, and partners, and strengthen the culture of quality. At the same time, it is necessary to introduce a mechanism for the regular evaluation of transparency and the level of external stakeholder involvement in quality assurance processes and to publish the monitoring results in the public domain, confirming the university's commitment to openness, accountability, and continuous improvement. Implementation period: Publication of the document and explanatory note - 2025; information dissemination and evaluation with publication of results - on a permanent basis starting from 2025.

2. Formalizing participation and regulatory frameworks for external stakeholders in quality assurance: The university administration should formalize the participation of external stakeholders - employers, representatives of professional associations, alumni, and public organizations - in the processes of developing, monitoring, and revising the Quality Policy. To this end, it is recommended to establish an advisory or expert council on education quality with the participation of external partners. The mechanism should include regular public discussions and expert reviews of key quality assurance documents, as well as the use of surveys and focus groups involving employers and graduates to ensure that their opinions are considered when adjusting the university's strategic priorities. In parallel, it is recommended that the university administration introduce amendments to the "Quality Manual" and other internal regulatory documents to define clear procedures for the university's interaction with external stakeholders. These documents should specify the functions, rights, and responsibilities of external participants in evaluating the effectiveness of the quality assurance system and contributing to strategic decision-making.

Implementation period: Establishment of mechanisms for stakeholder participation - starting from 2025, on an annual basis; amendments to the "Quality Manual" and other regulatory documents - 2025-2026 academic year.

Standard 2. DEVELOPMENT AND APPROVAL OF THE PROGRAM

1. The university should strengthen the design, revision, and practical relevance of its educational programs by approving a Regulation on the Development, Approval, and Revision of Educational Programs that clearly defines all stages (initiation, design, discussion, external review, approval, implementation, monitoring), responsible persons, and a regular review cycle (e.g., every three years), with systematic involvement of employers, professional associations, alumni, and foreign partner universities in working groups for program development and updating. Within this framework, the content of the programs Information Technology (050616), Information Security (050615), and Computer Engineering (050620) should be reviewed to eliminate overlap and clearly differentiate their focus (information systems design and management; data protection, risk management, and cybersecurity; hardware and software systems design and operation, respectively), while enhancing interdisciplinarity and flexibility through an expanded set of electives (e.g., innovative entrepreneurship, digital communications, artificial intelligence, project management). In parallel, the university should establish a centralized system for regular (annual) monitoring of graduates' employment, professional achievements, and career progression to evaluate the effectiveness and labor market relevance of its programs. Implementation period: 2025-2026 academic year for regulatory

framework, program revision, and curriculum enhancement; graduate career monitoring - starting from 2025, on an annual basis.

2. Graduate career tracking system: The university should establish a centralized system for regular (annual) monitoring of graduates' employment, professional achievements, and career progression, in order to evaluate the effectiveness and labor market relevance of educational programs. Implementation period: starting from 2025, on an annual basis.

Standard 3. STUDENT-CENTERED TRAINING AND ASSESSMENT

1. Institutionalizing student-centered, reflective teaching and feedback use: The university should further institutionalize student-centered education as an independent strategic direction by approving a normative document that clearly defines its principles, objectives, and implementation mechanisms (teaching methods, assessment practices, feedback systems) to ensure consistency across faculties and departments. At the same time, the university should foster a culture of pedagogical reflection focused on analyzing teaching effectiveness, sharing best practices between departments, and active participation of faculty in professional and methodological communities. It is also recommended to strengthen the collection and analysis of student feedback and systematically use the results to improve teaching and learning, while increasing transparency by demonstrating to students the concrete outcomes of their feedback (e.g., program adjustments, methodological improvements, better learning conditions), thereby enhancing their trust and engagement in quality management processes. Implementation period: 2025-2026 academic year for the framework and feedback enhancement; pedagogical reflection - on a permanent basis.

2. Developing individualized support for students: The university is advised to further develop the individualization of the educational process by expanding tutoring, academic advising, and psychological support systems, with particular attention to first-year and international students who require additional assistance and adaptation to the learning environment. Strengthening these support structures will contribute to higher student satisfaction and academic success. Implementation period: 2025-2026 academic year.

Standard 4. ADDMISSION, ACCESS, RECOGNITION AND CERTIFICATION OF STUDENTS

1. Data-driven quality monitoring and transparency: The Academic Department, the Department of Strategy and Quality Assurance, and the Rector's Office should jointly establish an integrated system of analytical and public reporting on education quality. This includes: (a) an annual analytical report "Admission Scores and Average Academic Performance for the Year" for each educational program, submitted to the Vice-Rector for Academic Affairs to monitor the relationship between entrance scores and final learning outcomes; (b) concise reports for students summarizing changes implemented based on student survey results, published within 30 days after each survey cycle; and (c) an open Annual Report on the Quality of Education presenting key data and management decisions for the academic year, published no later than 30 days after its end, to strengthen accountability and transparency. Implementation period: annually, with reports issued within the specified 30-day timeframes.

2. Internationalization and employer engagement: Faculty deans and the Career Center should enhance the international and practical orientation of educational programs by ensuring that at least five percent of students from each program participate in exchange programs every academic year and maintaining open statistics on this indicator, as well as organizing at least two formal meetings with employers per program per year and documenting their recommendations for improving training content. These measures will promote academic mobility, strengthen the international dimension of education, and align curricula with current labor market needs. Implementation period: annually.

3. Targeted support for students with low academic performance: Academic advisors should annually identify students with low academic performance (GPA below 71) and hold at least one individual consultation with each of them to provide timely intervention and personalized support. The

aim is to prevent persistent underperformance and reduce the risk of withdrawal or expulsion through early guidance and monitoring. Implementation period: annually.

Standard 5. TEACHING STAFF

1. Integrated professional development and mentoring system: The university is advised to develop and institutionalize a comprehensive professional development program for academic staff that combines internal and external capacity building with a structured pedagogical mentoring system. The program should include internships at foreign partner universities, advanced pedagogical training courses, instruction in blended learning methodologies and modern digital tools, and institutional support for designing and delivering online courses. Within this framework, experienced faculty members with high professional ratings and significant research achievements should act as mentors for early-career colleagues, supporting their development in academic culture, modern teaching practices, and research methodologies. This integrated approach will enhance teaching quality, ensure intergenerational knowledge transfer, and align faculty competencies with international standards. Implementation period: 2025-2026 academic year.

2. Strengthening international academic mobility and collaboration: The university is encouraged to further expand and systematize international academic mobility opportunities for faculty by developing long-term academic exchange programs and joint research projects with foreign partner universities. These activities will enhance the university's international visibility, enrich educational content, and promote sustained cross-cultural academic collaboration. Implementation period: on a permanent basis.

Standard 6. EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES AND STUDENT SUPPORT SYSTEM

1. Modernizing academic infrastructure and resources: The university is advised to develop a comprehensive strategy for the systematic renewal and modernization of its educational infrastructure, including a scheduled plan for replacing outdated laboratory equipment, establishing new specialized laboratories in emerging fields such as artificial intelligence, the Internet of Things, and robotics, and further digitalizing teaching and learning spaces. In parallel, the university should continuously expand its library and electronic resources by activating institutional subscriptions to leading international databases (such as Springer, IEEE, and ScienceDirect) and providing students and faculty with up-to-date English-language literature in computer science, information security, and engineering, thereby supporting academic and research excellence and alignment with current technological and academic standards. Implementation period: 2025-2026 academic year.

Standard 7. INFORMATION MANAGEMENT

1. Institutionalizing data-driven management of educational programs: The university should establish a mandatory data-based improvement cycle for all educational programs. Educational program committees (dean's offices together with departments) must conduct at least one formal annual review of each program using survey results, academic performance indicators, and graduate employment data, resulting in at least two specific, documented adjustments (e.g., course content changes, redistribution of practical hours, or revisions to assessment methods). Academic departments should formally record in meeting minutes at least two decisions per semester based on student performance data or feedback, while the Department of Strategy and Quality conducts an independent audit of at least 20 percent of programs each year to verify that data have led to measurable changes, with findings presented to the Academic Council. The Vice-Rector for Academic Affairs should also set an annual performance target requiring that at least 60 percent of educational programs demonstrate at least one documented modification based on data analysis, ensuring a shift toward an active, data-driven system of program enhancement. Implementation period: annually; departmental decisions - at the end of each semester.

2. Ensuring transparency of data-based changes in educational programs: The Rector's Office should approve and publicly release an annual report titled "Changes in Educational Programs Based on Monitoring Data," providing 1-2 pages for each faculty and summarizing key program adjustments

resulting from data analysis. This measure will strengthen transparency, accountability, and the evidence base of institutional decision-making, and will complement the internal data-driven improvement mechanisms described above. Implementation period: annually.

Standard 8. PUBLIC INFORMATION

It is recommended that the Public Relations Department, in cooperation with the Department of Strategy and Quality, prepare and publish on the official website at least one open report for each educational program on an annual basis. Each report should include: (1) the results of surveys and monitoring activities, (2) the key issues identified through analysis, and (3) the specific changes and improvements implemented as a result of these findings. This measure will allow the university to transition from purely descriptive public communication to an evidence-based model that demonstrates managerial accountability and the transparency of quality-related decisions. Implementation period: annually.

Standard 9. CONTINUIOUS MONITORING AND PERIODIC PROGRAM EVALUATION

1. It is recommended that the university strengthen the participation of students, employers, and other external stakeholders in the program revision cycle. The establishment of permanent advisory councils within faculties-comprising representatives of industry, employers, and alumni-would facilitate the systematic inclusion of expert opinions and labor market perspectives in the process of updating and improving program content. **Implementation period:** 2025-2026 academic year.

2. The university is advised to develop and publish annual public reports on the improvement of educational programs. These reports should include concrete results such as the introduction of new disciplines, the modernization of teaching and assessment methods, and updated data on graduate employment. Regular publication of such outcomes will enhance stakeholder confidence and reinforce the university’s image as a transparent, open, and progressively developing academic institution. **Implementation period:** annually.

Standard 10. PERIODIC PROCEDURES FOR EXTERNAL QUALITY ASSURANCE.

1. It is recommended that the Rectorate, in cooperation with the Strategy and Quality Department, develop and formally approve a schedule for regular external quality assessments with a defined periodicity of at least once every five years. This schedule should be established during the upcoming calendar year. In addition, the university should publish an annual brief report on the implementation status of the recommendations provided by external experts. These measures will ensure the transition from one-time participation in external evaluations to a sustainable, cyclical system of external quality assurance and will enhance the transparency and accountability of management decisions.

(IX) REVIEW OF RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF EDUCATIONAL ORGANIZATION

Not visible

(X) RECOMMENDATION TO THE ACCREDITATION COUNCIL

Recommend the educational programs 6006020 Chemical Engineering (level: bachelor's degree), 6006028 Mechanical Engineering (level: bachelor's degree), 6006008 Electrical and Electronic Engineering (level: bachelor's degree): of Baku Engineering University for accreditation for a period of 5 years

Appendix 1. Evaluation table "Conclusion of the External Expert Commission"

№	IAAR International Standards	Assessment Indicators			
		Strong	Satisfactory	Suggest improvements	Unsatisfactory
Standard 1. POLICY FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE					
1	Institutions should have a policy for quality assurance that is made public and forms part of their strategic management. Internal stakeholders should develop and implement this policy through appropriate structures and processes, while involving external stakeholders.		+		
Standard 2. DESIGN AND APPROVAL OF PROGRAMMES					
2	Institutions should have processes for the design and approval of their programmes. The programmes should be designed so that they meet the objectives set for them, including the intended learning outcomes. The qualification resulting from a programme should be clearly specified and communicated, and refer to the correct level of the national qualifications framework for higher education and, consequently, to the Framework for Qualifications of the European Higher Education Area.	+			
Standard 3. STUDENT-CENTRED LEARNING, TEACHING AND ASSESSMENT					
3	Institutions should 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.		+		
Standard 4. STUDENT ADMISSION, PROGRESSION, RECOGNITION AND CERTIFICATION					
4	Institutions should consistently apply pre-defined and published regulations covering all phases of the student "life cycle", e.g. student admission, progression, recognition and certification.		+		
Standard 5. TEACHING STAFF					
5	Institutions should assure themselves of the competence of their teachers. They should apply fair and transparent processes for the recruitment and development of the staff.		+		
Standard 6. LEARNING RESOURCES AND STUDENT SUPPORT					
6	Institutions should have appropriate funding for learning and teaching activities and ensure that adequate and readily accessible learning resources and student support are provided.		+		
Standard 7. INFORMATION MANAGEMENT					

7	Institutions should ensure that they collect, analyse and use relevant information for the effective management of their programmes and other activities.		+		
Standard 8. PUBLIC INFORMATION					
8	Institutions should publish information about their activities, including programmes, which is clear, accurate, objective, up-to date and readily accessible.		+		
Standard 9. ON-GOING MONITORING AND PERIODIC REVIEW OF PROGRAMMES					
9	Institutions should monitor and periodically review their programmes to ensure that they achieve the objectives set for them and respond to the needs of students and society. These reviews should lead to continuous improvement of the programme. Any action planned or taken as a result should be communicated to all those concerned.		+		
Standard 10. CYCLICAL EXTERNAL QUALITY ASSURANCE					
10	Institutions should undergo external quality assurance in line with the ESG on a cyclical basis.		+		
GRAND TOTAL ACCORDING TO ALL STANDARDS		**1**	**9**	**0**	**0**

Appendix 2. PROGRAMME OF THE SITE VISIT

AGREED
RECTOR
Baku Engineering University
_____ Piriyev Y. M.
2025 _____ «___»

APPROVED
GENERAL DIRECTOR,
«Independent Agency for Accreditation and Rating»
_____ Zhumagulova A.B.
2025 _____ «____»

PROGRAMME OF THE SITE VISIT OF THE IAAR EXTERNAL EXPERT PANEL (EEP) TO BAKU ENGINEERING UNIVERSITY

Visit Dates: October 6–8, 2025

Date and Time	EEP's Meetings with Target Groups	Position and Full Name (Last Name, First Name, Patronymic) of Target Group Participants	Contact Form
October 5, 2025.			
16.00-17.00	Preliminary Meeting of the EEP	*EEP of IAAR*	Join the Zoom https://us02web.zoom.us/j/6813032588 Conference ID: 681 303 2588
October 5, 2025.			
According to the schedule Throughout the day	Arrival of the External Expert Commission members		

20.00	Dinner	*EEP of IAAR*	
October 6, 2025.			
08.30-09.00 *Baku local time*	Transfer from the hotel to the University	*EEP, University Coordinator – Fuad Gurbanov*	
09.00-09.15	Distribution of Responsibilities Among Experts, Discussion of Organizational Issues	*EEP of IAAR*	Room № 356 (Main Building) Join the Zoom https://us02web.zoom.us/j/6813032588 Conference ID: 681 303 2588
09.15-09.45	Interview with the Rector	*Rector – Yagub Piriyev Maxim*	Room № 356 (Main Building) Join the Zoom https://us02web.zoom.us/j/6813032588 Conference ID: 681 303 2588
09.45-09.55	Technical Break		
09.55-10.30	Interviews with Vice-Rectors	1. *Vice-Rector for Academic Affairs Hamzagha Orujov* 2. *Vice-Rector for Science and Innovation Aghasi Malikov* 3. *Vice-Rector for International Relations Atraba Gul* 4. *Vice-Rector for Social Affairs and Public Relations Bayram Huseynzade* 5. *Vice-Rector for Finance and Economic Affairs Mikayil Zeynalov*	Room № 356 (Main Building) Join the Zoom https://us02web.zoom.us/j/6813032588 Conference ID: 681 303 2588
10.30-10.40	Technical Break		
10.40-11.20	Interviews with Heads of Structural Units of the Educational Organization	*Strategy and quality assurance department, Addin Mushtagov* *Business relations and career center, Gulchohra Ibrahimova* *Department of Science and Innovation, Mayis Azizov* *Department of Education, Ramil Hajiyev* *Teaching methodical and practice department, Nofel Nabiyev* *Library and information center, Amaliya Hamzayeva* *Technopark, Vusal Suleymanl* *International relationship*	Room № 356 (Main Building) Join the Zoom https://us02web.zoom.us/j/6813032588 Conference ID: 681 303 2588
11.20-11.30	Exchange of Opinions Among Members of the EEP		Room № 356 (Main Building) Join the Zoom https://us02web.zoom.us/j/6813032588 Conference ID: 681 303 2588

11.30-12.10	Interviews with Heads of Departments and Academic Unit Leaders	*Dean of the Faculty of Engineering, Asif Guliyev* *Dean of the Faculty of Information and Computer Technologies, Vagif Gasimov* *Head of the Department of Cybersecurity and Computer Engineering, Jabir Mammadov* *Head of the Department of Information Technologies and Programming, Sevinj Aliyeva* *Head of the Department of Automation, Telecommunications and Energy, Ramiz Humbatov* *Head of the Department of Mechanical Engineering, Prof. Mahir Bashirov* *Head of the Department of Chemical Engineering, Prof. Namig Shikhaliyev*	Room № 356 (Main Building) Join the Zoom https://us02web.zoom.us/j/6813032588 Conference ID: 681 303 2588
12.10-12.20	Work of the EEP	*EEP of IAAR*	Room № 356 (Main Building) Join the Zoom https://us02web.zoom.us/j/6813032588 Conference ID: 681 303 2588
12.20-13.00	Interviews with Academic Staff	*Appendix 1*	Room № 356 (Main Building) Join the Zoom https://us02web.zoom.us/j/6813032588 Conference ID: 681 303 2588
13.00-18.00	Academic Staff Survey (conducted in parallel)	*Appendix 2*	The link is sent personally to the teacher's email
13.00-14.00	***Lunch***		
14.00-14.15	Internal Discussion of the External Expert Commission		Room № 356 (Main Building) Join the Zoom https://us02web.zoom.us/j/6813032588 Conference ID: 681 303 2588
14.15-14.55	Interviews with Students	*Appendix 3*	Room № 356 (Main Building) Join the Zoom https://us02web.zoom.us/j/6813032588 Conference ID: 681 303 2588
15.55-19.00	Student Survey (conducted in parallel)	*Appendix 4*	The link is sent personally to the student’s email

14.55-15.05	Technical Break		
15.05-15.45	Meeting with Stakeholders (Representatives of Internship Bases and Employers)	*Appendix 5*	Room № 356 (Main Building) Join the Zoom https://us02web.zoom.us/j/6813032588 Conference ID: 681 303 2588
15.45-15.55	Technical Break		
15.55-16.45	Interviews with Alumni	*Appendix 6*	Room № 356 (Main Building) Join the Zoom https://us02web.zoom.us/j/6813032588 Conference ID: 681 303 2588
16.45-17.30	Work of the EEP. Discussion of the First Day's Results	*EEP of IAAR*	Room № 356 (Main Building) Join the Zoom https://us02web.zoom.us/j/6813032588 Conference ID: 681 303 2588
17.30-18.30	Dinner		
October 7, 2025.			
08.30-09.00	Transfer from the hotel to the university	*EEP of IAAR, University Coordinator – Fuad Gurbanov*	
09.00-09.15	Work of the EEP		Room № 356 (Main Building) Join the Zoom https://us02web.zoom.us/j/6813032588 Conference ID: 681 303 2588
09.15-10.50	Classroom Visits According to the Schedule and Work with Documents (Appendix: Links to Classes)	*EEP of IAAR* *Appendix 7*	
10.50-12.30	Visual Inspection of the Educational Organization's Material, Technical, and Teaching Laboratory Facilities	*Itinerary* *Appendix 8*	

12.30-13.00	Work of the EEP		Room № 356 (Main Building) Join the Zoom https://us02web.zoom.us/j/6813032588 Conference ID: 681 303 2588
13.00-14.00	**Lunch**		
14.00-16.00	Selective Visits to Internship Bases of the Study Program	*Appendix 9*	
16.00-17.30	Work of the EEP, Discussion of the Second Day's Results and Profile Parameters (Recording)		Room № 356 (Main Building) Join the Zoom https://us02web.zoom.us/j/6813032588 Conference ID: 681 303 2588
17.30-19.30	Dinner		
October 8, 2025.			
08.30-09.00	Transfer from the hotel to the university	*EEP of IAAR, University Coordinator – Fuad Gurbanov*	Hotel - University
09.00-09.15	Work of the EEP	*EEP of IAAR*	Room № 356 (Main Building) Join the Zoom https://us02web.zoom.us/j/6813032588 Conference ID: 681 303 2588
09.15-11.50	Work of the EEP, Development and Discussion of Recommendations (Recording)	*EEP of IAAR*	Room № 356 (Main Building) Join the Zoom https://us02web.zoom.us/j/6813032588 Conference ID: 681 303 2588
11.50-12.00	Technical Break		
12.00-12.30	Final Meeting of the EEP with the University Executive Team		Room № 356 (Main Building) Join the Zoom https://us02web.zoom.us/j/6813032588 Conference ID: 681 303 2588

12.30-13.00	Work of the EEP	*EEP of IAAR*	Room № 356 (Main Building) Join the Zoom https://us02web.zoom.us/j/6813032588 Conference ID: 681 303 2588
13.00-14.00	Lunch		
14.00-15.00	Work of the EEP, Discussion of the Quality Assessment Results	*EEP of IAAR*	Room № 356 (Main Building) Join the Zoom https://us02web.zoom.us/j/6813032588 Conference ID: 681 303 2588
15.00-15.15	Technical Break		
15.15-17.30	Work of the EEP, Discussion of Quality Assessment Results	*EEP of IAAR*	Room № 356 (Main Building) Join the Zoom https://us02web.zoom.us/j/6813032588 Conference ID: 681 303 2588

Appendix 3.

Survey results of the faculty members «Baku Engineering University»

Total number of questionnaires: 58

1. What educational program do you serve?

6006017 Information Security (level: bachelor's degree)	3 per.	5,2%
6006022 Computer Engineering (level: bachelor's degree)	6 per.	10,3%
6006016 Information Technologies (level: bachelor's degree)	18 per.	31%
6006020 Chemical Engineering (level: bachelor's degree)	4 per.	6,9%
6006028 Mechanical Engineering (level: bachelor's degree)	22 per.	37,9%
6006008 Electrical and Electronic Engineering (level: bachelor's degree)	5 per.	8,6%

2. Your Position

Professor	1 per.	1,7%
Associate Professor	20 per.	34,5%
Senior Teacher	6 per.	10,3%
Teacher	25 per.	43,1%
Head of the Department	4 per.	6,9%
Other	2 per.	3,4%

3. Academic degree, academic title

Honoured Worker	0 per.	0%
Doctor of Science	3 per.	5,2 %
Candidate of Science	9 per.	15,5%
Master	26 per.	44,8%
PhD	13 per.	22,4%
Professor	2 per.	3,4%
Associate Professor	7 per.	12,1%
No	4 per.	6,9%
Other	2 per.	3,4%

4. Work experience at this HEI

Less than 1 year	4 per.	6,9%
1 year – 5 years	24 per.	41,4%
Over 5 years	30per.	51,7%

№	Questions	Very good	Good	Relatively poor	Poor	Very poor
5	To what extent does the content of the educational programme meet your scientific and professional interests and requirements?	42 per. (72,4%)	15 per. (25,9%)	1 per. (1,7%)	0 per. (0%)	0 per. (0%)
6	How do you assess the opportunities provided by HEI for the professional development of the teaching staff?	36 per. (62,1%)	18 per. (31%)	2 per. (3,4%)	1 per. (1,7%)	1 per. (1,7%)
7	How do you assess the opportunities provided by HEI for teacher's career development?	35 per. (60,3%)	20 per. (34,5%)	1 per. (1,7%)	2 per. (3,4%)	0 per. (0%)
8	How do you assess the degree of academic freedom of teaching staff?	38 per. (65,5%)	18 per. (31%)	1 per. (1,7%)	0 per. (0%)	1 per. (1,7%)

9	To what extent can teachers use their own teaching strategies?	36 per. (62,1%)	20 per. (34,5%)	2 per. (3,4%)	0 per. (0%)	0 per. (0%)
10	To what extent can teachers use their own teaching methods?	38 per. (65,5%)	20 per. (34,5%)	0per. (0%)	0 per. (0%)	0 per. (0%)
11	To what extent can teachers use their own educational innovations?	37 per. (63,8%)	21 per. (36,2%)	0 per. (0%)	0 per. (0%)	0 per. (0%)
12	How do you evaluate the arrangement of health care and disease prevention in HEI?	26 per. (44,8%)	29 per. (50%)	3 per. (5,2%)	0 per. (0%)	0 per. (0%)
13	What attention does the school management pay to the educational programme content?	38 per. (65,5%)	19 per. (32,8%)	1 per. (1,7%)	0 per. (20%)	0 per. (0%)
14	How do you evaluate the sufficiency and accessibility of the necessary scientific and educational literature in the library?	31 per. (53,4 %)	25 per. (43,1%)	2 per. (3,4%)	0 per. (0%)	0 per. (0%)
15	Evaluate the level of the conditions created that take into account the needs of different groups of learners?	34 per. (589,6%)	24 per. (41,4%)	0 per. (0%)	0 per. (0%)	0 per. (0%)
16	Evaluate the openness and accessibility of management to students	38 per. (65,5%)	20 per. (34,5%)	0 per. (0%)	0 per. (0%)	0 per. (0%)
17	Evaluate the openness and accessibility of management to teaching staff	37 per. (63,8%)	18 per. (31%)	2 per. (3,4%)	0 per. (0%)	1 per. (1,7%)
18	What is the level of encouragement and involvement of young specialists in the educational process?	37 per. (63,8%)	20 per. (34,5%)	1 per. (1,7%)	0 per. (0%)	0 per. (0%)
19	Evaluate the opportunities for professional and personal growth created for each teacher and employee	30 per. (51,7%)	24 per. (41,4%)	4 per. (6,9%)	0 per. (0%)	0 per. (0%)
20	Evaluate the adequacy of recognition by HEI's management of teachers' potential and abilities	29 per. (50%)	27 per. (46,6%)	2 per. (3,4%)	0 per. (0%)	0 per. (0%)
21	How the activity is organised regarding an academic mobility	32 per. (52,2%)	24 per. (41,4%)	2 per. (3,4%)	0 per. (0%)	0 per. (0%)
22	How the activity is organised regarding teaching staff's professional development	29 per. (50%)	24 per. (41,4%)	3 per. (5,2%)	1 per. (1,7%)	1 per. (1,7%)
23	Evaluate how HEI and its management support teaching staff's research and development undertakings	38 per. (65,5%)	17 per. (29,3%)	1 per. (1,7%)	0 per. (0%)	2per. (3,4%)
24	Evaluate how HEI and its management support development of new educational programmes/academic disciplines/teaching methods	35 per. (60,3%)	22 per. (37,9%)	0 per. (0%)	0 per. (0%)	1 per. (1,7%)
25	Evaluate teaching staff's opportunity to combine teaching with scientific research	27 per. (46,6%)	27 per. (46,6%)	3 per. (5,2%)	1 per. (1,7%)	0 per. (0%)
26	Evaluate teaching staff's opportunity to combine teaching with practical activities	35 per. (60,3%)	22 per. (37,9%)	1 per. (1,7%)	0 per. (0%)	0 per. (0%)
27	Evaluate whether the knowledge students receive in HEI meets the requirements of the modern labour market	29 per. (50%)	28 per. (48,3%)	0 per. (0%)	0 per. (08%)	0 per. (0%)

28	How do HEI management and administration take criticism?	23 per. (39,7%)	27 per. (46,6%)	7 per. (12,1%)	0 per. (0%)	1 per. (1,7%)
29	Evaluate how well your teaching load meets your expectations and capabilities?	31 per. (53,4%)	21per. (36,2%)	5 per. (8,6%)	0 per. (0%)	1 per. (1,7%)
30	Evaluate the focus of educational programmes/curricula on providing students with the skills to analyse the situation and make forecasts	28 per. (48,3%)	28 per. (48,3%)	2 per. (3,4%)	0 per. (0%)	0 per. (0%)
31	Evaluate the extent to which the content and quality of implementation of the educational programme meet the expectations of the labour market and employer	26 per. (44,8%)	30 per. (51,7%)	2 per. (3,4%)	0 per. (0%)	0 per. (0%)

32. Why do you work in this particular HEI?

- ✓ *For my interests and good salary*
- ✓ *Daha prespektivli və tədris keyfiyyəti yüksəkdir*
- ✓ *As a teacher,I find it crucial to conduct lessons as effectively as possible, which is why I chose Baku Engineering University. The university offers excellent facilities, including modern computer laboratories, which are essential for teaching programming. Additionally, the administration's attitude toward teachers is very supportive, creating a comfortable and encouraging work environment.*
- ✓ *I chose BMU because it's one of the leading universities in Azerbaijan when it comes to technology and innovation. I really like the way the university connects academic knowledge with practical skills, since that fits perfectly with my own goal of preparing students for real-world challenges. I also appreciate BMU's strong focus on research, entrepreneurship, and digital transformation, because it not only helps me grow professionally but also gives me the chance to contribute to the development of students and the country.*
- ✓ *The transparent and fair environment created for the teaching staff, favorable conditions for professional development, the efficiency of scientific and pedagogical activities, the strong material and technical base, as well as the students' interest in learning and their technological engagement, have motivated me to work at Baku Engineering University.*
- ✓ *For good working solutions*
- ✓ *İt provides opportunities to me to improve myself*
- ✓ *The level of education and salary are high compared to other universities*
- ✓ *It provides opportunities to me to improve myself*
- ✓ *the level of education is high*
- ✓ *Because there is transparency in negation*
- ✓ *Working with High quality academic staff, and more supportive infrastructure*
- ✓ *l work in BEU because it is well-equipped, highly regarded, and maintains excellent relationships with students.*
- ✓ *For improving the quality of education and the opportunity for self-development*

- ✓ *more reliable than other universities*
- ✓ *I work in this HEI because it provides excellent opportunities for professional growth, supports research and teaching, and values both faculty and student development.*
- ✓ *circumstances led to this University*
- ✓ *I see here is the place that meet theory and practical knowledge*
- ✓ *Because everything is transparent here.*
- ✓ *For supporting the training of young engineers in country*
- ✓ *Because there are good conditions here for professional growth and conducting high-quality lessons*
- ✓ *It is modern field that can impact our country's future*
- ✓ *Because Baku Engineering University is a leading university in Azerbaijan.*
- ✓ *The level of education and wages are high.*
- ✓ *The universitys quality of education, laboratory facilites, and the opportunities created for both teachers and students are valuable to me.*
- ✓ *I work in this HEI because it is well-equipped, highly regarded, and maintains excellent relationships with students.*
- ✓ *Because it provides a positive boost to my scientific development and fosters a strong enthusiasm for teaching.*
- ✓ *All conditions for educational and research work have been created here.*
- ✓ *To teach future engineers.*

- ✓ *Because I like the way work is organized.*

33. How often do you hold master classes and practitioner classes as part of your course?

Very often	13 per.	22,4%
Often	26 per.	44,8 %
Sometimes	16 per.	27,6%
Very rarely	2 per.	3,4%
Never	1 per.	1,7%

34. How often do teachers invited from outside (local and foreign) to participate in the training process?

Very often	13 per.	22,4%
Often	15 per.	25,9%
Sometimes	26 per.	44,8%
Very rarely	3 per.	5,2%
Never	1 per.	1,7%

35. How often do you encounter the following problems in your work: (please, answer on each line)

	Often	**Sometimes**	**Never**	**No answer**
Lack of classrooms	8 per. (14,3%)	17 per. (30,4%)	31 per. (55,4%)	-
Unbalanced teaching load by semester	8 per. (13,8%)	25 per. (25,9%)	35 per. (60,3%)	-
Unavailability of necessary literature in the library	8 per. (13,8%)	22 per. (37,9%)	28 per. (48,3%)	-
Overcrowding of study groups (too many students in the group)	7 per. (12,1%)	17 per. (29,3%)	34 per. (58,6%)	-
Inconvenient schedule	7 per. (12,1%)	18 per. (31%)	33 per. (56,9%)	-
Inadequate facilities for classroom activities	8 per. (13,8%)	15 per. (25,9%)	35 per. (60,3%)	-
Lack of internet access/poor internet connection	8 per. (13,8%)	20 per. (34,5%)	30 per. (51,7%)	-
Students lack of interest in the study	8 per. (13,8%)	22 per. (37,9%)	28 per. (48,3%)	-
Late delivery of information about the events	7 per. (12,1%)	10 per. (17,2%)	41 per. (70,7%)	-
Absence of teaching aids in classrooms	6 per. (10,3%)	14per. (24,1%)	38 per. (65,5%)	-
Other problems	✓ *No problems* ✓ - ✓ *No problem* ✓ *Yoxdur* ✓ *Any minor issues, such as occasional network connection glitches or the need to adapt materials for students with varying levels of preparation, are typically resolved quickly thanks to available resources and collaboration with colleagues.* ✓ *We have no any problems* ✓ *Theres no important problem* ✓ *located outside of Baku* ✓ *There's no important problem* ✓ *no* ✓ *Outsait of Baku* ✓ *There are truly no problems at this university.* ✓ *I didn't come across* ✓			

	✓ *It would be very good if technical equipment is further increased and the internet speed is improved.* ✓ *there is no internet connection in the usual classrooms (in labs it's fine)* ✓ *location outside of Baku* ✓ *No any critical issues* ✓ *The university is located outside of Baku city.* ✓ *İ dont see any particular problem* ✓ *No big praying room.*

36. There are many different aspects in HEI's life that affect every teacher and employee in one way or another. Assess how satisfied you are with:

Questions	Fully satisfied	Partially satisfied	Unsatisfied	Unsure
HEI management's attitude towards you	44 per. (75,9%)	11 per. (19%)	2 per. (3,4%)	1 per. (1,7%)
Relationships with direct management	49 per. (84,5%)	9 per. (15,5%)	0 per. (0%)	0 per. (0%)
Relationships with colleagues at the department	50 per. (86,2%)	8 per. (13,8%)	0 per. (0%)	0 per. (0%)
Degree of participation in management decisions	40 per. (69%)	14 per. (24,1%)	3 per. (5,2%)	1 per. (1,7%)
Relationships with students	51per. (87,9%)	6 per. (10,3%)	1 per. (1,7%)	0 per. (0%)
Recognition of your success and achievements by administration	47 per. (81%)	7 per. (12,1%)	3 per. (5,2%)	1 per. (1,7%)
Support for your proposals and comments	41 per. (71,9%)	13 per. (22,8%)	3 per. (5,3%)	0 per. (0%)
HEI administration's activities	48 per. (82,8%)	8 per. (13,8%)	1 per. (1,7%)	1 per. (1,7%)
Remuneration terms	40 per. (69%)	11 per. (19%)	5 per. (8,6%)	2per. (3,4%)
Working conditions, list and quality of services provided in HEI	42 per. (72,4%)	14 per. (24,1 %)	2 per. (3,4%)	0 per. (0%)
Occupational health and safety	44 per. (75,9%)	12 per. (20,7%)	1 per. (1,7%)	1 per. (1,7%)
Management of changes in HEI's activities	40 per. (69%)	15 per. (25,9%)	1 per. (1,7%)	2 per. (3,4%)
Provision of a social package: recreation, sanatorium treatment, etc.	34 per. (58,6%)	18 per. (31%)	5 per. (8,6%)	1 per. (1,7%)
Arrangements for catering in HEI and its quality	38 per. (65,5%)	20 per. (34,5%)	0 per. (0%)	0 per. (0%)
Arrangements for health care and quality of medical services	38 per. (65,5%)	20 per. (34,5%)	0 per. (0%)	0 per. (0%)

Appendix 4

Results of the anonymous survey of the students of "Baku Engineering University"

Total number of questionnaires: 53

1. Educational Programme (Specialty)?

6006017 Information Security (level: bachelor's degree)	30 per	56,6%
6006022 Computer Engineering (level: bachelor's degree)	16 per	30,2%
6006016 Information Technologies (level: bachelor's degree)	3 per	5,7%
6006020 Chemical Engineering (level: bachelor's degree)	4 per	7,5%
6006028 Mechanical Engineering (level: bachelor's degree)	0 per	0%
6006008 Electrical and Electronic Engineering (level: bachelor's degree)	0 per	0%

2. Sex

Male	37 per	69,8%
Female	16 per	30,2%

3. Evaluate how satisfied you are with:

Вопросы	**Very good**	**Good**	**Relatively poor**	**Poor**	**Very poor**
3.1. Relations with the dean's office (school, faculty, department):	35 students (66 %)	16 students (30,2 %)	2 students (3,8%)	0 (0 %)	0 (0 %)
3.2 Accessibility of the dean's office (school, faculty, department):	36 students (67,9 %)	15 students (28,3 %)	2 students (3,8%)	0 (0 %)	0 (0 %)
3.3. Accessibility and responsiveness of management (of HEI, school, faculty, department)	35 students (66 %)	16 students (30,2 %)	2 students (3,8%)	0 (0 %)	0 (0 %)
3.4. Accessibility of academic consulting	37 students (69,8 %)	16 students (30,2%)	0 (0 %)	0 (0 %)	0 (0%)
3.5. Support with study materials in the learning process	34 students (64,2 %)	16 students (30,2%)	2 students (3,8 %)	1 student (1,9 %)	0 (0 %)
3.6. Accessibility of counselling on personal issues	32 students (60,4%)	19 students (35,8 %)	2 students (3,8 %)	0 (0 %)	0 (0 %)
3.7. Relationships between student and teachers	37 students (69,8%)	16 students (30,2%)	0 (0 %)	0 (0 %)	0 (0 %)
3.8. Activities of educational institution financial and administrative services	31 students (58,5%)	19 students (35,8%)	1 student (1,9 %)	1 student (1,9 %)	1 student (1,9 %)
3.9. Accessibility of medical services	33 students (62,3 %)	18 students (34%)	1 student (1,9 %)	0 (0 %)	1 student (1,9 %)
3.10.Quality of medical services in HEI	32 students (60,4%)	20 students (37,7 %)	1 student (1,9 %)	0 (0 %)	0 (0 %)
3.11. Accessibility of library resources	35 student (66 %)	15 student (28,3%)	2 student (3,8 %)	1 student (1,9 %)	0 (0 %)
3.12. Quality services provided in libraries and reading rooms	32 students (60,4%)	14 students (26,4%)	4 students (7,5 %)	1 student (1,9 %)	2 students (3,8%)
3.13. Educational resources available in HEI	37 students (69,8%)	14 students (26,4%)	2 students (3,8%)	0 (0 %)	0 (0 %)
3.14. Accessibility of computer classrooms	35 students (66%)	15 students (28,3%)	1 student (1,9%)	0 (0 %)	2 students (3,8%)
3.15.Accessibility and quality of internet resources	27 students (50,9 %)	8 students (15,1 %)	13 students (24,5%)	2 students (3,8%)	3 students (5,7%)

Вопросы	Very good	Good	Relatively poor	Poor	Very poor
3.16. Information content of the web-site of an educational institution, as a whole, and of faculties (schools), in particular	36 students (67,9 %)	15 students (28,3%)	1 student (1,9 %)	1 student (1,9 %)	0 (0 %)
3.17. Classrooms, lecture halls for big groups	36 students (67,9%)	17 students (32,1%)	0 (0 %)	0 (0 %)	0 (0 %)
3.18. Students' recreation rooms (if available) 3.19. Clarity of procedures for taking disciplinary measures	30 students (56,6%)	16 students (30,2%)	4 students (7,5 %)	1 student (1,9%)	2 students (3,8%)
3.20. Quality educational program as a whole	36 students (67,9%)	16 students (30,2%)	1 student (1,9%)	0 (0 %)	0 (0 %)
3.21. Quality of curricula in EP	30 students (56,6%)	22 students (41,5%)	1 students (1,9%)	0 (0 %)	0 (0 %)
3.22. Teaching methods as a whole	32 students (60,4 %)	20 students (37,7%)	1 student (1,9%)	0 (0 %)	0 (0 %)
3.23. Teacher's quick response to feedback on educational process issues	33 students (62,3%)	17 students (32,1%)	3 students (5,7%)	0 (0 %)	0 (0 %)
3.24. Quality of teaching in general	33 students (62,3%)	20 students (37,7%)	0 (0 %)	0 (0 %)	0 (0 %)
Качеством преподавания в целом	34 students (64,2%)	18 students (34%)	1 student (1,9%)	0 (0 %)	0 (0 %)
3.25.Academic load/requirements to students	34 students (64,2%)	17 students (32,1%)	2 students (3,8%)	0 (0 %)	0 (0 %)
3.26. Teaching staff's requirements for students	33 students (62,3%)	18 students (34%)	2 students (3,8%)	0 (0 %)	0 (0 %)
3.27. Informational support and explanation of the HEI entrance requirements and educational program (specialty) strategy before entering HEI	34 students (64,2%)	17 students (32,1%)	2 students (3,8%)	0 (0 %)	0 (0 %)
3.28. Information on requirements necessary to be met to complete this educational program (specialty) successfully	31 students (58,5 %)	20 students (37,7%)	1 student (1,9%)	1 student (1,9%)	0 (0 %)
3.29 Quality of examination materials (tests, examination questions and so on)	31 students (58,5%)	21 students (39,6%)	0 (0%)	1 student (1,9%)	0 (0 %)
3.30. Objectivity of evaluation of knowledge, skills and other academic achievements	34 students (64,2%)	16 students (30,2%)	3 students (5,7%)	0 (0 %)	0 (0 %)
3.31.Available computer classrooms	34 students (64,2 %)	17 students (32,1%)	2 students (3,8%)	0 (0 %)	0 (0 %)
3.32.Available scientific laboratories	33 students (62,3%)	17 students (32,1%)	2 students (3,8%)	0 (0 %)	1 student (1,9%)
3.33.Teacher's objectivity and fairness	36 students (67,9%)	15 students (28,3 %)	0 (0 %)	1 student (1,9 %)	1 student (1,9 %)
3.34.Informing students about courses, educational programs, and the academic degree being received	38 students (71,7%)	13 students (24,5 %)	1 student (1,9 %)	1 student (1,9 %)	0 (0 %)
3.35. Providing students with dormitory facilities	33 students (62,3%)	15 students (28,3 %)	3 students (5,7%)	0 (0 %)	2 students (3,8%)

4. Evaluate to what extent you agree that:

Утверждение	Fully agree	Agree	Partially agree	Disagree	Fully disagree	No answer

4.1 The course program was clearly presented	35 students (66 %)	15 students (28,3 %)	3 students (5,7%)	0 (0%)	0 (0 %)	-
4.2 The course content is well-structured	34 students (64,2%)	14 students (26,4%)	4 students (7,5%)	1 student (1,9%)	0 (0 %)	-
4.3 The key terms are properly explained	36 students (67,9%)	14 students (26,4%)	3 students (5,7%)	0 (0 %)	0 (0 %)	-
4.4 The material suggested by the Teacher is relevant and reflects the latest scientific and practical developments	34 students (64,2%)	15 students (28,3%)	3 students (5,7%)	1 student (1,9%)	0 (0 %)	-
4.5 The teacher uses effective teaching methods	34 students (64,2%)	15 students (28,3%)	4 students (7,5%)	0 (0 %)	0 (0 %)	-
4.6 The teacher is knowledgeable about information being taught	37 students (69,8%)	13 students (24,5%)	3 students (5,7%)	0 (0 %)	0 (0 %)	-
4.7 The teacher presents the material clearly	36 students (67,9 %)	14 students (26,4%)	3 students (5,7%)	0 (0 %)	0 (0 %)	-
4.8 The teacher presents the material in an interesting manner	33 students (62,3%)	15 students (28,3%)	3 students (5,7%)	2 students (3,8%)	0 (0 %)	-
4.9 Knowledge, skills and other academic achievements are evaluated objectively	32 students (60,4%)	18 students (34 %)	1 student (1,9 %)	0 (0 %)	0 (0 %)	2 students (3,8%)
4.10 The teacher meets your requirements and expectations regarding professional and personal development	34 students (65,4 %)	14 students (26,9%)	3 students (5,8 %)	0 (0 %)	0 (0 %)	1 student (1,9%)
4.11 The teacher boosts the students' activity	31 students (58,5%)	17 students (32,1 %)	4 students (7,5%)	1 student (1,9 %)	0 (0 %)	-
4.12 The teacher boosts the students' creative thinking	30 students (56,6 %)	16 students (30,2 %)	4 students (7,5%)	2 students (3,8 %)	0 (0 %)	1 student (1,9%)
4.13 Teacher's appearance and manners are adequate	34 students (64,2%)	17 students (32,1%)	1 student (1,9%)	1 student (1,9%)	0 (0 %)	-
4.14 The teacher demonstrates a positive attitude to students	33 students (62,3 %)	16 students (30,2 %)	4 students (7,5 %)	0 (0 %)	0 (0 %)	-
4.15 Academic achievement evaluation system (seminars, tests, questionnaires and others) reflects the content of the course	34 students (64,2 %)	15 students (28,3 %)	4 students (7,5 %)	0 (0 %)	0 (0 %)	-
4.16 Evaluation criteria the teacher uses are clear and available	34 students (64,2%)	16 students (30,2 %)	1 student (1,9%)	1 student (1,9%)	0 (0 %)	1 student (1,9%)
4.17 The teacher evaluates students' achievements objectively	36 students (67,9%)	14 students (26,4%)	1 student (1,9 %)	2 students (3,8%)	0 (0 %)	-
4.18 The teacher speaks the professional language	32 students (60,4%)	19 students (35,8%)	2 students (3,8%)	0 (0 %)	0 (0 %)	-
4.19 The educational organization allows for sporting and other leisure activities	28 students (52,8%)	17 students (32,1 %)	2 students (3,8%)	1 student (1,9%)	2 students (3,8%)	3 students (5,7%)
4.20 Equipment and facilities for students are safe, comfortable and up-to-date	29 students (54,7%)	18 students (34%)	2 students (3,8%)	1 student (1,9%)	2 students (3,8%)	1 student (1,9%)
4.21 The library is well-equipped and has a sufficient collection of scientific, educational and methodological literature	32 students (60,4 %)	16 students (30,2 %)	4 students (7,5%)	0 (0 %)	0 (0 %)	1 student (1,9%)
4.22 All students have equal opportunities for EP study and personal development	30 students (56,5%)	19 students (35,8%)	2 students (3,8%)	1 student (1,9%)	0 (0 %)	1 student (1,9%)
23. Equal opportunities are provided to all learners	35 students (66 %)	15 students (28,3 %)	3 students (5,7%)	0 (0%)	0 (0 %)	-

5. Other problems related to the teaching quality

1. Teachers don't have enough markers for whiteboards. And some computers and its equipments are very old
2. Nl
3. No problems