

Dear **PROF. DR. AHMET YOZGATLIGİL**
RECTOR OF ORTA DOĞU TEKNİK ÜNİVERSİTESİ

The Turkish Higher Education Quality Council (THEQC) evaluated your institution following THEQC's institutional external evaluation and accreditation criteria within the scope of **2025 Mid-term Evaluation Program** at the Council meeting dated **18/07/2025** and decided to grant your institution **Full Accreditation for 5 Years**.

The Council makes its accreditation decision based on the **Mid-term Evaluation Report** written by an evaluation team formed within the scope of **Mid-term Evaluation Program** and the recommendations of the Commission on Institutional External Evaluation and Accreditation as a result of the consistency analysis. During the Commission's consistency analysis process, there may be differences in evaluating some sub-criteria between the evaluation team and the Commission. The Council communicates these differences in this letter to your institution to guide your quality assurance work.

As a result of the evaluations made in this context, the Council decided differently about the maturity levels determined by the evaluation team in the following sub-criteria. Here are the points THEQC wants to make about your institution's institutional accreditation process:

For the sub-criteria **A.1.1 Governance model and administrative structure, A.1.3 Institutional transformation capacity, A.1.4 Internal quality assurance mechanisms, A.2.1 Mission, vision and policies, A.5.2 Internationalization resources**, under the heading of Leadership, Governance and Quality, THEQC reached a different conclusion **due to insufficient evidence and explanations**.

For the sub-criteria **B.1.3 The alignment of course objectives with program outcomes, B.2.3 Student admission and the recognition and crediting of prior learning, B.2.4 The certification of qualifications and the diploma, B.3.4 Disadvantaged groups, B.4.3 Incentives and rewards for educational activities**, under the heading of Learning and Teaching, THEQC reached a different conclusion **due to insufficient evidence and explanations**.

For the sub-criteria **C.2.1 Research competencies and their development**, under the heading of Research and Development, THEQC reached a different conclusion **due to insufficient evidence and explanations**.

For the sub-criterion **D.1.1 Management of service to society processes, D.1.1 Management of service to society processes, D.1.2 Resources, D.1.2 Resources, D.2.1 The follow-up and evaluation of service to society performance, D.2.1 The follow-up and evaluation of service to society performance**, under the heading of Service to Society, THEQC reached a different conclusion **due to insufficient evidence and explanations**.

The Council recommends that your institutional accreditation report should focus on the sub-criteria with a maturity level of 3 and below, that follow-up and improvements be made in these areas, and that existing areas of strength be maintained and developed. We believe that the improvement efforts to be made by your institution will contribute to the development of your quality assurance processes.

On the occasion of your institution being entitled to receive full accreditation, we congratulate you for leading this process, all your managers/directors and staff, quality commission members and all your stakeholders. THEQC wishes you success in your future continuous improvement work.



Prof.Dr. Ümit KOCABIÇAK
President of THEQC