

**International
Institutional
Accreditation
Report**

**University of
New York Tirana
- UNYT**
Albania

Evaluation Team:

Prof. Dr. Füsün Eyidoğan
Prof. Dr. Bülent Çavaş
Prof. Dr. Tonguç Ünlüyurt
Dr. Fatoş Özkan Erciyas
Eda Eren

2026

Table of Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	5
INTRODUCTION	6
BACKGROUND OF THE REVIEW AND OUTLINE OF THE REVIEW PROCESS	6
INFORMATION ABOUT INSTITUTION	7
INFORMATION ABOUT THE HIGHER EDUCATION SYSTEM IN ALBANIA.....	8
A. GOVERNANCE AND QUALITY	11
A.1. GOVERNANCE AND QUALITY	11
A.1.1. Governance model and administrative structure (ESG 1.1).....	11
A.1.2. Governance (Leadership and Quality Culture) (ESG 1.1)	13
A.1.3. Institutional transformation capacity (ESG 1.1)	15
A.1.4. Internal quality assurance mechanisms (ESG 1.1)	17
A.1.5. Public disclosure and accountability (ESG 1.8).....	19
A.2. MISSION AND STRATEGIC GOALS	21
A.2.1. Mission, vision and policies (ESG 1.1)	21
A.2.2. Strategic goals and objectives (ESG 1.1)	24
A.2.3. Performance management (ESG 1.1)	26
A.3. GOVERNANCE SYSTEMS.....	29
A.3.1. Information management system (ESG 1.7)	29
A.3.2. Human resources management (ESG 1.5)	33
A.3.3. Financial management	36
A.3.4. Process management (ESG 1.1).....	38
A.4. STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT	40
A.4.1. Internal and external stakeholder involvement (ESG 1.8)	40
A.4.2. Student feedback (ESG 1.3)	42
A.4.3. Alumni relations management (ESG 1.3)	43
A.5. INTERNATIONALISATION	45
A.5.1. Management of internationalisation processes	45
A.5.2. Internationalisation resources	47
A.5.3. Internationalisation performance	49
B. LEARNING AND TEACHING	51
B.1. PROGRAM DESIGN, EVALUATION AND UPDATE	51
B.1.1. Design and approval of programs (ESG1.2).....	51
B.1.3. The alignment of course objectives with program outcomes (ESG 1.2)	55
B.1.4. Student workload-based course design (ESG 1.2).....	57
B.1.5. Follow-up and updating of programs (ESG 1.9)	59
B.1.6. Management of learning and teaching processes (ESG 1.3).....	60
B.2. IMPLEMENTATION OF PROGRAMS.....	62

B.2.1. Teaching methods and techniques (ESG 1.3)	62
B.2.2. Measurement and Evaluation (ESG 1.3).....	64
B.2.3. Student admission and the recognition and crediting of prior learning (ESG 1.4)	65
B.2.4. The certification of qualifications and the diploma (ESG 1.2)	67
B.3. LEARNING RESOURCES AND ACADEMIC SUPPORT SERVICES.....	68
B.3.1. The learning environment and resources (ESG 1.6)	68
B.3.2. Academic support services (ESG 1.5)	70
B.3.3. Facilities and infrastructure (ESG 1.6)	72
B.3.4. Disadvantaged groups (ESG 1.6).....	73
B.3.5. Social, cultural, and sporting activities (ESG 1.6)	75
B.4. TEACHING STAFF	77
B.4.1. Recruitment, promotion, and appointment criteria (ESG 1.5).....	77
B.4.2. Teaching competencies and development (ESG 1.5)	79
B.4.3. Incentives and rewards for educational activities (ESG 1.5)	80
C. RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	82
C.1. MANAGEMENT OF RESEARCH PROCESSES AND THE RESEARCH RESOURCES.....	82
C.1.1. Management of research processes	82
C.1.2. Internal and external resources	83
C.1.3. Doctoral programs and postdoctoral opportunities	85
C.2 RESEARCH COMPETENCE, COLLABORATIONS, AND SUPPORTS	86
C.2.1. Research competencies and their development.....	86
C.2.2. National and international joint programs and joint research units.....	88
C.3. RESEARCH PERFORMANCE	89
C.3.1. The follow-up and evaluation of research performance.....	89
C.3.2. Performance evaluation for the teaching staff/researchers.....	91
D. SERVICE TO SOCIETY	93
D.1. MANAGEMENT OF SERVICE TO SOCIETY PROCESSES AND THE SERVICE TO SOCIETY RESOURCES	93
D.1.1. Management of service to society processes	93
D.1.2. Resources	94
D.2. SERVICE TO SOCIETY PERFORMANCE	95
D.2.1. The follow-up and evaluation of the service to society performance	95
CONCLUSION	97
SUMMARY OF COMMENDATIONS	98
OVERVIEW OF JUDGEMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	101
KEY RECOMMENDATIONS	102
SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER IMPROVEMENTS	109
MATURITY LEVELS OF SUB-CRITERIA.....	114

ANNEX	116
ANNEX 1: PROGRAMME OF THE ONLINE MEETING AND SITE VISIT.....	116
ANNEX 2: GLOSSARY	123

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report analyses the extent to which the University of New York Tirana (UNYT) complies with the evaluation criteria of the International Institutional Accreditation Program (IIAP). It is based on an external evaluation process coordinated by the Turkish Higher Education Quality Council (THEQC). IIAP is a cross-border evaluation process conducted using THEQC's ESG-based IIAP Evaluation Criteria and is explicitly structured around a continuous improvement approach. The evaluation relies on the institution's internal self-evaluation as its starting point and integrates external evaluation with the participation and perspectives of internal and external stakeholders. This report presents the findings of THEQC's IIAP external evaluation of the University of New York Tirana, conducted in accordance with THEQC's IIAP processes and tools, and based on the evidence provided through the institution's self-evaluation, supporting documentation, and stakeholder engagement during the evaluation activities.

The Evaluation Team conducted an online pre-visit on 24 March 2026, followed by an on-site visit between 7 and 10 April 2026. We would like to thank THEQC for its coordination and the arrangements that facilitated the effective conduct of the process, and the institution for its cooperation and for sharing information throughout the review.

This report evaluates the University of New York Tirana (UNYT) across four areas: governance and quality assurance, learning and teaching, research and development, and service to society. These areas, together, provide an evaluation framework aligned with the Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area (ESG 2015).

The evaluation draws on the submitted evidence set, institutional regulations and policies, findings from the external review, and observations gathered during the pre-visit and the site visit. In line with ESG 2015, the review goes beyond confirming the existence of arrangements. It focuses instead on the extent to which they are institutionalised, embedded in practice, systematically monitored, and continuously improved. To support consistent and evidence-based judgements, the report applies the five-level maturity model developed by the Turkish Higher Education Quality Council (THEQC). The IIAP evaluation of the institution began with the review of the Institutional Self-Evaluation Report and the submitted evidence set, followed by an online pre-visit to confirm the visit schedule and clarify key lines of inquiry. The on-site visit, triangulated evidence through meetings with institutional leadership, academic and administrative units, students, and other stakeholders, alongside document review and on-site observations. Following the visit, the peer-review team drafted an evidence-based report, incorporated the institution's feedback on factual accuracy, and finalised the report to inform THEQC's accreditation decision-making process.

Overall findings indicate a mature quality-management profile at the University of New York Tirana, supported by defined processes disseminated throughout the institution and by evidence-based monitoring practices.

Strengthening these processes with a clearly defined chain linking actions, responsibilities, timelines, indicators, and evidence of closure will further enhance institutional impact. Systematic closure of the PDCA cycle can be achieved by ensuring that monitoring outputs consistently inform improvement actions. The visibility and analytical use of indicators across the institution need to be enhanced beyond activity-based measures, supported by a structured, digital reporting framework. Focusing on these areas will enable the institution to maintain its current strengths while deepening its culture of quality.

INTRODUCTION

This report analyses the extent to which The University of New York Tirana (UNYT) aligns with the evaluation criteria framework of the International Institutional Accreditation Program of the Turkish Higher Education Quality Council (THEQC). This report is based on an external evaluation process coordinated by THEQC.

BACKGROUND OF THE REVIEW AND OUTLINE OF THE REVIEW PROCESS

The Turkish Higher Education Quality Council (THEQC) implements the International Institutional Accreditation Program (IIAP) as an external quality-assurance mechanism for higher education institutions operating outside the borders of the Republic of Türkiye. The IIAP is designed in alignment with the Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area and is grounded in the fundamental principle that higher education institutions hold primary responsibility for the quality and continuous enhancement of their learning and teaching, research and development, and service to society functions.

As a cross-border evaluation framework, the IIAP is conducted in accordance with THEQC's ESG-aligned evaluation criteria and is explicitly structured around the principle of continuous improvement. The process is initiated through the institution's internal self-evaluation and complemented by an external review that incorporates perspectives from both internal and external stakeholders.

This report sets out the findings of THEQC's IIAP external evaluation of the University of New York Tirana, undertaken in accordance with established IIAP procedures and instruments. The evaluation is based on evidence derived from the institution's self-evaluation report, supporting documentation, and stakeholder input obtained throughout the review process.

THEQC defines the IIAP as a multi-stage process comprising: (i) application and approval, (ii) preparation of the Institutional Self-Evaluation Report (ISER), (iii) appointment of the evaluation team and scheduling of site visits, (iv) pre-visit activities, (v) site visit, (vi) report drafting, (vii) consistency checks and finalisation, (viii) accreditation decision, (ix) follow-up procedures, and (x) complaints and appeals. In accordance with these procedures, THEQC constituted the Evaluation Team through its Evaluator System and conducted due diligence to

ensure the absence of any conflict of interest between the institution and the appointed reviewers.

The Evaluation Team was composed as follows:

- Team Leader: Prof. Dr Füsün EYİDOĞAN, Chair / Başkent University
- Team Member: Prof. Dr Bülent ÇAVAŞ / Dokuz Eylül University
- Team Member: Prof. Dr Tonguç ÜNLÜYURT / Sabancı University
- Team Member: Asst. Prof. Dr Fatoş ÖZKAN ERCİYAS/ University of Birmingham
- Student Evaluator: Eda EREN / Hacettepe University
- Review Coordinator (THEQC): Asst. Prof. Dr. Ayşegül KOZAK ÇAKIR

Prior to the site visit, the Evaluation Team convened preparatory meetings to clarify roles and responsibilities, review the IIAP criteria, establish linkages between evidence and analysis, and organise the report-writing process. The team conducted a detailed review of the ISER and its annexes and identified areas requiring further clarification during the pre-visit and site visit stages.

Following the site visit, the Evaluation Team prepared the International Institutional Accreditation Report (IIAR) using an evidence-based methodology, ensuring terminological precision and maintaining a constructive and impartial evaluative tone. In accordance with the IIAP timeline, the draft report was shared with the institution for verification of factual accuracy. Feedback received was duly considered, and where applicable, revisions were transparently documented through a structured comparison mechanism. The Evaluation Team affirms that it was granted full access to all relevant documentation and stakeholders throughout the evaluation process.

INFORMATION ABOUT INSTITUTION

The University of New York Tirana (UNYT) was founded in 2002 as the first private, English-medium higher education institution in Albania, at a time of significant transformation within the national higher education landscape. Subsequently, the University of New York Tirana (UNYT) was formally established by Council of Ministers Decision No. 448, dated 11 July 2012. The institution has been fulfilling its mission of "Educating Tomorrow's Leaders" since its establishment.

A defining component of the Institution's international profile is its longstanding partnership with the State University of New York – Empire State University (SUNY/ESU). This collaboration enables students to obtain dual degrees from both institutions, thereby reinforcing academic integrity, enhancing international visibility, and ensuring alignment with globally recognised academic standards.

In 2018, the Institution became part of the Turkish Maarif Foundation, a non-profit educational organisation operating across multiple levels of education in more than 50 countries. Under the auspices of the Turkish Maarif Foundation, the University has strengthened its institutional capacity, broadened its academic portfolio, and enhanced its role in promoting intercultural dialogue and international cooperation.

The Institution is structured into three main faculties: the Faculty of Economy and Business (including programmes in Business Administration, Economics and Finance, and Business Informatics and e-Business); the Faculty of Law and Social Sciences (Law, Political Science/International Relations, Psychology, and Education); and the Faculty of Engineering and Architecture (Computer Science, Information and Intelligent Systems, and Architecture and Design). In addition, the Institute of European and Balkan Studies encompasses two centres: the European Research Centre and the Balkan Research Centre. The institution also has a Research, Project and Innovation Centre.

The Institution offers study programmes across all three cycles of higher education in accordance with the Albanian Qualifications Framework, including Bachelor's degrees, Master of Science and Professional Master's programmes, and Doctoral (PhD) programmes. English is the official language of instruction. The institution currently hosts approximately 1,448 students representing 42 nationalities, with 477 new student registrations recorded in the 2025–2026 academic year. The Institution is a member of the European Universities Association (EUA) and the Balkan Universities Association (BUA). The Institution has been granted a 6-year institutional accreditation by the Albanian Ministry of Education and Sports in 2020.

INFORMATION ABOUT THE HIGHER EDUCATION SYSTEM IN ALBANIA

Higher education in Albania is centrally governed, with no local-level authorities, which distinguishes it from the pre-university education system.

At the higher education institution level, according to the Albanian Law on higher education, higher education institutions' organs at the university level include:

The Academic Senate is the highest collegial body of the higher education institutions, headed by the Rector. It is elected by general voting for a four-year period. The senate is composed of professors and students. The latter compose at least 10% of the Senate. At the institutional level, governance is administered through several key organs, including the Rector, the Rectorate, and the Deanate, as well as the Council of Ethics and various Permanent Commissions, all of which operate within the frameworks established for Main and Basic academic units.

The Bachelor's degree is awarded after the successful completion of at least three years of study, corresponding to 180 ECTS credits. To obtain a Bachelor's degree, a student must accumulate a minimum of 180 ECTS. First-cycle higher education studies in Albania correspond to level 6 of the *Albanian Qualifications Framework (AQF)*, and their normal duration is three academic years.

In Albania, to be admitted to first-cycle study programmes, whether in public or non-public higher education institutions, candidates must hold a State Matura Diploma or a State Vocational Matura Diploma, meet the minimum national quality threshold established by the Council of Ministers, and fulfil the specific admission criteria set by each institution of higher education. Under the new higher education law, study programmes will be codified at the national level, and similar programmes must have at least 70% identical content across all institutions. Student employment will be considered both a ranking parameter for universities and a performance indicator for evaluating funding for Albanian higher education institutions.

Upon completion of each level of higher education, students receive the corresponding diploma and a Diploma Supplement, which provides information about the level, type, and content of the completed studies, in accordance with the European Diploma Supplement format. Diplomas and supplements for each study programme must be registered in the State Register of Diplomas and Certificates for Higher Education and Scientific Research, administered by the Educational Services Centre.

In Albania, a second-cycle study corresponds to Level 7 of the Albanian Qualifications Framework (AQF) and EQF Level 7. A 2-year "Master of Science" program requires 120 ECTS upon completion, whereas a 5- or 6-year "Integrated Master of Science" program requires 300 or 360 ECTS, respectively. Second-cycle programs also include the "Professional Master" degree. "Professional Master" programs last 1 or 2 years and require the accumulation of 60 or 120 ECTS credits.

Admission to second-cycle programs is open to candidates who have completed a first-cycle (bachelor's) study program. Admission criteria are determined by the academic unit offering the program and may vary slightly between HEIs. Integrated study programs are exempt from this rule, with admission criteria established by the main unit and the Quality Assurance Agency. HEIs may recognise credits earned in "Professional Master" programs for transfer to "Master of Science" programs. It is important to note that one of the admission requirements for an MSc degree is proficiency in one of the five European Union foreign languages (English, French, German, Italian, or Spanish), certified by internationally recognised examinations.

The standard language of instruction is Albanian, but HEIs may conduct examinations, parts of courses, or entire programs in a minority language or another foreign language, which the HEI must declare in the licensing application.

Third-cycle higher education programs in Albania correspond to Level 8 of the Albanian Qualifications Framework (AQF) and EQF Level 8. Executive Master's programs provide advanced scientific and professional education, normally lasting one or two academic years and comprising 60 or 120 ECTS credits. Long-term specialised programs are professionally oriented, provide specialised knowledge, last at least two academic years, and include no fewer than 120 ECTS credits. They conclude with a comprehensive examination or a thesis, awarding a "Specialisation Diploma" in the relevant field.

Doctoral studies are designed as individual programs promoting independent research in the field offered by the base or main academic unit. They are based on scientific research and creative activities. Doctoral studies last a minimum of three academic years and a maximum of five years. HEIs establish annual evaluation criteria for candidate progress and research output.

Admission to third-cycle programs is open to candidates holding a Master of Science degree who meet the admission criteria set by the HEI. Additionally, proficiency in one of the five EU foreign languages (English, French, German, Italian, Spanish), certified by internationally recognised exams, is required. HEIs submit the list of doctoral graduates to the relevant ministry for recording in the national registry of academic degrees and credentials. Doctoral programs are financed through scientific research grants that the institution receives from the State Budget, but can also be self-financed.

A. GOVERNANCE AND QUALITY

A.1. GOVERNANCE AND QUALITY

A.1.1. Governance model and administrative structure (ESG 1.1)

Evidence

The University of New York Tirana (UNYT) was established in 2002 as Albania's first private, English-medium higher education institution and its governance framework is grounded in the UNYT Statute. It has been operating under the ownership of the Turkish Maarif Foundation since 2018. The organisational system articulates responsibilities across five principal bodies: the Board of Administration, the Academic Senate, the Rector, the Rectorate, and the Council of Ethics, complemented by Faculty Councils at the unit level.

The Board of Administration, established by the Board of Trustees of the Turkish Maarif Foundation, is the highest administrative authority. It approves and monitors the Strategic Plan, oversees budgets, financial management, and institutional regulations and appoints the Rector and University Administrator. The Academic Senate serves as the highest academic authority, chaired by the Rector, and is responsible for matters related to academics, research, and ethics. The Senate meets at least twice per academic year with broad internal stakeholder representation, including a student representative, and members serve four-year terms. The Rector is the highest academic authority and legal representative in academic matters. The Rectorate, as the central executive body, implements strategic plans and annual reports. The University Administrator is the highest authority in financial and administrative matters.

During the site visit, the evaluation team observed that governance bodies function operationally. Regular monthly meetings of the Academic Senate and the Board of Administration were confirmed, with structured agendas, documented minutes and decisions. Specific governance decisions were evidenced through Senate minutes and Board decisions, including formal decisions on programme naming, faculty restructuring, and budget approvals. The organisational chart is publicly available on the website and is reflected in the Strategic Plan 2026-2030.

The transition from a profit-oriented ownership model to foundation-based, non-profit management under the Turkish Maarif Foundation represents a documented transformation with strategic implications. This shift has accompanied a broadening of the strategic framework around four pillars: institutionalisation, digitalisation, internationalisation, and research orientation.

Analysis

There is evidence of an organisational chart with defined bodies and distributed responsibilities; however, the organisational governance model could benefit from greater clarity in documenting decision-making pathways within the institution. The separation between financial-administrative governance (Board of Administration) and academic governance (Senate) clarifies authority and accountability. The formal appointment of the Rector, alongside the structured role of the University Administrator with dual accountability to both the Board and the Senate, provides governance coherence across strategic and operational domains. The student representative's voting participation in the Senate further reinforces participatory governance.

Site-visit observations confirmed that governance bodies meet regularly and that communication channels between the Board, Senate, Rectorate and academic units are functional. The transition to Turkish Maarif Foundation ownership was described by institutional leaders as a catalyst for strengthening governance, supported by increased strategic investment, infrastructure development, and international visibility.

The evaluation team identified a development area related to the systematic evaluation and monitoring of governance effectiveness. While governance structures are formally defined and operationally present, evidence of structured governance performance evaluation, including KPIs for governance effectiveness, formal reporting on whether governance bodies are functioning as intended, and traceable examples where governance review identified weaknesses and implemented corrections, was not always clear. Additionally, during the site visit, decision-making was observed to be predominantly concentrated at the senior management level, with limited evidence of distributed decision-making responsibilities across broader academic and administrative units. The absence of formal divisions of responsibility for senior management positions, especially for Vice Rectors, was also noted. The institution does not have a systematic, regularly convened University Advisory Board that involves external stakeholders.

Evaluation Team Commendation I

The Evaluation Team commends the institution for maintaining a clearly structured organisational chart with defined bodies, regular meeting cycles, and documented decision-making pathways, all supported by the governance transformation associated with Turkish Maarif Foundation ownership, which has strengthened strategic coherence and institutional capacity.

Evaluation Team Recommendation I

The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution ensure that governance review processes produce traceable outputs by systematically recording follow-up actions arising from governance body meetings, with defined owners, timelines, and evidence of completion, thereby enabling clearer PDCA-cycle closure at the governance level.

Evaluation Team Recommendation II

The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution assign and publicly publish formal responsibilities for Vice Rectors in their respective areas.

Evaluation Team Recommendation III

It is recommends that the institution establish a University Advisory Board to support systematic external input into strategic governance.

Evaluation Team Suggestion for Further Improvement I

The Evaluation Team suggests that the institution strengthen the visibility of governance effectiveness by developing a small, well-defined set of key performance indicators covering, for instance, meeting regularity, decision implementation rates, and stakeholder representation, and routinely reviewing and reporting on these within governance outputs.

Evaluation Team Conclusion for Maturity Level: 3

The governance model and organisational structure of the institution function in a manner that includes the entirety of units and areas.

A.1.2. Governance (Leadership and Quality Culture) (ESG 1.1)

Evidence

The institution positions internal quality assurance (IQA) as an integral component of its governance framework and strategic management. The IQA system is grounded in Law No. 80/2015, ASCAL standards in Albania. The framework is operationalised through the Internal Quality Assurance Regulation, the Regulation of the PCAQS (Permanent Commission for the Assurance of Quality Standards), the Quality Assurance Manual, and the QA Strategic Plan, approved by the Academic Senate.

The Quality Assurance Unit (QAU) is composed of four members, including one external academic expert, and functions with operational independence. It coordinates QA activities across the institution in cooperation with the PCAQS, the Rectorate, the Deans, and the

Department Heads. The PCAQS, established by the Academic Senate and including a student representative, serves as the central collegial QA body with monitoring, evaluation, and enhancement responsibilities. The QAU collects and analyses evaluation data, prepares internal and external QA reports, proposes corrective actions, and reports to the Academic Senate.

Leadership commitment to quality culture was observed during the site visit through engagement of the Rector and senior management in quality-related discussions, evidence of structured communication procedures linking administrative leadership to academic units, and an accreditation engagement strategy with ASCAL. Annual departmental reports, quality sections on the university website and regular publication of Student Evaluation Reports based on course and instructor evaluation surveys reflect institutional accountability practices. The appointment of an external expert to the QAU provides an independent perspective within the QA structure.

Analysis

There is evidence that the institution has a structured internal quality assurance system with defined roles, documented instruments, and clear responsibilities across the institution. Leadership engagement with QA was directly observed during the site visit, and the institution demonstrates awareness of quality principles through its regulatory alignment and reporting structures. The QA framework's breadth, covering student course and instructor evaluations, peer review, individual performance assessments, and departmental reporting, provides a multi-source evidence base for institutional QA monitoring.

The inclusion of an external expert in the QAU strengthens the independence of the QA function. A further area for development concerns the visibility of impact. While the QA system is structurally well-defined, evidence demonstrating how quality assurance findings consistently lead to the implementation of institutional improvements that close the PDCA cycle from 'Check' to 'Act' was limited in depth. Plans and practices for developing a culture of quality are described. Still, concrete, traceable examples of how leadership reviews of QA results have produced specific changes in policy or practice remain underrepresented in the evidence base. The monitoring of leadership qualifications and competencies exists as a concept, but its systematic application and documented outcomes require strengthening.

Evaluation Team Commendation I

The Evaluation Team commends the institution for establishing a comprehensive internal quality assurance framework, including multiple evaluation instruments, a dedicated Quality Assurance Unit with external expert involvement, and a clear institutional positioning of QA as a strategic priority.

Evaluation Team Recommendation I

The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution establish a structured leadership development framework that draws on available resources to systematically build the leadership capabilities of academic and administrative staff.

Evaluation Team Recommendation II

The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution implement a 360-degree leadership evaluation process for senior academic and administrative leaders, incorporating structured feedback.

Evaluation Team Conclusion for Maturity Level: 3

The institution has leadership practices that complement the development of a quality assurance system and culture throughout the entire institution.

A.1.3. Institutional transformation capacity (ESG 1.1)

Evidence

The institution's institutional transformation is guided by strategic pillars as defined in its Strategic Plan 2026–2030. The revised Statute, adopted in 2025, alongside restructured governance regulations, reflects the institution's normative adaptation in response to changes in higher education frameworks, as outlined below. The transition from profit-oriented to foundation-based governance under the Turkish Maarif Foundation is presented as a significant transformation milestone, associated with strategic capacity-building and institutional expansion.

Digitalisation, one of the strategic pillars identified in the Strategic Plan 2026-2030, is evidenced by the deployment and ongoing development of the KION information management system, which integrates academic, financial, and administrative functions. The institution has also adopted an AI Policy for teaching contexts across the institution, reflecting responsiveness to the rapidly changing digital landscape in higher education. Infrastructure development, including the East Campus expansion and laboratories, demonstrates investment-linked transformation aligned with the institution's strategic growth objectives. In terms of physical infrastructure, the institution has acquired land to support future campus expansion, demonstrating forward-looking capacity planning. Also, student enrolment data is used to inform scenario planning and ensure that current facilities are utilised at feasible and sustainable levels.

Research development and internationalisation represent two areas where the institution acknowledges the need for further transformation, identifies them as core pillars in its Strategic Plan, and is actively working to strengthen capacity. In staffing, the institution is working to address recruitment challenges by attracting more internationally diverse academic staff, including those from Türkiye, and by establishing doctoral programmes in partnership with universities in Türkiye to strengthen research capacity and pipeline development.

Analysis

The institution demonstrates strategic awareness of the changing higher education environment and has established a coherent, mission-aligned framework for institutional development. The four-pillar strategic architecture provides a recognisable governance basis for managing change across institutional functions. The Turkish Maarif Foundation ownership transition, KION system deployment, AI policy adoption, and East Campus development each represent identifiable transformation initiatives with institutional impact.

At the same time, the evaluation team found that the evidence base for transformation capacity was predominantly structural and descriptive. There was limited evidence of the use of formal change management methodologies, structured innovation management processes, or documented scenario analyses for future higher education contexts. Systematic benchmarking analysis remains an area for development, as current practices are limited across the institution. Concrete case studies of crisis management, for example, enrolment pressures or sudden leadership transitions, were not presented as structured evidence of the capacity for transformation. Similarly, evidence for how the evaluation of the 2020–2025 Strategic Plan formally informed the design of the 2026–2030 plan was descriptive rather than evidence-based.

The absence of a documented AI operational policy for administrative processes (as distinct from a teaching-context AI policy), formal change management or risk management frameworks, and future scenario planning mechanisms represents an area requiring structured development. Establishing these instruments would enable the institution to demonstrate its capacity for transformation at the process level, not only at the strategic narrative level.

Evaluation Team Commendation I

The Evaluation Team commends the institution for defining a coherent four-pillar strategic framework and implementing tangible transformation initiatives that reflect an outward-facing orientation and responsiveness to institutional development priorities.

Evaluation Team Recommendation I

The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution develop formal change and risk management frameworks that operationalise how the institution identifies, assesses, plans for, and monitors institutional change, such as digitalisation, capacity risks, and shifts in the external environment, thereby moving transformation capacity from strategic narrative to embedded institutional practice.

Evaluation Team Recommendation II

The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution conduct a systematic benchmarking analysis to enhance competitiveness at the national, regional, and international levels.

Evaluation Team Suggestion for Further Improvement I

The Evaluation Team suggests that the institution strengthen its institutional transformation narrative by systematically documenting selected transformation episodes as case studies, capturing what triggered the change, how it was managed (including governance decisions and resource allocation), and the evidence demonstrating outcomes and learning, thereby enabling demonstrable evidence of transformation capacity.

Evaluation Team Conclusion for Maturity Level: 3

The change management approach is expanded throughout the institution and being carried out holistically.

A.1.4. Internal quality assurance mechanisms (ESG 1.1)

Evidence

The institution's IQA system is coordinated through three principal structures: the Permanent Commission for the Assurance of Quality Standards (PCAQS), the Quality Assurance Unit (QAU) and the governance chain of the Rector, Academic Senate, Deans, and Department Chairs. The PCAQS, established by the Academic Senate and comprising five to seven members, including a student representative, oversees institutional and programme-level quality monitoring and compliance with national and international standards. The QAU includes four members and an external expert, maintains operational independence, and reports to the Academic Senate.

QA mechanisms documented at the institution include: student course and instructor evaluations (conducted anonymously and electronically each semester); student evaluation of administrative units; peer evaluation for professional development and newly appointed staff; individual assessment performance (IAP) reviews; graduating student programme evaluation questionnaires; departmental and faculty annual reports; data reporting on

research outputs; and an institutional annual report approved by the Academic Senate and Board of Administration and submitted to the Ministry of Education and Sports.

During the site visit, the evaluation team observed that course and instructor evaluations are conducted each semester with electronic administration and anonymous collection, and that results are shared with academic leadership following grade submission. Peer evaluation processes were confirmed for newly appointed and part-time staff. The KION system supports data collection and management for students' QA activities. The Quality Assurance section of the institution's website publishes regulations, evaluation summaries, and annual QA reports, supporting transparency. In response to pre-visit requests, the institution submitted evidence packages demonstrating QA cycle documentation and sample improvement actions.

Analysis

The institution operates an IQA system with a portfolio of evaluation instruments covering teaching, administrative services, research, and institutional performance. The breadth of mechanisms, spanning course and instructor evaluations, peer reviews, grading audits, individual performance assessments, and layered reporting, provides substantive input for monitoring at the institutional level. The involvement of an external academic expert and a student representative in the PCAQS reflects alignment with ESG principles on stakeholder inclusion in quality governance.

Site-visit evidence confirmed that evaluation instruments are operational and that results are reviewed by academic leadership. The evaluators observed some positive examples of quality work, including revisions to the MSc Finance and Accounting programme driven by ACCA accreditation requirements and departmental evaluations, as well as evidence of curriculum reorganisation following analysis of student feedback. Provided materials and observations indicated that the PDCA cycle is more consistently evident at the 'Plan–Do–Check' stages, with documented closure of the cycle through structured 'Act' actions being demonstrated inconsistently.

A primary area for development is the consistent, institution-wide documentation of follow-up actions arising from QA evaluations. While quality mechanisms collect and report data, evidence of how findings systematically translate into structured improvement actions with owners, timelines, and documented outcomes is uneven across faculties and units.

Additionally, no evidence was found of faculty-level quality assurance committees operating in parallel to the central QAU structures.

Evaluation Team Commendation I

The Evaluation Team commends the institution for maintaining a comprehensive set of internal quality assurance instruments.

Evaluation Team Recommendation I

The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution reinforce the 'Act' stage of the PDCA cycle by systematically recording in a digital system, for each major QA evaluation cycle, which findings were reviewed, which improvement actions were agreed upon (with owners and timelines) and what evidence demonstrates that these actions were implemented. Their effects are assessed, enabling clearer traceability from evaluation to improvement across institutional levels.

Evaluation Team Suggestion for Further Improvement I

The Evaluation Team suggests that the institution strengthen the integration of QA mechanisms by establishing faculty-level QA focal points or committees to complement the central QAU structure, distribute quality assurance responsibilities more effectively across academic units, and support closer alignment between unit-level monitoring and institutional improvement cycles.

Evaluation Team Suggestion for Further Improvement II

The Evaluation Team suggests establishing a QA-integrated institutional dashboard to enable real-time cross-unit monitoring.

Evaluation Team Conclusion for Maturity Level: 3

A transparent and holistic internal quality assurance system is implemented throughout the entire institution.

A.1.5. Public disclosure and accountability (ESG 1.8)

Evidence

The institution's public disclosure practices are regulated through the UNYT Statute, University Regulation, and Quality Assurance Manual. Publicly available information includes governance body structures and decisions, study programme details and admission criteria, annual and financial reports, QA results, tuition and scholarship policies, institutional regulations, committee decisions, and research activities. Information is disseminated primarily through the official website, social media platforms, and annual reports, in both Albanian and English.

The Quality Assurance Office coordinates the accuracy and regular updates of publicly disclosed information, maintaining transparency through a dedicated QA section on the website. The institutional annual report is approved by the Academic Senate and Board of Administration, submitted to the Ministry of Education and Sports, and published publicly.

External financial audits are conducted annually by independent auditors in accordance with national standards.

Recent developments include expanded online publication of QA and accreditation results and stakeholder communication through newsletters and press releases. During the site visit, the evaluators confirmed that the website provides information on programmes, governance, and institutional activities.

Analysis

The institution demonstrates public disclosure practices with identifiable responsible units, documented regulatory grounding, multi-channel communication, and bilingual publication of institutional information. The combination of internal governance reporting (Senate and Board annual reports), external regulatory compliance (Ministry of Education and Sports submission), and independent financial audits provides a multi-tier accountability framework. The dedicated QA transparency section of the website is a notable practice in terms of disciplined publication of quality-related evidence.

Site-visit observations confirmed that institutional information is publicly accessible and that staff across units are aware of disclosure responsibilities. The institution demonstrates compliance-level awareness and has operationalised many disclosure requirements through routine reporting and communication channels.

A development area identified by the evaluation team is the systematic collection and analysis of stakeholder feedback on public information practices themselves, for example, whether disclosed information meets stakeholder needs, whether it is sufficiently accessible and comprehensible, and whether accountability mechanisms are effective from a stakeholder perspective. Such feedback mechanisms would enable the institution to move from compliance-oriented disclosure to participatory accountability. Additionally, performance indicators for institutional effectiveness are not systematically published in a way that enables external stakeholders to assess progress over time; disclosing selected KPIs and their trends would strengthen the accountability dimension of public information.

Currently, institutional communication responsibilities sit within the Public Relations and Marketing Office. While this arrangement provides a functional basis for external communication, institutional communication in a higher education context extends beyond marketing and promotional activities to encompass internal governance communication, quality reporting, stakeholder accountability, and crisis communication. Separating institutional communication from marketing into a dedicated unit would provide clearer ownership, greater strategic scope, and stronger alignment with the institution's governance and quality assurance functions.

Evaluation Team Commendation I

The Evaluation Team commends the institution for maintaining a multi-channel, bilingual public disclosure framework underpinned by regulatory compliance, independent financial auditing, a dedicated QA transparency section on the institutional website, and a structured annual reporting chain linking operational units to governance bodies and external regulators.

Evaluation Team Recommendation I

The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution strengthen the performance accountability aspect of its public disclosure by systematically publishing a defined set of institutional performance indicators, including trend data across academic years, in a publicly accessible format, enabling external stakeholders to assess institutional progress and reinforcing transparency beyond compliance-level reporting.

Evaluation Team Recommendation II

The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution publish the institutional communication responsibilities, workflow charts, reporting lines, and accountability mechanisms to ensure consistent and coordinated communication across academic and administrative units.

Evaluation Team Suggestion for Further Improvement I

The Evaluation Team suggests that the institution enhance the accountability dimension of its public disclosure practices by developing mechanisms to collect and act on stakeholder feedback on the accessibility, comprehensiveness, and usefulness of publicly available institutional information, thereby enabling iterative improvement of disclosure practices.

Evaluation Team Conclusion for Maturity Level: 3

The institution operates public disclosure and accountability mechanisms in line with its defined processes.

A.2. MISSION AND STRATEGIC GOALS

A.2.1. Mission, vision and policies (ESG 1.1)

Evidence

The institution's mission, which is 'Educating Tomorrow's Leaders', has been consistently pursued since the institution's founding in 2002 and is publicly articulated in the UNYT Statute and Strategic Plan 2026–2030. The mission emphasises creating, developing, and protecting knowledge while preparing future citizens, professionals, and scholars through teaching,

learning, and research, with attention to personal and professional development, ethical leadership, community engagement, and preparation for a diverse global environment. The institutional vision is to become a leading higher education institution in the Balkans and beyond, recognised for excellence in teaching, impactful research, and community engagement.

Institutional policies reflect a student-centred, internationally oriented educational philosophy that draws on both American and European higher education traditions. The policy framework promotes interdisciplinary learning, critical thinking, academic integrity, diversity, and professional development. The four strategic pillars (Institutionalisation, Digitalisation, Internationalisation, and Research Orientation) provide the operational framework through which mission and vision are pursued. The Statute and the Strategic Plan 2026–2030 are both publicly available on the institution's website, with the Strategic Plan approved by Senate Decision No. 110 on 07.05.2025.

During the site visit, the evaluation team observed that the mission and vision are understood and referred to by academic staff, students, and administrative leadership. Students, in particular, articulated awareness of the institutional brand and academic values. The establishment of the Institute of European and Balkan Studies, dual-degree partnerships with SUNY/Empire State University, and the institution's positioning as Albania's only English-medium private university reflect the operational embodiment of the internationalist mission. The 2026–2030 Strategic Plan development process included internal consultation with Rectorate and Senate members.

However, evidence demonstrating systematic evaluation of how policies are performing against mission objectives, including structured stakeholder feedback informing policy revision cycles, was limited. The institution described its policy framework and its alignment with mission, but concrete 'review-to-change' examples, where stakeholder input resulted in an identifiable policy update with documented outcomes, were not consistently presented.

Analysis

The institution's mission and vision are publicly articulated, institutionally embedded, and operationally referenced across governance documents, strategic plans, and stakeholder communications. The institution's 23-year track record, its consistent positioning as Albania's first private English-medium university, and its alignment with the Turkish Maarif Foundation's educational mission all reinforce the coherence of its institutional identity. Mission-driven institutional decisions, including the SUNY dual-degree partnership, the development of the Institute of European and Balkan Studies, and the internationalisation strategy, are traceable from the mission statement to implemented practice.

At the same time, the evaluation team found that the systematic evaluation of whether institutional policies are effectively serving the mission, measured through structured stakeholder reviews, formal policy feedback cycles, and documented impact assessments, is an area for development. Mission and vision are strong as communication anchors, but the evidence trail from mission to policy to stakeholder-validated outcome is not consistently maintained or demonstrable.

Another important area is the clarity of the link between institutional policies and the Strategic Plan. While both exist as documented frameworks, the connection between specific policies and the strategic goals and KPIs they support is not clearly mapped or consistently demonstrable. Additionally, several KPIs within the Strategic Plan lack sufficient measurability, making it difficult to assess whether policy implementation is advancing strategic objectives in a verifiable way.

Evaluation Team Commendation I

The Evaluation Team commends the institution for maintaining a consistent, publicly communicated mission and vision that are reflected operationally in institutional decisions, strategic partnerships, and governance structures, with strong mission awareness among students, staff, and leadership observed during the site visit.

Evaluation Team Recommendation I

The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution establish a structured, defined, and periodic policy review process, involving relevant internal and external stakeholders, through which institutional policies are formally evaluated against mission and vision objectives, with findings documented and used to inform policy updates and to communicate them to the academic community.

Evaluation Team Recommendation II

The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution establish clear and explicit links between institutional policies and Strategic Plan goals, ensuring that measurable KPIs support each policy.

Evaluation Team Suggestion for Further Improvement I

The Evaluation Team suggests that the institution strengthen the evidence base for mission-policy alignment by maintaining a concise record of policy revision cycles, documenting which stakeholder inputs were reviewed, which policy adjustments were made, and which evidence demonstrates implementation and effect, thereby enabling clearer traceability from institutional values to practice.

Evaluation Team Conclusion for Maturity Level: 3

There are practices in compliance with mission, vision and policies throughout the institution.

A.2.2. Strategic goals and objectives (ESG 1.1)

Evidence

The institution has developed and operationalised strategic plans, with the Strategic Plan 2026–2030 approved by Senate Decision No. 110, dated 07.05.2025, following the Strategic Plan 2020–2025. Both plans include mission, vision, values, strategic objectives, and an Action Plan with measurable indicators. The 2026–2030 Strategic Plan is publicly accessible on the institution’s website and introduces strategic objectives across four pillars.

Strategic planning is completed through internal consultation with the Rectorate, faculties, and academic units before Senate approval and Board of Administration ratification. The 2020–2025 Strategic Plan is reported to be substantially implemented, with outcomes including new study programmes, strengthened research structures, expanded partnerships, increased scholarships, improved ICT infrastructure, deployment of the KION system, and income diversification through research projects.

Strategic goals are operationalised through KPIs and action plans at institutional and unit levels. Departmental and faculty annual reports serve as monitoring instruments, and the RPIC Annual Plan monitors internationalisation objectives. Site-visit evidence confirmed that institutional leadership refers to strategic plan indicators in operational discussions. The institution also submitted evidence linking internationalisation targets to mobility and partnership metrics, and research targets to publication output data. The university implements an AI governance policy alongside research ethics guidelines that align with the institution’s strategic goals set out in the Strategic Plan 2026-2030.

However, strategic monitoring reports that systematically track KPI performance against the 2020–2025 plan targets are limited. Action plan review reports for the concluded strategic cycle were limited, and this limits the evidence-based transition from one strategic cycle to the next.

Staff demonstrated awareness of the Strategic Plan and its priorities during the site visit. However, the process through which the Strategic Plan was developed, including stakeholder consultation roadmaps, participation mechanisms, and how inputs were consolidated into final objectives, was not clearly documented. Additionally, the current Strategic Plan does not explicitly align with the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), representing a gap with respect to internationally recognised sustainability frameworks increasingly adopted by higher education institutions.

Analysis

The four-pillar framework provides coherence and facilitates communication of priorities across institutional units. The publicly accessible strategic plan supports transparency. Site-visit discussions confirmed that strategic priorities are referenced in operational planning at faculty and department levels, and that KPIs are tracked at the institutional level.

The key area for improvement is the systematic, consolidated documentation of strategic monitoring outcomes. While departmental and faculty annual reports serve monitoring functions, these are unit-level instruments rather than a consolidated strategic performance management view. The absence of strategic monitoring reports demonstrating KPI tracking, variance analysis, and corrective action decisions for the completed 2020–2025 cycle means that the 'output reflected in plans' dimension cannot be fully confirmed from submitted evidence alone. Site-visit conversations partly compensated for this documentation gap, with leadership describing how specific elements of the 2025 review informed the 2026–2030 plan, but this remains insufficiently documented.

The institution may have consolidated strategic monitoring outputs that cover what was tracked, where targets were met or unmet, what corrective actions were taken, and how findings shaped the succeeding plan, all systematically produced and accessible to an external evaluator.

While staff awareness of the Strategic Plan is a positive indicator, the absence of a clearly documented, predefined participatory process for preparing the Strategic Plan limits the ability to demonstrate inclusive stakeholder engagement in strategic planning. A structured roadmap that defines who is consulted, at what stages, through what mechanisms, and how inputs are reflected in final strategic decisions would strengthen both the quality and the legitimacy of the planning process. Furthermore, the absence of explicit SDG alignment in the Strategic Plan represents a missed opportunity to connect institutional priorities to globally recognised sustainability and development frameworks.

Evaluation Team Recommendation I

The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution reinforce the strategic monitoring-to-improvement chain by institutionalising an annual strategic monitoring report that consolidates KPI performance data across all pillars and units, records corrective and improvement decisions with defined ownership and timelines, and demonstrates how monitoring outputs have formally informed the subsequent planning cycle.

Evaluation Team Recommendation II

The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution integrate the UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) into the Strategic Plan to ensure institutional targets are formally linked with global sustainability priorities and international performance indicators.

Evaluation Team Recommendation III

The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution develop a predefined, documented participatory process that includes internal and external stakeholders for future strategic plan preparation.

Evaluation Team Suggestion for Further Improvement I

The Evaluation Team suggests that the institution monitor digitally and publish periodic strategic progress summaries, in an accessible and concise format, on the institutional website, highlighting key KPI performance trends, priority adjustments, and resulting improvement actions.

Evaluation Team Conclusion for Maturity Level: 3

The institution has a holistic strategic plan adopted by all its units and recognised by its stakeholders, and practices agree with this plan.

A.2.3. Performance management (ESG 1.1)

Evidence

The institution's performance management system is coordinated primarily by the Quality Assurance Unit and the Human Resources Office, with oversight from the Academic Senate, the Rectorate, and the Heads of Departments and Research Centres. The system covers both academic and administrative staff. For academic staff, performance assessment focuses on teaching, research, student advising, and administrative responsibilities, using course and instructor evaluations, peer evaluations, academic performance indicators, and individual performance reports (IAP). Course and instructor evaluations are conducted each semester electronically and released only after final grade submission. For administrative staff, structured appraisal tools are applied by the Human Resources Office under the supervision of the University Administrator.

The Individual Assessment Performance (IAP) framework is the primary instrument for monitoring academic performance. Academic staff complete annual performance assessments covering teaching load, research output (publications, project participation), advising activity, and institutional service. Departmental annual reports and faculty annual

reports consolidate unit-level performance data. The institutional Annual Report, approved by the Senate and Board, provides the overarching performance view. Curricula development and programme revision decisions are subject to Senate and Rectorate approval as part of the performance-improvement cycle.

In addition, the institution reported that KPIs are defined within the Strategic Plan Action Plans and tracked through departmental monitoring. The Strategic Plan 2026–2030 defines six strategic goals, namely Excellence in Academic Quality and Program Development, Internationalisation Strategy, Innovation and Research Excellence, Digital Transformation, Student-Centred University and Institutional Development and Sustainability, supported by 89 KPIs in total. A Job Satisfaction Survey for administrative staff was introduced in 2025 as a new engagement monitoring instrument, with plans to extend it to all staff by 2026.

During the site visit, the evaluation team confirmed that performance management instruments are operational. The IAP framework, course, and instructor evaluation reports were confirmed as active and consistently applied. However, the evaluation team observed that digital performance management systems operate across multiple platforms without a centralised performance dashboard, making cross-unit comparisons and aggregated trend analysis challenging. Evidence that IAP outcomes systematically inform resource allocation, promotion decisions, and targeted professional development actions was presented descriptively but not documented in a traceable chain.

Analysis

The institution maintains a performance management framework that covers academic and administrative staff and is supported by evaluation processes at individual, unit, and institutional levels. The IAP framework, departmental and faculty annual reports, and institutional annual reporting provide a layered monitoring architecture. The course and lecturer evaluations were conducted electronically, with post-grading release, reflecting good practice in integrity management.

A primary development area is the integration of these performance monitoring instruments into a cohesive, institution-wide performance management system with clear linkages from individual performance data to unit-level improvement decisions to institutional strategic priorities with their respective KPIs. As currently evidenced, performance management operates effectively at the data collection and reporting stages. Still, the consistency of 'Act' actions, in which performance monitoring outputs demonstrably lead to targeted improvement decisions with documented outcomes, is uneven. The lack of a centralised digital performance management framework was noted as a structural limitation that makes it harder to demonstrate consistent, institution-wide monitoring against strategic goals.

While the breadth of the KPI framework is commendable, the link between these strategic KPIs and the institution's operational performance management cycle is not clearly established. It is not sufficiently evidenced how KPI data is systematically collected, by whom, at what frequency, and how performance against these indicators feeds into management decisions and improvement actions at unit and institutional levels.

The introduction of the Job Satisfaction Survey for administrative staff is a positive development, and its planned extension to all staff reflects institutional commitment to evidence-based HR management. Accelerating this development and ensuring that results are systematically linked to specific improvement actions would strengthen the maturity of the overall performance management system.

Evaluation Team Recommendation I

The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution develop a digital, centralised performance management framework that integrates academic and administrative performance data, enables cross-unit trend analysis, and generates traceable links from monitoring findings to documented improvement decisions, thereby facilitating consistent PDCA-cycle closure across all institutional levels.

Evaluation Team Recommendation II

The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution establish a clear operational framework that links strategic KPIs to the performance management cycle, with defined responsibilities and reporting mechanisms, to ensure that KPI outcomes systematically inform management decisions and improvement actions.

Evaluation Team Suggestion for Further Improvement I

The Evaluation Team suggests that the institution strengthen the transparency and usefulness of performance management by developing an integrated performance summary report that consolidates IAP outcomes, course and instructor evaluation trends, and research productivity data at faculty and institutional levels, enabling more systematic identification of performance patterns and targeted improvement priorities.

Evaluation Team Conclusion for Maturity Level: 3

There are performance management practices throughout the entire institution.

A.3. GOVERNANCE SYSTEMS

A.3.1. Information management system (ESG 1.7)

Evidence

The institution operates a number of digital information systems that support the acquisition, storage, processing, use and evaluation of institutional information across key academic, administrative and financial functions. The primary institutional information management system is KION, a modular, web-based platform used to support academic and administrative operations. KION enables student course registration, grade entry, GPA calculation, financial transaction management, institutional reporting and demographic data analysis. Access to the system is role-based and supported by secure authentication, encrypted communication protocols, activity logging and audit trails.

KION is hosted on secure cloud infrastructure and is supported by firewalls, traffic monitoring and intrusion-prevention mechanisms. The institution's IT infrastructure holds ISO 27001 information security management certification, as confirmed during the site visit. This provides an internationally recognised framework for information security governance and indicates that the institution has formalised arrangements for protecting institutional data.

The evaluation team confirmed, through a presentation and demonstration during the site visit, that KION functions as the central operational information system for a number of academic and administrative processes. Students, academic staff, administrative units and leadership have role-differentiated access. The Student Affairs Office, Records Office and Finance Office each have defined KION access rights supporting their respective responsibilities. KION is also integrated with financial processes to the extent that students can make online payments, access invoices and track scholarships.

In addition to KION, the institution uses other digital systems to support specific institutional functions. These include Financa 5 for accounting and financial reporting, VENUT for procurement, Turnitin for academic integrity, and separate tools for human resources-related functions. The IT Office manages distribution, maintenance and technical assistance for institutional IT services across both campuses.

However, the evidence reviewed indicates that the institution's information management environment remains partially fragmented. While KION supports important academic, administrative and financial processes, the report does not demonstrate a fully integrated information management system covering all primary institutional processes, including quality assurance, research and development, and service to society. Integration between KION and quality assurance processes was described as only partially developed. No institutional analytics dashboard was evidenced that would enable systematic, cross-functional monitoring of institutional performance indicators in real time or near real time.

The evaluation team also noted that data flows across KION, Financa 5, VENUT and separate HR tools are not yet fully integrated. As a result, institutional reporting and performance analysis depend to some extent on manual extraction, consolidation and interpretation of

data from separate platforms. Evidence was not provided to demonstrate systematic use of integrated, system-generated data for strategic decision-making and improvement across all primary institutional processes and functions, including leadership and governance, teaching and learning, research and service to society.

Furthermore, no centralised Learning Management System is currently used across the institution. This limits the institution's ability to generate integrated learning analytics or to systematically link teaching and learning data with wider quality assurance and institutional performance monitoring processes.

Analysis

The institution has established a functional digital information environment that supports important operational processes. KION is used as a platform for managing student records, course registration, grade processing, financial information and selected institutional reporting functions. The role-based access structure, secure authentication, audit trails and ISO 27001-certified information security arrangements represent clear strengths. These features demonstrate that the institution has systems in place to support the secure acquisition, storage, processing and use of institutional data.

The site visit demonstration confirmed that KION is actively used by relevant administrative units and that it supports day-to-day institutional operations. The use of KION with student financial processes is also a positive feature, as it enables students and administrative offices to access and process financial information in a structured and timely manner. Together, these elements show that the institution has moved beyond informal or purely manual information management practices and has implemented digital systems that support operational effectiveness.

At the same time, the evidence does not yet demonstrate that the institution has a fully integrated information management system covering all primary institutional processes including learning and teaching, research and development, service to society, quality assurance. The current information environment is composed of several systems, including KION, Financa 5, VENUT and separate HR tools, each supporting specific operational areas. While these systems are functional within their respective domains, the evidence does not show sufficiently integrated data flows between them. This limits the institution's ability to produce consolidated institutional intelligence without manual data extraction and reconciliation.

The main development need therefore concerns the strategic and analytical use of institutional data. Although KION supports transactional and administrative processes effectively, the institution has not yet demonstrated a centralised analytics layer or institutional dashboard that enables senior management, quality assurance bodies and relevant committees to monitor institutional performance indicators systematically. Such a dashboard would be expected to support evidence-informed decision-making by allowing the institution to identify trends, monitor risks, evaluate progress against strategic objectives and track improvement actions across academic and administrative areas.

The integration of quality assurance processes into the information management environment also remains at an early stage. The evidence indicates that QA integration with KION is partially developed, but not yet sufficiently operational to enable systematic analysis of quality indicators in real time or near real time. As a result, the current system supports the collection and processing of information, but its capacity to generate integrated QA-linked analytics for institutional enhancement remains limited.

The institution has mechanisms for collecting and storing institutional information, and these mechanisms are used in several important operational areas. However, the evidence does not yet show that system-generated data are consistently used across all primary institutional functions to support strategic planning, quality enhancement and institutional improvement.

There is also a need to strengthen institutional data governance. While individual systems have defined access controls and security protocols, an overarching data governance framework defining data ownership, data classification, data quality standards, access responsibilities and reporting procedures across all digital platforms has not yet been fully established. Such a framework would improve consistency, reliability and accountability in the use of institutional data and would support more effective quality assurance and decision-making.

A further development area concerns risk management and business continuity planning. Although the institution has strong information security arrangements, including ISO 27001 certification, the evaluation team noted the need for a more explicit risk management and data governance policy addressing business continuity, data continuity and institutional resilience.

Overall, the institution demonstrates that it has operational information systems supporting the acquisition, storage, processing, use and evaluation of institutional information in several key areas. However, the evidence does not yet support a conclusion that these systems operate as a fully integrated institutional information management system across all primary processes including learning and teaching, research and development, service to society, quality assurance. The current arrangements provide a solid operational basis, but further development is required in the areas of integration, analytics, data governance, QA-linked reporting and strategic use of institutional data.

Evaluation Team Commendation I

The Evaluation Team commends the institution for operating an ISO 27001-certified information security management framework and for implementing KION as a secure and functional platform supporting core academic, administrative and financial transactions.

Evaluation Team Recommendation I

The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution enhance the strategic utility of its information management environment by developing an institutional analytics capability,

including a defined set of performance indicators and a monitoring interface accessible to quality assurance structures and senior leadership.

Evaluation Team Recommendation II

The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution develop an institutional data governance framework defining data ownership, data classification, data quality standards, access responsibilities and reporting procedures across all digital platforms.

Evaluation Team Recommendation III

The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution work towards developing a fully integrated information management system covering all primary institutional processes, including quality assurance, research and development, and service to society, thereby reducing reliance on manual data consolidation across fragmented platforms.

Evaluation Team Recommendation IV

The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution strengthen the integration between its information management systems and quality assurance processes, so that quality indicators can be systematically monitored, analysed and used for institutional improvement.

Evaluation Team Recommendation V

The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution develop information management functionality covering all primary institutional processes, including leadership and governance, teaching and learning, research and development, and service to society.

Evaluation Team Suggestion for Further Improvement I

To enhance international recruitment and global visibility, it is recommended that the university expand its website to include multilingual versions that provide information on programs, admission requirements, and campus life for diverse international audiences.

Evaluation Team Suggestion for Further Improvement II

The Evaluation Team suggests that the institution consider implementing or integrating a centralised Learning Management System to support teaching and learning analytics and to enable closer alignment between learning data, programme monitoring and quality assurance processes.

Evaluation Team Suggestion for Further Improvement III

The Evaluation Team suggests that the institution develop a phased data integration strategy, including short-, medium- and long-term milestones for consolidating institutional data flows, developing dashboards and improving cross-functional performance monitoring.

Evaluation Team Conclusion for Maturity Level: 2

The institution has information management systems to support the acquisition, storage, usage, processing and evaluation of institutional information.

A.3.2. Human resources management (ESG 1.5)

Evidence

Human Resources Management (HRM) at the institution is governed by the UNYT Statute, Strategic Plan 2026–2030, and the draft Human Resources Policies and Procedures document (2025). Recruitment is merit-based, using public announcements through institutional and external platforms, Ad Hoc Commission review, and Rector or Board of Administration approval for appointments. Employment contracts are standardised across full-time, part-time, and doctoral academic staff categories. International staff represent approximately 18–20% of the total academic staff and receive administrative support for residence and work permit procedures. Approximately 15% of the staff are alumni of the institution.

Professional development is supported through annual orientation programmes for new staff, academic seminars, administrative skills programmes, and health and safety sessions. Academic staff are encouraged to participate in Erasmus+ mobility, international projects, and professional networks. A Teaching Staff Evaluation and Promotion Guideline has been finalised to standardise performance monitoring, promotion criteria, and career development pathways.

Staff evaluation is structured using the IAP framework for academic staff, complemented by student course evaluations, instructor evaluations, and peer reviews. Administrative staff are evaluated through standardised appraisal tools by the HR Office. A Job Satisfaction Survey for administrative staff was introduced in 2025, with plans to extend to all staff by 2026. HR metrics tracking tenure, turnover rate, alumni staff proportion, and international staff ratios are reported.

Performance monitoring for administrative staff is conducted through standardised appraisal tools managed by the HR Office. Career progression opportunities for administrative staff are supported through defined promotion procedures and structured evaluation mechanisms. An open-door culture observed during the site visit reflects an institutional environment in which staff feel comfortable sharing opinions and proposing improvements, thereby contributing positively to organisational climate and staff engagement.

The HR Office organises orientation programmes for administrative staff. For academic staff, orientation is supported through the peer review system, and there is no centralised Human Resources Department-run orientation programme for all staff. Faculty- and department-level structured orientation activities that complemented the institutional-level onboarding were not evident.

During the site visit, staff demonstrated high levels of motivation and a strong sense of institutional belonging. Recruitment procedures were confirmed as publicly announced and procedurally consistent. However, the staff satisfaction monitoring system remains in early implementation stages.

The HR Policies and Procedures document, which would provide the overarching regulatory foundation for all HRM activities, remains in draft form and has not yet been formally adopted. Staff satisfaction monitoring, introduced in 2025, currently covers only administrative staff and is in early implementation, meaning institution-wide HRM monitoring data is not yet systematically collected or analysed. Orientation practices differ across staff categories, and there is no consistent institutional framework applicable to all staff in academic and professional services.

Analysis

The institution demonstrates a functional Human Resources Management (HRM) mechanism with merit-based recruitment, where decisions were reached through discussions among committee members and using criteria defined in the job descriptions, structured orientation for administrative staff, multi-source academic staff evaluation, and identifiable professional development pathways. The high levels of observed staff motivation and sense of institutional belonging are positive indicators of organisational culture and HRM effectiveness, consistent with the evaluation team's direct site-visit observations during meetings with academic and administrative staff groups.

The primary areas for development are the systematisation and documentation of HRM practices. The staff satisfaction monitoring system, while conceptually sound, is in its early stages of implementation and is not yet providing institutional-level analysis to inform HR improvement decisions.

A more consistent and structured orientation framework applicable to all staff categories, complemented by faculty- and department-level integration activities, would ensure that new staff are effectively introduced to both institutional policies and unit-specific practices. Incorporating the evaluation of the orientation programme effectiveness within the staff satisfaction survey would further support evidence-based improvement of onboarding practices.

The presence of performance-monitoring mechanisms and career-progression pathways for administrative staff reflects a commitment to equitable staff management beyond the academic domain. The open-door culture observed during the site visit is a notable strength, fostering a participatory environment that supports continuous improvement. However, a formal incentive and award mechanism recognising outstanding contributions by administrative staff is not yet in place. Introducing such a mechanism would complement existing evaluation practices and strengthen staff motivation and the institutional culture of recognition.

While the institution demonstrates functional HRM practices across recruitment, evaluation, and professional development, the evidence does not yet support a Level 4 assessment. The absence of a formally adopted HR policy document means the regulatory foundation for HRM remains incomplete. Staff satisfaction monitoring covers only one staff category and has not yet produced institutional-level analysis to inform documented improvement actions. Orientation practices lack a consistent cross-institutional framework. Taken together, these gaps indicate that HRM processes, while defined and implemented, are not yet systematically monitored and improved across all staff categories and all HRM functions.

Evaluation Team Commendation I

The Evaluation Team commends the institution for operating a transparent, merit-based recruitment system, maintaining high staff motivation and institutional belonging and for initiating systematic staff satisfaction monitoring for administrative staff.

Evaluation Team Recommendation I

The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution establish a systematic, institution-wide staff satisfaction monitoring cycle that extends the survey to all staff categories, analyses results at the institutional and unit levels, and documents specific improvement actions linked to the findings.

Evaluation Team Recommendation II

The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution establish a formal incentive and award scheme for administrative staff, recognising outstanding performance and contributions to institutional development, thereby complementing the existing academic recognition framework and fostering a more inclusive culture of excellence across all staff categories.

Evaluation Team Recommendation III

The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution develop a more consistent orientation framework across all staff categories, complemented by faculty- and department-level

integration activities, and incorporate an evaluation of orientation effectiveness into the staff satisfaction survey to enable evidence-based improvement of onboarding practices.

Evaluation Team Suggestion for Further Improvement I

The Evaluation Team suggests that the institution accelerate the formal adoption of the Human Resources Policies and Procedures document to provide a coherent, institutionally approved regulatory foundation for all HRM activities, including recruitment, evaluation, promotion, and professional development.

Evaluation Team Conclusion for Maturity Level: 3

The human resources management practices are maintained in line with the defined processes throughout the entire institution.

A.3.3. Financial management

Evidence

The institution's financial management is grounded in its Annual Academic Budget, Annual Fiscal Budget, and Three-Year Budget Plan, aligned with the Strategic Plan and implemented through efficiency and sustainability principles. Budget preparation is coordinated by the University Administrator based on proposals from all units. It is approved by the Academic Senate and the Board of Administration, with in-year reallocations following defined approval procedures. The Finance Office oversees financial transactions, budget implementation, documentation, and compliance for accounting, financial reporting, and procurement.

The financial management framework includes monthly financial reporting, budget monitoring, cash flow control, and verification of liabilities and payments. Internal controls encompass general, accounting, and financial controls with segregation of duties and documented procedures. External oversight is provided through annual independent audits conducted in accordance with National Auditing Standards, with audited financial statements submitted to tax authorities and the National Business Registration Centre. An external comprehensive audit by the Ministry of Education and Sports was conducted in 2023. The institution monitors financial management processes through monthly reporting, audit findings, and cash-flow analysis. However, documented examples demonstrating how monitoring results have led to specific corrective or improvement actions were not consistently evidenced during the evaluation.

From a financial sustainability perspective, the institution is primarily funded through tuition fees, with strategic support from the Turkish Maarif Foundation and growing alternative

revenue streams from research projects and international collaborations. This financial model was confirmed during the site visit, with institutional leadership describing a prudent and sustainable approach to financial management.

Analysis

The institution demonstrates a structured and documented financial management framework with defined processes for budget preparation, approval, implementation, monitoring, and external audit. The multi-layer control environment, combining internal controls, segregation of duties, monthly reporting, and independent annual audits, meets recognised financial governance standards. The alignment of budget preparation with Strategic Plan priorities reflects an attempt to link financial planning to institutional development objectives.

The financial management system's maturity is also evidenced by the specialised software environment and the Finance Department's ongoing staff training programme, reflecting investment in functional capacity.

A development area is the clarity of the link between financial resource allocation and strategic priorities at a demonstrable level, specifically, evidence that the budget allocation process explicitly tracks whether spending is aligned with and advancing strategic pillar objectives, with corrective reallocation triggered by strategic performance data. Additionally, the integration of the financial management system with KION and other institutional platforms remains partial, as noted in the information management system assessment.

While the institution demonstrates a structured and well-governed financial management framework, the evidence does not yet show that financial management processes are not only monitored but also improved based on monitoring results, with traceable examples that show what issue was identified, what corrective or improvement action was taken, and what outcome resulted. The current evidence does not provide such examples, for instance, how a specific audit finding led to a documented procedural change, how cash-flow monitoring triggered a defined reallocation decision, or how budget performance against Strategic Plan pillars resulted in a corrective adjustment. The link between financial monitoring outputs and concrete improvement actions, therefore, has room for improvement.

Evaluation Team Commendation I

The Evaluation Team commends the institution for maintaining a structured financial management framework with multi-layer internal controls, monthly reporting, independent annual audits, and professional development for finance staff, reflecting a disciplined and accountable approach to financial governance.

Evaluation Team Suggestion for Further Improvement I

The Evaluation Team suggests that the institution strengthen the visibility of strategic-financial alignment by developing a budget analysis report that explicitly tracks allocation and expenditure against Strategic Plan pillar objectives, enabling governance bodies to assess whether resource allocation is advancing strategic priorities and to make evidence-informed reallocation decisions.

Evaluation Team Conclusion for Maturity Level: 3

The financial resources management practices are maintained in line with the defined processes throughout the entire institution.

A.3.4. Process management (ESG 1.1)

Evidence

Process management at the institution is grounded in the UNYT Statute, which defines responsibilities, decision-making structures, and the operational scope of academic and administrative units. Academic processes are governed through Faculty Rules and Regulations across the three faculties, covering admissions, curriculum delivery, examinations, grading, appeals, and graduation procedures. Administrative processes are implemented through defined procedures within each office, Finance, Records, Student Affairs, Public Relations and Marketing, Human Resources, Operations, IT, and Library, with formal procedures for core services including diploma issuance, degree verification, recruitment, examination administration, and procurement.

Academic support and student support processes are implemented through units including the Quality Assurance Unit, International Relations Office, Alumni and Career Office, Math Centre, Academic Writing Centre, Legal Clinic, Student Counselling Centre, and the Office of the Dean of Students. The Statute, faculty regulations, and office-level procedures together constitute the institutional process framework. Documentation includes examination procedures, diploma-issuing procedures, and archive regulations. The KION system supports academic process management for registration, grading, and record-keeping.

Analysis

The institution maintains a documented process management framework that covers core academic and administrative functions across all institutional units and is grounded in regulatory instruments at the Statute, faculty, and office levels. The distribution of process governance across defined units, each with documented procedures, reflects an institutionalised approach to operational management. The range of support units, from the

Legal Clinic and Academic Writing Centre to the Counselling Centre and Career Office, demonstrates the breadth of the student-facing process architecture.

Stakeholder involvement in process design, review, and improvement is not systematically evidenced. While stakeholders contribute to governance and academic quality processes through defined representation mechanisms, their structured participation in identifying process inefficiencies, proposing improvements, and validating revised procedures at the operational level is not documented. Embedding stakeholder input into process review cycles would strengthen both the relevance and ownership of institutional processes. Furthermore, the absence of a comprehensive process handbook that consolidates workflow charts, process ownership, performance criteria, and risk management considerations reflects a gap in institutional process governance maturity.

The primary development area is the systematic monitoring and continuous improvement of processes themselves as a management discipline. The current evidence indicates that processes are defined and implemented, but structured review cycles assessing whether processes are efficient, whether they are achieving their intended outcomes, and what improvements are made based on review findings are not consistently documented as a regular institutional practice. Process owners at the unit level do not appear to systematically produce process review outputs that feed into institutional process improvement planning. Additionally, documented workflow charts mapping key processes end-to-end across unit boundaries were limited.

Evaluation Team Commendation I

The Evaluation Team commends the institution for maintaining a broad institutional process management framework that covers academic, administrative, and student support functions, supported by defined regulations at the Statute, faculty, and office levels, and implemented through a diverse range of specialised institutional units.

Evaluation Team Recommendation I

The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution establish a structured process review cycle in which key institutional processes are periodically evaluated against defined efficiency and outcome criteria, with review findings recorded, improvement actions agreed (with owners and timelines), and outcomes documented, enabling a demonstrable improvement culture at the process management level.

Evaluation Team Recommendation II

The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution develop a comprehensive process handbook consolidating key institutional process flowcharts, ownership responsibilities, performance criteria, and risk management considerations for each process. The flowcharts

may include key cross-unit processes such as the student admission-to-graduation cycle, the programme review and approval process, and the QA reporting cycle, enabling process bottlenecks and handoffs.

Evaluation Team Recommendation III

The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution establish structured mechanisms for stakeholder involvement in process review cycles.

Evaluation Team Suggestion for Further Improvement I

The Evaluation Team suggests that the institution develop a structured process for owner feedback mechanisms to ensure continuous improvement at the process management level.

Evaluation Team Conclusion for Maturity Level: 3

Defined processes are managed throughout the entire institution.

A.4. STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT

A.4.1. Internal and external stakeholder involvement (ESG 1.8)

Evidence

Stakeholder involvement at the institution is governed through the UNYT Statute 2025 and the Internal Quality Assurance Regulation 2024, which codify stakeholder roles and inclusion in governance and QA bodies. Internal stakeholders such as academic staff, administrative staff, and students hold formal participation rights in governance bodies, including student voting representation in the Academic Senate and Faculty Councils. External stakeholders, such as employers, alumni, partner universities, and public/private organisations, are prioritised in line with the Strategic Plan 2026–2030 objectives.

Student feedback is collected through semester evaluations consolidated in Student Evaluation Reports. Employer consultation meetings are conducted in accordance with the Curriculum Development Policy and Procedures.

Programme-level curriculum revisions require the involvement of external experts and student representatives.

During the site visit, the evaluation team observed external stakeholder engagement with employers, community partners, and alumni, with visible evidence of institutional ownership and commitment among these stakeholders. A notable example of structured external stakeholder involvement is the partnership with a banking institution in the Applied Banking

and Finance programme, in which industry input is formally integrated into curriculum design and delivery through a documented MoU.

Student representation in governance was confirmed as active and meaningful. However, the evaluation team noted that evidence of decisions based on stakeholder input, as distinct from evidence of systematic input-collection mechanisms, was not consistently documented in a traceable chain from feedback to institutional action.

Analysis

The institution demonstrates an approach to stakeholder engagement, including documented feedback collection instruments. The breadth of stakeholder groups engaged, covering students, staff, employers, alumni, research partners, and community organisations, reflects an understanding of the stakeholder landscape. The external stakeholder ownership observed during the site visit is a notable institutional strength.

The banking sector partnership within the Applied Banking and Finance programme represents a good practice of meaningful external stakeholder engagement. However, similarly structured involvement was not consistently observed in other programmes, suggesting that this remains programme-specific rather than institutionally embedded.

The primary development area is the documentation of the feedback-to-decision chain. While input collection mechanisms are well-defined, evidence that specific stakeholder feedback items were reviewed, discussed at the governance level, and translated into identifiable institutional changes with documented follow-up is not consistently presented.

Additionally, the absence of a University Advisory Board involving external stakeholders was identified as a gap in the formal architecture for systematic external input into strategic planning. While informal and project-based external engagement is active, a structured advisory body would provide a more institutionalised channel for external strategic input.

Evaluation Team Commendation I

The Evaluation Team commends the institution for the external stakeholder ownership and engagement observed during the site visit, reflecting effective relationship management with employers, community partners, and alumni.

Evaluation Team Recommendation I

The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution establish a University Advisory Board (see in A.1.1 Recommendation III) with external stakeholder membership, including employer, alumni, and community representatives, to provide a structured and institutionalised channel

for external input into strategic planning, programme development, and quality assurance, thereby strengthening the governance architecture for systematic external engagement.

Evaluation Team Suggestion for Further Improvement I

The Evaluation Team suggests that the institution strengthen the systematic collection of feedback from external stakeholders and the documentation of stakeholder input.

Evaluation Team Conclusion for Maturity Level: 3

There are mechanisms for the involvement of stakeholders in the PDCA layers of all processes throughout the entire institution.

A.4.2. Student feedback (ESG 1.3)

Evidence

Student feedback at the institution is collected through multiple structured mechanisms. Course and instructor evaluations are conducted anonymously through the KION system and released only after the final grade is submitted. Administrative service evaluations assess students' experiences with support services annually. The PCAQS, in which students are represented, oversees QA processes, including evaluation design and results analysis. Student representatives participate with voting rights in the Academic Senate and Faculty Councils, enabling student perspectives to inform institutional decision-making.

Additional feedback channels include academic advising sessions, petition procedures, Student Union activities, and the Dean of Students' Office. The Student Union is active in channelling student views to institutional leadership, and the communication between students and the Dean of Students provides a continuous feedback flow with documented follow-up actions. Annual Student Government elections support democratic representation.

Evidence submitted demonstrates that student feedback has led to tangible improvements across service and academic areas, including enhancements to transportation and accommodation services based on student satisfaction data, curriculum-related improvements in selected programmes such as the introduction of printing facilities, immersive field trips, and expanded student options, reflecting a responsive institutional culture.

Analysis

The institution operates a broad, formally structured student feedback system with multiple input channels, electronic collection via KION, and governance-level student representation. The timing of course and instructor evaluations, released post-grading, reflects an integrity-

conscious approach. The active Student Union, the open communication channel between students and the Dean of Students, and evidenced service and academic improvements resulting from student feedback collectively demonstrate that the feedback system functions as a genuine improvement mechanism rather than primarily as a data-collection exercise.

Evaluation Team Commendation I

The Evaluation Team commends the institution for maintaining a multi-channel student feedback system, with formal student representation in governance bodies, electronic evaluation administration through KION, and concrete examples of service and academic improvements resulting from student feedback.

Evaluation Team Suggestion for Further Improvement I

The Evaluation Team suggests that the institution systematically track and publish response rates for course and instructor evaluation instruments and routinely communicate to students what specific actions were taken in response to feedback, thereby completing the feedback loop and reinforcing student motivation to participate.

Evaluation Team Conclusion for Maturity Level: 4

Practices about collecting student feedback are monitored in all programs and they are improved with student involvement. Feedback results are reflected in decision-making processes.

A.4.3. Alumni relations management (ESG 1.3)

Evidence

Alumni engagement at the institution is coordinated primarily through the Career and Alumni Office. Alumni are involved in mentorship activities, guest lectures, seminars, and Career Fairs as employer representatives. The Career and Alumni Office prepares an annual plan aligned with institutional strategy and QA objectives.

Alumni are employed in both academic and administrative roles at the institution (approximately 15% of staff are alumni), strengthening institutional continuity. The institution supports lifelong learning through a Scholarship Policy providing tuition reductions for alumni pursuing further studies. The establishment of a UNYT Alumni Association is reported as under development but not yet operational. Regular Alumni Gatherings and promotion of alumni achievements through official communication channels reflect institutional investment in alumni relationship management.

During the site visit, it was noted that alumni demonstrate high employability, with a significant proportion pursuing international careers, reflecting positively on the institution's educational outcomes. It was observed that alumni tracking is currently completed manually. The institution mentioned during the site visit that the digital alumni tracking system is in a development stage. The employability data and tracing concept are in place, but systematic, structured mechanisms for maintaining ongoing alumni contact, tracking employment outcomes longitudinally, and ensuring that alumni feedback is demonstrably reflected in academic or institutional decisions are not yet fully matured.

Analysis

The institution demonstrates a commitment to alumni engagement through institutional investment in the Career and Alumni Office, documented engagement activities (mentorship, guest lectures, career fairs), and an annual plan. The employment of alumni as institutional staff and the scholarship support for further study reflect a meaningful commitment to long-term alumni relationships.

The primary area for development is the maturity of the alumni tracking system itself. A systematic, longitudinal alumni-tracking mechanism capable of monitoring employment outcomes, capturing structured feedback on programme relevance, and generating data that demonstrably informs curriculum revision and programme development decisions was observed in a manual system. The absence of structured, regular alumni feedback mechanisms connected to documented academic improvement decisions means the alumni relations management system is currently better characterised as an emerging rather than a systematic practice.

Evaluation Team Commendation I

The Evaluation Team commends the institution for the alumni engagement culture observed during the site visit, evidenced by high graduate employability, some alumni involvement in institutional events and career support activities, and the institutional staff contribution of alumni who maintain strong institutional belonging.

Evaluation Team Recommendation I

The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution develop a web-based alumni tracking system to engage with the alumni community, supported by structured feedback mechanisms linked to programme review cycles and appropriate privacy controls.

Evaluation Team Suggestion for Further Improvement I

The Evaluation Team suggests that the institution encourage and support the establishment of an Alumni Association.

Evaluation Team Conclusion for Maturity Level: 3

There are alumni tracking system practices throughout the programs in the entire institution.

A.5. INTERNATIONALISATION

A.5.1. Management of internationalisation processes

Evidence

Internationalisation is positioned as a core strategic pillar at the institution, operationalised through the Internationalisation Strategy and the Strategic Plan 2026–2030 Objective No. 2. The Internationalisation Action Plan 2026–2030 serves as the operational planning and tracking document for internationalisation activities, with implementation monitored and results disseminated internally to support transparency and accountability.

The organisational structure for internationalisation management is defined across three levels. The Vice-Rector provides strategic oversight for Research and Internationalisation. Operational delivery of mobility and partnership management is coordinated by the International Relations Office (IRO). Research collaboration, project applications, and grant management are coordinated by the Research, Projects and Innovation Centre (RPIC). Staff responsibilities in both offices are defined through job descriptions and performance objectives. IRO and RPIC produce annual reports reviewed by the Rectorate and Senate, providing a formal reporting and accountability channel for internationalisation governance. The internationalisation strategy is publicly available and formally aligned with the Strategic Plan.

The institution holds the Erasmus Charter for Higher Education (ECHE) and is a member of the European University Association (EUA) and the Balkan University Association (BUA). The Turkish Maarif Foundation's international network provides additional pathways for internationalisation capacity development, including attracting students from countries where the Foundation operates and developing new MoUs and partnership agreements. The institution's strategic collaboration with the State University of New York at Empire State University (SUNY/ESU) enables students to obtain dual degrees from both institutions, reinforcing international academic credibility and global employability.

However, evidence of structured monitoring of the organisational structure itself — for example, periodic review of whether IRO and RPIC mandates are functioning as intended, whether roles and responsibilities are appropriately distributed, and whether structural adjustments have been made based on performance review findings — was not consistently demonstrated.

Analysis

The institution has established a defined and transparently communicated organisational structure for internationalisation management, with clear role distribution across the Vice-Rector, IRO, and RPIC, and formal alignment between the internationalisation strategy and

the Strategic Plan. The annual reporting cycle, reviewed by the Rectorate and Senate, serves as a governance accountability mechanism, while the Internationalisation Action Plan provides a planning and tracking framework. The volume and diversity of international partnerships, the growth trajectory of Erasmus+ mobility, active participation in research projects, and the multinational composition of students and staff provide a substantive internationalisation portfolio. The EUA and BUA memberships, ECHE holding, and TMF network situate the institution within structured international frameworks that support the legitimacy and reach of its internationalisation governance.

However, the evidence does not consistently demonstrate that the management and organisational structure for internationalisation is itself monitored and improved in a traceable way. While internationalisation outputs are tracked through KPIs covering mobility numbers and agreement counts. Project participation, evidence of the governance structure being reviewed, for example, whether the division of responsibilities between IRO and RPIC is periodically assessed for effectiveness, whether structural changes have been made based on performance findings, and whether the internationalisation policy is formally evaluated and updated through a defined review cycle, was not presented. The PDCA cycle is partially evidenced at the output monitoring stage, but the Check-Act dimension applied to the governance and organisational structure itself requires strengthening. For these reasons, the evidence more consistently demonstrates a completed and transparently functioning organisational structure for internationalisation management, rather than monitoring and improving that structure itself.

Evaluation Team Commendation I

The Evaluation Team commends the institution for establishing a clearly defined and transparently communicated organisational structure for internationalisation management, supported by a documented strategy aligned with the Strategic Plan, active IRO and RPIC operations, and membership in European and regional academic networks, including EUA, BUA, and the Erasmus Charter for Higher Education.

Evaluation Team Recommendation I

The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution establish a structured periodic review mechanism for its internationalisation governance and organisational structure, including defined review cycles, role distribution, and the internationalisation policy itself, with findings documented and used to inform structural adjustments and policy updates, thereby enabling traceable PDCA-cycle closure at the governance level of internationalisation management.

Evaluation Team Suggestion for Further Improvement I

The Evaluation Team suggests that the institution would benefit further from developing a strategy that systematically leverages the Turkish Maarif Foundation network to attract students from a wider range of countries and to expand international teaching and research

collaborations, complemented by future scenario analyses to inform proactive strategic positioning in the international higher education landscape.

Evaluation Team Suggestion for Further Improvement II

The Evaluation Team suggests that the institution strengthen its internationalisation governance monitoring by introducing periodic structured reviews of the effectiveness and efficiency of the IRO and RPIC organisational structures and mandates, assessing whether roles and responsibilities are appropriately distributed and whether the internationalisation policy requires updating, thereby enabling traceable PDCA-cycle closure at the governance level.

Evaluation Team Conclusion for Maturity Level: 3

The institution has completed its organisational structure for the management of the internationalisation processes and functions in a transparent, inclusive, and participatory manner.

A.5.2. Internationalisation resources

Evidence

The institution holds the Erasmus Charter for Higher Education (ECHE) and is an active member of the European University Association (EUA) and the Balkan University Association (BUA). As of the evaluation period, the institution reports 72 active international agreements (29 Erasmus+ IIAs and 43 MoUs), 36 Erasmus+ student mobilities and 33 Erasmus+ staff mobilities (2022–2025), six ongoing international research projects, and an ongoing joint PhD programme development process with Izmir Bakircay University. International students represent students from 42 nationalities, with 196 international students enrolled in 2025–2026. International staff represent approximately 18–20% of the total staff.

Internationalisation funding at the institution is defined annually through the institutional budgeting process coordinated by the Finance Office in cooperation with the IRO and RPIC. The budget includes dedicated lines for EU-funded projects (Erasmus+ KA1/KA2, COST Action), bilateral cooperation, international events, staff development, and mobility support. Funds are managed through centralised financial procedures and project management rules, including budgeting, reporting, procurement, and auditing requirements for externally funded activities. Erasmus+ finances follow Grant Agreement requirements with compliance controls and, where applicable, external evaluation arrangements.

Human resource support for internationalisation is provided by IRO staff managing Erasmus+ mobility and by RPIC staff managing project development, grant administration, reporting, and monitoring of deliverables. Professional development for internationalisation staff is supported through EU project management training, Erasmus+ procedural training, intercultural communication training, and research collaboration activities.

The Finance Office, IRO, and RPIC jointly coordinate monitoring of internationalisation resource distribution. The Finance Office tracks budget utilisation against dedicated internationalisation budget lines through monthly financial reporting. The IRO monitors Erasmus+ fund utilisation per faculty and unit, reporting against Grant Agreement requirements. The RPIC tracks project-based funding allocation and deliverables across faculties and research centres, submitting monitoring reports to the Rectorate and Administrator. Annual performance reporting consolidates resource utilisation data across all internationalisation funding streams, enabling institution-wide review of whether resources are equitably and effectively distributed.

A concrete example of monitoring-informed improvement is the use of internal review findings to identify that international project participation was concentrated predominantly in social sciences disciplines. In response, the institution rebalanced resources toward underrepresented disciplines through a documented and open internal staff engagement call.

Analysis

The institution demonstrates a structured, monitored approach to internationalisation resource management, with clearly defined responsibilities distributed among the Finance Office, IRO, and RPIC. Resource monitoring operates through multiple complementary mechanisms: monthly financial reporting by the Finance Office tracks budget line utilisation; IRO reports monitor Erasmus+ fund distribution per faculty; and RPIC reports track project-based allocation across units. These monitoring streams are consolidated in annual performance reports reviewed by the Rectorate, providing a systematic Check stage in the resource management cycle.

Critically, monitoring findings have demonstrably led to improvement actions, supporting a Level 4 assessment. The identification, through internal review, that international project participation was concentrated predominantly in social sciences disciplines led to a concrete institutional response: resources were rebalanced toward underrepresented disciplines through a documented, open internal staff engagement call. This represents a traceable Check–Act example where monitoring data identified an equity gap, and a defined improvement action was implemented and documented.

A remaining development area is the further systematisation of impact monitoring, moving beyond resource utilisation rates to assess the qualitative outcomes and institutional impact of internationally funded activities. Ensuring that resource allocation decisions across faculties are consistently informed by defined equity criteria would further strengthen the fairness and transparency of internationalisation resource management.

Evaluation Team Commendation I

The Evaluation Team commends the institution for maintaining a structured internationalisation resource management framework with dedicated budget lines, clearly defined monitoring responsibilities across the Finance Office, IRO, and RPIC, compliance-aligned financial procedures, and a documented example of monitoring-informed resource rebalancing toward underrepresented disciplines.

Evaluation Team Suggestion for Further Improvement I

The Evaluation Team suggests that the institution develop an action plan to diversify internationalisation funding sources beyond current projects, exploring alternative international grant schemes, bilateral funding opportunities, and foundation-supported initiatives to strengthen the sustainability and resilience of internationalisation resource management.

Evaluation Team Conclusion for Maturity Level: 4

The distribution of internationalisation resources in the institution is monitored and improved.

A.5.3. Internationalisation performance

Evidence

The institution's internationalisation performance is assessed through structured indicators, including the number and diversity of international partnerships, participation in international projects and networks, staff and student mobility, international student representation, and academic staff participation in international conferences and publications. Results are disseminated internally to support transparency and accountability and to inform the Internationalisation Action Plan 2026–2030.

For 2025–2026, the institution reports 196 international students enrolled (139 foreign nationals and 57 Albanian diaspora), representing 27 nationalities among the current cohort. The institution has participated in six Erasmus+ Capacity Building in Higher Education projects between 2023 and 2025 (GITEKA, DUALBA, WEB-NIMBUS, INITIATION, UNIGREEN, TEACHUP) as coordinator or strategic partner, joined COST Action CA21131, and submitted 37 international grant applications in the period (including 25 in 2024–2025). Mobility data for 2019–2025 shows 16 incoming and 34 outgoing students, and 42 incoming and 67 outgoing staff through IRO, with additional RPIC-coordinated mobilities. The institution has expanded its bilateral agreements and MoUs and increased its participation in international events, including conferences, workshops, and publications, in collaboration with the Balkan University Association.

The IRO and RPIC produce annual reports that feed into the institutional self-evaluation cycle, which the Rectorate and Senate review.

The strategic dual-degree partnership with the State University of New York at Empire State University (SUNY/ESU) represents a distinctive internationalisation performance indicator, enabling students to obtain degrees conferred by both institutions. This partnership contributes measurably to international recognition, graduate employability, and the institution's positioning within the American liberal arts tradition.

Analysis

The institution's internationalisation performance reflects a growing and diversified portfolio with quantified outcomes across mobility, partnerships, project participation, and international research output. The SUNY/ESU dual-degree partnership is a particularly notable achievement, providing students with internationally recognised qualifications and serving as a model of deep, outcomes-oriented international collaboration that goes beyond activity-based metrics.

The institution demonstrates a functioning monitoring cycle for internationalisation performance. IRO and RPIC produce annual reports reviewed and monitored by the Rectorate and Senate. Also, these monitored results have led to documented improvement actions. A concrete example is the observation that internationalisation resources were more used by social sciences disciplines, and a decision was taken to rebalance the internationalisation resources toward underrepresented disciplines following internal review findings, operationalised through a documented internal staff engagement call. The consistent growth in grant applications (reaching 25 in a single year) reflects a strategic response to performance monitoring, with the institution systematically expanding its project engagement in line with capacity assessments. The growing number of bilateral agreements and MoUs, and the increasing participation in international events in collaboration with the Balkan University Association, similarly reflect a monitoring-informed expansion of internationalisation activities.

A remaining area for development is the impact dimension of performance monitoring. Current monitoring focuses predominantly on activity and output counts. Developing indicators that capture the effects of internationalisation on institutional quality, student outcomes, research productivity, and community engagement, for example, how Erasmus+ staff mobility enhanced teaching quality or how joint research projects contributed to curriculum development, would strengthen the depth and demonstrability of the monitoring-to-improvement cycle.

Evaluation Team Commendation I

The Evaluation Team commends the institution for its substantive and growing internationalisation performance profile, including expanding international project participation, diverse student and staff mobility, and a multinational campus community, reflecting a genuine internationalisation culture supported by effective management.

Evaluation Team Commendation II

The Evaluation Team commends the institution for the SUNY/ESU dual-degree partnership, which provides students with internationally recognised qualifications, strengthens academic credibility, and exemplifies a deep, outcomes-oriented approach to international collaboration that goes beyond activity-based internationalisation metrics.

Evaluation Team Suggestion for Further Improvement I

The Evaluation Team suggests that the institution strengthen its internationalisation performance monitoring by developing impact indicators that capture how international activities contribute to measurable improvements in teaching quality, student outcomes, and research productivity, complementing the existing activity-based metrics with evidence of internationalisation effects.

Evaluation Team Conclusion for Maturity Level: 4

Internationalisation activities in the institution are monitored and improved.

B. LEARNING AND TEACHING

B.1. PROGRAM DESIGN, EVALUATION AND UPDATE

B.1.1. Design and approval of programs (ESG1.2)

Evidence

The University of New York Tirana (UNYT) implements a clear and structured system for program design and approval. The development or revision of any program is driven by academic needs, benchmarking, labour-market analyses, and structured feedback from stakeholders such as employers, alumni, and students. Once drafted, programs undergo a multi-level internal review and approval process involving the relevant department, the Faculty Council, the Academic Senate, and the Board of Administration. Following these institutional approvals, the final dossier is submitted to the Ministry of Education and Sports for licensing in compliance with legal and quality standards.

Building upon this foundation, the institution utilises its diverse internal resources, including comprehensive supplementary operational documents, to ensure the seamless and practical implementation of these regulations across all departments.

The documentation provided by the institution explains the institutional hierarchy and decision-making roles. The institution utilises well-defined process flowcharts that ensure clear execution across all phases. This procedural maturity is proven by full alignment with the Ministry of Education and Sports bylaws and EHEA principles, guaranteeing that program objectives and learning outcomes remain competitive.

During the site visit, it was observed that the institution is actively documenting field-specific application diversities within learning designs to better showcase its adaptive instructional capacity. The faculty members provide documents on the role of a collaborative quality culture, and the institution is systematically consolidating evidence of internal and external

stakeholder engagement. While stakeholder feedback is an integral part of institutional procedures, formalising these contributions during the design phase is a strategic priority. The institution maintains clearly defined procedures for monitoring and improving design cycles. Through the systematic closure of quality assurance loops (PDCA), the institution provides evidence of improvements, demonstrating that all academic programs are subject to continuous evaluation in direct consultation with relevant stakeholders.

Analysis

The evaluation team confirms that program design and approval processes are standardised, clearly defined, and consistently implemented across the entire institution. All study programs strictly align with institutional strategic priorities, EHEA principles, and specific learning outcomes through a rigorous internal approval chain (Department → Faculty Council → Academic Senate → Board of Administration). Furthermore, UNYT demonstrates a closed-loop quality cycle for systematic monitoring and continuous improvement. The institution regularly evaluates its curricula by integrating multi-source feedback from key stakeholders, including students, alumni, and employers, ensuring that learning outcomes remain highly relevant to evolving labour market demands.

The governance workflow proceeds systematically from departmental drafting through Faculty Council review to Academic Senate validation, ensuring accountability at each stage. Evidence of alignment with the national qualifications framework is robust, with the institution maintaining strict credit category percentages that guarantee programme objectives and graduate profiles are mapped to professional standards. The institution demonstrates a participatory approach to curriculum development, with documented consultation of employers, alumni, and professional bodies. The institution demonstrates a participatory approach to curriculum development by utilising continuous stakeholder feedback—including documented consultations via questionnaires and focus groups with employers, alumni, and professional bodies—as well as peer staff insights and student-instructor evaluations.

However, while the stakeholder engagement framework is established, the formalisation of external stakeholder input before Academic Senate approval — particularly through structured feedback from students, alumni, and employers during the programme design phase — remains an area for further development. Additionally, although practice-based curricula and direct industry engagement are evident in certain programmes, such as Applied Banking and Finance, these approaches have not yet been systematically embedded across all programmes.

Evaluation Team Commendation I

The Evaluation Team commends the institution for consistently enhancing programmes through a collaborative cycle of student course and instructor evaluations, peer staff insights, and stakeholder feedback.

Evaluation Team Recommendation I

The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution establish a centralised digital tracking system to ensure full traceability of documentation across programme design and approval processes.

Evaluation Team Recommendation II

The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution enrich its programme approval process by incorporating formal stakeholder engagement mechanisms, integrating structured feedback from students, alumni, and employers prior to Academic Senate approval, to provide external validation and ensure curricula remain aligned with evolving market needs.

Evaluation Team Suggestion for Further Improvement I

The Evaluation Team suggests expanding practice-based curricula and direct industry engagement across all programmes.

Evaluation Team Conclusion for Maturity Level: 4

The design and approval processes for the programs are systematically monitored and improved by evaluating them with relevant stakeholders.

B.1.2. Course distribution balance of the program (ESG 1.2)

Evidence

The University of New York Tirana (UNYT) presents a set of evidence demonstrating that transparent principles and documented methods govern course distribution within each programme. In its report, the university documents the application of a consistent A–E taxonomy (core, characterising, interdisciplinary, supplementary, and final obligations), which ensures curricular coherence and alignment with learning outcomes. Furthermore, it includes detailed syllabi approved by Heads of Departments and Deans, which specify objectives, ECTS workloads, and assessment methods as primary evidence of academic rigour. Regarding staffing and workload, the university submits annual schedules and employment templates that align instructor expertise with specific course needs. It provides departmental monitoring reports to demonstrate how research time and administrative duties are safeguarded within the overall workload allocation. To ensure transparency in decision-making, UNYT publishes

minutes of Faculty Council and Senate meetings, establishing a clear audit trail for all academic assignments and curriculum revisions.

During the site visit, it was observed that the ECTS logic was integrated, with a balanced 60-credit annual workload maintained. The university has explained in a special meeting that the accessibility of this information through the KION system and the Diploma Supplement ensures that the mix of compulsory and elective courses is transparent to all stakeholders. Additionally, the university has presented its completed PDCA cycle, including course and instructor evaluations, as well as peer reviews. As a concrete example of continuous improvement, it has included data on the reorganisation of the MSc in Finance and Accounting, which achieved professional accreditation through evidence-based adjustments. Finally, UNYT has featured its annual monitoring reports and strategic planning documents to confirm the long-term operational and academic sustainability of its programmes.

Analysis

The documentation submitted by UNYT and the site visit confirm that the principles, rules, and methods governing course distribution are defined and systematically integrated into the institutional framework. By implementing the A–E taxonomy and formal program dossiers, the university ensures a structured educational framework aligned with ECTS standards. The evidence demonstrates a participatory approach to staffing. By utilising departmental monitoring reports and Faculty Council reviews, the university ensures that teaching staff's fields of expertise and workload are the primary elements of course allocation. This process successfully balances teaching responsibilities with research and administrative duties, fostering an environment where academic staff can maintain professional growth while meeting instructional demands.

A strength of the program is its structural diversity. The curriculum successfully strikes a balance between compulsory and elective courses, as well as between field-specific and non-field-specific content. By embedding "Category C" modules, the university actively promotes cultural competence and acquaintance with other disciplines, ensuring that students develop an important skill set. Furthermore, the organisation of the weekly course load reflects a student-centred philosophy. By limiting classroom hours to 40–50% of the total ECTS workload, the university strategically allows students sufficient time to engage in extracurricular activities, such as Model UN and various student clubs. The reorganisation of programs based on professional feedback demonstrates that relevant improvements are systematically implemented, ensuring the curriculum remains responsive to both academic standards and labour market requirements.

Evaluation Team Commendation I

The Evaluation Team commends the institution for its systematic application of the A–E taxonomy and ECTS logic, ensuring high curricular coherence and workload balance across programmes.

Evaluation Team Recommendation I

The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution implement a student-consultation framework for course planning to ensure that the distribution and timing of modules effectively reflect student preferences and workload capacity.

Evaluation Team Recommendation II

The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution systematically incorporate student feedback on course schedules into its academic planning processes to better align with student needs and workload balance.

Evaluation Team Suggestion for Further Improvement I

The Evaluation Team suggests that the institution establish a weekly 'Common Activity Hour' by designating a midday time slot free of classes, thereby reducing scheduling conflicts and increasing student participation in social, cultural, and sporting activities.

Evaluation Team Conclusion for Maturity Level: 4

The course distribution balance in the programs is monitored and improved.

B.1.3. The alignment of course objectives with program outcomes (ESG 1.2)

Evidence

The institution maintains a Quality Assurance system that links Course Learning Outcomes (CLOs) to Programme Learning Outcomes (PLOs). This alignment is governed by the University Statute and standardised syllabus templates applied across all degree levels. CLOs follow recognised taxonomies, including Bloom's revised cognitive domain, ensuring measurable progression from foundational knowledge to advanced evaluation. Each course is explicitly mapped to PLOs within the curriculum, and this mapping is verified by Faculty Councils and the QA Unit to prevent curricular gaps and ensure graduate profiles align with European qualification frameworks.

During the site visit, the evaluation team confirmed that constructive alignment is embedded as a mandatory requirement, with assessment methods ranging from case studies to examinations designed to directly measure specific CLOs. The institution employs a multi-tier evaluation strategy that encompasses standardised student feedback, annual syllabus revisions informed by assessment data, and individual performance reviews. Transversal skills, including ethical awareness and critical thinking, are systematically embedded and monitored through internship reports and external industry feedback.

Analysis

The institution demonstrates effective alignment between PLOs and CLOs through standardised syllabus templates and curriculum mapping, ensuring that every course serves the overarching graduate profile. These alignments and details are obtained and documented through the institution's course information packages.

CLOs structured using Bloom's taxonomy allow for measurable progression from foundational knowledge to complex synthesis. Faculty Councils and the QA Unit review these alignments to ensure that all PLOs are sufficiently covered across the curriculum. For courses taken outside the programme, adherence to approved curricula is mandatory, and approval is granted only when the Head of Department explicitly verifies alignment between specific course objectives and existing PLOs. The monitoring and improvement of this alignment are sustained through a multi-tier feedback loop: student course and instructor evaluations, annual syllabus updates, and grade-pattern analyses serve as primary evidence, with instructors required to refine their syllabi annually based on assessment results. A development area concerns the digital tracking of PLO-CLO achievement. At the same time, alignment exists in the documentation; a web-based platform that enables learning analytics would strengthen the institution's capacity to systematically monitor attainment of outcomes.

The institution has course descriptions and intended learning outcomes for all programmes, and students confirmed during the site visit that they have access to these materials. However, these materials are not publicly available on the institution's webpage.

Evaluation Team Commendation I

The Evaluation Team commends the institution for employing multi-dimensional mechanisms to enhance its Course Information Packages, supported by formal monitoring processes overseen by various academic boards.

Evaluation Team Commendation II

The Evaluation Team commends the institution for ensuring alignment between programme objectives and course outcomes and achieving institutional integration across all academic departments, a success evidenced by the systematic use of standardised syllabus templates, curriculum mapping, and comprehensive course information packages.

Evaluation Team Recommendation I

The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution implement a web-based platform (KION) to track PLO-CLO achievement through learning analytics.

Evaluation Team Recommendation II

The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution update its website to provide publicly accessible course descriptions and intended learning outcomes for all programmes, thereby enhancing transparency and improving information availability for stakeholders.

Evaluation Team Suggestion for Further Improvement I

The Evaluation Team suggests that the institution plan an in-service training workshop to ensure that PLOs and CLOs are fully aligned among academic staff.

Evaluation Team Conclusion for Maturity Level: 4

The alignment of the course objectives with the program outcomes is monitored and improved.

B.1.4. Student workload-based course design (ESG 1.2)

Evidence

Based on the institutional framework and academic practices at the University of New York Tirana (UNYT), it was provided that all program and course designs adhere to Law No. 80/2015 and the Albanian National Qualifications Framework. The ECTS system is applied consistently across all study cycles, with one credit defined as 25–30 hours of total student effort. This workload-based design ensures a balanced distribution while maintaining a maximum of 30 ECTS per semester, using the KION platform to track student workload. Between 2022 and 2024, the institution revised teaching-hour allocations in several departments, including Psychology and Architecture, to better align contact hours with independent study needs. These revisions were data-driven, stemming from departmental analyses and student evaluations of courses and instructors, and were formalised through the Academic Senate. Curricular reorganisations have been implemented in fields such as Business Administration and Computer Science to optimise course sequencing and disciplinary relevance without altering the total ECTS workload. During the site visit, the evaluation team confirmed that applied learning is embedded through external collaborations, including the banking partnership and the DUALBA Project. Internships and final graduation projects are credit-bearing components fully integrated into the ECTS structure and assessed through academic rubrics. A multi-level governance process, overseen by the Quality Assurance Unit, ensures continuous improvement by monitoring student feedback and perceptions of workload.

Analysis

The institution maintains a standardised syllabus template and Course Catalogue defining the breakdown of learning activities, translating ECTS credits into 25–30 hours of total student

effort across all academic cycles. Professional practice, mobility, and projects are fully integrated into the ECTS framework, with credit-bearing internships and graduation projects governed by specific rubrics and supervised by mentors. Professional partnerships embed practical workload into the curriculum, and mobility credits earned abroad are integrated through established recognition protocols. Student participation in workload determination is facilitated through standardised course and instructor evaluations, which capture student perceptions of workload and trigger adjustments when gaps between planned and actual effort are identified. The Diploma Supplement, issued in both Albanian and English, provides a comprehensive record of the student's academic path and workload-based competencies. A development area identified is the need for more structured mechanisms, such as focus group interviews and comprehensive surveys, to more directly involve students in determining workload-based processes.

Evaluation Team Commendation I

The Evaluation Team commends the institution for its proactive pedagogical enhancements and external partnerships, effectively integrating applied learning into the academic curriculum.

Evaluation Team Recommendation I

The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution document participatory activities in departmental annual reports to demonstrate an evidence-based approach to continuous improvement of workload-based course design.

Evaluation Team Suggestion for Further Improvement I

The Evaluation Team suggests that the institution establish an annual review mechanism for ECTS workloads, actively engaging students to identify and address potential imbalances systematically.

Evaluation Team Suggestion for Further Improvement II

The Evaluation Team suggests that the institution implement structured mechanisms, such as focus group interviews and comprehensive surveys, to collect student feedback on workload-based processes.

Evaluation Team Conclusion for Maturity Level: 4

Student workload in programs is monitored, and course design is updated accordingly.

B.1.5. Follow-up and updating of programs (ESG 1.9)

Evidence

The institution operates a comprehensive framework for the development, approval, and continuous enhancement of its academic programmes, ensuring alignment with the Albanian National Qualifications Framework and international academic standards. Curriculum revision follows a systematic cycle initiated by Ad-Hoc Working Groups, which include academic staff, student representatives, and industry professionals to ensure labour-market relevance. Revised programmes undergo a transparent, multi-level review involving the Faculty Council, the Academic Senate, and the Board of Administration before final licensing by the Ministry of Education and Sports. Graduation eligibility is monitored by academic advisors based on ECTS requirements (180 for Bachelor's, 120 for Master's, and 300 for Integrated Master's cycles), as well as minimum CGPA thresholds and mandatory internships. During the site visit, the evaluation team confirmed that the institution monitors statistical indicators, including enrolment rates, grade distributions, and dropout trends, to evaluate programme effectiveness.

During the site visit, the evaluation team confirmed that the institution monitors statistical indicators—including enrolment rates, grade distributions, and dropout trends—via the KION system to evaluate programme effectiveness.

Stakeholder feedback from alumni and other sectors, gathered through focus group interviews and surveys, is integral to updating learning outcomes and teaching methods.

All programmes are subject to ASCAL accreditation, which serves as a key component of the internal quality assurance system.

Analysis

The institution's annual review process serves as a responsive quality-assurance mechanism. By forming specialised "Ad-Hoc Working Groups," the institution regularly evaluates its curriculum in light of new data and trends. This mechanism ensures that program structures, long-term objectives, and student learning outcomes are systematically updated, preventing the curriculum from becoming outdated and keeping it aligned with modern standards.

Updates are governed by institutional principles that prioritise labour-market relevance and compliance with Ministry of Education and Sports directives. The multi-level approval hierarchy, from Faculty Councils to the Academic Senate, ensures that curricular modifications reinforce strategic goals. The KION system is used to monitor selected statistical indicators, including grade distributions and GPA trends, which serve as evidence for assessing the achievement of programme outcomes. Stakeholder communication is maintained through the institutional website and academic advisors. It was determined that there is a need for more

active utilisation of the KION system for historical tracking of programme updates, ensuring that all curricular modifications are chronologically documented for improved institutional monitoring.

Evaluation Team Commendation I

The Evaluation Team commends the institution for its framework for programme development, which ensures a multi-level approval process and systematic use of stakeholder feedback, together guaranteeing the academic credibility of all study cycles.

Evaluation Team Recommendation I

The Evaluation Team recommends that the KION system be utilised more actively to facilitate the historical tracking of programme updates, ensuring that all curricular modifications are chronologically documented for improved institutional monitoring.

Evaluation Team Recommendation II

The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution institutionalise annual alumni and employer satisfaction surveys, with results directly linked to curriculum revision reports.

Evaluation Team Conclusion for Maturity Level: 3

Mechanisms about the follow-up and updating of program outcomes are implemented in all programs.

B.1.6. Management of learning and teaching processes (ESG 1.3)

Evidence

The institution has an organisational structure where the management of learning and teaching is coordinated through its academic unit framework. The Rectorate and Academic Senate maintain strategic oversight, while faculties and departments carry out the direct implementation and quality assurance of teaching processes. This structured workflow ensures a clear allocation of responsibilities and accountability, with guidance from the Vice-Rector for Academic Affairs. The UNYT Statute and Strategic Plans (2020–2025 and 2026–2030) serve as the foundation for programme design and evaluation. The Internal Quality Assurance system requires systematic monitoring of student performance and stakeholder feedback to drive periodic reviews. Teaching modalities emphasise a student-centred approach, using interactive tools such as case studies, simulations, and project-based learning, supported by digital platforms.

During the site visit, the evaluation team observed that the institution uses the KION system for recording grades, registrations, and syllabi. Teaching is research-informed through projects including DUALBA and GITEKA. Dedicated units, including the Career Office and the International Relations Office, provide structured support for employability and mobility. Although organisational structures are in place, the formal governance framework, including specific workflow charts, is not fully defined or visible.

Analysis

The institution operates through a governance hierarchy where strategic decisions are centralised within the Rectorate and Academic Senate, while operational implementation is decentralised to faculties and departments. However, the formal governance framework and specific workflow charts are not fully documented or readily visible, creating ambiguity in reporting lines and oversight of academic processes.

The UNYT Statute and Strategic Plans provide a solid foundation for managing education and assessment, with a standardised academic calendar regulating teaching and examination periods. Assessment principles are aligned with learning outcomes, with mandatory rubrics and feedback mechanisms embedded in every syllabus. The KION system serves as the backbone of these processes, providing a centralised platform for student registration, grade management, and syllabus archiving. The Quality Assurance Office uses course and instructor evaluations, as well as staff performance reviews, to trigger pedagogical adjustments. However, the link between data collection and the completion of the PDCA cycle could be further strengthened by documenting how specific findings lead to concrete curricular changes. The absence of a dedicated Teaching and Learning Centre was identified as a structural gap that limits the institution's capacity for centralised governance of educational enhancement.

Evaluation Team Recommendation I

The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution improve its organisational governance model to clarify decision-making processes among the Rectorate, faculties, and departments in the management of learning and teaching.

Evaluation Team Recommendation II

The Evaluation Team recommends establishing a dedicated Teaching and Learning Centre to provide centralised governance for the systematic monitoring and enhancement of educational processes.

Evaluation Team Recommendation III

The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution formalise organisational flowcharts to clarify governance and systematically document the impact of stakeholder feedback on specific curricular improvements in annual quality reports.

Evaluation Team Conclusion for Maturity Level: 3

Learning and teaching processes are managed in accordance with the defined rules and principles throughout the entire institution.

B.2. IMPLEMENTATION OF PROGRAMS

B.2.1. Teaching methods and techniques (ESG 1.3)

Evidence

The institution applies a student-centred pedagogical philosophy across all academic programmes, rooted in constructive alignment, which ensures that Intended Learning Outcomes (ILOs), teaching activities, and assessments are systematically linked. These principles are embedded in institutional Teaching and Learning Strategies and strategic planning documents, which prioritise student engagement and the integration of theory with professional practice. The institution employs a range of interactive teaching and assessment methods, including guest lectures, simulations, and field visits, which are aligned with labour market requirements. The institution also applies diverse, practice-oriented methods: Law programmes use moot courts, while Psychology and Social Sciences implement clinical case studies, reflective assignments, and applied interventions. Formative and summative assessments are used across the institution. During the site visit, the evaluation team confirmed that experiential learning is a mandatory component, with credit-bearing internships and dual-learning initiatives ensuring workplace learning aligns with programme outcomes. These activities are supported by technology-enhanced tools, including McGraw-Hill Connect and Turnitin, to foster adaptive learning. Research-informed teaching is promoted through student participation in faculty research and international projects. The effectiveness of teaching methods is monitored through the Internal Quality Assurance System, which uses course and instructor evaluations, peer reviews, and annual syllabus cycles. The findings documented in departmental reports are directly utilised to implement corrective actions, update curricula, and drive continuous improvement, thereby completing the full PDCA cycle.

Analysis

The institution uses constructive alignment to ensure that teaching and learning activities (TLAs) are directly mapped to intended outcomes. It was evident that course syllabi explicitly

define delivery modes and interactive methodologies, such as moot courts in Law and studio models in Design, ensuring that student engagement is a formal requirement of the curriculum rather than an elective practice. It was confirmed that teaching materials are supported by digital platforms like Canvas and McGraw-Hill Connect to facilitate flipped classrooms. While the institution maintains a face-to-face focus, it was highlighted that technology-enhanced learning tools are used to provide formative feedback and adaptive learning pathways, ensuring pedagogical continuity. Active and interactive teaching processes are institutionalised through experiential learning and mandatory internships. It was evidenced that project-based learning and research-informed teaching are standard practices, supported by the Internal Quality Assurance System (IQAS) through regular peer reviews and course and instructor evaluations. Student-centred practices are continuously monitored and improved by the institution with the active participation of internal stakeholders through various mechanisms, including surveys and focus groups.

Evaluation Team Commendation I

The Evaluation Team commends the institution for its implementation of student-centred methodologies and assessments, which are monitored and enhanced on a semester basis with the collaborative involvement of internal stakeholders.

Evaluation Team Recommendation I

The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution implement systematic Training of Trainers programmes to bridge the gap between innovative teaching practices and digital tools.

Evaluation Team Recommendation II

The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution implement a centralised Learning Management System (LMS) to serve as a unified platform for managing, monitoring, and enhancing all teaching and learning activities across departments.

Evaluation Team Suggestion for Further Improvement I

The Evaluation Team suggests that the institution implement successful dual-learning models across all disciplines by establishing a standardised framework for industry-integrated education.

Evaluation Team Suggestion for Further Improvement II

The Evaluation Team suggests that Internal Quality Assurance processes, including course and instructor evaluations, peer reviews, syllabus cycles, and external benchmarking, are more visibly integrated and tracked within the KION system.

Evaluation Team Conclusion for Maturity Level: 4

Student-centred practices are monitored and improved in collaboration with relevant internal stakeholders.

B.2.2. Measurement and Evaluation (ESG 1.3)

Evidence

The institution maintains a student-centred assessment environment that prioritises practical application and professional readiness. All study programmes integrate activities allowing students to apply theoretical knowledge, ranging from laboratory work in Computer Science to clinical case studies in Psychology. A representative example is the Integrated Master of Science in Law, which uses Moot Court Competitions and applied legal exercises to bridge theory and practice. During the site visit, the evaluation team confirmed that projects, micro-theses, and consultancy tasks constitute core assessment components across all cycles, designed to measure disciplinary knowledge, transferable skills, and problem-solving abilities. Professional internships are mandatory, credit-bearing requirements for graduation, supported by a network of public and private partners, and are assessed through formal reports against predefined learning outcomes. Summative and formative evaluations are supported through digital tools such as Turnitin.

Analysis

The institution employs a diversified assessment strategy that extends beyond traditional examinations, with widespread use of formative and summative tools, including moot courts in Law, clinical case studies in Psychology, and project-based consultancy in Business Administration. Assessment tasks are explicitly mapped to Intended Learning Outcomes and programme competencies within course information packages, which specify grading rubrics and feedback mechanisms.

The institution has implemented mechanisms for examination security, including plagiarism detection software and proctoring protocols. It employs a personalised support system for students with disabilities, with accommodations overseen by the Student Affairs Office. Additionally, the institution lacks a formalised procedure to document and systematically communicate how feedback-driven adjustments to assessment are reported back to the academic community, leaving the quality improvement loop incomplete.

Evaluation Team Recommendation I

The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution implement systematic Training of Trainers programmes to ensure that faculty members can effectively align innovative teaching

practices and digital tools with modern assessment and evaluation frameworks, with a particular focus on performance-based and formative assessment techniques.

Evaluation Team Recommendation II

The Evaluation Team recommends that examination questions be aligned with course learning outcomes and that the relationship between student success and these outcomes be included in departmental evaluation reports.

Evaluation Team Suggestion for Further Improvement I

The Evaluation Team suggests that the institution use learning analytics from assessment data to identify students at risk or those with exceptional potential early in the semester, enabling more personalised and proactive pedagogical interventions.

Evaluation Team Conclusion for Maturity Level: 3

There are diversified student-centred measurement and evaluation practices throughout the entire programs.

B.2.3. Student admission and the recognition and crediting of prior learning (ESG 1.4)

Evidence

The institution operates a centralised admission system governed by Article 71 of the UNYT Statute, grounded in principles of merit, inclusivity, and non-discrimination. Admission criteria are proposed by Academic Departments and reviewed annually by the Academic Senate to maintain alignment with Joint Order No. 157 (2025) of the Ministry of Education and Sports. The Student Affairs Office serves as the primary executive body, managing the U-Albania portal data, verifying applicant eligibility, and overseeing the recognition of prior learning in accordance with ECTS principles. Dedicated support is available for international applicants, managed by an International Admissions Specialist, covering visa compliance, language proficiency (minimum B1 level), and social integration. During the site visit, the evaluation team observed that the institution maintains a structured financial aid system, with the Scholarship Committee awarding merit- and need-based tuition reductions and social vulnerability-based awards. Departments monitor these mechanisms through annual reports analysing enrolment trends and diversity indicators; the findings are then presented to university management and documented in the Institutional Performance Document, leading to improvements in admission criteria and applicant guidance.

Analysis

The admission framework is defined by the UNYT Statute and national legislation, ensuring that criteria are consistently applied, publicly announced, and reviewed annually by the Academic Senate. The recognition of prior learning and credit transfer is based on a workload-based credit system rooted in ECTS principles, ensuring that knowledge and skills acquired through formal study or prior mobility periods are evaluated based on learning outcomes and curriculum equivalence. The institution implements measures to prevent credit loss during international mobility, directly supporting its internationalisation strategy.

The Student Affairs Office provides a centralised administrative function, ensuring that applications and recognition requests are handled through defined, traceable procedures. For example, the institution uses Learning Agreements to match courses before Erasmus mobilities, thereby ensuring that students return without any loss of credits. The U-Albania state portal and structured communication channels ensure stakeholder information and administrative precision.

During the site visit, it was observed that the Student Affairs Office demonstrates an integrated approach to equity and inclusivity through the Admissions Specialist and the merit-based scholarship system for vulnerable groups.

During the site visit, the institution's structured financial aid system was verified. The Committee awards tuition reductions based on merit (top-ranking), financial need (low-income), and social vulnerability (disadvantaged groups). Monitored via annual reports, this data-driven process is documented in the Institutional Performance Document, directly leading to optimised admission criteria and enhanced applicant guidance.

Monitoring through annual performance reports confirms that the institution maintains continuous feedback leading to evidence-based improvements. A development area concerns the formal recognition of prior non-formal learning, allowing professional experience and certified skills to be mapped against ECTS credits for non-traditional students.

Evaluation Team Recommendation I

The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution improve formal procedures for the Recognition of Prior Non-Formal Learning, allowing professional experience and certified skills to be mapped against ECTS credits for non-traditional students.

Evaluation Team Conclusion for Maturity Level: 4

Student admission and the recognition and accrediting of prior learning processes are monitored and improved, and updates are declared.

B.2.4. The certification of qualifications and the diploma (ESG 1.2)

Evidence

The institution has a defined system for graduation approval and diploma issuance. Eligibility is contingent upon completion of ECTS requirements and minimum CGPA thresholds as defined in the Student Handbook and the UNYT Statute. Academic progress and graduation eligibility are tracked through the KION system, ensuring data integrity and traceability. The university follows a structured five-stage workflow, from initial identification of candidates to final archiving of records in both electronic and physical formats. Every graduate receives a Diploma, an Official Transcript, and a Diploma Supplement that provides transparency into learning outcomes and curriculum structure, in line with international standards. These documents are formally ratified by the Diploma Approval Committee, signed by the Rector and Dean, and issued only after full administrative and financial clearance.

During the site visit, the evaluation team confirmed that the Records Office, in collaboration with the Quality Assurance Office, conducts systematic monitoring and internal audits of graduation files, assessing processing timelines, documentation accuracy, and compliance with Ministry of Education and Sports standards.

Analysis

The criteria for graduation, including specific ECTS requirements and CGPA thresholds for different study cycles, are clearly defined in the UNYT Statute and the Student Handbook, ensuring that students and stakeholders have access to relevant information. These requirements are applied consistently across all faculties and are supported by the KION system, which serves as a mechanism for tracking academic progress and eligibility. The certification and diploma issuance procedures follow a systematic five-stage workflow that guarantees the validity and traceability of awarded qualifications.

The university ensures the issuance of a comprehensive Diploma Supplement aligned with international transparency standards. The rigorous verification conducted by the Diploma Approval Committee and the Records Office ensures that all administrative, financial, and academic obligations are met before certification.

Through internal audits and regular reviews by the Quality Assurance Office, the institution monitors processing timelines, document accuracy, and compliance with national legal standards, and findings lead to concrete corrective actions, such as refining workflows and updating archiving practices.

Evaluation Team Suggestion for Further Improvement I

The Evaluation Team suggests that the institution develop a digital request system for diplomas, allowing students to initiate the process online and providing a secure postal delivery option for those unable to collect their documents in person.

Evaluation Team Suggestion for Further Improvement II

The Evaluation Team suggests that the institution establish a Graduation Progress Tracking module in KION, providing students with an academic roadmap that highlights missing requirements at least two semesters prior to graduation, to prevent last-minute administrative delays.

Evaluation Team Conclusion for Maturity Level: 4

Practices are monitored, and defined processes are improved.

B.3. LEARNING RESOURCES AND ACADEMIC SUPPORT SERVICES

B.3.1. The learning environment and resources (ESG 1.6)

Evidence

Teaching and learning activities are supported by physical infrastructure, digital tools, and institutional library services across both campuses, in line with the institutional strategy and programme requirements. The institution also leverages opportunities from the European Union and Erasmus+ projects to strengthen and expand its educational resources.

During the site visit, the evaluation team confirmed that the teaching and learning environments on both campuses are similarly structured and include the fundamental tools necessary for teaching and learning. Activities are conducted in classrooms equipped with projectors and computers, computer laboratories, and studios. Course schedules are digitally announced across both campuses. The institution provides access to physical and online resources, including books, journals, and databases via library services. Some teaching environments feature smart boards. However, during focus group meetings, students expressed a demand to increase the quantity and variety of current teaching and learning resources in some undergraduate and graduate programmes, particularly in Computer Science and Software Engineering.

Access to online resources is provided via the institution's Wi-Fi network; however, students cannot access these resources from home or other locations — access is limited to campus. Physical resources in the library are kept in locked cabinets on the main campus and are accessible through the institutional borrowing mechanism controlled by librarians. The

institution uses digital tools, including Canvas, Teams, and Turnitin; however, the evaluation team observed that no comprehensive Learning Management System is deployed across the institution.

Analysis

The institution's teaching and learning environments are sufficient in terms of essential equipment for the current student population. The presence of libraries on both campuses is a positive feature; however, neither campus offers remote access to resources beyond its campus. Given that the institution serves both undergraduate and graduate students, there is a need for improved accessibility, particularly for graduate students who require remote access to research materials. Faculty members are primarily responsible for ensuring that their resources are up to date and diverse, with library resources updated each term based on faculty requests.

The institution could benefit from collecting resource requests through a participatory approach that accounts for the needs of both undergraduate and graduate students. Feedback on teaching and learning environments is collected through the Student Information Form and end-of-term feedback forms; however, a standardised evaluation and improvement process for these resources would strengthen the institutional approach. The absence of a comprehensive, shared Learning Management System for creating a teaching and learning archive represents an area for development.

Evaluation Team Recommendation I

The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution expand its physical and online collections to enhance its capacity for research, teaching, and learning through institutional support.

Evaluation Team Recommendation II

The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution extend the reach of online resources to enable access from outside the campus.

Evaluation Team Recommendation III

The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution develop a strategy to systematically and holistically collect satisfaction data on the teaching and learning environment.

Evaluation Team Recommendation IV

The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution adopt a comprehensive Learning Management System to create an archive for the teaching and learning process.

Evaluation Team Suggestion for Further Improvement I

The Evaluation Team suggests that the institution display course schedules on the doors of classrooms and faculty offices.

Evaluation Team Conclusion for Maturity Level: 3

The management of learning resources in the entire institution is performed by taking into consideration the fieldspecific conditions, accessibility, and the balance between units.

B.3.2. Academic support services (ESG 1.5)

Evidence

The University of New York Tirana provides integrated academic support services covering academic development, progression, career planning, and transition into employment. The academic advising process is governed by institutional regulations communicated through the Student Handbook 2025–2026 and related documents. Academic support services are documented and coordinated by the responsible departments, including the Academic Writing Centre, Maths Centre, Student Counselling Centre, Career Office, and Library services. Students regularly evaluate these units through evaluation forms at the end of each academic year.

The institution has *“UNYT Student Petition Guideline”*. The students submit their petitions online or in person. The Petition Officer evaluates these petitions from the Student Affairs Office, the Academic Petitions Committee, and the Administrative Petitions Committee.

According to the Counselling Centre’s Annual Monitoring Report for the 2024-2025 Academic Year, 16 students from different departments accessed these services mostly in exam periods, for a total of 75 hours.

The students' feedback on the counselling service is collected regularly. The Career Office organises the Career Fair annually in accordance with the Career Office Action Plan. Also, according to the results of the institution’s 2025 Administrative Unit Evaluation, most students obtained the necessary information about internships and job opportunities from the Career Office.

During the site visit, it was observed that academic advisors prepare annual reports that are submitted to faculty management via email. These reports are evaluated, and, where improvements are needed, feedback is provided to the respective advisors. Student requests and enquiries are collected via the Student Information Form on the official website and monitored by the Student Affairs Office. Petitions are formally reported, and improvements

are implemented through collaboration among the Student Affairs Office, faculties, and relevant departments.

The Career Office organises activities, including career fair preparation and CV writing workshops. The KION system includes a messaging function; however, according to observations during the site visit, this feature is not actively used. According to the site visit observation, the institution regularly evaluates all students' petitions and implements improvements based on the results. For example, the institution accepts the student's petition to extend the instalment payment.

Analysis

The institution offers support mechanisms that integrate academic advising, counselling services, career services, and academic support for students. During focus group meetings on the site visit, the evaluation team observed that students easily reach their academic advisors through email or face-to-face meetings. Students are assigned to academic advisors through a fair distribution process based on student-to-faculty ratios in relevant departments. Students consult with faculty members regarding course registration, academic requests, and other inquiries, and receive direct feedback on their submissions.

Students are generally satisfied with academic advising and other support services and can easily reach faculty members or other relevant staff. Students meet with academic advisors based on specific needs and during key periods such as course registration. Face-to-face group meetings with students are conducted at the beginning of each semester. Student requests, demands, and complaints are identified through multiple communication channels, including email, the Student Information Form, and face-to-face interactions. Although the institution uses the KION system, its messaging module remains underutilised.

Evaluation Team Recommendation I

The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution establish a structured, holistic mechanism to systematically and digitally follow up on student counselling and career services.

Evaluation Team Suggestion for Further Improvement I

The Evaluation Team suggests that the institution integrate the academic advising process with a digital system.

Evaluation Team Suggestion for Further Improvement II

The Evaluation Team suggests that the institution review the Student Counselling Centre's organisation to ensure that counselling staff do not have prior academic relationships with students, such as being lecturers.

Evaluation Team Conclusion for Maturity Level: 4

Practices regarding the academic development and career planning of students are monitored and improved with the involvement of students in the institution.

B.3.3. Facilities and infrastructure (ESG 1.6)

Evidence

The University of New York Tirana has institutional regulations governing its facilities and infrastructure. The Operations Management Department manages and optimises the institution's physical and technical infrastructure, coordinating Procurement, Maintenance, Facility Management, Security, and Logistics through formal procedures. Infrastructure includes computer laboratories, digitally equipped classrooms, and campus-wide Wi-Fi access. Mobile devices and specialised equipment are available to students in relevant degree programmes.

During the site visit, the evaluation team observed that the institution operates two campuses (Main Campus and East Campus), including computer and specialised laboratories, architecture ateliers, academic and administrative offices, library, service areas, cafeteria, canteen, sporting infrastructure, parking, meeting rooms, conference room, and student information office. Shuttle services connect the Main and East Campuses in accordance with academic schedules; however, stakeholders identified limitations, including rising costs and limited pick-up points. The institution provides student accommodation in a dormitory with Wi-Fi, shared kitchens, laundry, and study areas. Some sporting infrastructure is available through collaboration with the Turkish Maarif Foundation's secondary school; however, limitations in the variety of sporting activities and accessibility for all students were noted. The institution monitors facilities and infrastructure through regular student surveys and reporting from academic and administrative units.

Analysis

The institution provides teaching and learning environments at both campuses that are fundamentally similar and adequate for current needs. The transportation support between campuses was evaluated by stakeholders as limited due to the 2–3 daily trips aligned with the academic schedule; the institution's administration indicated plans to address East Campus transportation. Student dormitories are within walking distance and have sufficient capacity,

and management regularly meets with students to gather feedback and implement improvements. No dining halls are serving hot meals on either campus; students obtain food from nearby commercial outlets. Sporting activities are available but limited in variety and accessibility for all students. Feedback mechanisms exist but are evaluated only at the department or unit level, with limited evidence of external stakeholder engagement in facilities improvement.

Evaluation Team Recommendation I

The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution establish a mechanism to systematically collect, monitor, and evaluate feedback on facilities and infrastructure from internal and external stakeholders, in line with institutional priorities.

Evaluation Team Recommendation II

The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution provide additional sports activity options for students, such as table tennis, darts, and chess, on both campuses.

Evaluation Team Suggestion for Further Improvement I

The Evaluation Team suggests that the institution increase the frequency of transportation between the Main Campus and the East Campus to meet organisational needs.

Evaluation Team Conclusion for Maturity Level: 3

The facilities and infrastructure are accessible throughout the institution and they are utilised based on equal opportunity.

B.3.4. Disadvantaged groups (ESG 1.6)

Evidence

The University of New York Tirana offers a broad range of scholarships for disadvantaged students, including refugees, students with physical disabilities, and students experiencing financial hardship. The Student Affairs Office coordinates accommodation needs in collaboration with academic departments, while faculty members implement approved adjustments, such as extended examination time or modified assessment methods.

The institution provides financial support mechanisms for students facing economic difficulties, including tuition reductions, merit-based scholarships, and emergency financial assistance. Physical accessibility measures, including ramps and elevators, are available across campuses.

The institution has formalised partnerships that support disadvantaged groups, including a full scholarship programme for orphaned students through the Shpëtim Cinga Foundation and a 25% scholarship scheme through the Ardhmëria Association. In accordance with national legislation, the institution defines admission quotas for vulnerable groups, including students with disabilities, members of the Roma community, and orphaned youth.

The institution also supports students from conflict-affected regions through reduced tuition fees and visa facilitation measures. Furthermore, it has developed an Action Plan for Disadvantaged Groups for the 2026–2027 academic year, aimed at transforming support practices into a structured, sustainable, and measurable system, with clearly defined strategic objectives, target groups, and twelve key performance indicators (KPIs).

Analysis

The institution demonstrates a commitment to ensuring fair and equitable access to education for disadvantaged, vulnerable, and underrepresented groups, in line with the principles of equality, diversity, and inclusion outlined in its Social Responsibility and Inclusion Policy.

During the site visit, the Evaluation Team observed the enrolment of scholarship recipients, international students, and students with physical disabilities. Students completing undergraduate studies are also eligible to continue to graduate programmes with scholarship discounts based on academic achievement. International students reported receiving the necessary academic and personal support.

The institution's Action Plan for Disadvantaged Groups represents a positive development and reflects responsiveness to identified institutional needs. However, evidence regarding the implementation of practices informed by feedback from disadvantaged groups remains limited. Support for students with disabilities is currently managed primarily on a case-by-case basis.

Although physical accessibility features such as ramps and elevators are available, the campuses lack tactile paving systems to support guidance and orientation for visually impaired users. In addition, the institution's official website currently provides only limited accessibility features for users with disabilities, which may restrict access to information and services.

The institution does not conduct distance education activities in accordance with current Albanian regulations.

There is limited evidence that practices are being systematically implemented in response to feedback from students from disadvantaged groups.

Evaluation Team Commendation I

The Evaluation Team commends the institution for offering a wide range of scholarships for disadvantaged students, including refugees, students with physical disabilities, and students experiencing financial hardship.

Evaluation Team Recommendation I

The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution implement a systematic mechanism to monitor and improve support for disadvantaged groups, informed by their feedback and experiences. This mechanism should establish a structured, measurable, and sustainable support system to ensure that all students, regardless of disability, socio-economic status, or background, have equal access to academic, social, and career opportunities.

Evaluation Team Suggestion for Further Improvement I

The Evaluation Team suggests that the institution enhance the accessibility of its official website for students with disabilities.

Evaluation Team Suggestion for Further Improvement II

The Evaluation Team suggests that the institution expand access to educational resources for students with visual, hearing, or other similar impairments.

Evaluation Team Suggestion for Further Improvement III

The Evaluation Team suggests that the institution re-evaluate campus infrastructure to include tactile paving systems for guidance and orientation.

Evaluation Team Conclusion for Maturity Level: 3

Practices regarding the access of disadvantaged groups to learning opportunities are carried out

B.3.5. Social, cultural, and sporting activities (ESG 1.6)

Evidence

The University of New York Tirana supports social, cultural, and sporting activities as part of student development through eight student clubs (Charity Club, Sport Club, Music Club, Psychology Club, Debate Club, Drama Club, Book Club, and Türkiye Friendship Club), the Student Union, social events, and community engagement activities. These activities are organised, supported, and monitored through defined institutional processes aligned with students' needs and interests and the demands of academic and administrative units.

During the site visit, the evaluation team observed that the institution supports these activities through collaboration among relevant units, the Dean of Students, and student clubs. The institution has student-athletes across different sports and encourages their participation in institutional and national sporting activities. The institution organised social activities, including Spring Fest 2025 and field visits. Physical spaces for student activities are provided, with funds allocated from the institutional budget managed by the Student Affairs Office in coordination with the Dean of Students and senior management.

The institution provides social, cultural, and supporting activities, including social responsibility initiatives, cultural events, academic forums, international youth programmes, student conferences, exhibitions, and some sporting activities. In the 2025–2026 academic year, the institution organised 28 general activities, 7 sports activities, 5 social activities, 9 cultural activities, 12 workshops, 11 study visits, 26 open lectures, and 7 entertainment activities. Activity organisers submit activity plans and post-activity reports to the Student Affairs Office, documenting participation, outcomes, and challenges. Student feedback is collected systematically through surveys, direct consultations with student representatives, and meetings with the Student Union and the Student Affairs Office.

Analysis

The institution conducts a range of social, cultural, and sporting activities with a student-centred approach, in collaboration with Student Clubs, the Student Union, the Dean of Students, and other relevant units. Over 100 activities were organised in the 2025–2026 academic year, demonstrating increased activity over the past three years. These activities are monitored annually through various reporting mechanisms, including Student Activity Reports and unit-level reports.

Based on site visit observations and other evidence, it was determined that the institution supports student-athletes in various sports, including volleyball, basketball, and soccer. The institution also implements improvements based on students' feedback via formal and informal communication channels. According to the site visit notes, in response to this feedback, the institution has implemented this improvement by offering additional sports facilities, including the Turkish Maarif Foundation's High School sports complex. The institution also offers transportation services to students arriving there. The evaluation results inform activity planning for subsequent periods.

Evaluation Team Recommendation I

The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution create a systematic, holistic mechanism for social, cultural, and sporting activities that involves student participation from needs analysis through evaluation.

Evaluation Team Suggestion for Further Improvement I

The Evaluation Team suggests that the institution consider offering a broader range of sports activities through the Sport Club.

Evaluation Team Conclusion for Maturity Level: 4

The social, cultural and sporting activity mechanisms are monitored, and activities are diversified and improved based on needs and requests.

B.4. TEACHING STAFF

B.4.1. Recruitment, promotion, and appointment criteria (ESG 1.5)

Evidence

The institution's processes for the recruitment, promotion, and appointment of teaching staff are governed by institutional priorities and comply with Albanian national legislation and institutional regulations, including the Human Resource Department Policies and Procedures document. Job vacancies are publicly announced via the institution's official website. Recruitment, promotion, and appointment needs are regularly determined according to institutional priorities and programme requirements.

Recruitment opportunities for teaching staff are publicly announced on the website. Selection is based on determined criteria, including academic qualifications, teaching competence, research profile, professional experience, and alignment with programme needs. Ad Hoc Commissions, including academic and administrative representatives at the faculty level, evaluate applications. Shortlisted candidates are evaluated through teaching demonstrations via Mock Lectures. The Mock Lecture practices for some courses are also described by staff as an improvement, according to site visit notes. For example, in Architecture Design Studio III, Final appointment decisions are approved by the Rector or Board of Administration and formalised through standardised employment contracts. Newly appointed teaching staff receive an orientation at the faculty level.

Promotion and career advancement are governed by institutional and national regulations and are based on teaching and research performance, course and instructor evaluations, and service contributions. The selection of invited teaching staff complies with the institution's regular recruitment criteria as defined in the Human Resources Policies and Procedures document. Recruitment, promotion, and appointment practices are reviewed through evaluation instruments, including student feedback, individual performance assessment documentation, and departmental annual reports. It was confirmed that the recruitment data are reviewed regularly, and evidence indicates that the institution has improved its recruitment rate of academic staff over the past three years.

Analysis

According to the focus group meeting notes and other evidence, the institution's recruitment, promotion, and appointment processes are implemented transparently and fairly, in full compliance with institutional regulations and national legislation, and strategically account for teaching, research, and administrative workloads. Results are systematically monitored through regular data collection using annual forms completed by stakeholders, including students and teaching staff. Students' evaluation content includes instructor and course evaluations, as well as student feedback, for example, *"Student Evaluation Report-MSc in Artificial Intelligence, Academic Year 2024-2025"*. Based on the results of these forms, the necessary improvements have been implemented.

During the site visit, the evaluation team observed that the institution has a regular monitoring mechanism, including departmental annual reports, with findings integrated into improvement actions according to institutional needs for each academic year. Faculty members at all academic levels are well informed about recruitment procedures. Faculty workloads are distributed fairly by faculty management, in alignment with contractual obligations and balancing teaching, research, and administrative responsibilities. Staff maintains a high level of satisfaction with application, appointment, and workload distribution processes. However, although an orientation process exists for newly appointed teaching staff at the faculty level, it is not centrally structured or holistic in scope.

Teaching staff at the focus meetings stated that they are highly satisfied with recruitment, appointment, and promotion cycles. However, the institution has a limited, structured orientation framework to familiarise newly appointed teaching staff with institutional policies, procedures, and quality standards.

Evaluation Team Commendation I

The Evaluation Team commends the institution for its fair, transparent, and clear processes for staff recruitment, promotion, and appointment.

Evaluation Team Suggestion for Further Improvement I

The Evaluation Team suggests that the institution increase the number of international teaching staff in line with institutional preferences.

Evaluation Team Suggestion for Further Improvement II

The Evaluation Team suggests that the institution develop a centrally structured orientation programme for newly appointed teaching staff, covering institutional policies, procedures, and quality standards, based on instructional priority.

Evaluation Team Suggestion for Further Improvement III

The Evaluation Team suggests that the institution increase the recruitment rate of full-time teaching staff in line with institutional priorities.

Evaluation Team Conclusion for Maturity Level:4

The results of recruitment, promotion, and appointment practices are monitored, evaluated, and necessary action is taken accordingly.

B.4.2. Teaching competencies and development (ESG 1.5)

Evidence

The University of New York Tirana supports the development of teaching staff competencies in accordance with institutional and national regulations. For example, the institution's QA manual, HR regulation, etc. The institution integrates teaching competency development into the recruitment process through application criteria and Mock Lectures to assess candidates' teaching competency. Newly appointed teaching staff are evaluated by a mechanism that includes more experienced colleagues to assess their teaching performance and competency to define further development needs. Student course and instructor evaluations are monitored regularly to identify requirements for teaching competency development.

The institution's teaching competency evaluation is based on input from multiple stakeholders, including Student Evaluation Reports, peer evaluation reports, Individual Performance Assessments (IPAs), and Annual Departmental Monitoring Reports. Teaching competency development needs are identified through these monitoring, and where needs are detected, teaching staff are informed through feedback and supporting activities offered by the faculty. However, competency development is organised and monitored at the faculty level, with no centralised or structured Training-of-Trainers programme across the institution.

Analysis

The institution provides some support for assessing and developing teaching staff competencies, from recruitment through to ongoing professional development. During the site visit, the evaluation team confirmed that newly appointed teaching staff are supported by experienced colleagues and receive the necessary information about the academic unit and teaching processes. The institution encourages teaching staff to develop their competencies through Erasmus+ Staff Exchange Mobility and professional networks. Staff exchange programme opportunities are announced on the official website, including exchanges with partner universities. An experience-sharing culture exists among teaching staff, with some involved in various projects who share their expertise with colleagues. The institution provides financial and administrative support for teaching staff to participate in academic events.

Monitoring is conducted through multiple channels, including course and instructor evaluations, peer evaluations, and self-evaluations. Where areas for improvement are identified, faculties provide feedback to teaching staff and include them in the peer evaluation cycle. Monitoring and improvement activities are planned and organised at the faculty level.

Evaluation Team Recommendation I

The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution revise its competency development approach to include a customised, needs-based, continuous competency development programme for teaching staff.

Evaluation Team Recommendation II

The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution establish a centralised Training of Trainers programme for all teaching staff, delivered through a dedicated centre focused on improving their teaching and learning skills.

Evaluation Team Recommendation III

The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution implement the Technological Pedagogical Content Knowledge (TPACK) proficiency framework to ensure teaching staff effectively integrate digital tools into their pedagogical and curricular practice through Training of Trainers programmes.

Evaluation Team Conclusion for Maturity Level: 3

There are practices aiming at developing the teaching competencies of teaching staff throughout the entire institution.

B.4.3. Incentives and rewards for educational activities (ESG 1.5)

Evidence

The University of New York Tirana has a structured institutional teaching-reward mechanism that includes an 'Excellence in Teaching' award. This award is available to all teaching staff who meet the application criteria defined in the 'Best in Teaching Criteria and Procedure' document. Candidates are evaluated based on documented evidence, including course and instructor evaluation results, teaching portfolios, and Recommendations from Heads of Departments and Deans. The award recognises practices such as effective student engagement, innovative teaching methods, quality of assessment and feedback, and contributions to curriculum development. The reward system comprises three stages: nomination and application, evaluation, and decision. Awards are monitored regularly by

Quality Assurance reporting and institutional reviews and are announced at the Graduation Ceremony.

During the site visit, the evaluation team observed that teaching staff are informed about the Excellence in Teaching award application process, which is administered annually. Over the past three years, teaching staff from different departments have been awarded. During focus group meetings, stakeholders suggested expanding the award options by increasing the number of awards across different categories.

Analysis

The institution has a dedicated award for teaching excellence open to all teaching staff who meet the eligibility criteria, and awareness of the award is strong across the institution. The award mechanism is monitored through Quality Assurance Reports. However, the Excellence in Teaching award is limited to a single award per year, and stakeholders have expressed interest in introducing additional award categories. Awards have been distributed across different departments and faculties over the past three years, suggesting fair application of the criteria.

Evaluation Team Commendation I

The Evaluation Team commends the institution for strengthening its recognition of faculty teaching excellence through the presentation of teaching awards.

Evaluation Team Recommendation I

The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution develop a structured, holistic improvement mechanism that supports stakeholders' feedback and rewards educational activities.

Evaluation Team Suggestion for Further Improvement I

The Evaluation Team suggests that the institution expand teaching award opportunities across categories, such as student- and peer-nominated awards, aligned with the institution's priorities.

Evaluation Team Conclusion for Maturity Level: 3

Incentive and reward practices are implemented throughout the entire institution.

C. RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

C.1. MANAGEMENT OF RESEARCH PROCESSES AND THE RESEARCH RESOURCES

C.1.1. Management of research processes

Evidence

The institution oversees its research activities through a framework aligned with its Strategic Plan 2026–2030, which identifies research as a core pillar. The Rectorate, faculties, and the Institute for European and Balkan Studies have established mechanisms to enhance research productivity and management processes. These include the development of specialised laboratories in architecture and computer science, the allocation of dedicated annual departmental funds for conference participation, support for scientific publications, the provision of paid leave for academic staff to attend conferences and undertake research visits, and access to external resources supporting research activities. The Research, Projects and Innovation Centre (RPIC) coordinates and supports all research-related processes.

Analysis

The RPIC supports research-related processes. The Statute designates a Vice-Rector as responsible for overseeing research activities. During the site visit, the evaluation team observed that, in the current transitional period pending the appointment of a new Rector, these responsibilities are being handled by the acting Rector. This arrangement may limit the effectiveness of research management in the short term. A clear research governance model with defined responsibilities was not observed. Mechanisms to improve the research competencies of academic staff are not yet sufficient and could be strengthened through expanded training, mentoring, and increased support for research activities and international collaboration. The RPIC could work more closely with the administration and faculty by systematically collecting feedback from all stakeholders.

Evaluation Team Commendation I

The Evaluation Team commends the Balkan Research Centre and the European Research Centre for serving as platforms that promote research collaboration and academic exchange by facilitating joint initiatives, strengthening scholarly networks, and enhancing the institution's regional engagement.

Evaluation Team Recommendation I

The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution systematically collect feedback from academic staff and external stakeholders to analyse needs and identify actions required to enhance research management activities.

Evaluation Team Recommendation II

The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution develop a clear research governance model with well-defined responsibilities, possibly including a university-wide research committee to oversee research management.

Evaluation Team Conclusion for Maturity Level: 3

The management and organisational structure of research processes are practised in line with institutional preferences throughout the entire institution.

C.1.2. Internal and external resources

Evidence

The institution ensures that its physical, technical, and financial research resources are aligned with its mission, strategic objectives, and research priorities. Key units responsible for managing both internal and external resources include the RPIC Office, the Senate, departmental units, and the Finance Office.

The allocation and management of internal research resources are governed by well-defined institutional processes, particularly the RPI Regulation and the Internal Resource Usage Policy, which specify procedures for project approval, budget allocation, and resource utilisation. These are complemented by standardised formats for internal funding and Internal Resource Distribution Reports. For university-funded projects, the RPI submits regular reports to the Rectorate, the Administrator, and Internal Audit. In addition, each project is supported by a Monitoring and Performance Framework to ensure effective implementation and evaluation, but it lacks the control and action phases.

External resources are facilitated through cooperation agreements and memoranda of understanding with reputable higher education institutions, promoting scientific collaboration and joint research initiatives.

Analysis

The institution has provided examples of cases where internal and external resources are used for research activities. Defined processes via the budget plan for academic units govern how resources are distributed among units, and general results are reported through annual reports. Faculty members can apply for funds for conferences and other academic events through a form, and, as evidenced by the focus group meetings, the allocation is handled fairly and transparently for both faculty members and graduate students. However, evidence of improvements in the variety and sufficiency of internal and external resources was not presented.

The RPIC provides support in executing projects that receive external resources, with current projects mainly comprising capacity-building projects funded by the EU Erasmus+ programmes. The institution has expressed intentions to participate in Horizon projects, but this has not yet materialised. Although the institution is involved in European Union-funded research projects like “Advancing sustainability in Higher Education for the benefit of all” (UNIGreen, ERASMUS-EDU-2025-CBHE STRAND-1) and “Digital Transformation and Green Transition of Higher Education Institutions” (INITIATION, ERASMUS-EDU-2025-CBHE STRAND-2), there is a need for developing institutional capacity to increase external funding.

Evaluation Team Commendation I

The Evaluation Team commends the institution for allocating funds for conferences and other academic events fairly and transparently to both faculty members and graduate students, supporting active participation.

Evaluation Team Recommendation I

The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution increase the variety and sufficiency of internal and external research resources and follow up on the results obtained.

Evaluation Team Recommendation II

The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution introduce mechanisms to support novice researchers’ research activities through easily accessible core intra-university funds.

Evaluation Team Recommendation III

The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution increase RPIC’s capacity to provide sustainable support for enhancing the efficiency of research activities.

Evaluation Team Suggestion for Further Improvement I

The Evaluation Team suggests that, in addition to existing conference support, the institution introduce an internal support programme to fund research activities.

Evaluation Team Conclusion for Maturity Level: 3

The institution manages its research and development resources by taking its research strategy and the balance between its units into account.

C.1.3. Doctoral programs and postdoctoral opportunities

Evidence

The institution currently offers one PhD programme and maintains doctoral education through a focused cohort of enrolled students. In addition, two new doctoral programmes—PhD in Political Science and International Relations and PhD in Business Administration—are under evaluation and are expected to further strengthen the institution’s research and graduate education portfolio once approved. Although the institution does not currently host postdoctoral researchers, it is important to note that the existing Albanian legal framework for higher education does not recognize postdoctoral studies or postdoctoral research positions as a formal category of study programme or academic qualification. The university provides opportunities for their own teaching staff to visit other institutions as postdoctoral or visiting researchers. In addition, the institution hosts visiting researchers from other universities.

Analysis

The evaluation team recognises the institution’s commitment to developing doctoral education, particularly in light of the regulatory conditions facing private universities in Albania. The institution is actively pursuing the expansion of its doctoral portfolio through dual PhD programmes in collaboration with partner universities, including Izmir Bakırçay University and Ibn Haldun University, and has established the necessary rules and regulations governing these programmes.

The institution may also consider exploring future opportunities for postdoctoral research initiatives, initially at the national or regional level, should the regulatory environment evolve. In addition, several members of the teaching staff are graduates of the institution, reflecting strong institutional continuity and alumni engagement. To further enhance transparency in recruitment planning and promote academic diversity, the institution could consider formalising a policy regarding the balance between internally and externally trained academic staff.

Continued expansion of PhD programmes and research collaborations is expected to strengthen the institution’s research capacity, increase scholarly output, and further enhance its academic visibility.

Evaluation Team Recommendation I

The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution expands its doctoral programme offerings.

Evaluation Team Recommendation II

The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution introduces mechanisms to attract doctoral students.

Evaluation Team Suggestion for Further Improvement I

The Evaluation Team suggests that the institution develops plans for accommodating and attracting postdoctoral and visiting researchers, taking into account Albanian regulatory requirements.

Evaluation Team Conclusion for Maturity Level: 3

The institution carries out doctoral programs and postdoctoral opportunities that support and align with the institution's research policy, objectives, and strategies.

C.2 RESEARCH COMPETENCE, COLLABORATIONS, AND SUPPORTS

C.2.1. Research competencies and their development

Evidence

The institution supports the development of academic staff research competencies through direct funding, access to externally funded projects, and structured institutional mechanisms. The integration of teaching, research, and administrative responsibilities is clearly articulated in the institutional strategy, creating a sustainable academic environment that promotes research capacity and international and regional collaboration. The UNYT Statute and the Strategic Plan 2026–2030 emphasise internationalisation as a key driver for strengthening research competencies through partnerships and joint initiatives.

This commitment is further reflected in the Strategic Plan 2026–2030, which prioritises faculty training, enhanced research infrastructure, leadership development, and systematic support for grant writing and proposal preparation. These measures provide continuous support to academic staff in conducting research effectively throughout the year. The institution fosters its research culture through international projects, mobility schemes, guest lectures, and the publication of the *International Journal of Balkan Studies (IJBS)*. Departments incorporate research activities into their annual plans, including conferences, publications, and academic seminars. Institutionalised Academic Seminars offer regular platforms for presenting research and engaging in scholarly discussion, often involving international participants and diaspora academics.

The institution has also organised and co-hosted major international academic events, such as the Migration Symposium (April 2024) and the conference “Navigating Complexity and

Change” in Istanbul (December 2024), thereby enhancing research skills and international visibility.

The university participates in international research networks, including Erasmus+, Jean Monnet, COST Actions, and TIKa partnerships, supporting collaborative research and mobility. In addition, it has established strategic collaborations with universities and research institutes in Albania and abroad to strengthen knowledge exchange and innovation.

Analysis

Although the institution offers some workshops and training sessions to promote research competencies, these activities are limited in scope and do not fully capture the full range of available opportunities. Such activities should both inform researchers about opportunities and provide technical training for preparing research proposals. Close to half of the teaching staff hold PhD degrees from a variety of universities, and some staff without doctoral degrees are continuing their studies at other institutions.

The institution participates in various networks that facilitate the development of research competencies. Through these networks, the institution has opportunities for participating in projects as a partner or coordinator, as well as access to knowledge resources and training. To further develop research competency, the institution should implement mechanisms for collecting stakeholder feedback and conduct periodic reviews to identify areas for improvement.

Evaluation Team Recommendation I

The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution systematically collect feedback from researchers and monitor performance in research competence.

Evaluation Team Recommendation II

The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution conduct a needs analysis to identify areas for improvement in research competency.

Evaluation Team Recommendation III

The Evaluation Team recommends that the research capabilities of academic staff be further enhanced through structured training and mentoring, as well as increased international collaboration.

Evaluation Team Conclusion for Maturity Level: 3

There are practices for developing the research competencies of the teaching staff throughout the institution.

C.2.2. National and international joint programs and joint research units

Evidence

The institution fosters inter-institutional and interdisciplinary collaboration primarily through the Institute of European and Balkan Studies and its three research centres: the European Studies Centre, the Balkan Studies Centre, and the Research Project and Innovation Centre (RPIC). The RPIC acts as the central unit for building partnerships, managing projects, and engaging in research networks, while coordinating and supporting the implementation of joint academic and research initiatives. Its active involvement in international collaborations reflects the institution's broader research approach.

The university is a member of several international research networks, including Erasmus+, Jean Monnet, COST Actions, and TIKa partnerships, which facilitate collaborative research and researcher mobility. These networks are also used as platforms for joint projects and capacity-building activities.

Between 2020 and 2025, the institution has been consistently active in both international and national research aligned with its priority areas. It has organised and co-organised annual conferences and symposia on topics including Balkan studies, migration, regional security, economics, finance, and artificial intelligence. Notable examples include the joint international conference “Navigating Complexity and Change in the Balkans,” held in Istanbul (December 2024) in collaboration with Turkish-German University and Ibn Haldun University, as well as the conference “Artificial Intelligence (AI) in the Age of Transformation: Opportunities and Challenges” (May 2025), co-organised with AAB College.

Analysis

The institution is involved in joint research activities utilising national and international networks through projects and conferences, with recent efforts concentrated on Erasmus+ projects. These networks could be utilised more effectively through regular participation in a broader range of activities. These efforts have not yet led to the establishment of joint research units. However, there is potential, particularly in the social sciences, through the Balkan Research Centre and the European Research Centre.

The institution has signed Memoranda of Understanding with Turkish universities for dual PhD programmes. These need to be followed up on and new opportunities explored. The

institution should prepare an action plan to establish joint research units at the national, regional, and international levels, as well as joint PhD programme applications.

Evaluation Team Recommendation I

The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution direct its efforts towards establishing joint research units or centres at the national, regional, or international level.

Evaluation Team Recommendation II

The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution systematically collect stakeholder feedback to improve processes related to establishing joint research units or programmes.

Evaluation Team Recommendation III

The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution promotes and incentivises participation in research networks.

Evaluation Team Suggestion for Further Improvement I

The Evaluation Team suggests that the institution join professional networks in relevant fields to create opportunities for joint research activities or the establishment of joint research units.

Evaluation Team Conclusion for Maturity Level: 3

National and international joint programs and joint research activities are carried out throughout the institution.

C.3. RESEARCH PERFORMANCE

C.3.1. The follow-up and evaluation of research performance

Evidence

Improving research performance is one of the main pillars of the 2026–2030 Strategic Plan. At the institutional level, research performance is systematically overseen by the Research Projects and Innovation Centre (RPIC), which coordinates internal research meetings and the preparation of annual research plans. The outcomes of these evaluations are captured in RPIC reports and used to guide strategic decision-making, resource allocation, and the refinement of research policies in alignment with EU and national research priorities.

At the faculty level, Deans and the Director of the Institute, together with Research Centre Heads, are formally responsible for preparing, monitoring, and reporting on annual research plans, with the aim of ensuring alignment between institutional objectives and faculty

priorities. However, the extent to which act and check processes are implemented systematically and consistently appears limited. Monitoring of publications and projects is envisaged to support transparency and benchmarking across faculties.

At the departmental level, Heads of Departments manage the implementation of research activities through individual performance reviews and annual departmental reports. Departments integrate research with teaching, with student engagement to a degree, and with international collaboration; submit annual research performance reports to the Rectorate; and propose dedicated research budgets within their annual financial plans to support conferences, publications, and student participation in research, projects, and exchange programs. In addition, the institution offers an annual research award to a single high-performing researcher, serving as a motivation mechanism.

Analysis

Overall research performance is monitored through the annual report. The number of publications increased significantly in the past two years, reflecting a clear improvement in research output and academic productivity. The number of publications indexed in Scopus in 2024-2025 averaged 52, whereas in 2022-2023 the average was around 25. The institution would benefit from more specific goals aligned with its general strategy or regional priorities.

The institution has demonstrated capacity by successfully managing multiple EU-funded projects, like “Advancing sustainability in Higher Education for the benefit of all” (UNIGreen, ERASMUS-EDU-2025-CBHE STRAND-1) and “Digital Transformation and Green Transition of Higher Education Institutions” (INITIATION, ERASMUS-EDU-2025-CBHE STRAND-2), highlighting its growing research profile and international engagement. These are predominantly Erasmus+ projects, and the variety of internal and external resources remains limited. Addressing this limitation would provide positive momentum for research performance. Awareness and motivation regarding patent applications and intellectual property are currently limited. The institution needs mechanisms to manage such activities, which would, in turn, contribute to improved research performance.

Evaluation Team Commendation I

The Evaluation Team commends the institution for the significant increase in publications over the past two years, reflecting a clear improvement in research output and academic productivity.

Evaluation Team Recommendation I

The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution conduct benchmark analyses and prepare reports showing trends in the quality and quantity of research outputs over time.

Evaluation Team Recommendation II

The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution implement a digital system to monitor research performance from multiple perspectives, supported by a systematic collection of stakeholder feedback.

Evaluation Team Recommendation III

The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution organise structured training programmes for project proposal writing.

Evaluation Team Recommendation IV

The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution provide training and establish incentive mechanisms for patent applications and intellectual property management.

Evaluation Team Conclusion for Maturity Level: 3

Mechanisms established for follow-up and evaluation of the research performance are used throughout the institution.

C.3.2. Performance evaluation for the teaching staff/researchers

Evidence

At the end of each academic year, academic staff submit a record of their publications and all other research activities to their departments using the data reporting template, Research Contributions and Project Participation. The institution subsequently compiles and processes these data, incorporating the outcomes into its annual report at the end of each academic year. The institutional evaluation of research and innovation encompasses: (i) the preparation and implementation of annual research plans at the faculty and research centre levels; (ii) periodic monitoring through reports on publications, projects, international collaborations, and academic and societal impact; and (iii) the assessment of individual contributions in line with promotion criteria and annual performance reviews. This annual reporting supports the systematic monitoring of research activities by providing a structured approach to tracking performance, identifying strengths and areas for improvement, and facilitating ongoing evaluation. It is a written report that is compiled using a data reporting template that researchers fill in annually. A further mechanism for annual evaluation is the Individual Assessment Form and the Individual Annual Objectives, administered and assessed by Heads of Departments. The department promotes, coordinates, and administers teaching and research while respecting academic freedom and enabling staff to use available material and financial resources for academic activities. Scientific activities, projects, and study programmes form part of the annual work planning. The departments, therefore, play a

central role in defining and assessing yearly research obligations, aligning research priorities with institutional strategy, and promoting publications and projects with local and international partners.

The institution has an annual award mechanism that is given to the best researcher every academic year. Graduate students maintain regular interaction with their supervisors, ensuring consistent academic guidance, effective mentorship, and close monitoring of research progress, thereby affecting research performance.

Analysis

Each member of the teaching staff reports research outputs (publications, projects, conferences, and other activities) annually to the department heads. This information is consolidated at the department, faculty, and university levels to monitor overall performance. An annual research award is given through an open application process with a defined procedure. While the award serves as an incentive, its institutionalisation and broader implementation could be enhanced, as different faculties and departments contribute to research in distinct ways.

Currently, there is limited systematic research feedback for improving the performance evaluation of research activities. The institution does not have the authority to confer Associate Professorship and Professorship titles under Albanian law; staff must meet centrally determined conditions and apply to the Ministry of Education and Sports.

Evaluation Team Recommendation I

The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution introduce a range of awards and other incentive mechanisms to motivate researchers.

Evaluation Team Recommendation II

The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution systematically collect feedback from researchers and other relevant stakeholders to improve performance evaluation processes.

Evaluation Team Recommendation III

The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution develop a centralised digital system to track individual research performance.

Evaluation Team Conclusion for Maturity Level: 3

Established mechanisms for follow-up and assessment of the research and development performance of teaching staff are used throughout the institution.

D. SERVICE TO SOCIETY

D.1. MANAGEMENT OF SERVICE TO SOCIETY PROCESSES AND THE SERVICE TO SOCIETY RESOURCES

D.1.1. Management of service to society processes

Evidence

The institution delivers service to society activities aligned with its mission, vision, and strategic objectives, supporting social, cultural, and economic progress in Albania and the Balkan region. The UNYT Statute specifies the roles and responsibilities of units and individuals involved in service to society activities. Strategic oversight is provided by the Rector, Vice-Rector for Academic and Research Affairs, and the Senate, ensuring alignment with the Strategic Plan, academic priorities, and institutional goals. Faculties, departments, institutes, and centres manage operational delivery. Student engagement is facilitated through the Student Union and eight student clubs, coordinated by the Dean of Students. Service to society activities are tracked through Events Request Forms. A Social Responsibility and Inclusion Policy is in place. During the site visit, the evaluation team observed that service to society activities are delivered according to current needs and available resources, through collaboration across academic and administrative units at both strategic and operational levels. Activities are delivered collaboratively and in a decentralised manner across various units; however, no centralised structure for service to society exists. There is no specific organisational chart dedicated to service to society activities. Although the Finance Office and Events Request Forms provide partial monitoring, a comprehensive management mechanism has not yet been established. Evidence of systematic monitoring and improvement of management effectiveness remains limited.

Analysis

The institution provides service to society activities through collaboration among various academic and administrative units. The UNYT Statute defines some roles and responsibilities, and the Social Responsibility and Inclusion Policy is in place; however, this policy focuses primarily on student-relevant needs and activities, limiting its scope as a holistic service to society framework. For example, the institution offers scholarships to students with disabilities, minorities, and members of other vulnerable groups. Also, the institution's Strategic Plans for both 2020-2025 and 2026-2030 include an indirect emphasis on service-to-society activities. The Evaluation Team observed that the Social Responsibility and Inclusion Policy does not constitute a comprehensive framework covering all dimensions of service to society and social contribution. As a result, the institution cannot yet systematically align service activities with strategic objectives, allocate resources proportionately, or demonstrate cumulative institutional impact to external stakeholders. In addition, coordination among

relevant units and responsible persons is not clearly defined, indicating an area for development.

Evaluation Team Recommendation I

The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution improve its approach to service to society by developing a comprehensive service-to-society policy to strengthen the systematic planning, monitoring and improvement of service-to-society activities

Evaluation Team Conclusion for Maturity Level: 3

The management and organisational structure of the service to society processes are practised in line with the institutional preferences throughout the institution.

D.1.2. Resources

Evidence

The institution uses financial, human, and physical resources for service to society activities, including Bake and Sale events, Open Lectures, and activities organised by the Balkan Studies Centre in compliance with institutional priorities, through collaboration among academic and administrative units and students. Institution's financial resources are available for various services to society activities through the corporate budget; however, these budgets are defined at the departmental level without a specific institutional-level allocation for service to society. According to the site visit observation and additional evidence provided, the corporate budget is monitored through departmental reports regularly.

As a human resource, the institution has motivated academic and administrative staff, including the Dean of Students. Student engagement in these service to society activities is strong, delivered through motivated student clubs and the Student Union. The institution also has research centres, including the Balkan Research Centre within the Institute of European and Balkan Studies. The institution is a member of the Balkan Universities Association.

During the site visit, the evaluation team observed that service to society activities are supported by collaborative and decentralised resources across the Rectorate, Senate, academic and administrative departments, and the Dean of Students. The institution offers various resources, including financial, human, and physical resources. Budget and other resources are monitored regularly through departmental reports and student activity reports. There is no systematic follow-up mechanism for tracking improvements or changes.

Analysis

The institution has a range of resources to support service to society activities, including motivated staff and strong student engagement. Financial support is provided through the

institutional budget; however, there is no dedicated budget line at the institutional level for service to society activities. This absence of a distinct allocation represents a structural limitation, as resource allocation for social contribution remains embedded within departmental budgets, without the strategic visibility and accountability that a clearly defined budget line would provide.

Activities are monitored through departmental and student activity reports; however, no centralised, systematic mechanism exists to monitor resource use across the institution. Furthermore, year-on-year changes in resource allocation for service to society activities are not systematically tracked or reported at the institutional level. This limits the institution's ability to assess whether resource investment aligns with its strategic ambitions and constrains its capacity to demonstrate resource adequacy to external evaluators.

Evaluation Team Recommendation I

The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution create a systematic, digitally monitored mechanism for allocating and tracking service to society budgets and resources.

Evaluation Team Recommendation II

The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution systematically collect stakeholder perspectives on the monitoring and evaluation of service to society resources through a structured and methodologically robust approach.

Evaluation Team Conclusion for Maturity Level: 3

The institution manages its service to society resources by taking the service to society strategy and the balance between units into account.

D.2. SERVICE TO SOCIETY PERFORMANCE

D.2.1. The follow-up and evaluation of the service to society performance

Evidence

The institution organises service to society activities, including projects, Open Lectures, and other initiatives, with contributions from students, academic staff, administrative staff, and external stakeholders, aligned with institutional, national, and regional priorities. The institution participates in several projects that contribute to service to society, including "Democratisation and Reconciliation in the Western Balkans", "International Migration and Global Political Uncertainties", and "Migration Governance".

The institution organises Open Lectures on topics such as gender equality, diversity and inclusion, and Autism Spectrum Disorder. It also celebrates special days, including

International Children's Day, and offers free E-Matura preparation courses for Albanian high-school graduates. The institution has a Social Responsibility and Inclusion Policy.

The institution has defined eight categories of service to society activities, with a total of 30 indicators covering community engagement and outreach, student engagement and volunteering, and support services provided to society. The institution's Strategic Plans for 2020–2025 and 2026–2030 include objectives relevant to service to society activities. The institution identifies students, external partners, community beneficiaries, academic staff, and institutional quality assurance structures as stakeholders, with feedback mechanisms defined for each group.

The institution plans and organises service to society activities primarily through student engagement and collaboration among Student Clubs, the Student Union, and departmental units. Activities range from student-led initiatives, such as Charity Club events, to faculty-organised Open Lectures, Turkish-language courses, and research-oriented events delivered through the Institute of European and Balkan Studies. The institution also conducts research projects that contribute to social benefit, including studies on climate change, digital skills, Balkan common heritage, and regional needs.

During the site visit, the evaluation team observed motivation and collaboration in organising service to society activities; however, many activities are initiated through student clubs. While stakeholder engagement and feedback mechanisms are defined, evidence of systematic needs analysis and structured feedback from all stakeholder groups remains limited. A regular mechanism (Events Request Form) exists for event planning and resource documentation. Various departments and administrative units monitor service to society activities; however, no centralised mechanism exists to track overall results, impact, and improvement.

Analysis

The institution's service to society activities are organised primarily according to student and unit-level demands. While a range of activities is delivered, evidence of a holistic needs-analysis process involving all stakeholder groups remains limited. The institution lacks a centralised mechanism dedicated to service to society monitoring and reporting, and responsibilities are dispersed across units. This fragmentation constrains the institution's ability to present a consolidated institutional narrative of social contribution, measure cumulative impact, and use performance data to inform strategic planning.

A comprehensive framework for long-term impact assessment, including alignment with the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals, has not yet been established. Site visit observations and supporting evidence indicate a need to integrate the institution's service to society activities more explicitly into the Strategic Plan and to link them with the Sustainable Development Goals.

Current monitoring practices focus primarily on documenting activities rather than assessing their impact on society. There is no systematic and holistic follow-up mechanism to support improvement in the performance of services to society.

Evaluation Team Commendation I

The Evaluation Team commends the Institute of European and Balkan Studies, including the Balkan Research Centre and the European Research Centre, for contributing to Balkan common heritage and conducting studies that address regional needs.

Evaluation Team Commendation II

The Evaluation Team commends the institution for its role as a bridge between Albanian and Turkish cultures by providing Turkish-language courses.

Evaluation Team Recommendation I

The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution systematically collect stakeholder feedback on the monitoring and evaluation of service to society performance through a structured and methodologically robust approach.

Evaluation Team Recommendation II

The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution integrate mechanisms to measure, monitor, and evaluate the impact and outcomes of service-to-society activities, linked to specific UN Sustainable Development Goals, with transparent reporting to all stakeholders.

Evaluation Team Suggestion for Further Improvement I

The Evaluation Team suggests that the institution support lifelong learning programmes aligned with national and regional needs, in collaboration with community stakeholders, and organise them under a lifelong learning centre or unit.

Evaluation Team Conclusion for Maturity Level: 3

Mechanisms established for follow-up and evaluation of the service to society performance are used throughout the institution.

CONCLUSION

From the perspective of this evaluation, the institution exhibits an integrated set of practices, supported by formalised processes and documented evidence, across the core domains of governance, strategic management, teaching and learning, research and development, and

service to society. The maturity assessment shows that monitoring and improvement mechanisms are in place, particularly in the areas of teaching and learning and internationalisation, which the institution prioritises. In other areas, although there are institution-wide practices, further improvements are needed in harmonisation, the production of evidence to complete the auditable cycle, and the effective use of monitoring data for priority and strategic actions. Strengthening the monitoring of research and development and service to society activities through structured processes, and systematically using monitoring results alongside stakeholder feedback to inform improvement actions, will contribute to the institution's continued development within the framework of its mission and vision.

In this context, it is important to structure monitoring and improvement cycles through a digitalised system that includes defined responsibilities, workflows, performance indicators, and documented evidence, ensuring that all institutional activities contribute to the holistic improvement cycle. Equally important is enhancing the visibility and regularity of results-oriented and impact-oriented reporting, supported by systematic feedback from both internal and external stakeholders across all areas of institutional activity. These measures will support the development of a digitally integrated, transparent, and impact-oriented quality assurance system, while preserving the institution's established strengths.

The institution's strengths across the four evaluation areas are presented in the "Summary of Commendations." To support the institution's continued development and quality enhancement, areas for improvement have been identified and presented under "Recommendations"; suggestions to further enhance institutional performance are given under "Suggestions for Further Improvement."

SUMMARY OF COMMENDATIONS

The Evaluation Team recognises the University of New York Tirana for demonstrating substantial maturity in quality assurance across its operations. The following institutional strengths are particularly commendable:

A. Governance and Quality

- The Evaluation Team commends the institution for maintaining a clearly structured organisational chart with defined bodies, regular meeting cycles, and documented decision-making pathways, supported by the governance transformation associated with Turkish Maarif Foundation ownership that has strengthened strategic coherence and institutional capacity.
- The Evaluation Team commends the institution for establishing a comprehensive internal quality assurance framework with multiple evaluation instruments, a dedicated Quality Assurance Unit with external expert involvement, and clear institutional positioning of QA as a strategic priority.

- The Evaluation Team commends the institution for defining a coherent four-pillar strategic framework and implementing tangible transformation initiatives that reflect an outward-facing orientation and responsiveness to institutional development priorities.
- The Evaluation Team commends the institution for maintaining a comprehensive set of internal quality assurance instruments.
- The Evaluation Team commends the institution for maintaining a multi-channel, bilingual public disclosure framework underpinned by regulatory compliance, independent financial auditing, a dedicated QA transparency section on the institutional website, and a structured annual reporting chain linking operational units to governance bodies and external regulators.
- The Evaluation Team commends the institution for maintaining a consistent, publicly communicated mission and vision that are operationally reflected in institutional decisions, strategic partnerships, and governance structures, with strong mission awareness observed among students, staff, and leadership during the site visit.
- The Evaluation Team commends the institution for operating an ISO 27001-certified information security management framework and for implementing KION as a secure and functional platform supporting core academic, administrative and financial transactions.
- The Evaluation Team commends the institution for operating a transparent, merit-based recruitment system, maintaining high staff motivation and institutional belonging and for initiating systematic staff satisfaction monitoring for administrative staff.
- The Evaluation Team commends the institution for maintaining a structured financial management framework with multi-layer internal controls, monthly reporting, independent annual audits, and professional development for finance staff, reflecting a disciplined and accountable approach to financial governance.
- The Evaluation Team commends the institution for maintaining a broad institutional process management framework covering academic, administrative, and student support functions, supported by defined regulations at Statute, faculty, and office levels and implemented through a diverse range of specialised institutional units.
- The Evaluation Team commends the institution for the external stakeholder ownership and engagement observed during the site visit, reflecting effective relationship management with employers, community partners, and alumni.
- The Evaluation Team commends the institution for maintaining a multi-channel student feedback system, with formal student representation in governance bodies, electronic evaluation administration through KION, and concrete examples of service and academic improvements resulting from student feedback.
- The Evaluation Team commends the institution for the alumni engagement culture observed during the site visit, evidenced by high graduate employability, some alumni

involvement in institutional events and career support activities, and the institutional staff contribution of alumni who maintain strong institutional belonging.

- The Evaluation Team commends the institution for establishing a clearly defined and transparently communicated organisational structure for internationalisation management, supported by a documented strategy aligned with the Strategic Plan, active IRO and RPIC operations, and membership in European and regional academic networks including EUA, BUA, and the Erasmus Charter for Higher Education.
- The Evaluation Team commends the institution for maintaining a structured internationalisation resource management framework with dedicated budget lines, clearly defined monitoring responsibilities across the Finance Office, IRO, and RPIC, compliance-aligned financial procedures, and a documented example of monitoring-informed resource rebalancing toward underrepresented disciplines.
- The Evaluation Team commends the institution for its substantive and growing internationalisation performance profile, including expanding international project participation, diverse student and staff mobility, and a multinational campus community, reflecting a genuine internationalisation culture supported by effective management.
- The Evaluation Team commends the institution for the SUNY/ESU dual-degree partnership, which provides students with internationally recognised qualifications, strengthens academic credibility, and exemplifies a deep and outcomes-oriented approach to international collaboration that extends beyond activity-based internationalisation metrics.

B. Learning and Teaching

- The Evaluation Team commends the institution for consistently enhancing programmes through a collaborative cycle of student course and instructor evaluations, peer staff insights, and stakeholder feedback.
- The Evaluation Team commends the institution for its systematic application of the A–E taxonomy and ECTS logic, ensuring high curricular coherence and workload balance across programmes.
- The Evaluation Team commends the institution for employing multi-dimensional mechanisms to enhance its Course Information Packages, supported by formal monitoring processes overseen by various academic boards.
- The Evaluation Team commends the institution for ensuring alignment between programme objectives and course outcomes and achieving institutional integration across all academic departments, a success evidenced by the systematic use of standardised syllabus templates, curriculum mapping, and comprehensive course information packages.
- The Evaluation Team commends the institution for its proactive pedagogical enhancements and external partnerships, effectively integrating applied learning into the academic curriculum.

- The Evaluation Team commends the institution for its framework for programme development, which ensures a multi-level approval process and systematic use of stakeholder feedback, together guaranteeing the academic credibility of all study cycles.
- The Evaluation Team commends the institution for its implementation of student-centred methodologies and assessments, which are monitored and enhanced on a semester basis with the collaborative involvement of internal stakeholders.
- The Evaluation Team commends the institution for offering a wide range of scholarships for disadvantaged students, including refugees, students with physical disabilities, and students experiencing financial hardship.
- The Evaluation Team commends the institution for its fair, transparent, and clear processes for staff recruitment, promotion, and appointment.
- The Evaluation Team commends the institution for strengthening its faculty teaching excellence recognition through the presentation of teaching awards.

C. Research and Development

- The Evaluation Team commends the Balkan Research Centre and European Research Centre for serving as platforms for promoting research collaboration and academic exchange by facilitating joint initiatives, strengthening scholarly networks, and enhancing the institution's regional engagement.
- The Evaluation Team commends the institution for allocating funds for conferences and other academic events fairly and transparently to both faculty members and graduate students, supporting active participation.
- The Evaluation Team commends the institution for the significant increase in publications over the past two years, reflecting clear improvement in research output and academic productivity.

D. Service to Society

- The Evaluation Team commends the Institute of European and Balkan Studies, including the Balkan Research Centre and the European Research Centre, for contributing to Balkan common heritage and conducting studies that address regional needs.
- The Evaluation Team commends the institution for its role as a bridge between Albanian and Turkish culture through the provision of Turkish-language courses.

OVERVIEW OF JUDGEMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Evaluation Team assessed the institution across four main areas using a five-level maturity model. The results demonstrate strong performance, with a predominance of Level 3 (systematic implementation) and Level 4 (monitoring and improvement) ratings, indicating mature quality assurance practices.

For the next improvement cycle, three cross-cutting priorities stand out to help the institution increase institutional impact: (i) ensuring that monitoring results are consistently translated into documented follow-up actions with defined owners, timelines, and closure evidence, enabling systematic PDCA-cycle closure; (ii) enhancing the visibility and analytical use of performance indicators across the institution, moving beyond activity-based measurements towards outcome and impact-oriented reporting; and (iii) strengthening the digital integration of quality assurance processes through a centralised information management and reporting framework. These priorities will support a more consistent, traceable, and sustainable approach to quality enhancement while maintaining the institution's existing strengths.

KEY RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Governance and Quality

- The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution ensure governance review processes produce traceable outputs by systematically recording follow-up actions arising from governance body meetings, with defined owners, timelines, and completion evidence, thereby enabling clearer PDCA-cycle closure at the governance level.
- The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution assign and publicly publish formal responsibilities for Vice Rectors in their respective areas.
- It is recommended that the institution establish a University Advisory Board to support systematic external input into strategic governance.
- The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution establish a structured leadership development framework, drawing on resources to systematically build the leadership capabilities of academic and administrative staff.
- The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution implement a 360-degree leadership evaluation process for senior academic and administrative leaders, incorporating structured feedback.
- The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution develop formal change management and risk management frameworks that operationalise how the institution identifies, assesses, plans for, and monitors institutional change, such as digitalisation, capacity risks, and external environment shifts, thereby moving transformation capacity from strategic narrative to embedded institutional practice.
- The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution conduct systematic benchmarking analysis to increase competitiveness within the country, region, and internationally.
- The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution reinforce the 'Act' stage of the PDCA cycle by systematically recording in a digital system, for each major QA evaluation cycle, which findings were reviewed, which improvement actions were agreed upon (with owners and timelines) and what evidence demonstrates that these actions were

implemented. Their effects are assessed, enabling clearer traceability from evaluation to improvement across institutional levels.

- The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution strengthen the performance accountability aspect of its public disclosure by systematically publishing a defined set of institutional performance indicators, including trend data across academic years, in a publicly accessible format, enabling external stakeholders to assess institutional progress and reinforcing transparency beyond compliance-level reporting.
- The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution publish the institutional communication responsibilities, workflow charts, reporting lines, and accountability mechanisms to ensure consistent and coordinated communication across academic and administrative units.
- The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution establish a structured and defined periodic policy review process, involving relevant internal and external stakeholders, through which institutional policies are formally evaluated against mission and vision objectives, with findings documented and used to inform policy updates and their communication to the academic community.
- The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution establish clear and explicit links between institutional policies and Strategic Plan goals, ensuring that measurable KPIs support each policy.
- The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution reinforce the strategic monitoring-to-improvement chain by institutionalising an annual strategic monitoring report that consolidates KPI performance data across all pillars and units, records corrective and improvement decisions with defined ownership and timelines, and demonstrates how monitoring outputs have formally informed the subsequent planning cycle.
- The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution integrate the UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) into the Strategic Plan to ensure institutional targets are formally linked with global sustainability priorities and international performance indicators.
- The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution develop a predefined, documented participatory process, including internal and external stakeholders, for future strategic plan preparation.
- The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution develop a digital, centralised performance management framework that integrates academic and administrative performance data, enables cross-unit trend analysis, and generates traceable links from monitoring findings to documented improvement decisions, thereby enabling consistent PDCA-cycle closure in performance management across all institutional levels.
- The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution establish a clear operational framework linking strategic KPIs to the performance management cycle, with defined

responsibilities and reporting mechanisms, ensuring that KPI outcomes systematically inform management decisions and improvement actions.

- The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution enhance the strategic utility of its information management environment by developing an institutional analytics capability, including a defined set of performance indicators and a monitoring interface accessible to quality assurance structures and senior leadership.
- The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution develop an institutional data governance framework defining data ownership, data classification, data quality standards, access responsibilities and reporting procedures across all digital platforms.
- The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution work towards developing a fully integrated information management system covering all primary institutional processes, including quality assurance, research and development, and service to society, thereby reducing reliance on manual data consolidation across fragmented platforms.
- The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution strengthen the integration between its information management systems and quality assurance processes, so that quality indicators can be systematically monitored, analysed and used for institutional improvement.
- The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution develop information management functionality covering all primary institutional processes, including leadership and governance, teaching and learning, research and development, and service to society.
- The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution establish a systematic, institution-wide staff satisfaction monitoring cycle extending the survey to all staff categories, analysing results at institutional and unit levels, and documenting specific improvement actions linked to findings.
- The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution establish a formal incentive and award scheme for administrative staff, recognising outstanding performance and contributions to institutional development, thereby complementing the existing academic recognition framework and fostering a more inclusive culture of excellence across all staff categories.
- The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution develop a more consistent orientation framework across all staff categories, complemented by faculty and departmental-level integration activities, and incorporate evaluation of orientation effectiveness within the staff satisfaction survey to enable evidence-based improvement of onboarding practices.
- The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution establish a structured process review cycle in which key institutional processes are periodically evaluated against defined efficiency and outcome criteria, with review findings recorded, improvement actions agreed (with owners and timelines), and outcomes documented, enabling a demonstrable improvement culture at the process management level.

- The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution develop a comprehensive process handbook consolidating key institutional process flowcharts, ownership responsibilities, performance criteria, and risk management considerations for each process. The flowcharts may include key cross-unit processes such as the student admission-to-graduation cycle, the programme review and approval process, and the QA reporting cycle, enabling process bottlenecks and handoffs.
- The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution establish structured mechanisms for stakeholder involvement in process review cycles.
- The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution establish a University Advisory Board (see in A.1.1 Recommendation III) with external stakeholder membership, including employer, alumni, and community representatives, to provide a structured and institutionalised channel for external input into strategic planning, programme development, and quality assurance, thereby strengthening the governance architecture for systematic external engagement.
- The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution develop a web-based alumni tracking system to engage with the alumni community, supported by structured feedback mechanisms linked to programme review cycles and appropriate privacy controls.
- The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution establish a structured periodic review mechanism for its internationalisation governance and organisational structure, including defined review cycles, role distribution, and the internationalisation policy itself, with findings documented and used to inform structural adjustments and policy updates, thereby enabling traceable PDCA-cycle closure at the governance level of internationalisation management.

B. Learning and Teaching

- The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution establish a centralised digital tracking system to ensure full documentation traceability across programme design and approval processes.
- The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution enrich its programme approval process through formal stakeholder engagement mechanisms, integrating structured feedback from students, alumni, and employers before Academic Senate approval to provide external validation and ensure curricula remain aligned with evolving market needs.
- The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution implement a student-consultation framework for course planning to ensure that the distribution and timing of modules effectively reflect student preferences and workload capacity.
- The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution systematically incorporate student feedback regarding course schedules into its academic planning processes to ensure a better alignment with student needs and workload balance.

- The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution implement a web-based platform (KION) to track PLO-CLO achievement through learning analytics.
- The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution update its website to provide publicly accessible course descriptions and intended learning outcomes for all programmes, thereby enhancing transparency and improving the availability of information for stakeholders.
- The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution document participatory activities in departmental annual reports to demonstrate an evidence-based approach to continuous improvement of workload-based course design.
- The Evaluation Team recommends that the KION system be utilised more actively to facilitate the historical tracking of programme updates, ensuring that all curricular modifications are chronologically documented for improved institutional monitoring.
- The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution institutionalise annual alumni and employer satisfaction surveys, with results directly linked to curriculum revision reports.
- The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution improve its organisational governance model to clarify decision-making processes between the Rectorate, faculties, and departments in the management of learning and teaching processes.
- The Evaluation Team recommends that a dedicated Teaching and Learning Centre be established to provide centralised governance for the systematic monitoring and enhancement of educational processes.
- The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution formalise organisational flowcharts for governance clarity and systematically document the impact of stakeholder feedback on specific curricular improvements within annual quality reports.
- The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution implement systematic Training of Trainers programmes to bridge the gap between innovative teaching practices and digital tools.
- The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution implement a centralised Learning Management System (LMS) to serve as a unified platform for managing, monitoring, and enhancing all teaching and learning activities across departments.
- The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution implement systematic Training of Trainers programmes to ensure that faculty members can effectively align innovative teaching practices and digital tools with modern assessment and evaluation frameworks, particularly focusing on performance-based and formative assessment techniques.
- The Evaluation Team recommends that examination questions be aligned with course learning outcomes and that the relationship between student success and these outcomes be included in departmental evaluation reports.

- The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution improve formal procedures for the Recognition of Prior Non-Formal Learning, allowing professional experience and certified skills to be mapped against ECTS credits for non-traditional students.
- The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution expand its physical and online collections to enhance research, teaching, and learning capacity through institutional support.
- The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution extend the reach of online resources to enable access from outside campus.
- The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution develop a strategy to systematically and holistically collect satisfaction data on the teaching and learning environment.
- The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution adopt a comprehensive Learning Management System to create an archive for the teaching and learning process.
- The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution establish a structured and holistic mechanism to systematically and digitally follow up on student counselling services and career services.
- The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution establish a mechanism to systematically collect, monitor, and evaluate feedback on facilities and infrastructure from internal and external stakeholders, in line with institutional priorities.
- The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution provide additional sports activity options for students, such as table tennis, darts, and chess, on both campuses.
- The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution implement a systematic mechanism for monitoring and improving support for disadvantaged groups, based on their feedback and experiences. This mechanism should establish a structured, measurable, and sustainable support system to ensure that all students, regardless of disability, socio-economic status, or background, have equal access to academic, social, and career opportunities.
- The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution create a systematic and holistic mechanism for social, cultural, and sporting activities involving student participation from needs analysis to evaluation.
- The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution revise its competency development approach to include a customised, needs-based, continuous competency development programme for teaching staff.
- The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution establish a centralised Training of Trainers programme for all teaching staff, delivered through a specific centre that focuses on improving the teaching and learning skills of the staff.
- The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution implement the Technological Pedagogical Content Knowledge (TPACK) proficiency framework to ensure teaching staff effectively integrate digital tools into their pedagogical and curricular practice through Training of Trainers programmes.

- The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution develop a structured, holistic improvement mechanism that supports stakeholders' feedback and rewards educational activities.

C. Research and Development

- The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution systematically collect feedback from academic staff and external stakeholders to analyse needs and identify actions required to enhance research management activities.
- The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution develop a clear research governance model with clearly defined responsibilities, possibly including a university-wide research committee to oversee the management of research processes.
- The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution increase the variety and sufficiency of internal and external research resources and follow up on the results obtained.
- The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution introduce mechanisms to support the research activities of novice researchers through easily accessible core intra-university funds.
- The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution increase the capacity of RPIC to provide sustainable support for enhancing the efficiency of research activities.
- The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution expand its doctoral programme offerings.
- The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution introduce mechanisms to attract doctoral students.
- The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution systematically collect feedback from researchers and monitor performance in research competence.
- The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution conduct a needs analysis to identify areas for improvement in research competency.
- The Evaluation Team recommends that the research capabilities of academic staff be further enhanced through structured training and mentoring, along with increased international collaboration.
- The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution direct efforts towards establishing joint research units or centres at national, regional, or international levels.
- The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution systematically collect stakeholder feedback to improve processes related to establishing joint research units or programmes.
- The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution promotes and incentivises participation in research networks.
- The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution conduct benchmark analyses and prepare reports showing trends in the quality and quantity of research outputs over time.

- The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution implement a digital system to monitor research performance from multiple perspectives, supported by a systematic collection of stakeholder feedback.
- The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution organise structured training programmes for project proposal writing.
- The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution provide training and establish incentive mechanisms for patent applications and intellectual property management.
- The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution introduce a range of awards and other incentive mechanisms to motivate researchers.
- The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution systematically collect feedback from researchers and other relevant stakeholders to improve performance evaluation processes.
- The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution develop a centralised digital system to track individual research performance.

D. Service to Society

- The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution improve its approach to service to society by developing a comprehensive service-to-society policy to strengthen the systematic planning, monitoring and improvement of service-to-society activities
- The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution create a systematic, digitally monitored mechanism for allocating and tracking service to society budgets and resources.
- The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution systematically collect stakeholder perspectives on the monitoring and evaluation of service to society resources through a structured and methodologically robust approach.
- The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution systematically collect stakeholder feedback on the monitoring and evaluation of service to society performance through a structured and methodologically robust approach.
- The Evaluation Team recommends that the institution integrate mechanisms to measure, monitor, and evaluate the impact and outcomes of service-to-society activities, linked to specific UN Sustainable Development Goals, with transparent reporting to all stakeholders.

SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER IMPROVEMENTS

Beyond the key recommendations outlined above, the following priority suggestions are offered to enhance institutional quality and consistency further:

A. Governance and Quality

- The Evaluation Team suggests that the institution strengthen the visibility of governance effectiveness by developing a small, defined set of key performance indicators covering, for instance, meeting regularity, decision implementation rates,

and stakeholder representation and routinely reviewing and reporting these within governance outputs.

- The Evaluation Team suggests that the institution strengthen its institutional transformation narrative by systematically documenting selected transformation episodes as case studies, capturing what triggered the change, how it was managed (including governance decisions and resource allocation), and what evidence demonstrates outcomes and learning, enabling demonstrable evidence of transformation capacity.
- The Evaluation Team suggests that the institution strengthen the institutional integration of QA mechanisms by exploring the establishment of faculty-level QA focal points or committees to complement the central QAU structure, enabling quality assurance responsibilities to be distributed more effectively across academic units and supporting closer alignment between unit-level monitoring and institutional improvement cycles.
- The Evaluation Team suggests the establishment of a QA-integrated institutional dashboard that enables cross-unit monitoring in real time.
- The Evaluation Team suggests that the institution enhance the accountability dimension of its public disclosure practices by developing mechanisms to collect and act upon stakeholder feedback regarding the accessibility, comprehensiveness, and usefulness of publicly available institutional information, enabling iterative improvement of disclosure practices.
- The Evaluation Team suggests that the institution strengthen the evidence base for mission-policy alignment by maintaining a concise record of policy revision cycles, documenting what stakeholder inputs were reviewed, what policy adjustments were made, and what evidence demonstrates implementation and effect, enabling clearer traceability from institutional values to practice.
- The Evaluation Team suggests that the institution monitor digitally and publish periodic strategic progress summaries highlighting key KPI performance trends, priority adjustments, and resulting improvement actions in an accessible and concise format on the institutional website.
- The Evaluation Team suggests that the institution strengthen the transparency and usefulness of performance management by developing an integrated performance summary report that consolidates IAP outcomes, course and instructor evaluation trends, and research productivity data at faculty and institutional levels, enabling more systematic identification of performance patterns and targeted improvement priorities.
- To enhance international recruitment and global visibility, it is recommended that the university expand its website to include multilingual versions that provide information on programs, admission requirements, and campus life for diverse international audiences.

- The Evaluation Team suggests that the institution consider implementing or integrating a centralised Learning Management System to support teaching and learning analytics and to enable closer alignment between learning data, programme monitoring and quality assurance processes.
- The Evaluation Team suggests that the institution develop a phased data integration strategy, including short-, medium- and long-term milestones for consolidating institutional data flows, developing dashboards and improving cross-functional performance monitoring.
- The Evaluation Team suggests that the institution accelerate the formal adoption of the Human Resources Policies and Procedures document to provide a coherent, institutionally approved regulatory foundation for all HRM activities, including recruitment, evaluation, promotion, and professional development.
- The Evaluation Team suggests that the institution strengthen the visibility of strategic-financial alignment by developing a budget analysis report that explicitly tracks allocation and expenditure against Strategic Plan pillar objectives, enabling governance bodies to assess whether resource allocation is advancing strategic priorities and to make evidence-informed reallocation decisions.
- The Evaluation Team suggests that the institution develop a structured process for owner feedback mechanisms to ensure continuous improvement at the process management level.
- The Evaluation Team suggests that the institution strengthen the systematic collection of feedback from external stakeholders and the documentation of stakeholder input.
- The Evaluation Team suggests that the institution systematically track and publish response rates for course and instructor evaluation instruments and routinely communicate to students what specific actions were taken in response to feedback, thereby completing the feedback loop and reinforcing student motivation to participate.
- The Evaluation Team suggests that the institution encourages and supports the establishment of an Alumni Association.
- The Evaluation Team suggests that the institution would benefit further from developing a strategy that systematically leverages the Turkish Maarif Foundation network to attract students from a wider range of country backgrounds and to expand international teaching and research collaborations, complemented by future scenario analyses informing proactive strategic positioning in the international higher education landscape.
- The Evaluation Team suggests that the institution strengthen its internationalisation governance monitoring by introducing periodic structured reviews of the effectiveness and efficiency of the IRO and RPIC organisational structures and mandates, assessing whether roles and responsibilities are appropriately distributed and whether the internationalisation policy requires updating, thereby enabling traceable PDCA-cycle closure at the governance level.

- The Evaluation Team suggests that the institution develop an action plan for diversifying internationalisation funding sources beyond current projects, exploring alternative international grant schemes, bilateral funding opportunities and foundation-supported initiatives to strengthen the sustainability and resilience of internationalisation resource management.
- The Evaluation Team suggests that the institution strengthen its internationalisation performance monitoring by developing impact indicators that capture how international activities contribute to measurable improvements in teaching quality, student outcomes, and research productivity, complementing the existing activity-based metrics with evidence of internationalisation effects.

B. Learning and Teaching

- The Evaluation Team suggests expanding practice-based curricula and direct industry engagement across all programmes.
- The Evaluation Team suggests that the institution establish a weekly 'Common Activity Hour' by designating a midday time slot free from all classes, thereby removing scheduling conflicts and increasing student participation in social, cultural, and sporting activities.
- The Evaluation Team suggests that the institution plan an in-service training workshop to ensure that PLOs and CLOs are fully aligned among academic staff.
- The Evaluation Team suggests that the institution establish an annual review mechanism for ECTS workloads, actively engaging students to identify and address potential imbalances systematically.
- The Evaluation Team suggests that the institution implement structured mechanisms, such as focus group interviews and comprehensive surveys, to collect student feedback on workload-based processes.
- The Evaluation Team suggests that the institution implement successful dual-learning models across all disciplines by establishing a standardised framework for industry-integrated education.
- The Evaluation Team suggests that Internal Quality Assurance processes, including course and instructor evaluations, peer reviews, syllabus cycles, and external benchmarking, are more visibly integrated and tracked within the KION system.
- The Evaluation Team suggests that the institution uses learning analytics from assessment data to identify students at risk or those with exceptional potential early in the semester, enabling more personalised and proactive pedagogical interventions.
- The Evaluation Team suggests that the institution develop a digital request system for diplomas, allowing students to initiate the process online and providing a secure postal delivery option for those unable to collect their documents in person.
- The Evaluation Team suggests that the institution establish a Graduation Progress Tracking module in KION, providing students with an academic roadmap highlighting missing requirements at least two semesters before graduation to prevent last-minute administrative delays.

- The Evaluation Team suggests that the institution display course schedules on the doors of classrooms and faculty offices.
- The Evaluation Team suggests that the institution integrate the academic advising process with a digital system.
- The Evaluation Team suggests that the institution reviews the Student Counselling Centre's organisation to ensure that counselling staff do not have prior academic relationships with students, such as being lecturers.
- The Evaluation Team suggests that the institution increase transportation frequency between the Main Campus and East Campus according to organisational needs.
- The Evaluation Team suggests that the institution enhance the accessibility of its official website for students with disabilities.
- The Evaluation Team suggests that the institution expand access to educational resources for students with visual, hearing, or other similar impairments.
- The Evaluation Team suggests that the institution re-evaluate campus infrastructure to include tactile paving systems for guidance and orientation.
- The Evaluation Team suggests that the institution consider offering a more diverse range of sports activities under the Sport Club.
- The Evaluation Team suggests that the institution increase the number of international teaching staff according to institutional preferences.
- The Evaluation Team suggests that the institution develop a centrally structured orientation programme for newly appointed teaching staff, covering institutional policies, procedures, and quality standards, based on instructional priority.
- The Evaluation Team suggests that the institution increase the recruitment rate of full-time teaching staff in line with institutional priorities.
- The Evaluation Team suggests that the institution expand teaching award opportunities across categories, such as student- and peer-nominated awards, aligned with the institution's priorities.

C. Research and Development

- The Evaluation Team suggests that, in addition to existing conference support, the institution introduce an internal support programme to fund research activities.
- The Evaluation Team suggests that the institution develop plans to accommodate and attract postdoctoral and visiting researchers, taking into account Albanian regulatory requirements.
- The Evaluation Team suggests that the institution join professional networks in relevant fields to create opportunities for joint research activities or the establishment of joint research units.

D. Service to Society

- The Evaluation Team suggests that the institution support lifelong learning programmes aligned with national and regional needs, in collaboration with community stakeholders, and organise them under a lifelong learning centre or unit.

MATURITY LEVELS OF SUB-CRITERIA

Criteria	ESG Mapping	Maturity Level
A. GOVERNANCE AND QUALITY		
A.1. Governance and Quality		
A.1.1. Governance model and administrative structure	ESG 1.1	3
A.1.2. Governance (Leadership and Quality Culture)	ESG 1.1	3
A.1.3. Institutional transformation capacity	ESG 1.1	3
A.1.4. Internal quality assurance mechanisms	ESG 1.1	3
A.1.5. Public disclosure and accountability	ESG 1.8	3
A.2. Mission and Strategic Goals		
A.2.1. Mission, vision and policies	ESG 1.1	3
A.2.2. Strategic goals and objectives	ESG 1.1	3
A.2.3. Performance management	ESG 1.1	3
A.3. Governance Systems		
A.3.1. Information management system	ESG 1.7	2
A.3.2. Human resources management	ESG 1.5	3
A.3.3. Financial management		3
A.3.4. Process management	ESG 1.1	3
A.4. Stakeholder Involvement		
A.4.1. Internal and external stakeholder involvement	ESG 1.8	3
A.4.2. Student feedback	ESG 1.3	4
A.4.3. Alumni relations management	ESG 1.3	3
A.5. Internationalisation		
A.5.1. Management of internationalisation processes		3
A.5.2. Internationalisation resources		4
A.5.3. Internationalisation performance		4
B. LEARNING AND TEACHING		
B.1. Program Design, Evaluation and Update		
B.1.1. Design and Approval of Programs	ESG 1.2	4
B.1.2. Course Distribution Balance of The Program	ESG 1.2	4
B.1.3. The alignment of course objectives with program outcomes	ESG 1.2	4
B.1.4. Student workload-based course design	ESG 1.2	4
B.1.5. Follow-up and updating of programs	ESG 1.9	3
B.1.6. Management of learning and teaching processes	ESG 1.3	3
B.2. Implementation of Programs		
B.2.1. Teaching methods and techniques	ESG 1.3	4
B.2.2. Measurement and evaluation	ESG 1.3	3

B.2.3. Student admission and the recognition and crediting of prior learning	ESG 1.4	4
B.2.4. The certification of qualifications and the diploma	ESG 1.2	4
B.3. Learning Resources and Academic Support Services		
B.3.1. The learning environment and resources	ESG 1.6	3
B.3.2. Academic support services	ESG 1.5	4
B.3.3. Facilities and infrastructure	ESG 1.6	3
B.3.4. Disadvantaged groups	ESG 1.6	3
B.3.5. Social, cultural and sporting activities	ESG 1.6	4
B.4. Teaching Staff		
B.4.1. Recruitment, promotion and appointment criteria	ESG 1.5	4
B.4.2. Teaching competencies and development	ESG 1.5	3
B.4.3. Incentives and rewards for educational activities	ESG 1.5	3
C. RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT		
C.1. Management of Research Processes and the Research Resources		
C.1.1. Management of research processes		3
C.1.2. Internal and external resources		3
C.1.3. Doctoral programs and postdoctoral opportunities		3
C.2. Research Competence, Collaborations, and Supports		
C.2.1. Research competencies and their development		3
C.2.2. National and international joint programs and joint research units		3
C.3. Research Performance		
C.3.1. The follow-up and evaluation of research performance		3
C.3.2. Performance evaluation for the teaching staff/researchers		3
D. SERVICE TO SOCIETY		
D.1. Management of Service to Society Processes and Resources		
D.1.1. Management of service to society processes		3
D.1.2. Resources		3
D.2. Service to Society Performance		
D.2.1. The follow-up and evaluation of the service to society performance		3

ANNEX

ANNEX 1: PROGRAMME OF THE ONLINE MEETING AND SITE VISIT

ONLINE PRE-VISIT SCHEDULE (24th March 2026)

Time	Activities
14:00-14:30	Meeting between the evaluation team and the institution's rector and senior management members
14:30-16:15	Meeting of the evaluation team and the members of the institution's unit responsible for quality

SITE VISIT SCHEDULE - IIAP Evaluation Team's

Arrival Day (6th APRIL, 2026)

Time	Activities
21:00-22:00	Dinner for the evaluation team
22:00-23:30	Meeting between the evaluation team members

Day 1 (7 April,2026) Tuesday		
9:00-09:30	Meeting of the evaluation team with the contact person and the senior manager of the institution	Assoc. Prof. Ilir Kalemaj, Acting Rector Enes Durmus, Administrator Prof. Dr Murat Ertekin Ermelinda Alia, Contact Person
09:45-11:00	Meeting between the evaluation team and the members of the institution's senate and executive board (excluding Rector)	Kemal BULUT, Board Member (Online) Ali Çiçek, Board Member (Online) Prof. Dr Nertila Gjini, Board Member Assoc. Prof. Eda Gemi Alessandro Massoni, PhD. Vehap Kola, PhD.
11:00-12:00	Meeting of the evaluation team and the members of the institution's unit responsible for quality	Assoc. Prof. Dorina Papa – Chair of PCAQS Prof. Dr Fatos Tarifa – Faculty Member Ardit Gjeci, Ph.D. – Faculty Member Brunilda Basha, PhD. – Faculty Member Jona Puci, PhD. – Faculty Member Gentjan Ulaj, PhD. Cand. – Faculty Member Assoc. Prof. Enkeleda OLLDASHI – External Expert
12:00-12:45	The evaluation team meet the deans of -Faculty of Engineering and Architecture, -Faculty of Economy and Business, -Faculty of Law and Social Sciences	Assoc. Prof. Juna Miluka, Dean of Economy and Business Assoc. Prof. Enila Cenko, Dean of Law and Social Science

	-Dean of Students	Ervin Ramollari, PhD, Vice-Dean of Engineering and Architecture Jonathan Pano, MSc., Dean of Students
12:45-13:30	Lunch (Team members)	

13:30-14:30	The evaluation team meet the academic staff of -Faculty of Engineering and Architecture, -Faculty of Economy and Business, -Faculty of Law and Social Sciences	Prof. Dr Nese Ozdemir – Department of Political Science and IR Assoc. Prof. Mirela Bogdani – Department of Political Science and IR Tahsin Ugurlu, PhD – Department of Information and Intelligent Systems Esmeralda Bushi, PhD. Cand. - Department of Information and Intelligent Systems Dr Mariana Prifti – Department of Computer Science Ledia Thomo, PhD. – Department of Business Informatics and e-Business Athina Tori, MSc. – Department of Economics and Finance Andrea Mazelliu, PhD. Cand. - Department of Law
14:30-15:30	Evaluation team meet the (bachelor's,) students of -Faculty of Engineering and Architecture, -Faculty of Economy and Business, -Faculty of Law and Social Sciences -Representative from the Student Union	Anas Abusefrita – Software engineering (3rd year) Rozana Mustafa (PCAQS Member) – Law (4th year) Elian Bilibashi (Council of Ethics) – Finance (2nd year) Ambra Boci (SU Treasurer) – Computer Science (3rd year) Kerim Kerimoglu – Architecture (4th year)

		Abdulkadir Kiizilirmak – Computer Science (3 rd year) Devi Zyrbo – Applied Banking and Finance (3 rd year)
15:30-17:00	The evaluation team meets with the institution's stakeholders.	Assoc. Prof. Niko Hyka, Institut for Quality in Education Edlira Memushaj -National Commercial Bank BKT One representative (TIKA) One representative (YUNUS Emre) Dr Roden Hoxha (Alumni) – PhD in Law, graduated in 2024 Megi Gjoni (Alumni) – MSc. in International Relations, graduated in 2019 Elkida Bazaj (Alumni) - Bachelor's in Computer Science, graduated in 2020
17:15	The evaluation team’s transfer to the place of accommodation}	
19:30-20:30	Evaluation team and review coordinator	
20:30	The team members hold a meeting to share and review their first-day observations and make plans for the second day.	
Day 2 (8 April 2026) Wednesday		
9:00-9:45	Evaluation team meets with the managers/directors (Programme/department heads) of academic units at (Faculty of Engineering and Architecture, Faculty of Economy and Business, Faculty of Law and Social Sciences, Turkish Language Unit, English Language Unit)	Assoc. Prof. Andromahi Kufo – Dep. of Economics and Finance Assoc. Prof. Eriona Shtembari – Dep. of Business Informatics and e- Business Assoc. Prof. Besmira Lahi – Dep. of Psychology and Education

		Miralda Cuka, PhD. – Dep of Information and Intelligent Systems Dr Irisi Kasapi - Dep of Business Administration Fatma Hosca, PhD. – Head of Turkish Unit Klodjana Skendaj, PhD. Cand. - Head of English Unit
09:45-10:45	The evaluation team meet the academic staff of the academic units. (Faculty of Engineering and Architecture, Faculty of Economy and Business, Faculty of Law and Social Sciences, Turkish Language Unit, English Language Unit)	Elona Gjebrea, Ph.D. – Department of Psychology & Education Eriona Cela, PhD. – Department of Psychology & Education Serdar Ozdemir, PhD. – Department of Psychology & Education Dr Matilda Lopari - Department of Business Administration Dorian Aliu, PhD. - Department of Business Administration Hektor Ruci, MSc. – Department of Law Ermal Bezhani, MSc. – Department of Architecture
10:45-11:45	Evaluation team meets the (master's, doctoral, post-doc) students.	Esmeralda Doku – MSc. International Relations (1st year) Florian Hiso – MSc. Artificial Intelligence (2nd year) Uendi Kaja – MSc. Finance and Accounting (2nd year)

		Sonila Shqezi – MSc. Artificial Intelligence (2nd year) Emma Peza – MSc. Law (4th year) Dea Doksani – MSc. Computer Science (2nd year)
12:00-12:30	Meeting between the evaluation team and the chairperson of the board of trustees (for foundation higher education institutions)	Mahmut M. ÖZDİL
12:30-13:30	Lunch (team members and review coordinator)	
14:00-15:00	The evaluation team meets the managers/directors of the administrative units of the institution (General Secretary, Student Affairs Office, Human Resources Office, Finance Office, Library, IT Services, International Relations Office, Student and Career Office, Student Counselling Centre, Dormitory/Accommodation and related student support units and so on).	Enes Durmus, Administrator Fatjona Ndreu, Head of Student Affairs Office Arisela Hebovija, Head of HR Olgerta Cekrezi, Head of Finance Zühal Alanlar, Finance Coordinator Marjola Dashi, Head of Library Orgest Rrushi, IT Specialist Gisilda Pali, Career and Alumni Coordinator Kosovare Krasniqi, Counselling Centre Coordinator Sabian Ruqi, Dormitory Manager
15:00-16:00	Meeting with the administrative staff of selected administrative units	Daniela Bozaxhiu, Head of Records Rozeta Tusha, Head of Marketing Eriona Adhjari, IRO Specialist Rafaela Kataroshi, Legal Specialist Sonela Hysenaj, HR Senior

		Specialist Igli Isufi, Senior Procurement Specialist
16:00-17:30	Meeting with the directors of research units (Research and Projects and Innovation Centre, Balkan Research Centre, European Research Centre, Institute of International European and Balkan Studies, etc.)	Assoc Prof. Ines Nurja, Director of the Institute Adela Danaj, PhD., Director of Research and Projects and Innovation Centre Sokol Lleshi, PhD., Director of European Research Centre Muhamet Kola, PhD., Director of Balkan Research Centre
17:30	The evaluation team's transfer to the place of accommodation}	
18:00-19:00	Dinner (team members and review coordinator)	

Day 3 (9 April 2026) Thursday		
9:00-11:30.	Visit the facilities at the higher education institutions on two campuses (classrooms, libraries, laboratories, etc.).	
11:30-13:00	Meeting with the IT team about the Information Management System (a presentation-app. 30 min and questions) (Ibrahim Ayvaz, PhD; Selma Mena)	
13:00-13:30	Lunch	
13:30-20:30	Preparation of the "exit statement"	
20.30-21:30-	Dinner (team members and review coordinator)	

Day 4 (10 April 2026) Friday		
09:45-11:45	Final meeting	Assoc. Prof. Ilir Kalemaj, Acting Rector, Enes Durmuş Prof. Dr. Murat Ertekin, Ermelinda Alia, Prof. Dr. Nertila Gjini, Assoc. Prof. Juna Miluka, Assoc. Prof. Enila Cenko,
12:00	The evaluation team leaves the institution.	

ANNEX 2: GLOSSARY

Abbreviation	Full Form
ACCA	Association of Chartered Certified Accountants
AQF	Albanian Qualifications Framework
ASCAL	Agency for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (Albania)
BUA	Balkan Universities Association
CLO	Course Learning Outcomes
ECHE	Erasmus Charter for Higher Education
ECTS	European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System
EHEA	European Higher Education Area
EQF	European Qualifications Framework
ESG	Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area (2015)
EUA	European University Association
HR	Human Resources
HRM	Human Resources Management
IAP	Individual Assessment Performance
IIAP	International Institutional Accreditation Program
IIAR	International Institutional Accreditation Report
IQA	Internal Quality Assurance
IRO	International Relations Office
ISER	Institutional Self-Evaluation Report
KION	Institutional Information Management System
KPI	Key Performance Indicator
LMS	Learning Management System
MoU	Memorandum of Understanding
PCAQS	Permanent Commission for the Assurance of Quality Standards
PDCA	Plan-Do-Check-Act
PLO	Programme Learning Outcomes
QA	Quality Assurance
QAU	Quality Assurance Unit
RPIC	Research, Projects and Innovation Centre
SDG	Sustainable Development Goals (United Nations)
SUNY/ESU	State University of New York / Empire State University
THEQC	Turkish Higher Education Quality Council
TPACK	Technological Pedagogical Content Knowledge
UNYT	University of New York Tirana

