INDEPENDENT AGENCY FOR ACCREDITATION AND RATING
External Expert Commission

Addressed to the
IAAR Accreditation Board

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

REPORT

on the results of the External Expert Commission assessment of compliance with the requirements of specialized accreditation standards for educational programs
6B07101 "Automation and Control"
7M07101 “Automation and control” (1.5 y),
7M07101 “Automation and control” (2 y),
7M07105 “Instrument Engineering”

Abylkas Saginov Karaganda Technical University NJSC

within the period from April 20 to 22, 2026

Karaganda **April 22, 2026**

CONTENTS

	Page
(I) LIST OF SYMBOLS AND ABBREVIATIONS	3
(II) INTRODUCTION	4
(III) PRESENTATION OF THE EDUCATION ORGANIZATION	7
(IV) DESCRIPTION OF THE PREVIOUS ACCREDITATION PROCEDURE	8
(V) DESCRIPTION OF THE VICE	9
(VI) COMPLIANCE WITH SPECIALISED ACCREDITATION STANDARDS	10
6.1. Standard "Educational Program Management"	10
6.2. Standard "Information Management and Reporting"	15
6.3. Standard "Development and Approval of the Educational Program"	17
6.4. Standard "Continuous Monitoring and Periodic Evaluation of Educational Programs"	20
6.5. Standard "Student-Centered Learning, Teaching and Assessment of Academic Performance"	22
6.6. Standard "Students"	24
6.7. Standard "Teaching Staff"	27
6.8. Standard "Educational Resources and Student Support Systems"	30
6.9. Public Information Standard	33
(VII) OVERVIEW OF STRENGTHS/BEST PRACTICES FOR EACH STANDARD	38
(VIII) OVERVIEW OF RECOMMENDATIONS FOR QUALITY IMPROVEMENT FOR EACH STANDARD	39
(IX) RECOMMENDATION TO THE ACCREDITATION BOARD	41
APPENDIX 1. EVALUATION TABLE "CONCLUSION OF THE EXTERNAL EXPERT COMMISSION"	42
APPENDIX 2. AGENDA OF THE VISIT OF THE EXTERNAL EXPERT COMMISSION	49
APPENDIX 3. RESULTS OF THE FACULTY SURVEY	57
APPENDIX 4. RESULTS OF THE STUDENT SURVEY	65

(I) LIST OF SYMBOLS AND ABBREVIATIONS

RK MHE – Ministry of Science and Higher Education of the Republic of Kazakhstan
SCES – State Compulsory Education Standard
HEI – Higher Education Institution (the University)
EP – Educational Program
EMW – Educational and Methodological Work
EMT – Educational and Methodological Tutorial
WC – Working Curriculum
EMC – Educational and Methodological Complex
IC – Individual Curriculum
CED – Catalog of Elective Courses
CD – Core Disciplines
SD – Specialized Disciplines
BD – Basic Disciplines
QMS – Quality Management System
Faculty – Teaching Staff
FC – Final Certification
R&D – Research Work
SIWT – Independent Student Work with a Teacher
RM – Rating Monitoring
CM – Current Monitoring
GPA – Grade Point Average (Average Academic Performance)
AC – Academic Council

(II) INTRODUCTION

In accordance with Order No. 61-26-OD dated February 12, 2026, of the Director General of the Independent Agency for Accreditation and Rating, from April 20 to 22, 2026, an external expert commission assessed the compliance of educational programs 6B07101 "Automation and Control", 7M07101 "Automation and Control" (1.5 years), 7M07101 "Automation and Control" (2 years), 7M07105 "Instrument Engineering" of Abylkas Saginov Karaganda Technical University NJSC (Karaganda) with the standards of specialized accreditation of educational programs of higher and postgraduate education organizations of the IAAR (No. 189-23-OD dated December 4, 2023, sixth edition).

The External Expert Commission (EEC) report contains an assessment of the submitted educational programs against the IAAR standard criteria, recommendations for further improvement of the educational programs, and parameters for the profile of the educational programs.

The EEC report was compiled in accordance with the current IAAR standards for specialized accreditation of higher and postgraduate education and reflects the results of a comprehensive assessment of the educational programs' compliance with established requirements. The methodological basis for the assessment includes an analysis of documented information, a comparison of actual data with the standard criteria, and an expert interpretation of the results.

The EEC utilized the following sources of information:

• Internal regulatory and policy documents of the University;

• Teaching and methodological materials (working curricula, catalogs of elective courses, and curricula);

• Educational process quality monitoring materials;

• Results of surveys and feedback from students, graduates, and employers;

• Data from the University's official website and open information resources;

• Results of interviews with the University management, faculty, students, and representatives of industrial partners.

The University operates in a rapidly developing educational environment characterized by the integration of educational, scientific, and innovative activities. Its organizational structure and management system are focused on implementing strategic priorities related to the development of engineering education, the digitalization of the educational process, and enhanced interaction with industry.

During the assessment, special attention was paid to the following areas:

• the alignment of educational programs with the University's mission, strategy, and quality assurance policy;

• the effectiveness of educational program management mechanisms and data-driven decision-making;

• the extent to which student-centered learning principles and flexible educational pathways are implemented;

• the quality of staffing and the level of professional development of faculty;

• the state of the material and technical resources and digital infrastructure;

• the effectiveness of interactions with employers and the participation of industrial partners in the educational process;

• the functioning of the internal quality assurance system and continuous improvement mechanisms.

An important element of the analysis was the review of the results of the previous accreditation procedure for educational programs and the extent to which the monitoring group had implemented the recommendations of the external expert commission. The University carried out systematic work to implement the recommendations issued, which was reflected in the improvement of individual management processes, the strengthening of practice-oriented training, and the development of feedback mechanisms. According to the self-assessment, a significant portion of the recommendations were implemented satisfactorily, demonstrating the maturity of the internal quality assurance system and the University's capacity for institutional development.

It should be noted that the University demonstrates a commitment to integrating modern educational technologies, including digital learning management platforms, data analytics tools, and distance learning elements. The development of a digital educational environment contributes to increased accessibility of educational resources and expanded opportunities for individualized learning.

The University's human resources are represented by qualified faculty with experience in both research and practical work. The University implements a policy of faculty development aimed at introducing innovative pedagogical approaches, developing research activities, and expanding international cooperation.

Interaction with employers and industrial partners is a key factor in ensuring the practice-oriented nature of educational programs. Representatives of the professional community participate in the development and updating of educational programs, organizing internships, implementing project activities, and assessing learning outcomes. This format of collaboration helps improve the relevance of educational programs to labor market requirements.

The University's internal quality assurance system is comprehensive and includes procedures for planning, monitoring, analyzing, and adjusting educational activities. Management decisions are made based on an analysis of quantitative and qualitative indicators, ensuring the evidence-based and transparent nature of management processes.

Thus, the EEC report represents a systematic result of an independent expert assessment of the University's educational programs and reflects their current status, their level of compliance with established requirements, and the potential for further development in the context of the transformation of higher education and increasing demands from the economy and society.

The EEC composition

Chairman – Vladimir Nikolayevich Kossov, Doctor of Physical and Mathematical Sciences, Professor, Non-profit Joint-stock Company Abai Kazakh National Pedagogical University (Almaty);

IAAR Foreign Expert – Vyacheslav Nastassenko, PhD, Associate Professor, Technical University of Moldova (Chisinau, Moldova);

IAAR Expert – Vadim Pavlovich Markovsky, Candidate of Technical Sciences, Associate Professor, Toraighyrov University (Pavlodar);

IAAR Expert – Edilkhan Didar, PhD, Associate Professor, Director of the Smart City Research Center, Astana IT University (Astana);

IAAR Expert – Maksim Sergeyevich Korobkov, PhD, Gumarbek Daukeyev Almaty University of Power Engineering and Telecommunications (Almaty);

IAAR Expert – Adil Ramazanovich Fayzullin, PhD, Kazakh National University of Sport (Astana);

IAAR Expert – Saltanat Abenovna Yussupova, PhD in Engineering, Associate Professor, Gumarbek Daukeev Almaty University of Power Engineering and Telecommunications (Almaty);

IAAR Expert, Employer – Artem Nurakhmetovich Autov, Director of the Production and Service Support Department, Freedom Satellite (Almaty);

IAAR Expert, Student – Aidana Manapkyzy Turdybekova, 3-year student, EP 6B06201 "Radio Engineering, Electronics, and Telecommunications", International Education Corporation (Almaty);

IAAR Expert, Student – Aruzhan Kanatkyzy Kissym, 1-year Master's student, EP 7M07102 - Automation and Control, L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University (Astana);

Coordinator from IAAR – Dinara Kairbekovna Bekenova, IAAR project manager (Astana).

(III) PRESENTATION OF THE EDUCATION ORGANIZATION

A. Saginov Karaganda Technical University (KTU) is one of the leading technical universities in the Republic of Kazakhstan. Founded in 1953, the University has a long history of developing its engineering school and a proven track record of implementing technical educational programs.

The University's mission is to train qualified engineering personnel for industry and the real sector of the economy, including mining and metallurgy, energy, mechanical engineering, IT, and construction. A. Saginov KTU implements a multi-level education system encompassing undergraduate, graduate, and doctoral (PhD) programs, ensuring educational continuity and the development of a research culture.

The University has a well-developed educational and research infrastructure, including specialized laboratories equipped with equipment from global leaders (Siemens, Festo, Schneider Electric), computer labs, and research centers. A key feature of the University is its close integration with industry: educational programs are developed with the participation of major employers and industrial partners, ensuring their relevance to the labor market. The University's international activities include collaboration with over 30 foreign universities in Europe, Asia, and the CIS, as well as participation in academic mobility programs such as Erasmus+ and DAAD. The quality of the educational process is confirmed by regular international accreditation by the IAAR and the implementation of Industry 4.0 standards.

The University actively develops research and innovation activities aimed at addressing pressing industrial challenges in Kazakhstan. A. Saginov KarTU houses research and technology centers and engineering laboratories equipped with modern equipment acquired through research projects and through sponsorship. The University implements national and international research projects, develops collaboration with industrial enterprises within the framework of its corporate University, and places special emphasis on training specialists in Industry 4.0, digital engineering, mechatronics, and robotics. Priority areas include the implementation of research results in production and the commercialization of developments.

Collaboration with international partners, including Chinese scientific and educational organizations, plays a significant role in developing scientific potential. Research income accounts for approximately a quarter of the University's total revenue, with approximately a third of research receipts coming from contractual work. To support research, the University annually allocates grants for internal research projects and creates an "idea bank" for the development of promising initiatives.

The University high level of personnel training and scientific potential is confirmed by its stable positions in national and international rankings, including the QS World University Rankings. The University ranks among Kazakhstan's leading technical universities, and the high employment rate of graduates in their fields demonstrates the demand for graduates and the close connection between the educational process and the needs of the industrial sector.

(IV) DESCRIPTION OF THE PREVIOUS ACCREDITATION PROCEDURE

The educational programs 6B07101 "Automation and Control," 7M07101 "Automation and Control" (1.5 years), 7M07101 "Automation and Control" (2 years), and 7M07105 "Instrument Engineering" offered by Abylkas Saginov Karaganda Technical University (Karaganda) were accredited in 2019 and received certificates valid for seven years.

Following the accreditation process, the EEC issued recommendations for improving the University's operations. To implement these recommendations, an "Action Plan for the Implementation of the EEC Recommendations on Assessing Compliance with Institutional and Specialized Accreditation Standards" was developed and approved. The results of the implementation were reflected in the interim report on the implementation of the recommendations, submitted to the IAAR within the established deadlines.

Post-accreditation monitoring was conducted as part of the action plan for implementing the EEC recommendations and was implemented in accordance with its criteria. The list of recommendations and their implementation conclusions are provided below:

1.1 To systematize the assessment of educational program development risks and develop a mitigation mechanism, including factors such as program development and improvement, risk management, monitoring, and fact-based decision-making. Conclusion: The recommendation has been fully implemented (100%).

1.2 To develop Development Plans for each program in accordance with the current Development Strategy of Abylkas Saginov KTU and ensure their transparency. Conclusion: The recommendation has been fully implemented (100%).

1.3 To identify the unique features and advantages of these programs and their Development Plans compared to other programs implemented in the region and throughout the Republic. Conclusion: The recommendation is currently being implemented (95%).

2.1 To implement the interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary principle (within the program), involve other University departments in development and implementation. Conclusion: The recommendation has been fully implemented (100%).

3.1 The supervising structural unit shall develop a mechanism for conducting regular surveys (at least twice a year) within the department and develop procedures for analyzing survey results, developing a corrective action plan within the department, and ensuring oversight of their implementation. Conclusion: The recommendation has been fully implemented (100%).

4.1. CEDs should be developed based on the needs of students and postgraduates, rather than on the specialization and interests of the faculty. Conclusion: The recommendation has been fully implemented (100%).

5.1. Due to the abundance of modern software and hardware from leading global manufacturers, it is recommended to expand the department's space to accommodate constantly updated educational and laboratory equipment. Conclusion: The recommendation is currently being implemented (95%).

Based on the accreditation monitoring results, most recommendations have been fully implemented, including risk management, development of educational program development plans, and improvement of internal control mechanisms and interaction with employers. However, certain areas related to expanding employer participation and modernizing the material and technical infrastructure were still under implementation at the time of monitoring and required further support.

(V) DESCRIPTION OF THE ECC VISIT

The EEC work was carried out based on the approved Program for the Expert Ccommission visit to A. Saginov KTU from April 20 to 22, 2026.

The EEC work was coordinated by the on-site IAAR project manager. Prior to the work, the Commission was briefed on the procedure, the Commission members' responsibilities were clarified, the schedule for the work and the EEC visit was finalized, and responsible members were assigned to clusters. The EEC work was conducted in a hybrid format (with EEC members present both offline and online).

To obtain objective information of the University performance assessment, the EEC members met with all the representatives of the University organizational structure during the visit: Chairman of the Management Board, Rector, Vice-Rectors, Heads of Departments, Deans of Faculties, Heads of Departments (heads of educational programs), faculty, students, and external stakeholders from among graduates and employers. Meetings and interviews with representatives of the structural divisions were conducted within the framework of the EEC Visit Program. During the EEC visit, a survey was conducted among the faculty (53 participants) and students (139 participants).

Table 1 - Information of representatives who participated in meetings with the IAAR EEC:

Participant category	**Number**
Rector	1
Vice-Rectors	5
Heads of structural subdivisions	24
Faculty deans	2
Heads of departments, heads of Eps	4
Faculty	15
Students	30
Stakeholders (representatives of practice bases and employers)	12
Graduates	14
Total	**107**

During the tour, the EEC members reviewed the University's facilities and equipment, including classrooms for lectures, practical training, and laboratory work related to the accredited programs, the University library, and the locations of academic, research, and social support services.

At the meeting of the IAAR EEC with the University's target groups, the mechanisms for implementing University policies were clarified and certain information presented in the University's self-assessment report was elaborated on.

The EEC experts visited several practical training sites and carefully examined their operations. In accordance with the accreditation procedure, an online survey of students and faculty members from the accredited programs was conducted.

To confirm the information presented in the Self-Assessment Report, external experts requested and analyzed the University's working documentation. Additionally, the experts examined the University's online presence through its official website and social media. As part of the planned program of the visit, preliminary recommendations for improving the accredited educational programs of Abylkas Saginov Karaganda Technical University NJSC (Karaganda), developed by the EEC based on the results of the examination, were presented at a meeting with the management on April 22, 2026.

(VI) COMPLIANCE WITH SPECIALISED ACCREDITATION STANDARDS

6.1. Standard "Educational Program Management"

● *The University must demonstrate the development of a program goal and development strategy based on an analysis of external and internal factors with the broad involvement of diverse stakeholders.*

● *The quality assurance policy must reflect the link between research, teaching, and learning.*

● *The University demonstrates the development of a quality assurance culture.*

● *A commitment to quality assurance must apply to all activities performed by contractors and partners (outsourcing), including joint/dual-degree education and academic mobility.*

● *The program management ensures transparency in the development of the program development plan based on an analysis of its functioning, the actual positioning of the University, and the focus of its activities on meeting the needs of the state, employers, stakeholders, and students.*

● *The program management demonstrates the functioning of mechanisms for the formation and regular review of the program development plan and monitoring its implementation, assessing the achievement of educational goals, meeting the needs of students, employers, and society, and making decisions aimed at continuously improving the program.*

● *The program management must engage representatives of stakeholder groups, including employers, students, and faculty, in developing the program development plan.*

● *The program management must demonstrate the individuality and uniqueness of the program development plan, its alignment with national development priorities and the education institution development strategy.*

● *The University must demonstrate a clear definition of those responsible for business processes within the program, the distribution of staff responsibilities, and the delineation of the functions of collegial bodies.*

● *The program management ensures the coordination of the activities of all persons involved in the development and management of the program and its continuous implementation, and involves all stakeholders in this process.*

● *The program management must ensure the transparency of the management system, the functioning of the internal quality assurance system, including its design, management, and monitoring, as well as appropriate decision-making.*

● *The program management must implement risk management.*

● *The program management must ensure the participation of stakeholders (employers, faculty, and students) in the collegial governing bodies of the educational program, as well as their representativeness in decision-making on educational program management issues.*

● *The University must demonstrate innovation management within the program, including the analysis and implementation of innovative proposals.*

● *The program management must demonstrate its openness and accessibility to students, faculty, employers, and other stakeholders.*

● *The program management confirms completion of training in educational management programs.*

● *The program management must strive to ensure that progress achieved since the last external quality assurance procedure is taken into account in preparation for the next procedure.*

Evidence section

The training of students in EP 6B07101 "Automation and Control", 7M07101 "Automation and Control" (1.5), 7M07101 "Automation and Control" (2), 7M07105 "Instrument Engineering" is carried out in accordance with the Concept of Development of Higher Education and Science in the Republic of Kazakhstan for 2023-2029, the Academic Policy and Quality Policy of A. Saginov KTU, the University Development Plan for 2024-2029, the Development Plans for OP 6B07101 "Automation and Control", 7M07101 "Automation and Control" (1.5), 7M07101 "Automation and Control" (2) for 2025-2028 and 7M07105 "Instrument Engineering" for 2025-2027.

According to the University Development Plan for 2024-2029, the goals of A. Saginov KTU NJSC are as follows:

1. Increasing the financial and economic stability and developing the University's material and technical infrastructure
2. Focusing on customers (employers, students, and society)
3. Ensuring effective management
4. Highly qualified human resources.

The quality assurance policy reflects the connection between research, teaching, and learning, which is ensured through the integration of research results and faculty project activities into the content of disciplines, practical training, and project/graduation work, as well as through the participation of employers in the development of applied problems. Goals and objectives are determined based on an analysis of external factors (technological trends, employer demands, regulatory requirements) and internal factors (learning outcomes, academic performance, feedback, results of internal/external quality assessments) and are consistent with the quality policy posted on the University's official website, which guarantees accessibility, openness, and transparency not only for employees and students, but also for employers and other stakeholders.

The educational program is updated annually by up to 30%, taking into account labor market interests. When developing the University's educational programs, representatives of the business community and practicing specialists are involved in the process to improve their content to meet labor market requirements. The development plan for educational programs 6B07101 and 7M07101 "Automation and Control" (1.5 years), 7M07101 "Automation and Control" (2 years), and 7M07105 "Instrument Engineering" (Minutes No. 8 dated March 11, 2025) demonstrates its uniqueness through a focus on the digital transformation of industry and the needs of the business community. Roundtables with stakeholder participation are regularly held for the accredited educational programs of Cluster 2, and partner reviews of the educational programs are also available, significantly contributing to the possibility of further development and updating of the educational programs.

The University existing internal quality assurance system is functioning successfully. This is achieved through decision-making at all management levels (University and institute collegial bodies, program management, and heads of structural divisions), based on factual analysis and effective management (including design, development, monitoring, and improvement). This positively influences the development of a quality culture, as evidenced by the successful completion of the post-monitoring procedure within the framework of programs 6B07101 "Automation and Control," 7M07101 "Automation and Control" (1.5), 7M07101 "Automation and Control" (2), and 7M07105 "Instrument Engineering" and 100% compliance with the recommendations of the previous IAAR EEC. The University internal quality assurance system (IQAS) is integrated and based on the Quality Assurance Policy, academic regulations, and educational program monitoring procedures. Its functioning is ensured by collegial bodies and Quality Assurance Committees, regular data collection (academic performance, learning outcomes, feedback), and the documentation of corrective actions. Stakeholder engagement is ensured through the formation of working groups and discussions at the departmental and relevant collegial bodies (Quality Assurance Committee) levels, with decisions recorded in minutes. Analytical support and assessment of the University's positioning are provided by materials based on national and international ranking indicators.

Academic Quality Committees make collective decisions on the content and conditions of the institute's educational programs and analyze the results of student surveys assessing the quality of the educational program, identifying any violations of academic integrity. The Academic Quality Committee includes faculty, students, department heads, and academic staff of the institute. Composition of the collegial bodies: the Collegial Committee for the development of EP 6B07101 "Automation and Control", 7M07101 "Automation and Control" (1.5), 7M07101 "Automation and Control" (2) (consisting of Chairman of the Collegial Committee of the Automation and Control Department Em G.A., Head of the Automation of production Processes Department Yugai V.V., Head of the Research Laboratory of the Automation and Control Department Kaverin V.V., employers: Executive Director of the ASEP LLP Bratsev S.A.,

Commercial Director Shchigolev Ya.A., Director of the KAZPROM AVTOMATIKA LLP Chaika B.A., member of the Corporate University, Commercial Director of the KAZPROM AVTOMATIKA LLP Lepekhov D.A., Director of the PromElektrosistem LLP Pichugin A.V.), for EP 7M07105 "Instrument Engineering" (Chairman of the Collegial Committee Kadirova Zh.B., employers: Director of the SP KAYUR LLP Yu.D. Denissov, Director of the KazTMT" Zh.A. Koylybayev, Master's student F.R. Ospanova)

The University conducts a survey of students, faculty, and employers to measure the degree to which their needs are met. Based on an analysis of the department's teaching, research, and educational activities, measures are being taken to improve the quality of the educational program. Based on the survey results, the department compiles a report and discusses the results; appropriate decisions are made at department meetings.

All the activities performed by contractors and partners are regulated and monitored within the framework of the University's developed quality policy. The University has developed a mechanism for determining the types of activities to be outsourced. For example, the Department of Cybersecurity and Artificial Intelligence (EP 7M07105 "Instrument Engineering") has an agreement under which academic mobility was carried out for one master's student to Tomsk Polytechnic University (TPU) and two master's students from Tomsk Polytechnic University (TPU) to KTU (master's students enrolled in 2022), as well as two master's students from Tomsk Polytechnic University (TPU) to KTU (master's students enrolled in 2024). The EP management ensures transparency in the development of the EP and its development plan based on an analysis of its functioning, the actual positioning of the University, and its focus on meeting the needs of the state, employers, stakeholders, and students. To ensure transparency in the program management system, communication channels are used, including department meetings, the Institute Council, the Educational and Methodological, Scientific and Technical, and Academic Councils of the University, meetings with employers (round tables), the operation of the University's educational portal, the Platonus automated information system, etc.

Reports on the work performed and the results achieved, including those within the program, will be generated based on the Work Plans. Management monitors the implementation of the Work Plans annually. Monitoring of the program's development plan is carried out through the analysis of annual reports on their implementation, department reports, monitoring of department readiness for the academic year, assessing the quality of the educational and methodological complexes (EMCD), the program educational, methodological, and logistical support, the readiness of the program classroom and laboratory facilities, etc. Surveys of students and graduates, employers, and parents on their level of satisfaction with the educational services they receive are also conducted. Based on the results of monitoring the program plan implementation, corrective action plans are developed, the implementation of which is overseen by the Academic Affairs Department.

At Abylkas Saginov Karaganda Technical University, the analysis of the available resources (human, material, financial, organizational, etc.) necessary for the implementation of the educational program is being conducted. The analysis of the department human resources potential is carried out to identify the need for additional human resources with appropriate qualifications, determine the need for professional development (advanced training, training, and retraining), develop and update educational program development plans, develop a system of incentives for faculty, and explore the possibility of transferring faculty to other positions. The status of human resources is regularly discussed at department meetings implementing the accredited educational programs. The shortage of qualified teaching staff is addressed by planning the training of departmental faculty in doctoral programs at universities in the Republic of Kazakhstan.

The University has created a special automated risk management system, which identifies risks in detail. For example, the HR department is faced with the following risks: risks of decreasing the quality of faculty, risks of decreasing the quality of teaching; risks of decreasing the interest in individual research activities of faculty over 40 years old; the risk of decreasing/absence of positive dynamics of the teaching staff in the context of departments, as well as the risks of reducing the number of first-year students, the risk of a discrepancy between the level of practical skills of the teaching staff and modern production technologies, etc. Risks are identified and systematized based on educational process data (academic performance, learning outcomes, internship results), stakeholder feedback and the results of internal quality control procedures; based on the analysis results, corrective actions are developed aimed at preventing or minimizing risks. Risks are recorded within the framework of the University risk management system and are reviewed by responsible process owners at established intervals, and the analysis results are reflected in reporting materials and action plans. The management and departments identify, analyze and assess potential risks in the implementation of the EP and take measures to prevent them. For this purpose, continuous monitoring of all areas of the departments' activities related to the implementation of the EP is carried out: educational and methodological, research, personnel, educational work, provision of information, financial, material and technical resources. An assessment of the risks of the EP development is carried out; A decision is made to update measures to reduce the impact of risks on the implementation of the EP and to prevent/reduce risks, a number of measures are carried out:

1. Based on the results of the winter and summer examination sessions, student surveys were conducted on the "Efficiency of the Educational Process," "Student Social Well-Being," and "Clean Session" questionnaires, the results of which are discussed at department meetings.

2. The educational workshops and specialized classrooms for the educational program were equipped and supplemented with the necessary instruments, equipment, and auxiliary and technical teaching aids.

3. Department branches are located at internship sites, where both department faculty and invited internship teachers work. This also addresses the need to purchase the necessary equipment for laboratories and create additional specialized classrooms and workshops.

Innovation management within the educational program is expressed in an adequate and synchronous response to changing national priorities, University strategy, and the demands of the real economy and the business community. New disciplines are being introduced into the educational program, whose content (software within the educational program's profile) and the sources used in their development meet modern requirements.

In addition, the departments have laboratories where students have the opportunity to conduct laboratory classes, conduct research, and research projects.

Transparency in the development of educational programs is ensured through a multi-level discussion system: meetings of the graduating departments → review by quality assurance committees → approval by the University's collegial bodies. All decisions are documented in minutes and are accessible to stakeholders.

The University and educational program management are open and accessible to students, faculty, employers, and other stakeholders. To promote openness and accessibility, the University has developed a "Regulation on Research Ethics." These provisions apply to the activities of educational researchers as supervisors of master's and doctoral students, and as instructors (teachers). A hotline and a rector's blog are also in operation. The University's leadership holds regular meetings with students, faculty, and staff to inform them about the University's governance system, management decisions, and the activities of the rector's office and collegial governing

bodies. All decisions made during meetings of the Academic Council, the Institute Council, the department, academic committees, and academic quality committees are communicated to internal stakeholders.

The management of the educational program "Automation of Industrial Processes" and the Institute of Cybersecurity and Artificial Intelligence, represented by the heads of the accredited educational programs, have completed training in the programs "Education Management" and "Modern IT Technologies and the Use of AI in Educational Activities".

Analytical section

The Expert Commission acknowledges the high quality of the educational program management system, based on the principles of evidence-based learning, transparency, and stakeholder engagement. The internal quality assurance system functions as a unified management system (data → analysis → decision → results monitoring), ensuring manageable change and continuous improvement of the program. During their visit to the University, the experts confirmed a published and implemented quality assurance policy that reflects the link between research, teaching, and learning. The experts note that the University and program management have demonstrated a developing quality assurance culture, including within the program, and a commitment to ensuring this culture extends to all ongoing processes, as evidenced by internal agreements, memoranda of cooperation, and other documents.

The experts were presented with program development plans, which demonstrate transparency in their development, and were provided with documentation on the process of their design, approval, and adjustment, involving internal and external stakeholders. The program development plan is discussed with stakeholders and, if necessary, adjusted to reflect the changing labor market.

The EEC experts note that risk management at the University is implemented at a professional level using modern IT tools and risk management methodologies. The automated system enables timely identification, assessment, and monitoring of risks, with documentation of corrective actions.

At the same time, the EEC commission identified some areas for improvement.

The program management needs to more thoroughly articulate the unique features of the accredited programs. The submitted materials do not sufficiently highlight the distinctive features of programs 6B07101 "Automation and Control," 7M07101 "Automation and Control" (1.5), 7M07101 "Automation and Control" (2), and 7M07105 "Instrument Engineering" from similar programs at other technical universities in the republic, near and far abroad. At the same time, it is necessary to plan achievement indicators in line with national development priorities and the educational institution's development strategy indicators. Unique competencies, methodological approaches, and practice-oriented solutions must be developed and documented to clearly position the programs in the educational market.

The EEC experts note the need for a clearer distinction between the administrative component and the academic management of the program. The current organizational structure does not sufficiently detail the functional responsibilities and rights of program directors, which can create uncertainty in making operational decisions regarding program development.

Furthermore, implementation of innovative teaching and learning methods requires greater focus. Despite the availability of modern facilities and partnerships with leading technology companies, the potential for digitalization of the educational process and the introduction of advanced pedagogical technologies has not been fully utilized.

The results of the faculty survey showed that the educational institution's leadership pays attention to the content of the educational program.

Strengths/Best practices:

The EEC notes the high level of risk management implemented using the automated information system. The system ensures comprehensive identification, classification, and management of operational risks, establishing personal responsibility and monitoring frequency.

Recommendations:

- The management of the educational programs is recommended to more clearly formalize and substantively explain the distinctive features of the educational programs, including their academic, research, technological, and practice-oriented advantages, taking into account the national priorities and strategic guidelines of the University. Deadline: August 31, 2026.
- The University management is recommended to formulate detailed functional responsibilities and rights of the educational program managers, ensuring a clear distinction between the administrative component (faculty, department level) and the academic leadership of the educational programs being accredited. Deadline: August 31, 2026.
- The management of the University and the educational programs being accredited is recommended to expand the implementation of innovative teaching and learning methods, including digital educational technologies, project-based learning, and interactive class formats. Deadline: phased implementation until March 31, 2027.

EEC findings on the criteria:

According to the standard “Educational Program Management”, 17 criteria are disclosed, of which: 1 position is a strong point, 15 criteria have a satisfactory position and 1 requires improvement.

6.2. Standard Information Management and Reporting

● *The University must ensure a functioning system for collecting, analyzing, and managing information based on modern information and communication technologies and software.*

● *The program management demonstrates the systematic use of processed, adequate information to improve the internal quality assurance system.*

● *The program management demonstrates the existence of a reporting system reflecting the activities of all structural divisions and departments within the program, including an assessment of their performance.*

● *The University must determine the frequency, forms, and methods for evaluating program management, the activities of collegial bodies and structural divisions, and senior management.*

● *The University must demonstrate a mechanism for ensuring information security, including identifying persons responsible for the accuracy and timeliness of information analysis and data provision.*

● *The University demonstrates the involvement of students, staff, and faculty in the processes of collecting and analyzing information, as well as in decision-making based on this information.*

● *The program management must demonstrate the existence of communication mechanisms with students, staff, and other stakeholders, including conflict resolution.*

● *The University must ensure that the needs of faculty, staff, and students within the program are measured and demonstrated to be met, and demonstrate evidence of addressing any identified deficiencies.*

● *The University must evaluate the effectiveness and efficiency of its activities, including within the program. The information collected and analyzed by the University within the program must take into account:*

● *Key performance indicators;*

● *Student population dynamics by program type and format;*

● *Student performance, achievement, and dropout rates;*

● *Student satisfaction with the program's implementation and the quality of education at the University;*

● *Availability of educational resources and support systems for students;*

● *Employment and career development of graduate;*

● *Students, staff, and faculty must document their consent to the processing of personal data;*

● *The program management must facilitate the provision of all necessary information in the relevant fields of study.*

Evidence section

The University has developed a comprehensive information management system that supports the full cycle of collecting, processing, and using data for strategic and operational decision-making. The University guarantees the functioning of information flows and data exchange based on modern ICT and software (including automated educational management systems), minimizing the risk of data loss and ensuring its relevance. The current reporting system has a hierarchical structure and covers the activities of all departments, from graduate departments to the University's collegial bodies. This ensures regular assessment of the effectiveness of each educational program based on the key indicators: enrollment, academic performance, knowledge quality, and resource availability. Information management processes are strictly regulated by internal regulations, including the Corporate Governance Code, and data protection mechanisms are supported by a clear division of responsibility among officials who guarantee the accuracy and timeliness of the information provided.

The key element of the system is the involvement of stakeholders—students, faculty, and administrative staff—in the monitoring and analysis of information management through software. Through regular surveys and participation in advisory bodies, educational process participants directly influence the development of the management agenda. Well-established communication and feedback mechanisms enable the University to promptly respond to student requests, identify conflicts, and adjust the program's development trajectory. All the data regarding the program content, qualifications, learning conditions, and student achievements are systematically published publicly on the University's official website, confirming the University commitment to the principles of transparency and public accountability.

The effectiveness of the information management system within the cluster's educational programs is confirmed by high satisfaction rates among key stakeholders. According to student survey results, over 90% of respondents were completely satisfied with the quality of information support, including explanations of admission rules, program strategy (89.9%), and information on requirements for successful completion (92.1%). The accessibility and responsiveness of faculty and department leadership (92.1%), as well as the transparency of the academic assessment system (92.1%), are particularly noted, demonstrating well-established feedback processes and openness of administrative information. The faculty survey data correlate with these results: 98.2% of faculty members positively assess their level of involvement in management decision-making, and 73.6% of staff members confirmed the absence of systemic delays in receiving up-to-date information, demonstrating the stability of internal information flows.

Despite sustainability of the existing processes, the University recognizes the need for a qualitative transformation in its approach to using accumulated information. Currently, the program's management is focused on strengthening the analytical component of reporting: a shift is planned from factual reporting to a deep analysis of cause-and-effect relationships and the assessment of long-term trends based on collected data. In the near future, a regular benchmarking system will be implemented, enabling a detailed comparison of the effectiveness of the "Automation and Control" and "Instrument Engineering" programs with similar programs at leading global and national educational centers. Work has also begun on assessing the user experience (UX/UI) of the information systems currently in use from the perspectives of students and faculty to eliminate technical barriers. These measures will ensure the systematic use of adequate information not only for monitoring but also for the continuous improvement of the

internal quality assurance system and the increased competitiveness of educational programs in the market.

Analytical section

The University has developed and operates a comprehensive information management system, ensuring the transparency and effectiveness of educational program implementation. The foundation of the University's digital ecosystem is a developed IT infrastructure, including a corporate network, the kstu.kz domain environment, and specialized educational support systems. Power BI tools are actively used for in-depth analysis and visualization of key performance indicators, and strategic KPIs are monitored through automated development programs. Data collection and analysis is systematic and encompasses all management levels. The University has implemented an automated risk management system, enabling the timely identification and mitigation of potential threats during program implementation. Particular attention is paid to monitoring stakeholder satisfaction. According to survey results, the overwhelming majority of students (over 90%) are completely satisfied with the quality of examination materials, the objectivity of knowledge assessment, and the availability of academic counseling. Applicants and current students are also well-informed about program requirements: 89.9% of respondents confirmed the quality of information support provided prior to admission. The University demonstrates openness by using a variety of channels to disseminate up-to-date information: its official website, social media, and media outlets. Published information about the program is objective and includes learning objectives, expected outcomes, assessment systems, and information on academic mobility and employment opportunities. However, expert recommendations highlight the need for further development in terms of analyzing the effectiveness of IT systems used and more detailed regulation of information security and reliability mechanisms.

Strengths/Best practices:

- none.

Recommendations:

- University and program management should improve and formalize systematic data collection and analysis processes to enhance the internal quality assurance system, including implementing procedures for user-assessed effectiveness of the information systems themselves and regulations for data verification, protection, and reliability. Deadline: December ***31, 2026.***

EEC findings on criteria:

For the "Information Management and Reporting" standard, 17 criteria were identified, of which 0 are considered strong, 16 are considered satisfactory, and 1 requires improvement.

6.3. Standard "Development and Approval of e Educational Program"

● *The University must demonstrate the existence of a documented procedure for the development of the program and its approval at the institutional level.*

● *The University must demonstrate the alignment of the developed program with the established objectives and planned learning outcomes.*

● *The program management must determine the influence of disciplines and professional practices on the development of learning outcomes.*

● *The University can demonstrate the existence of a program graduate model describing the learning outcomes and personal qualities.*

● *The qualification awarded upon completion of the program must be clearly defined, explained, and correspond to a specific level of the NQF and QF-EHEA.*

● *The program management must demonstrate the modular structure of the program based on the European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System (ECTS), and ensure that the program and its modules (in terms of content and structure) are consistent with the set objectives and are focused on achieving the planned learning outcomes.*

● *The program management must ensure that the content of academic disciplines and learning outcomes correspond to each other and to the level of study (bachelor's, master's, doctoral).*

● *The program management must demonstrate that external evaluations of the program have been conducted.*

● *The program management must provide evidence of the participation of students, faculty, and other stakeholders in the development of the program and its quality assurance.*

● *The program management must demonstrate the program's positioning in the educational market (regional/national/international) and its uniqueness.*

● *An important factor is the ability to prepare students for professional certification.*

● *An important factor is the availability of a double-degree program and/or joint programs with foreign universities.*

Evidence section

The EEC experts confirmed the existence of a documented procedure for developing educational programs in accordance with Methodological Guidelines MG V-05-2022 and MG V-03-2022, and the requirements of the State Standard for Higher and Postgraduate Education. The development and approval of the educational program are guided by the requirements of the internal quality policy, which determines the mandatory evidence base, the frequency of document updates, and the responsibility of departments for the quality of the program design and implementation.

The educational programs were developed in accordance with regulatory requirements and, based on the Qualification Handbook of Positions of Managers, Specialists, and Other Employees (approved by Order No. 553 of the Minister of Labor and Social Protection of the Population of the Republic of Kazakhstan dated October 30, 2020, as amended on August 12, 2022, No. 309), were institutionally approved, and registered in the Register of Educational Programs of the European Higher Education Area. The provisions of the Atlas of New Professions and Competencies and relevant professional standards were also taken into account. During the program design stage, learning outcomes were developed taking into account the required competencies, level of training, professional standards, and employer expectations.

The accredited programs were developed with the active participation of representatives of the professional community as part of the academic committees. For the "Automation and Control" program, there were involved Technical Director of the KAZPROM AVTOMATIKA LLP D.A. Lepekhov; Executive Director of the ASEP LLP S.A. Brattsev; and Director of the PromElektrosistem LLP A.V. Pichugin. For the "Instrument Engineering" there participated Director of the SP KAYUR LLP, Yu.D. Denissov; Director of the KazTMT LLP, Zh.A. Koylybayev; and student representatives.

Integration with industry is achieved through the Corporate University innovative educational consortium, which includes 86 industrial enterprises, ensuring a direct link between educational programs and production needs.

The level of learning outcomes achieved in the disciplines is assessed through examinations.

Professional Development Support for Graduates is a program aimed at ensuring the continuous professional development of graduates.

Graduate models are developed in accordance with professional standards, qualification reference books, and employer requirements. The awarded qualifications are clearly defined and correspond to the NQF and QF-EHEA levels. The graduate model is part of the program development plan.

Completion of professional certification by students is an important indicator of the appropriate level of knowledge and skills, as well as the professional competence of University graduates. Eight master's degree students in the program 7M07105 "Automation and Control" completed training on the Festo Didactic training complex as part of the international University network project "SYNERGY" and received the corresponding certificates, enabling them to find employment with international companies in the field of mechatronics and automation.

The programs have a modular structure based on the ECTS credit system. Elective course catalogs offer students the opportunity to develop individual educational pathways based on their professional interests and specialization.

External review of the educational program is conducted with the participation of representatives of employers and partner organizations. Experts submitted reviews from directors of leading design companies and government agencies. For the "Automation and Control" educational program for all the levels, an expert opinion was issued by M.V. Melikuzev, Associate Professor at Islam Karimov Tashkent State Technical University, and for the 7M07105 "Instrument Engineering" master's program, an expert opinion was issued by the employer, Yu.D. Denissov, Director of Non-profit Partnership LLP "Kayur".

The University has established a Center for In-Demand Skills, where students receive a work-related qualification through internships after their second year, enabling them to complete further internships in full-time positions and more quickly adapt to the conditions of dual education at enterprises.

The University was one of the first in Kazakhstan to initiate the transition to a new training system, establishing the Corporate University innovative educational consortium in 2008 with the participation of major industrial companies (including the Kazakhmys Corporation LLP, the QARMET JSC, the SSMPC JSC, and the Shubarkol Komir JSC), as well as research centers and scientific and industrial organizations in Kazakhstan and several foreign countries.

The uniqueness of the accredited educational programs is that graduates will acquire not only competencies in two key areas: Technological Equipment Repair and Maintenance Engineer and Artificial Intelligence Engineer.

The types of professional internships students receive under this educational program include industrial, pre-graduation, and research. Internships are conducted in manufacturing, research, and design organizations, whose primary activities determine the availability of facilities and types of professional activities for graduates under this educational program. The University has entered into agreements for student internships with the following enterprises: the KASTON DMC Karaganda, the KAZPROM AVTOMATIKA DNC, the KAZPROM ENGINEERING DMC, and the Energy System LLP, Karaganda.

Partner universities are selected for the development and implementation of joint and/or dual-degree programs based on academic and institutional criteria: compliance of the training profile with the program areas, readiness to align curricula and learning outcomes, availability of resources and human resources, transparency of training and assessment procedures, and the ability to ensure recognition of learning outcomes according to agreed rules. When selecting partners, their recognition in the national educational space of the partner country and participation in international academic interaction (networks/associations/projects) are taken into account, which ensures the sustainability of cooperation and comparability of academic requirements. Academic support was provided to the accredited programs as part of the implementation of the dual-degree program EP 7M07105 "Instrument Engineering" mobility of 1 master's student to TPU, Tomsk and 2 master's students from TPU, Tomsk to KTU, master's students admitted in 2022, also 2 master's students from TPU, Tomsk to KTU, master's students admitted in 2024.

Analytical section

The EEC experts note that the educational program development and approval procedures comply with established requirements. Active participation by employers in program design ensures practice-oriented training and the alignment of graduates' competencies with labor market demands.

The EEC experts confirm the high quality of the educational program's facilities, including specialized centers from leading global manufacturers (the Mitsubishi Electric, the Schneider Electric, the Festo Didactic), which creates the conditions for mastering modern production technologies.

At the same time, the Commission identified areas for improvement: The EEC previously noted the need to define the individuality and uniqueness of the educational program. Following this recommendation, it is advisable not only to document the program's unique characteristics but also to ensure their practical implementation as a basis for strategic positioning in the regional, national, and international educational markets. The self-assessment materials do not sufficiently explain how the identified competitive advantages of the educational program are translated into specific mechanisms for academic branding, external promotion, comparative analysis with similar educational programs at the other universities, and strengthening industrial partnerships.

Strengths/ Best practices

- none.

Recommendations:

- The EP management should include in its development plans activities aimed at promoting educational programs in the regional, national, and international educational markets, including participation in ranking and professional initiatives, benchmarking analysis, and academic branding mechanisms. Deadline: December 31, 2026.

EEC findings on criteria:

For the standard "Development and Approval of Educational Programs," 12 criteria were disclosed, of which 0 were considered strong, 11 are considered satisfactory, and 1 suggests improvement.

6.4. Standard "Continuous Monitoring and Periodic Evaluation of Educational Programs"

● *The University must ensure that the content and structure of the educational program is reviewed, taking into account changes in the labor market, employer demands, and social demands of society.*

● *The University must demonstrate the existence of a documented procedure for monitoring and periodically evaluating the educational program to ensure that its objectives are met. The results of these procedures are aimed at continuously improving the educational program. The monitoring and periodical evaluating of the educational program must consider:*

● *the content of the programs in the context of the latest scientific and technological advances in a particular discipline;*

● *changes in the needs of society and the professional environment;*

● *the workload, academic performance, and graduation of students;*

● *the effectiveness of student assessment procedures;*

● *the needs and satisfaction of students;*

● *the alignment of the educational environment and the activities of support services with the objectives of the educational program.*

● *All the stakeholders must be informed of any planned or undertaken actions regarding the educational program. All changes made to the educational program must be published.*

● *Support services should identify the needs of different groups of students and the degree of their satisfaction with the organization of learning, teaching, assessment, and mastery of the educational program as a whole*.

Evidence section

The University has demonstrated the existence of a documented system for monitoring and periodically evaluating its educational programs, regulated by the methodological instructions "Monitoring and Evaluation of Educational Programs" and "Monitoring the Quality of Educational Services Using Student Surveys."

The monitoring system covers the key indicators: the program content in the context of modern scientific and technological advances, changes in the needs of the professional environment, student workload and academic performance indicators, the effectiveness of assessment procedures, student satisfaction, and the educational environment's alignment with the program's objectives.

Program reviewing is performed systematically with the participation of employers on collegial governing bodies. Experts have confirmed that program content is regularly updated, taking into account proposals from industrial partners and the results of surveys of all stakeholder groups.

Evaluation procedures are implemented using a point-rating system on a 100-point scale, with a ratio of current/midterm assessment (60%) and final examination (40%). Transparency of evaluation procedures is ensured through the use of appeals committees and the involvement of independent observers.

Analytical section

The EEC experts note the functioning of an effective system of ongoing monitoring and periodic evaluation of educational programs. Monitoring procedures are structured as a managed cycle with documented decisions and traceable corrective actions, implemented as a cycle: "data → analysis → decision → improvement."

Experts note the high quality of feedback from employers, expressed in specific proposals for the content of courses and competencies of graduates. The following are positively assessed: employer participation in the Scientific and Methodological Council (since 2025); the implementation of competency-based assessment (cases, projects, startups); and the transparency of procedures (appeals, independent observers). Student survey results demonstrate positive trends in satisfaction with the quality of the educational process.

At the same time, the Commission identified some areas for improvement.

1. Despite the stated monitoring cycle, the analytical depth of data processing is limited: there are no quantitative indicators of the effectiveness of changes, and no KPIs for improvement are provided

.2. Decision traceability: Changes are recorded but their impact is not always demonstrated; there is no before/after analysis.

3. Publication of changes: Information is posted but not systematized as a program change history.

The program management must ensure regular publication of information on program changes to ensure timely notification of all stakeholders. During the visit, it was discovered that there was no systematic practice of posting detailed information about program content updates on the University's official website. This reduces the transparency of the program improvement process.

Strengths/ Best practices:

- none.

Recommendations:

- The program management should ensure regular publication of information about all changes made to the accredited programs on the University's official website to promptly inform stakeholders of the decisions made and how their suggestions are taken into account. Deadline: within 10 days of the changes being made.

The EEC's findings on the criteria:

For the "Information Management and Reporting" standard, 12 criteria were disclosed, of which 0 are considered strong, 11 are considered satisfactory, and 1 requires improvement.

6.5. Standard "Student-Centered Learning, Teaching and Assessment of Academic Performance"

● *The program management must ensure respect and attention to various student groups and their needs, providing them with flexible learning paths.*

● *The program management must ensure that teaching is based on the latest advances in global science and practice in the field of study, using various modern teaching and learning assessment methods that ensure the achievement of the program's objectives, including the development of competencies and skills for conducting research at the required level.*

● *The program management must determine mechanisms for distributing students' academic workload between theory and practice within the program, ensuring that each graduate masters the content and achieves the program's objectives.*

● *An important factor is the availability of in-house research in the field of teaching methods for the program's disciplines.*

● *The University must ensure that learning outcomes assessment procedures correspond to the planned outcomes and objectives of the program.*

● *The University must ensure consistency, transparency, and objectivity in the program learning outcomes assessment mechanism. The criteria and methods for learning outcomes assessment must be published in advance.* ● *Assessors must be proficient in modern methods of assessing learning outcomes and regularly receive professional development in this area.*

● *The program management must demonstrate the existence of a feedback system for the use of various teaching and assessment methods.*

● *The program management must demonstrate support for student autonomy while simultaneously providing guidance and assistance from the teacher.*

● *The program management must demonstrate the existence of a procedure for responding to student complaints.*

Evidence section

The University implements a student-centered learning model aimed at ensuring individualized educational pathways, flexible learning, and transparent assessment. Individualized curricula are developed with the participation of students and advisors, ensuring that educational pathways are tailored to students' academic and professional goals.

The educational process is supported by a digital educational environment. The primary source of teaching and methodological materials is the internal Univer information and educational system, which, starting with the current academic year, will be replaced by the Platonus system, which provides centralized access to syllabi, educational materials, assignments, schedules, and assessment results. Access is provided through personalized authorization, ensuring individualized learning and protecting student data.

The use of information systems promotes transparency in the educational process, as students have the ability to track their current academic progress, access course materials, and interact with instructors digitally. Additionally, the University has developed instructions and training materials to ensure the effective use of the system. The academic assessment system is based on a point-rating model using a 100-point scale and is translated into the ECTS system. Knowledge assessment is carried out through ongoing, midterm, and final assessments, allowing for a comprehensive evaluation of student competency development. Assessment criteria are communicated to students through course syllabi.

The University has an appeals procedure aimed at ensuring the objectivity of assessment and protecting students' rights. Appeals procedures are regulated and help eliminate potential instances of biased assessment.

Student survey results confirm a high level of satisfaction with the educational process. For key indicators such as teaching quality, assessment objectivity, and interaction with faculty, the overall satisfaction rate is 84-93%. However, certain areas for improvement have been identified, including the availability of internet resources (82%) and infrastructure conditions (approximately 81%), which are recorded by the University and taken into account in development planning.

Student and employer participation in the management of educational programs is implemented through the Quality Assurance Committee (QAC). The QAC includes representatives of the teaching staff, employers, and students, which ensures that the opinions of all stakeholders are taken into account when developing and updating educational programs.

Analytical section

The analysis demonstrates that the University has developed a sustainable model of student-centered learning based on the integration of digital technologies, feedback mechanisms, and stakeholder participation.

The use of the "Univer" system ensures transparency of the educational process and allows students to actively participate in managing their own educational trajectory. The availability of digital monitoring and feedback tools enhances student accountability for learning outcomes.

Survey results are used not only as an indicator of satisfaction but also as a tool for management decisions. The University is considering identified problem areas such as internet access and infrastructure as areas for development, demonstrating a shift to an evidence-based approach.

Thus, the University implements a closed-loop quality management system: questionnaire data collection, academic performance → analysis → decision-making → improvement of the educational environment.

Strengths/Best Practices:

- None

Recommendations:

- None

EEC findings based on criteria:

For the standard "Student-Centered Learning, Teaching, and Assessment," 10 criteria were identified, of which 0 are strong, 10 are satisfactory, and 0 suggest improvement.

6.6. Standard "Students"

● *The University must demonstrate its student enrollment policy and ensure transparency of its procedures. Procedures governing the student lifecycle (from admission to completion) must be defined, approved, and published.*

● *The program management must provide special adaptation and support programs for newly enrolled and international students.*

● *The University must demonstrate compliance with the Lisbon Recognition Convention, including the existence and implementation of a mechanism for recognizing the results of student academic mobility, as well as the results of additional, formal, and informal learning.*

● *The University must provide opportunities for external and internal academic mobility for students, as well as assist them in obtaining external grants for their studies.*

● *The University must actively encourage students to engage in self-education and development outside the core program (extracurricular activities).*

● *The existence of a support mechanism for gifted students is an important factor.* ● *The University must demonstrate cooperation with other educational organizations and national centers of the "European Network of National Information Centres on Academic Recognition and Mobility/National Academic Information Centres for Recognition" (ENIC/NARIC) to ensure comparable recognition of qualifications.*

● *The University must provide students with practices, demonstrate a procedure for facilitating graduate employment, and maintaining contact with them.*

● *The University must demonstrate a procedure for issuing graduates documents confirming the acquired qualifications, including the learning outcomes achieved.*

● *The program management must demonstrate that program graduates possess skills that are in demand in the labor market and that these skills are actually in demand in the labor market.*

● *The program management must demonstrate the existence of a mechanism for monitoring graduates' employment and professional activities.*

● *The presence of an active Alumni Association is an important factor.*

Evidence section

An analysis of the presented materials shows that all stages of the student life cycle: from admission to completion of studies, are formalized by internal regulations and integrated into the overall internal quality assurance system. Admission, transfer, re-entry, academic mobility, midterm and final assessment processes are supported by digital services and information systems, increasing the transparency of procedures and accessibility of information for students.

KTU student body consists of over 9,000 bachelor's, master's, and doctoral students in engineering and technical fields. Students are trained in undergraduate, graduate, and PhD programs. The University is one of the largest technical universities in Central Kazakhstan.

The management of the educational programs pays attention to the adaptation of students to the University's academic environment. The presented support mechanisms for first-year and international students demonstrate the existence of a comprehensive approach to academic and organizational support. The work of advisors, curators, deans' offices, and the Student Services Center helps mitigate adaptation risks and foster a sustainable educational trajectory for students.

The presented materials confirm that the University adheres to the principles of the Lisbon Recognition Convention and ensures the recognition of learning outcomes obtained through academic mobility, supplementary, and informal education. Mechanisms for course transfer and recognition of learning outcomes are integrated into the University's academic policy and are implemented through a comparison of learning outcomes and the volume of credits earned, consistent with international approaches to academic mobility.

It should be noted that the University forms conditions for developing internal and external academic mobility for students. Agreements have been concluded with universities in Kazakhstan and partner universities abroad. Bachelor's and master's students participate in exchange programs, research internships, and semester-long studies abroad. Collaboration with partner universities and industrial organizations allows students to participate in exchange programs, internships, and international educational initiatives. The educational program management team provides organizational and advisory support to students, including information on grant and

external funding opportunities. In 2024, the University participated in the academic mobility program of the Ministry of Science and Higher Education of the Republic of Kazakhstan, which included student studies at universities in Europe and Southeast Asia. Ten international mobility grants were awarded.

Double-degree and international cooperation is developing. The University development program for 2024–2029 envisages expanding the network of international partnerships, attracting international students and experts, and developing joint educational programs. The University has a Code of Honor for students, master's students, and doctoral students, developed in accordance with the laws of the Republic of Kazakhstan and the University's internal regulations. The Code regulates academic ethics, addresses academic and disciplinary violations, and aims to develop a culture of academic integrity and strengthen the University's image.

Evidence demonstrates that the University has created an environment that encourages students to engage in self-education, research, and extracurricular activities. A practice-oriented training model, student engagement in project-based and research activities, and participation in scientific events, competitions, and hackathons contribute to the development of professional competencies. The functioning of the STU IDEA BANK system, which allows student participating in the improving of the educational environment, further confirms student engagement in the University development processes.

The analysis of the materials reveals the existence of support mechanisms for gifted students through their involvement in research activities, project work, and academic initiatives. The University provides opportunities for students to participate in competitions, conferences, and applied research, while interactions with academic supervisors and faculty facilitate the development of students' research competencies and professional potential. These issues are outlined in the Regulation on the reimbursement of students' expenses for research internships, practical training, and participation in the youth policy events.

The presented data confirm that the University builds its interactions with educational organizations, employers, and partners to ensure comparable recognition of qualifications and learning outcomes. The use of credit-based learning and a focus on the principles of the Bologna Process ensure the integration of educational programs into the international educational space.

Practical training for students is organized systematically and supported by a well-developed network of internship centers and industrial partners, including through interactions with employers and the Corporate University program, which includes 86 industrial enterprises. Students complete industrial and pre-graduation internships at partner companies in the region. Employers are involved not only in organizing the internships but also in developing educational programs, developing professional competencies, and assessing the quality of graduate training. The University operates a joint KTU-EPAM Systems R&D laboratory, one of the first such projects in Kazakhstan. This ensures practice-oriented training and improves the alignment of learning outcomes with labor market demands.

An important confirmation of the effectiveness of the educational programs is participation of employers in their design and updating. Representatives of partner companies participate in the development of learning outcomes and the content of courses, allowing the University to promptly respond to technological changes and industrial demands. Particular attention is paid to developing competencies in automation, digital technologies, and modern engineering solutions in demand in the context of industrial transformation.

The University has demonstrated the existence of a mechanism for monitoring graduate employment and professional performance. Collecting and analyzing information on graduates'

career trajectories, interacting with employers, and using feedback data allows assessing the demand for graduates and use the monitoring results to improve educational programs.

Analytical section

The analysis shows that academic mobility and employment rates are the key indicators of the effectiveness of educational programs and their alignment with labor market demands.

High levels of mobility demonstrate the demand for educational programs and their integration into the international educational environment. The widespread nature of internal mobility confirms the availability of educational resources and the flexibility of the educational process.

The analysis of graduate employment rates shows their high demand in the labor market. The employment rate for undergraduates ranges from 73.6% to 100%, while for master's degrees it ranges from 87% to 100%. However, a decline in the employment rate for undergraduates has been observed, which the University considers a factor for further analysis and corrective action. Overall, the decline in undergraduate employment rates is considered a manageable risk. The University uses monitoring data to make decisions aimed at strengthening engagement with employers and adapting educational programs.

The analysis of student surveys revealed that the overwhelming majority of respondents positively evaluate key aspects of the educational process. The highest satisfaction rates were recorded in the following areas:

- interaction with the dean's office, departments, and University administration (over 90%);
- accessibility of academic advising and student support;
- quality of educational programs and courses (approximately 90–91%);
- teaching quality, professionalism, and competence of faculty;
- objectivity and transparency of the academic assessment system;
- availability of library and educational resources (up to 93.5%).

The results obtained indicate that the educational process is generally organized effectively, and interactions between students and faculty are constructive. High scores for parameters related to the quality of teaching and the content of educational programs indicate that the programs meet student expectations and the requirements of the modern educational environment.

At the same time, the survey revealed a number of aspects requiring additional attention. These include the following:

- Relatively lower scores for the availability and quality of internet resources compared to other indicators;
- Some comments regarding the accessibility of computer labs and digital infrastructure;
- Insufficient development of spaces for student extracurricular activities, such as lounges and interaction zones;
- Moderate scores for stimulating students' creative and critical thinking;
- Some comments regarding the quality of medical care.

It should be noted that these problems are not systemic; however, their presence indicates the need for further infrastructure development and strengthening practice-oriented and interactive forms of education.

Thus, student management is implemented on the basis of an evidence-based approach: data → analysis → adjustment of educational programs → quality improvement.

Strengths/Best practices:

- none.

Recommendations:

- none.

The EEC's findings on the criteria:

According to the "Students" standard, 12 criteria were identified, of which 0 were strong, 10 were satisfactory, and 0 suggested improvement.

6.7. Standard "Teaching Staff"

● *The University must have an objective and transparent HR policy for the program, covering recruitment (including invited faculty), professional growth, and staff development, ensuring the professional competence of all staff.*

● *The University must demonstrate that the quality of the faculty competencies meets established qualification requirements, the University strategy, and the program's goals.*

● *The program management must demonstrate the changing role of the faculty in connection with the transition to student-centered learning and teaching.*

● *The University must provide opportunities for career growth and professional development for faculty, including young faculty.*

● *The University must attract specialists from relevant fields with professional competencies that meet the program's requirements.*

● *The University must demonstrate the presence of a mechanism for motivating the professional and personal development of faculty.*

● *The University must demonstrate the extensive use of information and communication technologies and software by its faculty in the educational process (e.g., online learning, e-portfolios, MOOCs, etc.).*

● *The University must demonstrate a focus on developing academic mobility and attracting the best international and domestic faculty.*

● *The University must demonstrate the commitment of each faculty member to promoting a culture of quality and academic integrity within the University and identify the contribution of the faculty, including invited faculty, to achieving the program's goals.*

● *The involvement of the faculty in the development of the economy, education, science, and culture of the region and country is an important factor.*

Evidence section

The teaching staff constitutes the key resource for ensuring the quality of educational programs. The faculty comprises educators with diverse qualifications, including PhD holders, Candidates of Sciences, and Associate Professors, as well as specialists with practical industry experience. The University's total academic and research staff exceeds 500 individuals. The University ensures that its staffing aligns with the strategic directions of engineering education development and the requirements of its educational programs.

The University demonstrates a personnel policy focused on ensuring the quality of educational program delivery, developing human capital, and aligning faculty qualifications with modern higher education and labor market standards. An analysis of the submitted materials indicates that the personnel policy is integrated into the internal quality assurance system and reflects the University's strategic priorities regarding the development of engineering education, digitalization, and practice-oriented training.

The faculty recruitment is conducted in accordance with qualification requirements approved by the Board and the specific needs of educational programs. The University ensures transparency in hiring procedures, competitive selection, teaching workload allocation, and performance assessment. The submitted materials confirm that recruitment decisions take into

account educational background, research qualifications, professional experience, publication activity, and practical experience in the relevant industry. Qualification requirements and professional standards have been established for the following academic positions:

- Professor-Mentor
- Research Professor
- Professor
- Associate Professor
- Assistant Professor
- Senior Lecturer
- Lecturer
- Teaching Assistant

The academic staff assigned to the educational programs aligns with the fields of study and ensures the achievement of stated learning outcomes. The programs are delivered by faculty members possessing scientific and professional expertise in automation, digital technologies, instrumentation, artificial intelligence, and engineering systems, including experience with PLC/SCADA systems, industrial automation, IoT, telemetry, and Industry 4.0 technologies. The presence of faculty with practical industrial experience enhances the applied nature of student training and facilitates the integration of modern industry solutions into the educational process.

Evidence demonstrates that the University fosters an environment conducive to the professional and scientific development of its academic staff. Faculty members regularly engage in professional development, scientific research, internships, seminars, and academic mobility programs. Professional development is viewed not merely as a formality, but as a means to update course content, implement modern educational technologies, and build competencies in digitalization and innovative engineering education.

It is worth noting that the University encourages faculty involvement in research and project-based activities. Research findings are integrated into course curricula, project topics, and final thesis work, thereby fostering a research culture among students and bridging the gap between education, science, and industry. The faculty participation in R&D and collaboration with industry partners reinforces the practice-oriented focus of the educational programs.

The involvement of employers and industry representatives in the educational process is a key aspect. The University engages industry specialists to conduct classes, to review educational programs, and to organize practical training. Such collaboration helps keep the curriculum up to date and ensures that the competencies developed by students meet the requirements of the professional environment.

The analysis of the materials indicates that the University operates a system for monitoring and evaluating the performance of academic staff. This system encompasses differentiated remuneration, performance assessment, support for publication activity, and participation in research projects and the commercialization of developments. The results of this monitoring and evaluation inform management decisions, the formulation of development plans, the allocation of performance-based incentives, and the determination of professional development priorities. This approach sustains faculty motivation and ensures that academic staff activities are aligned with the University's strategic goals.

The University demonstrates the necessary conditions for implementing modern educational technologies and digital learning tools. Academic staff make extensive use of digital technologies and ICT in the educational process, including LMS platforms (such as Platonus and Univer 2.0), Power BI, online learning, electronic educational resources, digital laboratories, and

remote interaction formats, thereby ensuring flexibility in the educational process and expanding opportunities for interaction with students.

The submitted materials confirm that educational program leadership ensures faculty involvement in the development, monitoring, and updating of educational programs. Faculty members participate in discussions regarding learning outcomes, the updating of courses, the development of teaching and learning materials, and the adjustment of practice-oriented program components. This demonstrates the existence of a robust mechanism for faculty participation in ensuring the quality of the educational process.

The University also demonstrates the development of a corporate and academic culture grounded in principles of academic integrity, professional ethics, and collegial collaboration. Faculty activities are governed by internal codes and regulatory documents, while the involvement of instructors in collegial bodies fosters transparency in management processes and promotes a culture of quality.

It is worth noting that faculty tenure ranges from 10 to 50 years, striking a balance between experienced specialists and staff renewal. The presence of faculty members with practical experience facilitates the integration of theoretical knowledge and practical skills into the educational process. Professional development for academic staff is practice-oriented. Lecturers undertake internships at enterprises in the real economy, including the ASEP LLP as evidenced by official orders and certificates. These internships enable lecturers to master modern technologies and integrate them into the educational process.

Furthermore, the teaching staff is actively involved in organizing student internships at enterprises, such as the KAYUR LLP, thereby integrating the educational process with the real-world production environment.

The development of human resource capacity is enshrined in the University's strategic documents, which mandate professional development for the teaching staff, the advancement of research activities, and the engagement of industry practitioners.

Analytical section

The analysis demonstrates that the teaching staff ensures educational programs meet modern requirements by combining academic expertise with practical experience.

Practice-oriented professional development for teaching staff directly influences the content of educational programs, ensuring that courses remain up-to-date and foster competencies in high demand in the labor market.

A clear, logical chain is evident: teaching staff → course content → quality of training → graduate employment.

The survey results also indicate a high level of satisfaction among teaching staff regarding their working conditions and the organization of the educational process. Key positive aspects include:

- full alignment of educational program content with the academic and professional interests of the faculty (100% positive ratings);
- a high level of academic freedom, including the ability to employ personal methodologies, teaching strategies, and educational innovations;
- a favorable socio-psychological climate, characterized by a high level of satisfaction with relationships among colleagues, students, and management;
- the adequacy and accessibility of educational and research literature;
- a high level of satisfaction with working conditions, social protections, and safety.

These results confirm the existence of a stable academic environment within the University that fosters the professional development of academic staff and ensures the high-quality delivery of educational programs.

At the same time, the faculty members identified several issues requiring management attention:

- insufficient involvement of the teaching staff in managerial and strategic decision-making processes;
- limited administrative receptiveness to criticism and suggestions from faculty;
- IT infrastructure issues, such as unstable internet and outdated equipment;
- difficulties in balancing teaching, research, and practical activities;
- insufficient mechanisms for incentivizing innovation and recognizing academic staff achievements.

Thus, despite the generally positive assessment, the survey results indicate a need to improve management practices, communication mechanisms, and the material-technical infrastructure.

Overall, the teaching staff management system ensures the continuous development of human capital and maintains the quality of educational programs at the required level.

Strengths/Best practices:

The External Expert Commission notes the high level of involvement of industry specialists possessing professional competencies in the teaching process, as well as the development of these competencies through practice-oriented professional development and faculty participation in industry internships.

Recommendations:

- none.

EEC findings on the criteria:

For the "Teaching Staff" standard, 10 criteria are addressed; of these, 1 is rated as strong and 9 as satisfactory.

6.8. Standard "Educational Resources and Student Support Systems"

● *The University must ensure that its educational resources, including material and technical resources, and infrastructure meet the objectives of the educational program.*

● *The program management must demonstrate the availability of classrooms, laboratories, and other facilities equipped with modern technology and capable of achieving the program's objectives.*

The University must demonstrate that its information resources meet the needs of the University and the program being implemented, including in the following areas:

● *Technological support for students and faculty in accordance with the educational programs (e.g., online learning, modeling, databases, data analysis programs);*

● *Library resources, including a collection of educational, methodological, and scientific literature on general, basic, and specialized disciplines in paper and electronic formats, periodicals, and access to scientific databases;*

● *Plagiarism assessment of research results, theses, and dissertations;*

● *Access to educational online resources;*

● *Operation of Wi-Fi on its premises.*

● *The University must demonstrate that it creates conditions for conducting scientific research, integrating science and education, and publishing the results of scientific research by faculty, staff, and students.*

● *The University must strive to ensure that the educational equipment and software used for mastering educational programs are similar to those used in the relevant sectors of the economy.*

● *The program management must demonstrate the existence of procedures for supporting various groups of students, including information and counseling.*

● *The program management must demonstrate the existence of conditions for student advancement along an individual educational trajectory.*

● *The University must consider the needs of various groups of students (adults, working students, international students, and students with special educational needs).*

● *The University must ensure that the infrastructure meets security requirements.*

Evidence section

Abylkas Saginov KTU guarantees that its material-technical resources and educational infrastructure fully align with the goals and specific requirements of its educational programs. Specialized training and student research activities are supported by modern, specialized laboratories equipped with operational industrial and educational hardware from leading global technology brands such as the Schneider Electric, the Siemens, and the Festo. These specialized facilities and computer labs provide the environment necessary for developing solid practical skills, completing coursework and final qualification projects, and implementing project-based learning that meets current labor market demands.

The University operates a comprehensive, well-resourced student support system, structured around the key areas of the University life:

- Academic Support: The Department of Academic Affairs, dean's offices, and graduating departments provide timely information and assistance in designing individual educational paths (IEPs) and selecting elective courses; they also coordinate processes related to academic mobility, transfers, and reinstatement.

- Research and Innovation Track: The Department of Science and Innovation provides methodological and organizational support to students engaged in research, facilitating their participation in scientific conferences, startup projects, competitions, and grant programs.

- Social, Personal, and Civic Support: The Department of Youth Policy and the Zhas Orda youth association support student initiatives in the areas of personal development, extracurricular activities, and volunteering.

The University employs a personalized approach to identifying and meeting the needs of specific student groups through continuous monitoring tools (surveys, individual consultations, and reports from academic advisors). A barrier-free architectural and educational environment has been established for individuals with special educational needs and disabilities. Similar mechanisms for adaptation, counseling, and support are in place for international students, as well as for adult learners and students who combine their studies with employment.

The high quality of the environment and infrastructure accessibility is confirmed by independent surveys of KTU students, which show consistently high satisfaction rates (with the combined "fully satisfied" and "partially satisfied" figures exceeding 98–100%):

- Relations with the dean's office and departments: 92.1% of students are fully satisfied with the level of interaction, and 90.6% with the accessibility of department leadership.

- Academic advising: 92.1% of respondents express complete satisfaction with the quality and accessibility of advising services.

- Responsiveness of University leadership: 92.1% of those surveyed confirm the administration's openness to dialogue.

As part of the ongoing improvement of the educational environment and support systems, KTU plans to expand its evidence base and scale up the following processes:

- Evaluation of innovation effectiveness: shifting from merely listing interactive and innovative teaching methods to conducting in-depth analytical monitoring of their impact on specific learning outcomes (including comparative analysis of student academic performance).

- Psychological adaptation: strengthening targeted psychological support services aimed at helping students overcome academic challenges and accelerating their adaptation to a student-centered learning environment

Analytical section

Implementation of educational programs is supported by a specialized research-and-production ecosystem. The practice-oriented nature of the training relies on operational industrial automation testbeds, including those from the Schneider Electric, the Siemens, and the Festo, integrated into the curriculum, as well as the international "SYNERGY" network project. A closed-loop "science-to-production" cycle is evidenced by the end-to-end utilization of laboratory facilities, ranging from standard laboratory coursework to thesis research conducted by Master's and PhD students within the Corporate University consortium.

Institutional support is distributed across functional tracks (Department of Academic Affairs, Department of Science and Innovation, Department of Youth Policy), thereby minimizing the risk of compromising students' academic stability. Monitoring of individual educational needs (including Individual Educational Plans, inclusion requirements, and the specific trajectories of international and working students) is conducted by academic advisors and Quality Assurance Committees, ensuring a proactive response to the needs of diverse student groups.

Verified survey data (Appendix 4) provide direct evidence of the stability of this internal support environment. The correlation between the high accessibility of department heads and dean's office staff (90.6%) and the high level of satisfaction with academic advising (92.1%) demonstrates the effectiveness of the advising system. The commitment to student-centered learning is further confirmed by the administration's openness to criticism and its prompt response to student inquiries (with a 92.1% approval rate).

The need to upgrade the wireless network infrastructure is supported by observations made during the External Expert Commission visit, which recorded internet connectivity interruptions and unstable Wi-Fi performance in specific campus areas. These issues affected the speed of access to digital educational resources, LMS platforms, and online services utilized in the educational process.

In the course of the survey, students also noted the poor quality of the internet connection, citing insufficient data transfer speeds, connection instability, and limited network coverage in academic buildings and dormitories. Amid the rapid digitalization of education, such limitations hinder the effectiveness of independent student work, impede the use of interactive teaching methods, and negatively affect student satisfaction with the educational environment.

Consequently, the external audit conducted by the External Expert Commission (EEC) highlighted the need to strengthen evidence-based indicators in the following areas:

- The need to modernize network infrastructure to improve the stability, speed, and performance quality of the Wi-Fi network.

- Assessment of the effectiveness of pedagogical innovations: the reporting materials show an imbalance, while a list of interactive and innovative teaching methods is detailed, there is a lack of measurable evidence regarding their direct impact on student academic performance or the quality of knowledge (requiring the introduction of dynamic academic performance charts).

- Psychological support within the framework of student-centered education: there is a need to formalize and expand evidence regarding the activities of psychological support services aimed at proactively mitigating the risk of student dropouts due to academic difficulties.

Strengths/Best Practices:

The EEC notes a high level of conditions formed for conducting scientific research, integrating science and education, and publishing the research results of academic staff, employees, and students.

Recommendations:

- the University management should modernize the wireless network infrastructure to improve the stability, speed, and performance quality of the Wi-Fi network across the entire campus, including academic buildings, dormitories, and adjacent areas. Deadline: by December 31, 2026.

- the educational program management should develop a system to monitor the effectiveness of didactic innovations using quantitative and qualitative indicators, including performance trend charts, interim and final assessment results, and comparative analyses of student academic achievements. Deadline: by December 31, 2026.

- the University management should formalize psychological support services within a student-centered framework by implementing mechanisms for documenting counseling sessions, monitoring academic risks, and evaluating the effectiveness of preventive measures aimed at reducing student dropout rates caused by academic failure and adjustment difficulties. Deadline: by December 31, 2026.

EEC findings on the criteria:

For the "Educational Resources and Student Support Systems" standard, 13 criteria were evaluated: 1 is rated as strong, 11 as satisfactory, and 1 requires improvement.

6.9. Standard "Public Information"

● *The information published by the University must be accurate, objective, and up-to-date, and reflect all areas of the University's activities within the educational program.*

● *Public information must include support for and clarification of national development programs and the higher and postgraduate education system.*

● *The University management must use a variety of information dissemination methods (including media, web resources, information networks, etc.) to inform the general public and interested parties.*

The information published by the University about the educational program must be objective and up-to-date and include:

● *the purpose and planned outcomes of the educational program, the qualification awarded;*

● *the information of the student assessment system;*

● *the information of academic mobility programs and other forms of cooperation with partner universities and employers;*

● *the information of opportunities for developing students' personal and professional competencies and employment;*

● *the data reflecting the program positioning in the educational services market (regional, national, and international).*

● *An important factor is the publication of reliable information of the faculty, broken down by individual, on open resources.*

● *The University must publish audited financial statements for the program on its own website.*

● *The University must post information and links to external resources based on the results of external evaluation procedures.*

● *An important factor is the publication of information about collaboration and interaction with partners, including research/consulting organizations, business partners, social partners, and educational organizations.*

Evidence section

Abylkas Saginov Karaganda Technical University NJSC has established a systematic and sustainable model of information openness, aimed at ensuring transparency in its educational,

research, and administrative activities. The University's information policy is implemented through a combination of official and digital communication channels and is regarded as an integral part of the internal quality assurance system for its educational programs. Key tools for public communication include the University's official website, social media accounts, corporate publications, and engagement with regional and national media outlets. This approach ensures broad access to information for students, prospective students, employers, and other stakeholders.

The primary channels for public information include the University's official website (kstu.kz), social media accounts (Instagram, Facebook), regional and national media, and corporate publications, such as the newspaper "Za Politekhnicheskie Znaniya" (For Polytechnic Knowledge) and the scientific journal "Trudy Universiteta" (University Proceedings). Furthermore, the University publicly releases the Rector's annual reports, financial statements, and strategic development materials, demonstrating its commitment to maintaining a high level of trust among the public and the professional community.

The effectiveness of the current information system is confirmed by the results of student surveys. High levels of satisfaction with the quality and content of the University's official website demonstrate the practical value of digital resources and the accessibility of information essential to the educational process. Positive feedback regarding the information provided during the admissions stage indicates that the University offers adequate informational support to prospective students and ensures transparency in procedures related to choosing an educational path. The use of digital platforms and social media ensures the prompt dissemination of information, expands the reach of the target audience, and helps strengthen the reputation of educational programs within the academic and professional communities.

The Alumni Association plays a vital role in ensuring openness and engagement with external stakeholders, fostering lasting professional connections between the University and the labor market. Feedback from alumni serves as a valuable source of information regarding the demand for educational programs and the quality of graduate training; it is also utilized to refine program content and enhance practice-oriented training.

It should be noted that the University's information policy aims not only to inform the public but also to build the academic and professional reputation of its educational programs. Official channels regularly publish information on the research achievements of faculty and students, the University participation in international projects, competitions, and conferences, as well as details on academic mobility and collaboration with industry partners. This practice boosts the visibility of educational programs and underscores the University's integration into the national and international educational landscape.

Further evidence of the transparency regarding the staffing of educational programs is the publication of detailed information on faculty members, covering their individual profiles, academic qualifications, professional achievements, and research areas. This enables stakeholders to objectively assess the human resource capacity of the educational programs and the level of the faculty's academic expertise.

At the same time, external expert assessments indicate room for further improvement in the University's information policy. Specifically, an analysis of information resources reveals that the University does not consistently publish up-to-date and verified information regarding its educational programs, such as program objectives and content, expected learning outcomes, graduate qualification profiles, staffing, academic mobility, and external quality assessment and accreditation procedures.

Furthermore, the analysis of information channel effectiveness needs to be strengthened by implementing a system of measurable indicators. These should track section traffic, target

audience reach, the demand for specific information services, and trends in user activity. Adopting this approach would provide empirical evidence of the University's information environment's effectiveness and facilitate a shift from a primarily descriptive presentation of information to an analytical approach to public communication.

The transparency of graduate career paths is another area requiring further development. While employment monitoring mechanisms are already in place, it would be beneficial to expand the practice of publishing verified information on graduates' professional activities, employment rates, career progression, participation in industry projects, and labor market demand. Such practices would boost confidence among prospective students and employers while providing tangible evidence of the educational programs' effectiveness.

In summary, the University demonstrates a consistent approach to public communication based on the principles of transparency, accessibility, and regular information updates. The existing communication system ensures a sufficient level of transparency regarding the University's activities and educational programs; the identified areas for improvement are primarily analytical and strategic in nature, focusing on further developing the evidence base, enhancing the effectiveness of digital communications, and strengthening the reputational aspect of the University information policy.

Analytical section

The information policy of Abylkas Saginov KTU regarding the accredited cluster of educational programs is structured around the principles of transparency, accessibility, and accountability to key stakeholders. The University employs a centralized system for the preparation and verification of published materials. Information is posted to web resources following an established procedure: ranging from the submission of a formal request by the graduating departments to the Department of Information Technology, through to final moderation and publication by the Software Center. This workflow ensures adherence to the trilingual format (Kazakh, Russian, and English) and terminological consistency, while eliminating the risk of discrepancies across public sources. To maximize reach among the target audience, the University utilizes a multi-channel approach: the official website (www.kstu.kz) serves as the primary hub for disclosing regulatory and institutional information (financial statements, Rector's reports, and faculty details); social media (Instagram, Facebook) and mass media are used to provide timely updates on current achievements, scientific events, and career guidance activities. Furthermore, an analysis of publication practices for the "Automation and Control" and "Instrument Engineering" educational programs demonstrates that all materials undergo comprehensive verification to ensure the completeness of information. This fosters a high level of faculty engagement in promoting the corporate culture of quality.

Empirical results from student surveys provide direct evidence of the accessibility and quality of the information disseminated (Appendix 4):

- Content quality: 91.4% of students are fully satisfied with the content and informational scope of the official University and faculty websites.

- Initial support: 89.9% of respondents expressed complete satisfaction with the clarity of explanations regarding admission rules and educational program strategies during the pre-enrollment stage.

- Feedback: The activities of the Alumni Association ensure sustained continuity and a continuous exchange of information between the departments responsible for the degree programs and the labor market.

Overall, the established business process for publishing information via the Software Center ensures a high level of linguistic adaptation for materials and minimizes technical errors. The University maintains full transparency regarding financial reporting and external assessment results, as evidenced by open access to the University leadership's annual reports. Engagement with various media outlets (print, radio, television, and specialized online portals) effectively supports the image of the educational programs in both regional and national markets.

Despite a robust general IT infrastructure, the detailed content analysis of public-facing resources revealed a systemic lack of targeted information at the level of specific educational programs. The primary issue is the absence of up-to-date, comprehensive, and systematized data regarding program objectives, intended learning outcomes, and awarded qualifications in the public domain. This is largely because the established publication procedure, involving internal memos sent to the IT Department and the Software Center, works well for general news updates but creates bureaucratic and time-related barriers to the prompt updating of specific academic documents (such as program specifications, elective course catalogs, and competency matrices) at the departmental level. The website structure tends to emphasize general descriptions of facilities and departmental staff, while the programs' core value, specifically, the competencies students will acquire and the qualifications they will earn, remains insufficiently detailed. This limits the information available to prospective students and external employers. Thus, based on the findings of the external expert audit, the management of the educational programs (EPs) needs to implement and reflect the following compensatory mechanisms:

- to publish information regarding the goals, planned outcomes, and qualifications awarded for the educational programs on the University’s official information channels;

- to conduct an analysis of media channel effectiveness: shift from merely listing platforms to presenting measurable metrics (statistics on unique visits to EP sections on the website, target audience reach on social media, and analysis of the types of data most frequently requested by the public);

- to enhance the transparency of career pathways: supplement public-facing EP resources with verified and regularly updated information on graduate employment and actual labor market demand for specialists.

Overall, the public information system for the cluster educational programs rests on a solid regulatory and technical foundation that ensures satisfactory compliance with many of the standard's criteria. Nevertheless, to advance to a level of sustainable development, it is necessary to bridge the information gap regarding the publication of academic goals and learning outcomes. Shifting the focus from routine news feed management to a comprehensive, substantive disclosure of EP specifications will help boost program competitiveness and ensure full transparency of the educational process.

Strengths/Best Practices:

- None.

Recommendations:

- The University management should publish information regarding the objectives, intended learning outcomes, and qualifications awarded for the educational programs on the University's official information channels. Deadline: August 31, 2026.

- The University management should implement a system for the regular monitoring and analysis of the effectiveness of the educational programs' official media channels. This system should utilize quantitative indicators, such as web traffic statistics, social media reach and audience

engagement, and an analysis of the most common information requests from prospective students, current students, and other stakeholders. Deadline: December 31, 2026.

- The University management should enhance the transparency of alumni career paths by publishing verified and regularly updated information on official program resources regarding graduate employment, job roles held, employers, and labor market demand for these specialists. Deadline: December 31, 2026.

EEC findings on the criteria:

For the "Public Information" standard, 11 criteria were assessed: 0 are rated as strong, 10 as satisfactory, and 1 requires improvement.

(VII) OVERVIEW OF STRENGTHS/BEST PRACTICES FOR EACH STANDARD

For the Standard “Educational Program Management”:

- The EEC notes the high level of risk management achieved through the use of an automated information system. The system ensures the comprehensive identification, classification, and management of operational risks, while establishing personal accountability and monitoring intervals.

For the Standard "Development and Approval of the Educational Program":

None.

For the Standard "Continuous Monitoring and Periodic Evaluation of Educational Programs":

None.

For the Standard "Student-Centered Learning, Teaching and Assessment of Academic Performance":

None.

For the Standard "Students":

None.

For the Standard "Teaching Staff":

- The EEC notes ahe high level of involvement of industry specialists possessing professional competencies in the teaching process, including the further development of these competencies through practice-oriented professional development and faculty participation in industry internships.

For the Standard "Educational Resources and Student Support Systems":

- The EEC notes that the University creates high-quality conditions for conducting scientific research, integrating science and education, and publishing the research findings of academic staff, employees, and students.

For the Standard “Public Information”:

None.

(VIII) OVERVIEW OF RECOMMENDATIONS FOR QUALITY IMPROVEMENT FOR EACH STANDARD

For the Standard "Educational Program Management"

- The management of the educational program (EP) is recommended to more clearly formalize and substantively articulate the program's distinctive features—including its academic, research, technological, and practice-oriented advantages—while aligning them with national priorities and the University's strategic goals. Deadline: August 31, 2026.

- The University management should define the detailed functional responsibilities and rights of EP heads, ensuring a clear distinction between administrative functions (at the faculty or department level) and the academic leadership of the accredited educational programs. Deadline: August 31, 2026.

- The University and EP management should expand the implementation of innovative teaching and learning methods, including digital educational technologies, project-based learning, and interactive class formats. Deadline: Phased implementation by March 31, 2027.

For the Standard "Information Management and Reporting":

- The University and EP management should improve and formalize processes for the systematic collection and analysis of data to enhance the internal quality assurance system; this includes implementing procedures for users to evaluate the effectiveness of the information systems themselves, as well as establishing protocols for data verification, protection, and reliability assurance. Deadline: December 31, 2026.

For the Standard "Development and Approval of the Educational Program":

- EP leadership should incorporate measures into development plans aimed at promoting educational programs within regional, national, and international markets; these measures should include participation in ranking and professional initiatives, benchmarking analysis, and academic branding mechanisms. Deadline: December 31, 2026.

For the Standard "Continuous Monitoring and Periodic Evaluation of Educational Programs":

- The management of the educational program (EP) must ensure the regular publication of information regarding all changes made to the accredited EP on the University’s official website to keep stakeholders timely informed of decisions and to take their proposals into account. Deadline: within 10 days of the changes being made.

For the Standard "Student-centered Learning, Teaching, and Assessment"

- None

For the Standard "Students"

- None

For the Standard "Teaching staff"

- None

For the Standard "Educational resources and student support systems"

- The University management must modernize the wireless network infrastructure to improve the stability, speed, and quality of Wi-Fi performance across the entire campus, including academic buildings, dormitories, and adjacent areas. Deadline: by December 31, 2026.

- The EP management must develop a system to monitor the effectiveness of didactic innovations using quantitative and qualitative indicators, including dynamic academic performance charts, results of interim and final assessments, and comparative analysis of student academic achievements. Deadline: by December 31, 2026.

- The University management must formalize the operations of psychological support services within a student-centered framework by implementing mechanisms for documenting counseling activities, monitoring academic risks, and evaluating the effectiveness of preventive measures aimed at reducing dropout rates due to academic failure and adjustment difficulties. Deadline: by December 31, 2026.

For the Standard "Public Information"

- The University management is to publish information regarding the objectives, intended learning outcomes, and qualifications awarded for educational programs on the University's official information channels. Deadline: August 31, 2026.

- The University management is to implement a system for the regular monitoring and analysis of the effectiveness of official media channels associated with educational programs, utilizing quantitative metrics, such as web traffic statistics, audience reach and engagement on social media, and an analysis of the most common information inquiries from prospective students, current students, and other stakeholders. Deadline: December 31, 2026.

- The University management is to enhance the transparency of alumni career paths by publishing verified and regularly updated information on official educational program platforms regarding graduate employment, job roles held, employers, and labor market demand for these specialists. Deadline: December 31, 2026.

(IX) RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE ACCREDITATION BOARD

The members of the External Expert Commission came to the unanimous opinion that the educational programs 6B07101 "Automation and Control", 7M07101 "Automation and Control" (1.5 years), 7M07101 "Automation and Control" (2 years), 7M07105 "Instrument Engineering" of the Abylkas Saginov Karaganda Technical University can be accredited for the period of 5 years.

APPENDIX 1. EVALUATION TABLE EXTERNAL EXPERT COMMISSION OPINION

Conclusion of the External Expert Commission on the quality assessment of the educational program 6B07101 "Automation and Control", 7M07101 "Automation and Control" (1.5), 7M07101 "Automation and Control" (2), 7M07105 "Instrument Engineering" at Abylkas Saginov Karaganda Technical University NJSC

No.	No.	Assessment criteria	Education organization position			
			Strong	Satisfactory	Suggests improvement	Unsatisfactory
Standard «Educational Program Management»						
1	1.	The University must demonstrate the development of a program goal and development strategy based on an analysis of external and internal factors with the broad involvement of diverse stakeholders.		+		
2	2.	The quality assurance policy must reflect the link between research, teaching, and learning.		+		
3	3.	The University demonstrates the development of a quality assurance culture.		+		
4	4.	A commitment to quality assurance must apply to all activities performed by contractors and partners (outsourcing), including joint/dual-degree programs and academic mobility.		+		
5	5.	The program management ensures transparency in the development of the program development plan based on an analysis of its functioning, the actual positioning of the University, and the focus of its activities on meeting the needs of students, the government, employers, and other stakeholders.		+		
6	6.	The program management demonstrates the functioning of mechanisms for developing and regularly reviewing the program development plan and monitoring its implementation, assessing the achievement of learning objectives, meeting the needs of students, employers, and society, and making decisions aimed at continuously improving the program.		+		
7	7.	The program management must engage representatives of stakeholder groups, including employers, students, and faculty, in developing the program development plan.		+		
8	8.	The program management must demonstrate the individuality and uniqueness of the program development plan, its alignment with national development priorities and the educational institution's development strategy.		+		
9	9.	The University must demonstrate a clear definition of those responsible for business processes within the program, the distribution of staff responsibilities, and the delineation of the functions of collegial bodies.		+		
10	10.	The program management ensures the coordination of the activities of all individuals involved in the development and management of the program and its continuous implementation, and engages all stakeholders in this process.		+		
11	11.	The program management must ensure the transparency of the management system and the functioning of the internal quality		+		

		assurance system, including its design, management, and monitoring, as well as appropriate decision-making.				
12	12.	The program management must implement risk management.	+			
13	13.	The program management must ensure the participation of stakeholders (employers, faculty, and students) in the collegial governing bodies of the educational program, as well as their representativeness in decision-making on educational program management issues.		+		
14	14.	The University must demonstrate innovation management within the program, including the analysis and implementation of innovative proposals.			+	
15	15.	The program management must demonstrate its openness and accessibility to students, faculty, employers, and other stakeholders.		+		
16	16.	The program management confirms completion of training in educational management programs.		+		
17	17.	The program management must ensure that the progress achieved since the last external quality assurance procedure is taken into account in preparation for the next procedure.		+		
		Total for the standard	**1**	**15**	**1**	**0**
Standard «Information Management and Reporting»						
18	1.	The University must ensure a functioning system for collecting, analyzing, and managing information based on modern information and communication technologies and software.		+		
19	2.	The program management demonstrates the systematic use of processed, relevant information to improve the internal quality assurance system.			+	
20	3.	The program management demonstrates the existence of a reporting system reflecting the activities of all structural divisions and departments within the program, including an assessment of their performance.		+		
21	4.	The University must determine the frequency, forms, and methods for evaluating program management, the activities of collegial bodies and structural divisions, and senior management.		+		
22	5.	The University must demonstrate a mechanism for ensuring information security, including identifying persons responsible for the accuracy and timeliness of information analysis and data provision.		+		
23	6.	The University demonstrates the involvement of students, staff, and faculty in the processes of collecting and analyzing information, as well as in decision-making based on this information.		+		
24	7.	The program management must demonstrate the existence of communication mechanisms with students, staff, and other stakeholders, including conflict resolution.		+		
25	8.	The University must ensure that the needs of faculty, staff, and students within the program are met and demonstrate evidence of the rectification of identified deficiencies. The University must evaluate the effectiveness and efficiency of activities within the context of the educational program.		+		
26	9.	The University must ensure a functioning system for collecting, analyzing, and managing information based on modern information and communication technologies and software.		+		
		The information collected and analyzed by the University within the framework of the educational program must take into account:				
27	10.	key performance indicators;		+		
28	11.	student enrollment dynamics by program type and format;		+		
29	12.	student performance, achievement, and dropout rates;		+		

30	13.	student satisfaction with the educational program's implementation and the quality of education at the University;		+		
31	14.	availability of educational resources and support systems for students;		+		
32	15.	employment and career development of graduates.		+		
33	16.	Students, staff, and faculty must provide documented consent to the processing of personal data.		+		
34	17.	The educational program management must facilitate the provision of all necessary information in the relevant fields of study.		+		
		Total for the standard	**0**	**16**	**1**	**0**
Standard "Development and Approval of Educational Programs"						
35	1.	The University must demonstrate the existence of a documented procedure for program development and its institutional approval.		+		
36	2.	The University must demonstrate the alignment of the developed program with the established objectives and planned learning outcomes.		+		
37	3.	The program management must determine the impact of disciplines and professional practices on the development of learning outcomes.		+		
38	4.	The University can demonstrate the existence of a program graduate model describing the learning outcomes and personal qualities.		+		
39	5.	The qualification awarded upon completion of the program must be clearly defined, explained, and correspond to a specific level of the NQF and QF-EHEA.		+		
40	6.	The program management must demonstrate the modular structure of the program, based on the European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System (ECTS), and ensure that the program and its modules (in content and structure) are aligned with the established objectives and are focused on achieving the planned learning outcomes.		+		
41	7.	The program management must ensure that the content of the academic disciplines and learning outcomes are consistent with each other and the level of study (Bachelor's, Master's, or Doctoral).		+		
42	8.	The program management must demonstrate that external evaluations of the program have been conducted. The program managementmust provide evidence of the involvement of students, faculty, and other stakeholders in the program's development and quality assurance.		+		
43	9.	The program management must demonstrate the program's positioning in the educational market (regional/national/international) and its uniqueness.		+		
44	10.	An important factor is the ability to prepare students for professional certification.			+	
45	11.	An important factor is the availability of a double-degree program and/or joint programs with foreign universities.		+		
46	12.	The University must demonstrate the existence of a documented procedure for program development and its institutional approval.		+		
		Total for the standard	**0**	**11**	**1**	**0**
Standard "Continuous Monitoring and Periodic Evaluation of Educational Programs"						

47	1.	The University must ensure that the content and structure of the educational program are reviewed, taking into account changes in the labor market, employer demands, and social demands of society.		+		
48	2.	The University must demonstrate the existence of a documented procedure for monitoring and periodic evaluation to achieve the program's objectives and continuously improve it.		+		
		Monitoring and periodic evaluation of the educational program must consider:				
49	3.	the program content in the context of the latest scientific and technological advances in a specific discipline;		+		
50	4.	changes in the needs of society and the professional environment;		+		
51	5.	student workload, academic performance, and graduation;		+		
52	6.	the effectiveness of student assessment procedures;		+		
53	7.	student needs and satisfaction;		+		
54	8.	the alignment of the educational environment and support services with the program's objectives.		+		
55	9.	Program management must publish information about changes to the program and inform stakeholders of any planned or completed actions within the program.			+	
56	10.	Support services must identify the needs of different student groups and their level of satisfaction with the organization of learning, teaching, assessment, and overall program development.		+		
		Total for the standard	**0**	**9**	**1**	**0**
Standard "Student-centered Learning, Training, and Assessment of Performance"						
57	1.	The program management must ensure respect and attention to various student groups and their needs, providing them with flexible learning paths.		+		
58	2.	The program management must ensure that instruction is based on current advances in global science and practice in the program's field of study, utilizing a variety of modern teaching and learning assessment methods that ensure the achievement of the program's objectives, including the development of competencies and skills for conducting research at the required level.		+		
59	3.	The program management must determine mechanisms for distributing students' academic workload between theory and practice within the program, ensuring that each graduate masters the program's content and achieves its objectives.		+		
60	4.	An important factor is the availability of in-house research into the teaching methods of the program's disciplines.		+		
61	5.	The University must ensure that its learning assessment procedures are consistent with the planned outcomes and objectives of the program.		+		
62	6.	The University must ensure consistency, transparency, and objectivity in the program's learning assessment mechanism. Criteria and methods for assessing learning outcomes must be published in advance.		+		
63	7.	Assessors must be proficient in modern methods of assessing learning outcomes and regularly receive advanced training in this area.		+		
64	8.	The program management must demonstrate the existence of a feedback system for the use of various teaching and assessment methods.		+		

65	9.	The program management must demonstrate support for student autonomy while simultaneously providing guidance and assistance from the instructor.		+		
66	10.	The program management must demonstrate the existence of a procedure for responding to student complaints.		+		
		Total for the standard	**0**	**10**	**0**	**0**
Standard "Students"						
67	1.	The University must demonstrate its student recruitment policy and ensure transparency and publicity of the procedures governing the student lifecycle (from admission to completion).		+		
68	2.	The program management must provide special adaptation and support programs for newly enrolled and international students.		+		
69	3.	The University must demonstrate compliance with the Lisbon Recognition Convention, including the existence and implementation of a mechanism for recognizing the results of student academic mobility, as well as the results of additional, formal, and informal learning.		+		
70	4.	The University must provide opportunities for external and internal academic mobility for students and assist them in obtaining external grants for their studies.		+		
71	5.	The University must actively encourage students to engage in self-education and development outside the core curriculum (extracurricular activities).		+		
72	6.	The existence of a support mechanism for gifted students is an important factor. The University must demonstrate cooperation with other educational organizations and national centers of the European Network of National Information Centers on Academic Recognition and Mobility/National Academic Information Centers for Recognition (ENIC/NARIC) to ensure comparable recognition of qualifications.		+		
73	7.	The University must provide students with internship placements, demonstrate a process for facilitating graduate employment, and maintain communication with them.		+		
74	8.	The University must demonstrate a process for issuing graduates documents confirming their qualifications, including the learning outcomes achieved.		+		
75	9.	The program management must demonstrate that program graduates possess skills that are in demand in the labor market and that these skills are truly relevant.		+		
76	10.	The program management must demonstrate the existence of a mechanism for monitoring graduates' employment and professional activities.		+		
77	11.	The existence of a functioning alumni association/association is an important factor.		+		
78	12.	The University must demonstrate its student recruitment policy and ensure transparency and publicity of the procedures governing the student lifecycle (from admission to completion).		+		
		Total for the standard	**0**	**12**	**0**	**0**
Standard "Teaching Staff"						
79	1.	The University must have an objective and transparent HR policy for the program, covering recruitment (including invited faculty), professional growth, and staff development, ensuring the professional competence of all the staff.		+		
80	2.	The University must demonstrate that the quality of its faculty competencies meets established qualification requirements, the University's strategy, and the program's goals.		+		

81	3.	The program management must demonstrate the changing role of faculty members in connection with the transition to student-centered learning and teaching.		+		
82	4.	The University must provide opportunities for career growth and professional development for faculty members, including young faculty members.		+		
83	5.	The University must attract specialists from relevant fields with professional competencies that meet the program's requirements.	+			
84	6.	The University must demonstrate the existence of a mechanism for motivating the professional and personal development of its faculty.		+		
85	7.	The University must demonstrate the extensive use of information and communication technologies and software in the educational process (e.g., online learning, e-portfolios, MOOCs, etc.).		+		
86	8.	The University must demonstrate a focus on developing academic mobility and attracting the best international and domestic faculty.		+		
87	9.	The University must demonstrate the commitment of each faculty member to promoting a culture of quality and academic integrity within the University and identify the contribution of the faculty, including invited faculty, to achieving the program's goals.		+		
88	10.	An important factor is the involvement of the faculty in the development of the economy, education, science, and culture of the region and country.		+		
		Total for the standard	**1**	**9**	**0**	**0**
Standard "Educational Resources and Student Support Systems"						
89	1.	The University must ensure that its educational resources, including material and technical resources, and infrastructure are aligned with the objectives of the educational program.		+		
90	2.	The program management must demonstrate the adequacy of classrooms, laboratories, and other facilities equipped with modern equipment to ensure the achievement of the program's objectives.		+		
		The University must demonstrate that its information resources meet the needs of the University and the programs being implemented, including in the following areas:		+		
91	3.	technological support for students and faculty in accordance with the educational programs (e.g., online learning, modeling, databases, data analysis programs);		+		
92	4.	library resources, including a collection of educational, methodological, and scientific literature on general, basic, and specialized disciplines in paper and electronic formats, periodicals, and access to scientific databases;		+		
93	5.	review of research results, theses, and dissertations for plagiarism;		+		
94	6.	access to educational Internet resources;		+		
95	7.	operation of Wi-Fi in the whole territory.			+	
96	8.	The University must strive to ensure that the educational equipment and software used for mastering educational programs are comparable to those used in the relevant economic sectors.	+			
97	9.	The program management must demonstrate the existence of support procedures for various student groups, including information and counseling.		+		
98	10.	The program management must demonstrate the existence of conditions for student advancement along an individual educational trajectory.		+		

99	11.	The University must consider the needs of various student groups (adults, working students, international students, and students with special educational needs).		+		
100	12.	The University must ensure that its infrastructure meets safety requirements.		+		
101	13	The University must ensure that its educational resources, including material and technical resources, and infrastructure are aligned with the objectives of the educational program.		+		
		Total for the standard	**1**	**11**	**1**	**0**
Standard "Public Information"						
102	1.	The University guarantees that the published information is accurate, objective, up-to-date, and reflects all areas of the University's activities within the educational program.		+		
103	2.	Public information should include support for and clarification of national development programs and the higher and postgraduate education system.		+		
104	3.	University management should use a variety of information dissemination methods (including media, web resources, information networks, etc.) to inform the general public and interested parties.		+		
		Information of the educational program is objective, up-to-date, and should include:				
105	4.	the purpose and planned outcomes of the program, the qualification awarded;			+	
106	5.	information of the student assessment system;		+		
107	6.	information of academic mobility programs and other forms of cooperation with partner universities and employers;		+		
108	7.	information of opportunities for developing students' personal and professional competencies and employment;		+		
109	8.	data reflecting the program positioning in the educational services market (at the regional, national, and international levels)		+		
110	9.	An important factor is the publication of reliable information about the faculty, broken down by individual, on open resources.		+		
111	10.	The University must post information and links to external resources based on the results of external evaluation procedures.		+		
112	11.	An important factor is the publication of the information of collaboration and interaction with partners, including research/consulting organizations, business partners, social partners, and educational organizations.		+		
		Total for the standard	**0**	**10**	**1**	**0**
		TOTAL	**3**	**103**	**6**	**0**

APPENDIX 2. PROGRAM OF THE EXTERNAL EXPERT COMMISSION VISIT

AGREED
Chairman of the Management Board, Rector of
Abylkas Saginov Karaganda Technical University NJSC
_____ S.S. Sagintayeva
_____ _____, 2026

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

APPROVED
General Director of the Independent Agency
for Accreditation and Rating
_____ A.B. Zhumagulova
_____ _____, 2026

PROGRAM
OF THE EXTERNAL EXPERT COMMISSION
OF THE INDEPENDENT AGENCY FOR ACCREDITATION AND RATING (IAAR) VISIT
TO ABYLKAS SAGINOV KARAGANDA TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY NJSC
(International Program Accreditation)
Date of the visit: April 20-22, 2026

Cluster 1 (accreditation)	6B07108 "Heat Power Engineering" 6B06201 "Radio Engineering, Electronics, and Telecommunications" 7M07106 "Heat Power Engineering" 8D07103 "Electric Power Engineering"
Cluster 2 (accreditation)	6B07101 "Automation and Control" 7M07101 "Automation and Control" (1.5 years) 7M07101 "Automation and Control" (2 years) 7M07105 "Instrument Engineering"

Date and time	EEC work with target groups	Position, surname, name and patronymic of the target group participants	Form of communication
April 19, 2026			
15.00-16.00 *The time will be verified*	Preliminary meeting of the EEC to discuss key issues and the visit program	*IAAR external experts*	Join the Zoom meetinghttps://us02web.zoom.us/j/4641732969 Conference identifier: 464 173 2969
According to the schedule within the day	Arrival of the External Expert Commission members		
18.00	Dinner	*IAAR external experts*	
Day 1: April 20, 2026.			
09.00-09.30	Distribution of responsibilities of experts, resolution of organizational issues	*IAAR external experts*	Main building, room 253, the EEC working room Join the Zoom https://us02web.zoom.us/j/4641732969 Conference identifier: 464 173 2969
09.30-10.00	Meeting with Chairman of the Board, Rector	*Saule Savetovna Sagintayeva, Chairman of the Board, Rector*	Main building, conference room Join the Zoom https://us02web.zoom.us/j/4641732969 Conference identifier: 464 173 2969
10.00-10.15	Technical break		Main building, room 253, the EEC working room
10.15-11.00	Meeting with the Board members, Vice-Rectors	*Bekbolat Rakhishevich Nussupbekov, Member of the Management Board, Vice-Rector for Academic Affairs;* *Ali Dzhavanshirovich Mekhtiyev, Member of the Management Board, Vice-Rector for Science and Innovation;*	Join the Zoom https://us02web.zoom.us/j/4641732969 Conference identifier: 464 173 2969

		Timur Erbolatovich Kanapyanov, Member of the Management Board, Vice-Rector for Strategic Development and Internationalization; *Azamat Zhanbulatovich Amirov, Member of the Management Board, Vice-Rector for Digitalization;* *Abay Koblandiyevich Kalykov, Member of the Management Board, Vice-Rector for Social and Educational Work*	
11.00-11.10	Technical break		Main building, room 253, the EEC working room
11.10-11.50	Meeting with the heads of structural divisions of the University	*Aristotle Zeynullinovich Issagulov, Chief of Staff;* *Angela Aleksandrovna Zhizhite, Corporate Secretary;* *Bakhyt Kuanyshevna Kurmasheva, Director of the Academic Affairs Department;* *Ainagul Rymkulovna Toleuova, Director of the Strategic Development Department;* *Bakhtiyar Daniyarovich Suleyev, Director of the Science and Innovation Department;* *Bayan Kanatbekovna Maudarbekova, Director of the International Cooperation Department;* *Gulden Khasenovna Adamova, Director of the Youth Policy Department;* *Nurlan Berikovich Aitbaev, Acting Director of the Marketing and PR Department;* *Aigul Khamzeyevna Abiltussupova, Head of the Finance, Accounting and Chief Accountant;* *Madina Muratovna Kozhukhova, Head of the Administrative Department;* *Gulnaz Nurgaliyevna Mussina, Director of the Infrastructure Development;* *Gulfarida Ergaliyevna Samash, Head of the Registrar Office;*	Main building, conference room Join the Zoom https://us02web.zoom.us/j/4641732969 Conference identifier: 464 173 2969

		Nurlan Bagdatuly Altynbekov, Head of the Institute of Continuous Education; *Zhanar Mazhitovna Assanova, Head of the Quality Management and Accreditation Center;* *Olga Andreyevna Shebalina, Head of the Sustainable Development Center;* *Gulzat Aliyevna Tussupova, Head of the Career and Employment Center;* *Gulnara Ermekovna Bekbergenova, Head of the Professional Development Center;* *Bayan Omarovna Beisembayeva, Head of the Scientific Library;* *Gulnar Sovetovna Ayazbayeva, Head of the Legal Service;* *Rustam Ravilyevich Buzyakov, Head of the Commercialization Office;* *Felix Anatolyevich Yakusevich, Acting Director of the Information Technology Department* *Kirill Borisovich Shtefan, Head of the Software Center;* *Bagdat Baigaryaeva, Head of the Office;* *Kyrmyzy Nurlanovna Tursyngaliyeva, Scientific Secretary.*	
11.50-12.00	Exchange of opinions of the External Expert Commission members	*IAAR external experts*	Main building, room 253, the EEC working room Join the Zoom https://us02web.zoom.us/j/4641732969 Conference identifier: 464 173 2969
12.00-12.50	Meeting with the deans and heads of departments of the accredited EPs	*Felix Nazimovich Bulatbaev, Dean of the Faculty of Power Engineering, Automation, and Telecommunications;* *Aleksey Anatolyevich Kalinin, Dean of the Faculty of Information Technology;* *Yelena Gennadyevna Neshina, Head of the Department of Energy Systems;*	Main building, conference room

		Vyacheslav Viktorovich Yugay, Head of the Department of Automation of Production Processes; *Nurbol Baltabayevich Kaliaskarov, Head of the Department of Radioelectronics and Telecommunication Technologies;* *Aliya Dauletkhanovna Alkina, Acting Head of the Department of Cybersecurity and Artificial Intelligence*	
12.50-13.00	EEC work	*IAAR external experts*	Main building, room 253, the EEC working room
13.00-14.00	***Lunch***	*IAAR external experts*	
14.00-14.15	EEC work	*IAAR external experts*	Main building, room 253, the EEC working room
14.15–15.00	Meeting with the teaching staff	*Cluster 1,* ***Appendix No. 1****, Main Building, Room 256, Zoom1 Session Hall* *Cluster 2****, Appendix No.2****, Main Building, Conference Hall, Zoom2 Session Hall*	Join the Zoom https://us02web.zoom.us/j/4641732969 Conference identifier: 464 173 2969
15.00-16.00	Parallel staff questionnaire	*The teaching staff* ***Appendix No.3***	The link is sent to the teacher's e-mail personally
15.00-15.10	Exchange of opinions of the External Expert Commission members	*IAAR external experts*	Main building, room 253, the EEC working room Join the Zoom https://us02web.zoom.us/j/4641732969 Conference identifier: 464 173 2969
15.10-16.00	Meeting with the students	*Cluster 1****, Appendix No. 4,*** *Main Building, Room 256, Session Hall, Zoom1* *Cluster 2,* ***Appendix No. 5,*** *Main Building, Conference Hall, Zoom2*	Join the Zoom https://us02web.zoom.us/j/4641732969 Conference identifier: 464 173 2969
16.00-17.00	Parallel student questionnaire	*Students* ***Appendix No.6***	The link is sent to the student's e-mail personally
16.00-16.10	Technical break	*IAAR external experts*	Main building, room 253, the EEC working room

16.10-17.00	Meeting with the stakeholders, representatives of practices bases, and employers (hybrid)	*Stakeholders* ***Appendix No.7***	Main building, conference room Join the Zoom https://us02web.zoom.us/j/4641732969 Conference identifier: 464 173 2969
17.00-17.10	Technical break	*IAAR external experts*	Main building, room 253, the EEC working room
17.10-17.50	BMeeting the EP graduates (hybrid)	*Graduates* ***Appendix No.8***	Гл. корпус, конференц-зал Join the Zoom https://us02web.zoom.us/j/4641732969 Conference identifier: 464 173 2969
17.50-18.00	EEC work, discussion of the 1st day results	*IAAR external experts*	Main building, room 253, the EEC working room Join the Zoom https://us02web.zoom.us/j/4641732969 Conference identifier: 464 173 2969
18.00-19.00	Dinner	*IAAR external experts*	
Day 2: April 21, 2026.			
09.00-09.10	EEC work	*IAAR external experts*	Main building, room 253, the EEC working room Join the Zoom https://us02web.zoom.us/j/4641732969 Conference identifier: 464 173 2969
09.10-10.00	Visual inspection of the OP and the material, technical and educational laboratory facilities	*The route schedule* ***Appendix No.9***	*According to the route schedule*
10.00-13.00	Working with department documents: *Documents must be uploaded to the cloud in clusters in advance. If necessary, department heads will be invited to the online Zoom room and attend scheduled faculty classes.*	*Class schedule* ***Appendix No.10***	Main building, room 253, the EEC working room

13.00-14.00	**Lunch**	*IAAR external experts*	
14.00-16.00	Selective visiting the EP practice bases	*IAAR external experts according to the route sheet* ***Appendix No.11***	According to the route
16.00-16.30	Технический перерыв	*IAAR external experts*	Main building, room 253, the EEC working room
16.30-19.00	EEC work, discussion of the results of the second day *being recorded*	*IAAR external experts*	Main building, room 253, the EEC working room
19.00-20.00	Ужин	*IAAR external experts*	
Day 3: April 22, 2026			
09.00-11.30	EEC work, developing and discussing recommendations	*IAAR external experts*	Main building, room 253, the EEC working room Join the Zoom https://us02web.zoom.us/j/4641732969 Conference identifier: 464 173 2969
11.30-11.40	Technical break	*IAAR external experts*	Main building, room 253, the EEC working room
11.40-12.30	EEC work, developing and discussing recommendations *being recorded*	*IAAR external experts*	Main building, room 253, the EEC working room Join the Zoom https://us02web.zoom.us/j/4641732969 Conference identifier: 464 173 2969
12:30-13:00	EEC work	*IAAR external experts*	Main building, room 253, the EEC working room
13.00-14.00	Lunch	*IAAR external experts*	
14.00-16.00	EEC work, discussion, taking decisions by voting *being recorded*	*IAAR external experts*	Main building, room 253, the EEC working room Join the Zoom https://us02web.zoom.us/j/4641732969 Conference identifier: 464 173 2969
16.00-16.30	EEC work. Discussion of the quality assessment results	*IAAR external experts*	Main building, room 253, the EEC working room
16.30–17.00	EEC final meeting with the University management	*Saule Savetovna Sagintaeva - Chairman of the Board, Rector*	Main building, conference room

		Bekbolat Rakhishevich Nussupbekov, Member of the Board, Vice-Rector for Academic Affairs; *Ali Dzhavanshirovich Mekhtiyev, Member of the Board, Vice-Rector for Science and Innovation;* *Timur Erbolatovich Kanapyanov, Member of the Board, Vice-Rector for Strategic Development and Internationalization;* *Azamat Zhanbulatovich Amirov, Member of the Board, Vice-Rector for Digitalization;* *Abay Koblandievich Kalykov, Member of the Board, Vice-Rector for Social and Educational Work.*	Join the Zoom https://us02web.zoom.us/j/4641732969 Conference identifier: 464 173 2969
18.00-19.00	Dinner	*IAAR external experts*	

APPENDIX 3. RESULTS OF THE STAFF QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Total number of questionnaires: 53

2. Position, %

Professor	4 (7,5 %)
Associate Professor	12 (22,6 %)
Senior lecturer	31 (58,5 %)
Lecturer	6 (11,3 %)
Head of the department	0 (0 %)
Other	0 (0 %)

3. Academic degree, title

Distinguished Figure	1 (1,9 %)
Doctor of Sciences	1 (1,9 %)
Candidate of Sciences	11 (20,8 %)
Master's Degree	29 (54,7 %)
PhD	8 (15,1 %)
Professor	1 (1,9 %)
Associate Professor/Associate Professor	5 (9,4 %)
None	5 (9,4 %)
Other	0 (0 %)

4. Experience in this University

Less than 1 year	4 (7,5 %)
1 – 5 years	4 (7,5 %)
More than 5 years	45 (84,9 %)
Other	0 (0%)

No	Questions	Very good	Good	Rather bad	Bad	Very bad	No answer
1	To what extent does the educational program content meet your academic and professional interests and needs?	34 (64,2 %)	19 (35,8 %)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
2	How do you rate the opportunities provided by the University for the professional development of faculty members?	31 (58,5 %)	20 (37,7 %)	2 (3,8 %)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
3	How do you rate the opportunities the University provides for	29 (54,7 %)	23 (43,4 %)	1 (1,9 %)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

	faculty career advancement?						
4	How do you rate the degree of academic freedom of faculty?	18 (34 %)	34 (64,2 %)	1 (1,9 %)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
	To what extent can faculty use their own...						
5	• Teaching strategies	28 (52,8 %)	25 (47,2 %)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
6	• Teaching methods	33 (62,3 %)	20 (37,7 %)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
7	• Educational innovations	33 (62,3 %)	20 (37,7 %)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
8	How would you rate the University's efforts to organize medical care and prevent disease?	20 (37,7 %)	29 (54,7 %)	4 (7,5 %)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
9	What attention does the University's leadership pay to the content of the educational program?	28 (52,8 %)	24 (45,3 %)	1 (1,9 %)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
10	How would you rate the adequacy and accessibility of the necessary scientific and educational literature in the library?	36 (67,9 %)	17 (32,1 %)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
11	How would you rate the level of conditions created to meet the needs of various student groups?	28 (52,8 %)	24 (45,3 %)	1 (1,9 %)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
	Assess the openness and accessibility of management						
12	• Students	31 (58,5 %)	20 37,7 %)	1 (1,9 %)	1 (1,9 %)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
13	• Faculty	24 (45,3 %)	25 (47,2 %)	3 (5,7 %)	1 (1,9 %)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
14	Evaluate the involvement of faculty in management and strategic decision-making	20 (37,7 %)	26 (49,1 %)	5 (9,4 %)	2 (3,8 %)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

15	How is faculty innovation encouraged?	24 (45,3 %)	26 (49,1 %)	3 (5, 7 %)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
16	Assess the level of feedback from faculty to management.	24 (45,3 %)	26 (49,1 %)	3 (5,7 %)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
17	What is the level of incentives and involvement of young professionals in the educational process?	23 (43,4 %)	27 (50,9 %)	3 (5,7 %)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
18	Assess the opportunities created for professional and personal growth for each faculty member and staff member.	27 (50,9 %)	24 (45,3 %)	2 (3,8 %)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
19	Assess the adequacy of University management's recognition of faculty potential and abilities.	24 (45,3 %)	27 (50,9 %)	2 (3,8 %)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
	How is the work organized:						
20	• Academic mobility	25 (47,2 %)	25 (47,2 %)	3 (5,7 %)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
21	• Faculty professional development	31 (58,5 %)	21 (39,6 %)	1 (1,9 %)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
22	**Assess the University and its management's support for faculty research initiatives**	28 (52,8 %)	22 (41,5%)	3 (5,7 %)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
23	Development of new educational programs/disciplines/teaching methods	22 (41,5%)	30 (56,6%)	1 (1,9 %)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
	Assess the faculty's ability to combine teaching						
24	• with research	18 (34 %)	30 (56,6%)	5 (9,4%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
25	• with practical activities	16 (30,2 %)	35 (66 %)	2 (3,8 %)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
26	Assess how well students' knowledge at the University matches the	23 (43,4 %)	28 (52,8 %)	2 (3,8 %)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

	realities of the modern labor market.						
27	How do the University's management and administration respond to criticism?	14 (26,4 %)	31 (58,5 %)	7 (13,2 %)	1 (1,9 %)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
28	Assess how well your academic workload matches your expectations and capabilities.	20 (37,7 %)	32 (60,4 %)	1 (1,9 %)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
29	Assess how well the educational programs/curriculums focus on developing students' skills and abilities to analyze situations and make predictions.	21 (39,6 %)	32 (60,4 %)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
30	Assess how well the educational program's content and delivery meet the expectations of the labor market and employers.	22 (41,5 %)	30 (56,6 %)	1 (1,9 %)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

Why do you work at this University?

I chose to work at this University because it creates favorable conditions for professional growth and research. It boasts a strong faculty and maintains a high-quality educational environment.

After graduating, I stayed on to teach.

It meets my professional standards.

I work at this University because it offers opportunities for professional growth, an engaging research environment, and the opportunity to share knowledge with students.

I work at this University specifically because it offers the opportunity to combine teaching, research, and practical work. It's important for me not only to share knowledge with students but also to participate in the development of educational programs, research, and collaboration with businesses. This University offers the perfect conditions for such work.

Since Soviet times, this University has been the strongest technical University in the republic.

Where I studied, there was a place where I found it useful.

The best University in Kazakhstan is my alma mater.

I studied here and have extensive experience working in industrial enterprises.

The working conditions are satisfactory.

I studied here. While working at the company, I maintained contact with the University.

The quality of education is good, the faculty is friendly.

Suitable educational program, financial incentives.

I'm used to it.

I enjoy teaching.

I like this University.

My basic education is right for me; this is my University.

It just happened. The University's needs and my abilities coincided.

Because this University is a strong engineering school with a solid reputation and a focus on training in-demand specialists for the real economy.

It's possible to impart fundamental knowledge to students.

I am a graduate of this University, both an undergraduate and graduate, which allowed me to appreciate its enormous potential from the inside. It's a leading University in Kazakhstan, consistently demonstrating its leadership through high achievements in science and education. My desire to work here stems from a desire to be part of a strong, competitive team. A leading University in the country, prestigious, interesting, and beneficial.

A prestigious University with strong traditions and a good resource base.

I like it.

Our University supports the research endeavors of both faculty and students and creates the necessary conditions.

It's close to home.

I like the work, the team, and my Alma Mater.

Good salary, excellent staff, benefits package, and incentives.

This University meets my expectations and requirements for a place of work.

I've been working here for over 20 years, and the University fully meets my high expectations and provides the opportunity to realize them in scientific and pedagogical fields.

Here, I not only impart knowledge and teach, but also develop alongside students and participate in research.

This is my University. I graduated from it, and it's a wonderful University.

The University matches my professional, scientific, and personal interests. I really like the working conditions.

Because I studied here once.

Working conditions are satisfactory.

I received my higher education here, defended my PhD dissertation, became an associate professor, and am now an associate professor.

32. How often do your course include master classes and workshops with practitioners?

Very often	Often	Sometimes	Very seldom	Never
13 (24,5 %)	28 (52,8 %)	11 (20,8 %)	1 (1,9 %)	0 (0 (0%))

33. How often do invited teachers (domestic and foreign) participate in the teaching process?

Very often	Often	Sometimes	Very seldom	Never
10 (18,9 %)	26 (49,1 %)	17 (32,1 %)	0 (0 (0%))	0 (0 (0%))

34. How often do you encounter the following problems in your work: (please provide an answer in each line)

Questions	Often	Sometimes	Never	No answer
Insufficient classroom space	1 (1,9 %)	19 (35,8 %)	33 (62,3 %)	0 (0,00 %)
Unbalanced academic workload across semesters	1 (1,9 %)	22 (41,5 %)	30 (56,6 %)	0 (0,00 %)
Unavailability of necessary literature in the library	0 (0,00 %)	17 (32,1 %)	36 (67,9 %)	0 (0,00 %)
Overcrowded study groups (too many students per group)	0 (0,00 %)	17 (32,1 %)	36 (67,9 %)	0 (0,00 %)
Inconvenient schedule	0 (0,00 %)	16 (30,2 %)	37 (69,8 %)	0 (0,00 %)
Inadequate classroom conditions	1 (1,9 %)	16 (30,2 %)	36 (67,9 %)	0 (0,00 %)
Lack of internet access/weak internet connection	4 (7,5 %)	27 (50,9 %)	22 (41,5 %)	0 (0,00 %)
Lack of student interest in learning	2 (3,8 %)	29 (54,7 %)	22 (41,5 %)	0 (0,00 %)
Untimely receipt of information about events	0 (0,00 %)	14 (26,4 %)	39 (73,6 %)	0 (0,00 %)
Lack of technical teaching aids in classrooms	1 (1,9 %)	18 (34 %)	34 (64,2 %)	0 (0,00 %)
Other problems	No problem Internet Classes should not exceed 80 minutes The break between classes is 10 minutes, so students don't always have time to walk from one building to the other Sometimes there are no bells. The lecture halls have outdated computers, so documents saved in a later version of a program (WORD, etc.) don't load. Sometimes students are distracted by various activities. It can be hot in the spring/summer or cold in the fall/winter, and sometimes there's insufficient lighting. Lack of interactive learning tools I haven't encountered any difficulties. All issues are resolved quickly.			

	Weak internet Weak internet Reduce faculty involvement in student educational work Slow internet Inflated criteria (indicators) in the Faculty Ranking Regulations, reduced validity periods for credits for completed assignments. Gradual obsolescence of the department's equipment (computers)

35. The University life has many different facets and aspects that affect every faculty and staff member in one way or another. Please rate your satisfaction with:

Questions	Completely satisfied (1)	Partly satisfied (2)	Unsatisfied (3)	Difficult to answer (4)
The University administration's attitude toward you	45 (84,9 %)	8 (15,1 %)	0 (0,00 %)	0 (0,00 %)
Relationships with your immediate supervisor	48 (90,6 %)	5 (9,4 %)	0 (0,00 %)	0 (0,00 %)
Relationships with colleagues in the department	52 (98,1 %)	1 (1,9 %)	0 (0,00 %)	0 (0,00 %)
Degree of participation in management decisions	37 (69,8 %)	16 (30,2 %)	0 (0,00 %)	0 (0,00 %)
Relations with students	49 (92,5 %)	4 (7,5 %)	0 (0,00 %)	0 (0,00 %)
Recognition of your successes and achievements by the administration	44 (83 %)	8 (15,1 %)	1 (1,9 %)	0 (0,00 %)
Support for your suggestions and comments	36 (67,9 %)	16 (30,2 %)	0 (0,00 %)	1 (1,9 %)
The activities of the University administration	41 (77,4 %)	11 (20,8 %)	1 (1,9 %)	0 (0,00 %)
Remuneration terms	34 (64,2 %)	16 (30,2 %)	2 (3,8 %)	1 (1,9 %)
Working conditions, the list and quality of services provided at the University	4 (83 %)	9 (17 %)	0 (0,00 %)	0 (0,00 %)
Occupational health and safety	49 (92,5 %)	4 (7,5 %)	0 (0,00 %)	0 (0,00 %)
Management of changes in University operations	36 (67,9 %)	14 (26,4 %)	0 (0,00 %)	3 (5,7 %)
Provision of a social package: vacations, spa treatment, etc.	42 (79,2 %)	11 (20,8 %)	0 (0,00 %)	0 (0,00 %)
Organization and quality of food at the University	28	18	5	2

	(52,8 %)	(34 %)	(9,4 %)	(3,8 %)
Organization and quality of medical care	37 (69,8 %)	11 (20,8 %)	2 (3,8 %)	3 (5,7 %)

APPENDIX 4. RESULTS OF STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

Total number of questionnaires: 139

Educational program (specialty):

6B07101 Automation and Control	57 (41%)
7M07101 Automation and Control	2 (1,4%)
6B07108 Heat Power Engineering	43 (30,9%)
7M07106 Heat Power Engineering	2 (1,4%)
Computer Hardware and Software	33 (19,9%)
Radio Engineering, Electronics, and Telecommunications	31 (22,3%)
7M07105 Instrument Engineering	2 (1,4%)
Electric Power Engineering	2 (1,4%)

Gender:

Male	105 (75,5%)
Female	34 (24,5%)

Rate how you are satisfied:

Questions	Completely satisfied	Partly satisfied	Partly unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Difficult to answer
1. Relationships with the dean's office (school, faculty, department)	128 (92,1%)	11 (7,9%)	0 (0,00%)	0 (0,00%)	0 (0,00%
2. Accessibility of the dean's office (school, faculty, department)	126 (90,6%)	13 (9,4%)	0 (0,00%)	0 (0,00%)	0 (0,00%)
3. Accessibility and responsiveness of the administration (University, school, faculty, department)	128 (92,1%)	11 (7,9%)	0 (0,00%)	0 (0,00%)	0 (0,00%)
4. Availability of academic advising	128 (92,1%)	11 (7,9%)	0 (0,00%)	0 (0,00%)	0 (0,00%)
5. Support with educational materials during the learning process	126 (90,6%)	13 (9,4%)	0 (0,00%)	0 (0,00%)	0 (0,00%)
6. Availability of counseling on personal issues	122 (87,8%)	16 (11,5%)	0 (0,00%)	0 (0,00%)	0 (0,00%)
7. Student-teacher relationships	128 (92,1%)	11 (7,9%)	0 (0,00%)	0 (0,00%)	0 (0,00%)
8. Activities of the educational institution's financial and administrative services	122 (87,8%)	16 (11,5%)	1 (0,7%)	0 (0,00%)	0 (0,00%)

9. Availability of healthcare services	117 (84,2%)	21 (15,1%)	0 (0,00%)	0 (0,00%)	1 (0,7%)
10. Quality of healthcare services at the University	117 (84,2%)	19 (13,7%)	0 (0,00%)	0 (0,00%)	3 (2,2%)
11. Availability of library resources	130 (93,5%)	9 (6,5%)	0 (0,00%)	0 (0,00%)	0 (0,00%)
12. Quality of services provided in libraries and reading rooms	129 (92,8%)	10 (7,2%)	0 (0,00%)	0 (0,00%)	0 (0,00%)
13. Existing educational resources at the University	127 (91,4%)	12 (8,6%)	0 (0,00%)	0 (0,00%)	0 (0,00%)
14. Availability of computer labs	122 (87,8%)	13 (9,4%)	1 (0,7%)	2 (1,4%)	1 (0,7%)
15. Availability and quality of internet resources	114 (82%)	18 (12,9%)	5 (3,6%)	1 (0,7%)	1 (0,7%)
16. Content and informational content of the website of educational organizations in general and faculties (schools) in particular	127 (91,4%)	11 (7,9%)	1 (0,7%)	0 (0,00%)	0 (0,00%)
17. Classrooms and auditoriums for large groups	129 (92,8%)	9 (6,5%)	1 (0,7%)	0 (0,00%)	0 (0,00%)
18. Student lounges (if any)	113 (81,3%)	16 (11,5%)	3 (2,2%)	2 (1,4%)	5 (3,6%)
19. Clarity of disciplinary procedures	124 (89,2%)	12 (8,6%)	2 (1,4%)	0 (0,00%)	1 (0,7%)
20. Overall quality of the educational program	126 (90,6%)	13 (9,4%)	0 (0,00%)	0 (0,00%)	0 (0,00%)
21. Quality of the educational programs in the educational program	127 (91,4%)	12 (8,6%)	0 (0,00%)	0 (0,00%)	0 (0,00%)
22. Teaching methods in general	125 (89,9%)	13 (9,4%)	1 (0,7%)	0 (0,00%)	0 (0,00%)
23. Responsiveness to feedback from faculty on educational process issues	125 (89,9%)	11 (10,1%)	0 (0,00%)	0 (0,00%)	0 (0,00%)
24. Overall quality of teaching	127 (91,4%)	12 (8,6%)	0 (0,00%)	0 (0,00%)	0 (0,00%)
25. Academic workload/requirements for students	123 (88,5%)	15 (10,8%)	1 (0,7%)	0 (0,00%)	0 (0,00%)
26. Faculty requirements for students	120 (86,3%)	17 (12,2%)	1 (0,7%)	0 (0,00%)	1 (0,7%)
27. Information support and explanation of admission rules and strategies for the educational program (specialty) before admission to the University	125 (89,9%)	12 (8,6%)	1 (0,7%)	0 (0,00%)	1 (0,7%)
28. Information on the requirements for successfully completing a given educational program (specialty)	128 (92,1%)	10 (7,2%)	0 (0,00%)	0 (0,00%)	1 (0,7%)
29. Quality of examination materials (tests and examination questions, etc.)	129 (92,8%)	10 (7,2%)	0 (0,00%)	0 (0,00%)	0 (0,00%)
30. Objectivity of assessment of knowledge, skills, and other academic achievements	128 (92,1%)	11 (7,9%)	0 (0,00%)	0 (0,00%)	0 (0,00%)
31. Available computer labs	119	17	3	0	0

	(85,6%)	(12,2%)	(2,2%)	(0,00%)	(0,00%)
32. Available research laboratories	119 (85,6%)	18 (12,9%)	0 (0,00%)	1 (0,7%)	1 (0,7%)
33. Objectivity and fairness of faculty	124 (89,2%)	15 (10,8%)	0 (0,00%)	0 (0,00%)	0 (0,00%)
34. Informing students about courses, educational programs, and the academic degree they will receive	126 (90,6%)	13 (9,4%)	0 (0,00%)	0 (0,00%)	0 (0,00%)
33. Providing students with dormitory accommodation	120 (86,3%)	9 (6,5%)	0 (0,00%)	0 (0,00%)	10 (7,2%)

Rate how much you agree:

Statement	Completely agree	Agree	Partly agree	Do not agree	Completely don't agree	No answer
34. The course syllabus was clearly presented	119 (85,6%)	17 (12,2%)	3 (2,2%)	0 (0,00%)	0 (0,00%)	0 (0,00%)
35. The course content was well structured	117 (84,2%)	19 (13,7%)	3 (2,2%)	0 (0,00%)	0 (0,00%)	0 (0,00%)
36. Key terms were adequately explained	115 (82,7%)	22 (15,8%)	2 (1,4%)	0 (0,00%)	0 (0,00%)	0 (0,00%)
37. The material presented by the instructor is relevant and reflects the latest advances in science and practice	115 (83,5%)	21 (15,1%)	2 (2,4%)	0 (0,00%)	0 (0,00%)	0 (0,00%)
38. The instructor uses effective teaching methods	118 (84,9%)	18 (12,9%)	3 (2,2%)	0 (0,00%)	0 (0,00%)	0 (0,00%)
39. The instructor is proficient in the material being taught	121 (87,1%)	15 (10,8%)	3 (2,2%)	0 (0,00%)	0 (0,00%)	0 (0,00%)
40. The instructor's presentation is clear	117 (84,2%)	19 (13,7%)	3 (2,2%)	0 (0,00%)	0 (0,00%)	0 (0,00%)
41. The instructor presents the material in an interesting manner	118 (84,9%)	15 (10,8%)	6 (4,3%)	0 (0,00%)	0 (0,00%)	0 (0,00%)

42. The assessment of knowledge, skills, and other academic achievements is objective	118 (84,9%)	18 (12,9%)	3 (2,2%)	0 (0,00%)	0 (0,00%)	0 (0,00%)
43. The assessment of student academic achievement is timely	117 (84,2%)	19 (13,7%)	3 (2,2%)	0 (0,00%)	0 (0,00%)	0 (0,00%)
44. The instructor meets your needs and expectations for professional and personal development	116 (83,5%)	20 (14,4%)	3 (2,2%)	0 (0,00%)	0 (0,00%)	0 (0,00%)
45. The instructor encourages student participation	114 (82%)	22 (15,8%)	3 (2,2%)	0 (0,00%)	0 (0,00%)	0 (0,00%)
46. The instructor stimulates students' creative thinking.	115 (82,7%)	16 (11,5%)	8 (5,8%)	0 (0,00%)	0 (0,00%)	0 (0,00%)
47. 34. The instructor's appearance and demeanor are appropriate.	121 (87,1%)	15 (10,8%)	3 (2,2%)	0 (0,00%)	0 (0,00%)	0 (0,00%)
48. The instructor demonstrates a positive attitude toward students.	121 (87,1%)	12 (8,6%)	5 (3,6%)	0 (0,00%)	1 (0,7%)	0 (0,00%)
49. The academic assessment system (seminars, tests, questionnaires, etc.) reflects the course content.	118 (84,9%)	18 (12,9%)	3 (2,2%)	0 (0,00%)	0 (0,00%)	0 (0,00%)
50. The instructor's assessment criteria are clear and accessible.	120 (86,3%)	14 (10,1%)	4 (2,9%)	1 (0,7%)	0 (0,00%)	0 (0,00%)
51. The instructor objectively evaluates students' achievements.	119 (85,6%)	16 (11,5%)	4 (2,9%)	0 (0,00%)	0 (0,00%)	0 (0,00%)
52. The instructor speaks the professional language.	119 (85,6%)	17 (12,2%)	3 (2,2%)	0 (0,00%)	0 (0,00%)	0 (0,00%)
53. The educational organization provides sufficient opportunities for sports and other leisure activities.	118 (84,9%)	17 (12,2%)	4 (2,9%)	0 (0,00%)	0 (0,00%)	0 (0,00%)
54. Student facilities and equipment are safe, comfortable, and modern.	119	17	3 (2,2%)	0	0 (0,00%)	0

	(85,6%)	(12,2%)		(0,00%)		(0,00%)
55. The library is well-equipped and has a sufficient collection of scientific, educational, and methodological literature.	117 (84,2%)	18 (12,9%)	4 (2,9%)	0 (0,00%)	0 (0,00%)	0 (0,00%)
56. All the students are provided with equal opportunities for mastering the educational program and for personal development.	122 (87,8%)	14 (10,1%)	3 (2,2%)	0 (0,00%)	0 (0,00%)	0 (0,00%)

Other problems regarding the teaching quality:

None

Everything is all right

Politech is the best! Prosperity to our University!