



This review method
is ESG-compliant

International Quality Accreditation

New Uzbekistan University

Review Report

June 2026

Contents

About this review	1
Key findings.....	2
Executive summary.....	2
QAA's conclusions about New Uzbekistan University	4
European Standards and Guidelines	4
Good practice.....	4
Recommendations	4
Explanation of the findings about New Uzbekistan University	6
Standard 1.1 Policy for quality assurance	7
Standard 1.2 Design and approval of programmes	9
Standard 1.3 Student-centred learning, teaching and assessment.....	12
Standard 1.4 Student admission, progression, recognition and certification	15
Standard 1.5 Teaching staff.....	18
Standard 1.6 Learning resources and student support.....	20
Standard 1.7 Information management.....	23
Standard 1.8 Public information	25
Standard 1.9 Ongoing monitoring and periodic review of programmes	27
Standard 1.10 Cyclical external quality assurance	29
Glossary	31

About this review

This is a report of an International Quality Accreditation conducted by The Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education (QAA) at New Uzbekistan University. The review took place from 2-4 June 2026 and was conducted by a team of three reviewers, as follows:

- Professor Stephen Doughty
- Dr Harry Williams
- Dr Kikelomo Ladipo (student reviewer).

International Quality Accreditation (IQA) offers institutions outside the UK the opportunity to have a review by the UK's The Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education (QAA). The review benchmarks the institutions' quality assurance processes against international quality assurance standards set out in Part 1 of the [Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area \(ESG\)](#).

In International Quality Accreditation, the QAA review team:

- makes conclusion against each of the 10 standards set out in Part 1 of the ESG
- makes conditions (if relevant)
- makes recommendations
- identifies features of good practice
- comes to an overall conclusion as to whether the institution meets the standards for International Quality Accreditation.

A summary of the findings can be found in the section: [Key findings](#). The section [Explanations of the findings](#) provides the detailed commentary.

The QAA website gives more information [about QAA](#) and its mission. A dedicated section explains the method for [International Quality Accreditation](#) and has links to other informative documents. For an explanation of terms see the [Glossary](#) at the end of this report.

Key findings

Executive summary

New Uzbekistan University (the University) is a state institution located in Tashkent and was founded by presidential decree 5158, made in December 2021 as the country's first public autonomous University. Its mission is to become a national leader in both research and teaching, forming part of Uzbekistan's broader presidential education system and serve as flagship for other universities in the country.

Its vision is set out as follows:

'This University will embody the pinnacle of achievements not only for our republic but also for the entire world. It will serve as a model for all our institutes and universities, being the flagship of our country's higher education system.'

Its mission is set out by the University, who state that 'New Uzbekistan University is committed to integrating advanced research with transformative education to nurture a diverse community of leaders, thinkers, and innovators. Through interdisciplinary collaboration and global partnerships, we empower our students to tackle complex challenges, drive innovation, and make significant contributions to the knowledge economy and society'.

In support of this vision and mission, the University sets out five core values; excellence, impact, integrity, innovation and collaboration with six guiding principles; integration of research and education, global engagement, community engagement, student centred approach, continuous improvement and quality assurance.

The University employs 83 faculty members, all of whom have international experience and 44 of whom are non-Uzbekistanis. These staff deliver 10 undergraduate, 11 postgraduate and 18 doctoral programmes across Schools of Computing, Engineering, Humanities and Natural and Social Science and Management. The University caters for 1,624 students, of whom 1,175 study at undergraduate level, 349 study at masters level and 100 are pursuing doctoral level studies. These students are drawn from applications across the country. All applicants are expected to have achieved English language certification (IELTS or equivalent). Students are eligible for state scholarships and University scholarships, depending on their eligibility and performance at interview.

The University's development is supported by several international partners, including Massachusetts Institute of Technology, for the development of human skills, University of Cambridge for the development of admissions and recruitment of staff and with the Technical University of Munich (TUM), Germany, for the development of technical skills. It has also expanded its network through partnerships established in 2023 and 2024 with institutions such as Nazarbayev University in Kazakhstan and multiple universities in Saxony and Bavaria. In all, the University works with 46 partner universities across 19 countries.

The University works with several international technology companies who have invested in training facilities on campus, including an Apple Authorized Training Centre for Education, a Huawei Information and Communication Technology Academy, and a Yandex Machine Learning School.

The University maintains mobility partnerships with over 30 academic and mobility partners worldwide, including the Hong Kong University of Science and Technology, Peking University in China, Sejong University in Korea and Khalifa University in the United Arab Emirates. This enables the involvement of over 150 students in exchange programmes on

both long-term exchanges (1-2 semesters) and short-term programmes (summer and winter sessions). A joint double-degree program in industrial management (M.Sc.) is offered in cooperation with Hochschule Mittweida.

In line with its responsibilities as national leader in both research and teaching and its mission, the University delivers training for school teachers across Uzbekistan, delivering to 1,400 trainers who then cascade to 20,000 teachers. The University also plans to deliver training for rectors at other presidential universities. The University hosts the Institute for Advanced Studies, which is a research centre focussing on interdisciplinary research, scientific discovery and technological innovation and is directly supported by the President's administration. The research centre maintains a number of global academic and research partnerships including Ocean University of China, Voronezh State University in Russia and the China Spallation Neutron Source.

The University strategy is to expand significantly in the imminent future, with the development of an ambitious new campus in the New Tashkent conurbation being built outside of the current capital and designed to accommodate 10,000 students. This expansion is expected to include the development of 16 new buildings over a 50 hectare site and aims to prioritise knowledge transfer with local, regional and international industries. These new buildings include a library to be sited alongside the new Uzbekistan national library, and a new School of Medicine, developed in collaboration with the University of Freiberg, TUM and the University of Heidelberg and University Hospital Frankfurt, all in Germany. The University has begun recruiting to the new six year undergraduate programme, comprising two years premedical study and four years medical study. The plan is to maintain the current University campus for postgraduate students.

In reaching conclusions about the extent to which the University meets the ESG Standards, the QAA review team followed the evidence-based review procedure as outlined in the handbook for International Quality Review (October 2023). ¹The University provided the review team with a self-evaluation and supporting evidence. During the review visit, which took place on 2-4 June 2026, the review team held a total of eight meetings with the rector, senior management team, academic staff, professional support staff, students, alumni and external stakeholders, the facilitator and a final meeting with the rector and facilitator. The review team also had the opportunity to observe the University's facilities and learning resources, and a demonstration of its data management system.

In summary, the team found two examples of good practice and made recommendations for improvement and enhancement. The recommendations are of a desirable rather than essential nature and are proposed to enable the University to build on existing practice which is operating satisfactorily but which could be improved or enhanced. The team did not set any conditions.

Overall, the team concluded that New Uzbekistan University **meets** all standards for International Quality Accreditation.

¹ The International Quality Review method was renamed during the period of the review and the University transitioned the updated International Quality Accreditation (IQA) method in the latter stages of the review process.

QAA's conclusions about New Uzbekistan University

The QAA review team reached the following conclusions about the higher education provision at New Uzbekistan University.

European Standards and Guidelines

New Uzbekistan University meets all of the 10 ESG Standards and Guidelines.

Good practice

The QAA review team identified the following features of **good practice** at New Uzbekistan University.

- The close working relationship between the University and external partners that enables knowledge exchange (Standard 1.2).
- The University's transparent approach to publishing admissions data that provides detailed information for prospective and current students as well as for graduates, other stakeholders and the public (Standard 1.8).

Recommendations

The QAA review team makes the following **recommendations** to New Uzbekistan University. That the University:

- continues to develop clear, accessible and detailed policies, procedures and structures, along with increased capacity to underpin the core Quality Assurance Framework, in order to embed further a culture of quality as the institution develops (Standard 1.1).
- considers a strategy to deliver formal and scheduled external program reviews using learning data and benchmarks, and comprehensive feedback from all stakeholders, at all stages of the process (Standard 1.2).
- strengthens its assessment process to ensure that students are always provided with detailed, constructive and effective feedback to support their learning, encourage reflection and promote continuous improvement in line with the expectations of the University's Assessment Policy (Standard 1.3).
- develops and implements a plan for the systematic use of data on assessment outcomes and performance-based improvement cycles to more effectively deliver a student-centred approach to learning, teaching and assessment (Standard 1.3).
- makes explicit conditions under which an admissions appeal can be launched in the Admissions Regulations (Standard 1.4).
- further develops its use of data in the proactive monitoring of student progression (Standard 1.4).
- develops formal policies and procedures to ensure continuous professional development and improve pedagogical skills (Standard 1.5).
- develops a formal process for the ongoing checking of public information to ensure clarity, accuracy, objectivity, and accessibility (Standard 1.8).

- further enhances its approach for the periodic review of programmes to ensure that it includes additional local external stakeholders (Standard 1.9).

Explanation of the findings about New Uzbekistan University

This section explains the review findings in more detail.

Terms that may be unfamiliar to some readers have been included in a [brief glossary](#) at the end of this report. A fuller [glossary of terms](#) is available on the QAA website, and formal definitions of certain terms may be found in the operational description and handbook for the [review method](#), also on the QAA website.

Standard 1.1 Policy for quality assurance

Institutions should have a policy for quality assurance that is made public and forms part of their strategic management. Internal stakeholders should develop and implement this policy through appropriate structures and processes, while involving external stakeholders.

Findings

1.1 The strategic management of the University prioritises the integration of research and education, global engagement, community engagement, student centred approach, continuous improvement and quality assurance. As part of this strategic approach, the University has implemented a Framework for Quality Assurance since December 2025 that reflects Academic Council's responsibility for academic standards. The Framework sets out how it establishes and maintains academic standards, assures academic quality, and continuously enhances teaching and learning. To support this, the Framework is formally adopted and made publicly accessible. The review team encountered widespread awareness of the Framework at all levels of the institution's staff and in the students that were spoken to during the review visit.

1.2 The University's Quality Assurance Policy outlines the principles, procedures, and mechanisms that ensure academic and administrative excellence across the University. The stated aim of the policy is to reflect a commitment to continuous enhancement, transparency, accountability, and alignment with international standards in higher education. The Policy applies to all academic and administrative units, including faculties, research centres, student services, and governance structures. The Policy also states the guiding principles of quality assurance at the University based on student-centredness, transparency and accountability, continuous improvement, equity and inclusiveness and alignment with international standards such as those of QAA (UK), ESG (Europe), other international accrediting bodies (for example in business and engineering) and relevant national regulations.

1.3 Within the Quality Assurance Policy, sections cover details on programme development and review; teaching and learning; assessment and academic integrity; research and innovation; administration and support services; feedback and continuous improvement; external QA and accreditation; and includes provision for review and amendments to the policy itself. The review team heard from multiple stakeholders within the University who were aware of and had engaged with the Framework for Quality Assurance, policies and procedures. Overall, the review team was assured that most internal stakeholders were aware of where to locate information and that there was an evolving culture of quality assurance, which the University is encouraged to build and develop further.

1.4 Governance and management structures within the institution facilitate implementation of the Framework. The review team confirmed that effective management and governance structures are in place to support the management and development of quality assurance and enhancement across the institution. Key quality assurance structures are in place to support the development and delivery of quality assurance including the Quality Assurance Office (QAO) responsible for oversight, policy implementation and reporting as well as working with academic departments, committees and other stakeholders.

1.5 The University recognises that quality assurance responsibilities reside at different levels alongside the QAO. For example, academic departments are responsible for programme level quality assurance including curriculum design, assessment practices and student support; boards and committees such as Academic Council provide

governance, review and approval mechanisms; and external stakeholders and accreditation bodies provide independent evaluation to ensure credibility and comparability.

1.6 Documentation provided to the review team stated that there is an Academic Quality Sub-committee of the Academic Council of the University. This sub-committee was also mentioned during meetings, although it became apparent to the review team that, due to the size and scale of the institution, this sub-committee's function was effectively being carried out by inviting QAO staff along to Academic Council meetings and the sub-committee was not meeting formally. The review team acknowledges that while the institution is small scale there is little point in duplicating activity and discussion. However, as the institution grows in size and complexity care needs to be taken to ensure that appropriate structures, reporting, decision making and recording are in place to ensure that the culture of quality assurance develops alongside institutional growth.

1.7 Alongside this, the review team noted that the QAO was effectively being driven by a single committed individual and was doing an excellent job in initiating a new quality assurance framework and associated policies and procedures. However, the review team considered that as the institution develops, then due consideration to capacity within the QAO should be given as well as to the development of governance and structures appropriate to the size of the institution. In order to fully develop an institutional culture of quality assurance and enhance quality further, the capacity and size of QAO is likely to need to increase appropriately. The review team therefore **recommends** that the University continues to develop clear, accessible and detailed policies, procedures and structures, along with increased capacity, to underpin the core Quality Assurance Framework, in order to embed further a culture of quality as the institution develops.

1.8 The review team explored whether there had been significant external stakeholder involvement in the development of the Quality Assurance Framework and policy and learnt that this had come from several sources. Senior leaders had held significant positions within other high-quality institutions within Uzbekistan and had implemented good practice gleaned from those institutions as well as overseas experience. However, significant input was obtained from the University's overseas partners in developing the quality assurance ecosystem and this engagement was ongoing. Hence while the review team did not meet any external stakeholders who were directly involved in developing the framework and policies, the review team was assured by senior leaders and evidence supplied by the University that appropriate externality was involved during development.

1.9 The Quality Assurance Policy is visible to external stakeholders and the public through the University website.

1.10 While the University would benefit from further enhancement and development of its quality assurance systems, especially as the institution increases in size and complexity, the review team concludes that the University has a policy for quality assurance that is made public and forms part of their strategic management. The policy is relatively well implemented and supported by effective structures and processes for monitoring and feedback. Overall, the review team concludes that Standard 1.1, Policy for quality assurance, is **met**.

Standard 1.2 Design and approval of programmes

Institutions should have processes for the design and approval of their programmes. The programmes should be designed so that they meet the objectives set for them, including the intended learning outcomes. The qualification resulting from a programme should be clearly specified and communicated, and refer to the correct level of the national qualifications framework for higher education and, consequently, to the Framework for Qualifications of the European Higher Education Area.

Findings

2.1 The University offers 10 bachelors programmes across four schools/departments, 11 masters programmes across five schools/departments and 18 PhD programmes. The University program development draws on global partnerships for collaboration in teaching, students exchange, and curriculum development. As noted above, the University partners with several universities and each partnership has been developed to align with program aims and student objectives. For example, the BSc Software Engineering program adopts a 60 ECTS/year modular format and is validated by TUM and PhD students conduct research at Nazarbayev University, Kazakhstan or Khalifa University, United Arab Emirates.

2.2 The Decree on Education is the overarching legal framework for all educational procedures in Uzbekistan. The University has processes for the design and approval of their programmes which align with the standards set by the National Quality Assurance Agency for Education (NQAAE). The NQAAE is currently finalising a comprehensive National Quality Assurance Code, which is undergoing approval for all higher education institutions within Uzbekistan. The National Quality Assurance Code will be shared with faculty staff once it is published and incorporated into training Programmes delivered by the University Quality Assurance and Accreditation Department to ensure institutional alignment with national standards.

2.3 Based on the documentation provided, the review team considered that the University has a comprehensive and systematic policy for the design and approval of its academic Programmes. This is underpinned by the Academic Quality Framework (AQF), which requires institutional alignment with international standards such as the QAA benchmarks, UK and European Standards and Guidelines (ESG). Although the University is yet to undergo external program accreditation, the review team saw evidence that the University benchmarks its practices against globally recognised frameworks such as Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB) and the Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology (ABET).

2.4 The Academic Quality Sub-Committee of the Academic Council is an advisory body to the Academic Council. The Sub-Committee is intended to oversee the process of review and approval of Programmes and ensures that it is conducted periodically for all Programmes not just new proposals. However, because of the institution's scale and complexity, the committee's responsibilities were, in practice, being undertaken through the participation of QAO staff at Academic Council meetings, rather than meeting as a distinct body (see section 1.6). Senior staff met by the review team explained that, in addition, the Sub-Committee is intended to share good practice in quality assurance and enhancement that feeds into the University staff development framework.

2.5 The Department of Quality Assurance and Accreditation together with the Academic Council manages the program design and approval process to ensure regular monitoring and revision based on performance data, graduate outcomes, and stakeholder feedback. The University Programmes undergo a multi-stage formal approval process to ensure

academic quality and alignment with institutional standards. Documentation reviewed by the team confirmed that the Head of Department leads the design and development of the curriculum. This includes defining course structure, learning outcomes, and assessment methods. The proposed curriculum is then discussed within the department and further reviewed at the school level, where academic staff and relevant stakeholders provide input and feedback. Thereafter, the Dean of the School submits the curriculum to the Academic Council for review to ensure it meets the University's academic standards and strategic objectives and for subsequent approval. Evidence viewed by the review team, and meetings with staff and students, confirmed that the arrangements for programme design and approval are effective.

2.6 All courses completed at other higher education institutions and intended for transfer are subject to review in accordance with the requirements of the relevant academic programme. Although the review team did not receive an example of the conversion of equivalent modules, which would normally illustrate arrangements for student mobility and programme transparency, the procedure is clearly set out in the Academic Regulations document.

2.7 The approval process considers students' feedback and insights from Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) reports. During the student meeting, the review team heard that students are also able to provide feedback through the student representatives in formal meetings. Issues gathered are discussed at student/staff meetings and improvements are effected, often for the benefit of forthcoming students. Changes are articulated in 'you said we did' posters evident during the team's tour of facilities.

2.8 In addition to gleaning current student feedback, the University is currently in the process of establishing a strategy to ensure that feedback from employer surveys, exit surveys and alumni surveys are used to inform the design of Programmes. This builds on the effective relationships that the University has built with local, regional and international employers. The University have scheduled the first cycle of comprehensive Alumni and Employer surveys for June/July 2026. The data gathered from these sessions will be formally integrated into upcoming internal program review processes to ensure that the curriculum remains aligned with industry needs.

2.9 While the review team was satisfied that the University has effective processes for the design and approval of Programmes, and that data generated by the design and approval process usefully informs internal program review, it recognised that the process could be extended to ensure that data and benchmarks are used to inform future external program reviews. The University has identified the need to establish scheduled external program reviews using learning data and benchmarks but currently has no formal strategy to do so. The review team therefore **recommends** that the University consider a strategy to deliver formal and scheduled external program reviews using learning data and benchmarks, and comprehensive feedback from all stakeholders, at all stages of the process.

2.10 This recommendation recognises the strong relationship that the University has developed and maintained with industry such as the Central Bank of Uzbekistan and partner organisations such as ADM Global Group of Companies. Documentation reviewed by the team confirmed the Central Bank's involvement in the learning experience of the student and hosting of internships. This close working relationship has been achieved through the high quality of student interns from the University, support from University staff for interns, the involvement of staff in developing dialogue with industry and the subsequent involvement of industry in the development of programmes. Students met by the team during the visit spoke of their appreciation of the opportunity to gain vocational experience. Alumni and employers represented at the stakeholders meeting described the strong relationship with the University and how this has positively impacted student skills development, graduate employment and

collaborative activities such as the University/ADM Business Case Competition. The review team recognises as **good practice**, the close working relationship between the University and external partners that enables knowledge exchange.

2.11 Overall, the review team concludes that the University has clear processes for the design and approval of their programmes. The review team therefore concludes that Standard 1.2, Design and approval of Programmes, is **met**.

Standard 1.3 Student-centred learning, teaching and assessment

Institutions should ensure that the programmes are delivered in a way that encourages students to take an active role in creating the learning process, and that the assessment of students reflects this approach.

Findings

3.1 The University employs diverse delivery and assessment strategies, including lectures, tutorials, labs, independent study, projects, and applied case studies to encourage students to take an active role in creating the learning process. The Academic Policies and Procedures document sets out clear norms on exams, integrity, resits, and misconduct procedures. The University is currently updating the Academic Regulations document in accordance with its annual review policy.

3.2 The Teaching and Learning Strategy is integrated into the Academic Quality Framework and the Academic Handbook, focusing on student-centered learning and innovative pedagogical methods. The Academic Policies and Procedures document was developed in accordance with the educational legislation of the Republic of Uzbekistan and defines the academic rights and obligations of the students. Staff met by the review team confirmed that focused training sessions had enabled them to usefully engage with the Teaching and Learning Strategy. This document complements the Programme Handbook, which is clearly communicated to admitted students by the Academic Unit of the University prior to the commencement of their studies enabling students to select pathways suited to their aspirations. It ensures that students, academic staff, non-academic staff, and the management team are aligned in terms of academic and administrative timelines and expectations. Students met by the review team confirmed that they were issued with, and used, the Programme Handbook particularly with reference to rules and policy information.

3.3 The University ensures that all students undergo at least six weeks of internship within or outside of Uzbekistan with partner organisations such as ADM Global Group of Companies and the Central Bank of Uzbekistan. Students maintain contact with the University in this time and a log book is used to track student activities and learning (see the good practice statement in Standard 1.2).

3.4 The University has a student complaint and appeals policy and procedure to ensure that academic results, teaching quality, or assessment decisions are handled transparently and fairly. The policy and procedure demonstrates that provisions are made for students' voices to be heard and that outcomes are documented and communicated within established timelines. Mitigating circumstances are addressed through institutional mechanisms and staff can be proactive in arranging assistance. Students facing health or family-related issues can file for assessment extensions or format adjustments through formal procedures managed by the Exam Committee. Students met by the review team reported that incapacitated students may take exams off campus on approval of the Academic Board. The review team confirmed that students are aware of the complaints and appeals policy and procedure. This can be formally escalated to Academic Affairs for an independent review in alignment with the University quality regulation. Students met by the review team commented that the University provides a supportive environment, and postgraduate students in particular affirmed that supervisors offer strong academic guidance and deliver feedback on their work in a timely manner. All departments conduct six monthly checks on progress of research students and they have access to developmental activities including conference participation.

3.5 The assessment system at the University includes two types of transfer of credit from outside the University. The University sponsored student mobility Programmes and student

initiated study abroad, ensures that formal prior learning is acknowledged and appropriately integrated into student progression to enhance mobility and flexibility within and across contexts. Students can submit credit transfer applications electronically through the University's student portal or via email to the Academic Affairs office. Students may transfer from one programme to another, either within the same department or between different departments or schools within the first and second year of study. No applications for the recognition of prior learning (RPL), had been submitted at the time of the review therefore it was not possible to test how well the credit transfer process worked in practice.

3.6 Examination and coursework are graded in accordance with the University Grading Scheme. Grading is intended to be completed and communicated to the Office of Academic Affairs within two weeks of the examination or assignment deadline or by the deadline specified in the University Academic Calendar, whichever one is sooner. A masters level final project was provided as an example of the University's assessment and feedback process. This document includes 18 pages of the student's submission alongside comments and scores provided by the supervising professor. However, in the view of the review team the feedback was vague, limiting the effectiveness of the feedback in enabling the student to improve in future assessments. The University assessment regulations state that students must receive timely, constructive feedback that guides further improvement, and that academic staff bear responsibility for designing assessments and must provide timely feedback to students. The Academic Quality Policy Programme states that Directors must ensure compliance with the Academic Regulations. The review team therefore **recommends** that the University strengthen its assessment process to ensure that students are always provided with detailed, constructive and effective feedback to support their learning, encourage reflection and promote continuous improvement in line with the expectations of the University's Assessment Policy.

3.7 The ongoing Academic Regulations document specifies that feedback must be provided to students within a set timeframe (typically two weeks). Students are informed of assessment criteria, grading scale and marking rubrics in the course syllabus provided at the start of the semester. The Academic Calendar outlines all the key dates and deadlines for the academic year acting as a roadmap for students, faculty, and staff so that everyone is aware of key dates in the academic calendar. The student workload varies across Programmes due to the specific nature of the discipline. For disciplines such as engineering, a sizeable proportion of the assessment is of a practical nature. The Course Syllabus reviewed by the team provide comprehensive information including course instructors, teaching material, course description, student attendance policy, Course Learning Outcomes (CLOs), assessment instruments and comprehensive instructor review. Course syllabi include the mapping of assessment instruments against the CLOs, to ensure the proper alignment between the assessment used and the level, knowledge and skills appropriate to each outcome.

3.8 The Academic Policies and Procedures document consists of clear expectations, policies and procedures governing student academic misconduct and disciplinary procedures. Penalties for academic misconduct are divided into three categories, in increasing order of severity. Records of disciplinary decisions are shared with relevant University authorities. The ongoing Academic Regulations document specifies, and the Exam Guidebook for Proctors formalises, the arrangements for ensuring exam integrity, proctoring, and multiple assessor mechanisms to mitigate bias and ensure fairness.

3.9 To encourage a student-centred learning and teaching process, the student course evaluation survey takes into consideration students' feedback on both courses and instructors. However, evidence provided by the University suggests that data on assessment outcomes might be gathered more systematically and used in performance-based improvement cycles. This is cited by the University as a potential improvement although no

action plan was evident. The review team **recommends** that the University develops and implements a plan for the systematic use of data on assessment outcomes and performance-based improvement cycles to more effectively deliver a student-centred approach to learning, teaching and assessment.

3.10 The review team saw evidence to show that academic staff are responsible for, and receive support in, developing course syllabi, defining learning outcomes, and delivering lectures and tutorials. Staff met by the review team commented that they participate in the Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) process. This was corroborated in evidence provided by the University. Academic staff met by the review team commented that teaching techniques are monitored through informal peer observations, annual staff evaluations, and student surveys, incorporating student feedback, research output and teaching performance and must align with the Intended Learning Outcomes (ILOs). Whilst academic staff confirmed that there is no systematic process for peer observations, Deans and Heads of Departments periodically observe staff teaching without warning to assess delivery, although this practice is more common for new staff.

3.11 To ensure that curricula is adaptable and student-driven allowing alignment with personal learning goals and career objectives, the curricula allows for elective choices and are reviewed annually to ensure relevance to career goals. Input levels are classified based on the National Qualifications Framework and students must meet specific English proficiency standards (such as IELTS 6.0 for undergraduate provision).

3.12 Overall, the review team concludes that the University ensures that programmes are delivered in a way that encourages students to take an active role in creating the learning process, and that the assessment of students reflects this approach. The review team therefore concludes that Standard 1.3, Student-centred learning, teaching and assessment, is **met**.

Standard 1.4 Student admission, progression, recognition and certification

Institutions should consistently apply pre-defined and published regulations covering all phases of the student "life cycle", e.g. student admission, progression, recognition and certification.

Findings

4.1 Information on the University's higher education offer is available online. This includes information on which programmes are available, course fees, and entry requirements. Policies and procedures relating to student admission, progression, recognition and certification are also available on the website. During the review visit the team heard from students and graduates who confirmed that the information they found online about the University's admissions process was clear, accessible, and helpful.

4.2 The University has approved admissions regulations covering the recruitment, selection, and admission of new students. The admissions process is overseen by the University's Admission Commission, a body chaired by the Rector and first Vice-Rector. A working group under the Admission Commission carries out the actual process of receiving and screening submitted applications.

4.3 Documentation available to the review team demonstrated the admissions process. Prospective students apply to the University using its 'Admission Portal'. Following examination by the admissions working group, successful applicants are invited to a selection exam. Given the distributed nature of applicants, the University runs its selection exam simultaneously in 13 different locations throughout Uzbekistan and applicants who score at least 50% on the selection exam may be recommended for admission. Graduates of Uzbekistan's Presidential Schools can in some cases bypass this selection exam but must still attend an interview with University staff exploring their commitment to the programme and future plans. Where the number of successful applicants exceeds the number of places on a programme, a waitlist is established. Student quotas are imposed by the Uzbekistan Government and vary by programme: for example, the University's Applied Mathematics programme has a cap of 25, whereas the Industrial Management programme has a cap of 50. Generally, the University's programmes are significantly over-subscribed with courses in Economics (Bachelor-level) and TESOL (Master-level) being the most popular. Places are filled according to entrance exam score until the quota is met with offers communicated by email. A demonstration of the system behind the admissions portal, including a walk-through of admissions records, allowed the review team to conclude the University's admissions processes worked effectively and as designed.

4.4 There are minimum English language requirements for the University's programmes, and this is to generally have at least a B2 level of English proficiency according to the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR). Evidence of English language ability must be provided at the time of application and is then verified by the admissions working group.

4.5 All new students are provided with the University Student Handbook and relevant programme-specific information. The review team saw evidence of a comprehensive induction programme for new students, which included introductory talks by the University's professional support services, department presentations, and demonstrations of the University's key systems including the VLE. During the review visit, the team met with students who reflected positively on the induction programme.

4.6 The admissions appeals process is published, and this is outlined in the University's admissions regulations. Applicants may submit an appeal regarding the selection exam results through the admission portal and appeals are considered by the Admissions Committee and the outcome communicated to the applicant. At the time of the review visit, there had been no admissions appeals and therefore it was not possible for the review team to test how well this process worked in practice. However, the review team noted that while the admissions regulations state that applicants can "send an appeal" in relation to their selection exam results, the grounds on which an appeal can be lodged (for example: procedural irregularity or miscalculation of score) are not actually explicit within the regulations. The review team considered that this lack of clarity has the potential to impede transparency and consistency. The review team therefore **recommends** that the University make explicit conditions under which an admissions appeal can be launched in the Admissions Regulations.

4.7 Arrangements are in place for the recognition of prior learning (RPL), and these are referenced in the University's new academic regulations. These clarify that for prior credit to be transferred, a learning agreement specifying the courses and credits is required and must be approved in advance by the student's Head of Department. The maximum number of ECTS credits eligible for recognition varies, although this variation is clearly outlined in the University's new academic regulations. While the review team concluded that the rules and procedure relating to RPL were clear and accessible, at the time of the review visit, no applications for RPL had been submitted and therefore it was not possible to test how well the credit transfer process worked in practice.

4.8 Processes to monitor and support student progression throughout their academic journey are in place including the academic advising system. All new students are assigned a tutor by the Student Affairs Department, whose role is to provide guidance on any academic matters (further details on the range of student support available is provided under section 1.6 below). The review team were informed during the visit that students often seek advice and guidance from teaching staff during posted office hours and students confirmed that they were supported and knew who to contact if they needed additional advice.

4.9 With regards to progression, students must maintain a Cumulative Grade Point Average (CGPA) of 2.0 or higher and complete all mandatory courses to progress into the next year of study. Students failing to progress are provided with additional support by the Academic Affairs Department, who put in place individualised study plans that support the student in question to catch-up. The number of students failing to progress from 2025-26 to 2026-27 was 84, representing around 5% of all bachelor and graduate students enrolled in 2025-26. While students failing to meet year-to-year progression criteria are easily identified at the end of the academic year, academic support staff met by the review team commented that the identification of struggling students within an academic year primarily falls to teaching staff who may, for example, identify a decline in a student's attendance or attainment. The review team considered that the University could use the student data it generates to greater effect to analyse trends in student attendance and attainment throughout the academic year and more proactively identify students at-risk of not progressing into the next year of study, particularly considering the University's significant growth plans. The review team **recommends** the University further develop its use of data in the proactive monitoring of student progression (see also section 1.7 below).

4.10 The University has standard requirements for graduation, and these are captured in their new academic regulations and programme-specific student handbooks. These state that students must have a minimum CGPA of 2.0 in their final semester and have met the credit requirement for their programme. Graduates receive a diploma and transcript of their studies. The review team reviewed a sample of graduation certificates and transcripts at the

bachelor and master's level (at the time of the review, there had been no PhD completions) and concluded that the documentation outlined the qualification gained, including the context, level and status of the studies that were pursued and successfully completed. Interim transcripts can be downloaded by students throughout a student's studies at no cost via the University's VLE.

4.11 Notwithstanding the two recommendations which aim to enhance pre-existing arrangements, the review team concluded that the processes for the admission, progression, graduation and certification of students are aligned with the requirements of this standard. Therefore, the review team concludes that Standard 1.4, Student admission, progression, recognition and certification is **met**.

Standard 1.5 Teaching staff

Institutions should assure themselves of the competence of their teachers. They should apply fair and transparent processes for the recruitment and development of the staff.

Findings

5.1 The University is committed to employing diverse academic staff from a variety of educational and cultural backgrounds who have obtained their degrees from internationally recognised universities.

5.2 Student-to-teacher ratio is determined by national regulations set by the Ministry of Higher Education and is benchmarked against international standards for specific disciplines. The student-to-teacher ratio is currently 20:1 and the University is actively aiming for a ratio of 10:1. The Human Resources (HR) department oversees recruitment and candidate evaluations, ensuring objectivity and compliance with the internal working regulation in collaboration with other authorities, including the deans of the relevant schools and senior faculty members. The review team confirmed that ratios are monitored by the HR department and reported to University management and that teaching loads for academic staff are balanced between instruction and research.

5.3 Documentation provided to the review team and meetings with senior managers outlined the University's approach to recruitment. The regulations on recruitment to academic positions, and the regulation governing competitions for vacant posts, set out a fair and transparent procedure for appointing teaching staff. Candidates are assessed initially by a recruitment office and, at the final stage, by the university management using standardised criteria. Recruitment quotas are reviewed annually by the Supervisory Board so that they align with the University's strategic growth targets. The recruitment process follows a clearly structured, multi-stage procedure.

5.4 The University evaluates the competence and continuous development of its teaching staff through well-established and transparent recruitment, evaluation, and professional growth policies aligned with national regulations and institutional strategies. The Hiring Policy explicitly outlines all institutional requirements and standards for staff. Furthermore, staff performance is monitored through annual reports, documented staff achievements, and a structured appraisal form, all of which contribute to continuous quality improvement. The review team was given a demonstration of the One Desk portal, which is a comprehensive repository of information for administrative, academic and managerial staff. Student support staff met by the review team commented on the system's usefulness in providing up to date information about staff contracts, research activity, career history and professional development activity to help support staff development.

5.5 The University has a long-term strategic development goal to support sustainability in staffing by increasing the proportion of PhD-qualified staff and fostering a diverse, international academic community. As part of its commitment to this sustainability strategy, the review team saw evidence of comprehensive support for relocation and integration, including support with visa documentation, government registration on arrival, accommodation. In addition, international staff are able to access translated policies and procedures in English to ensure that they understand the rules and regulations of the University, a welcome handbook, a welcome induction programme and easy access to the Registrar to promptly resolve any issues that may arise. Retention is supported through competitive salaries and career development opportunities.

5.6 The University Master Plan, outlines the strategic development of infrastructure, academic programmes, research initiatives, recruitment and international partnerships over a 10-year period. A designated Agency, the University and Ministry of Foreign Affairs will be responsible for staff recruitment and international partnerships.

5.7 The University maintains a structured staff development framework through attendance of workshops and conferences. While the review team saw evidence of conferences and workshops attended, there are no requirements for staff to engage with continuous professional development. The University does not currently have a formal policy for staff training and development that applies to either faculty or professional support staff. There is a risk in such an informal approach that staff development opportunities are not spread evenly between and amongst departments. Further, that workshops and conferences staff attend are not appropriately aligned with the University's strategic aims. A more joined-up approach to staff development would mitigate these risks significantly. The review team therefore **recommends** that the University develops formal policies and procedures to ensure continuous professional development and improvement of pedagogical skills.

5.8 The Regulations on the Innovation and Research Committee defines the procedure for conducting innovation and research activities at the University. The University has internal research grants and organises training sessions on research methodology and publication in a bid to promote scholarly activities within the University community. University students are recruited as research assistants, teaching assistants or course assistants in order to involve them in research labs and co-authored publications. During the review visit, academic staff discussed the opportunities for cross level involvement of students in research projects with capacity to link with coursework. Students are encouraged to publish articles and are part of the bi-weekly research presentation organised by professors in active research. The students met by the team also reflected on how the University promotes research through the research club, communicates research opportunities to students and encourages students to present at conferences for valuable feedback from international attendees ensuring professional growth.

5.9 Overall, the review team concludes that the University assure themselves of the competence of their staff and they apply fair and transparent processes for the recruitment of the staff. The review team therefore concludes that Standard 1.5, Teaching staff, is **met**.

Standard 1.6 Learning resources and student support

Institutions should have appropriate funding for learning and teaching activities and ensure that adequate and readily accessible learning resources and student support are provided.

Findings

6.1 The University has a wide range of physical and online teaching and learning resources that support and enable students to achieve both academically and professionally. Classrooms and seminar rooms allow for the delivery of in-person teaching. All teaching is conducted on campus and there is currently no remote teaching outside of emergency situations, such as, during extreme weather events. The University also provides specialist facilities that support the practical delivery of the University's more technically demanding courses. For example, the chemistry, physics, and mechatronics lab facilities are used in the delivery of the chemical and materials engineering programme. The review team undertook a tour of the University's teaching and learning facilities during the review visit and considered them to be well-maintained, equipped with standard equipment and an asset to the University.

6.2 Research activities at the University are organised under the banner of the Tashkent Institute for Advanced Studies (TIAS) and covers a range of topics from bioinformatics to materials science. While TIAS labs and facilities are largely used for the purposes of research, they can also be used for small group teaching and student projects. The review team toured a small number of these primarily research labs, including the Materials Science, Laser, and Nanotechnology lab and the computing cluster, and considered them a positive addition to the learning environment at the University.

6.3 The University's library serves as the central repository for textbooks, online articles, eBooks and other online material. The review team undertook a tour of the University library as part of a wider campus tour and concluded that the facilities were well-established and the library staff welcoming. Separately, during the review visit, the team met with students and student representatives who reflected on their experience of using the University's teaching and learning facilities, including the library, and commented positively on their experience. Overall, the review team concluded that the University's library facilities, including the University's online learning resources, were high-quality and staffed appropriately.

6.4 The University is currently located at a temporary location in Tashkent while a new campus to support the University's strategic aim to significantly expand is constructed in New Tashkent. It is expected that construction of the new campus will complete over several phases, with the first areas being usable from late 2026. Contingency plans are in place if construction works delay the University moving to the new campus. Once complete, the new campus will include a total of 16 new buildings, representing around 450,000 m². Alongside dedicated new buildings for the Schools of Engineering, Natural Sciences, Management, Digital Technologies, Medicine, and Agrotechnology, the University plans to build new student dormitories, a sports complex, and a medical centre with clinics that will be used in the delivery of a planned Bachelor of Medicine programme. The new University campus will be surrounded by important local and national infrastructure, which is also re-locating to the New Tashkent site. Examples include the National Library of Uzbekistan, and several national government ministries, who will re-locate their headquarters to the New Tashkent site. In theory, this will allow the already close links between the University and government to grow further. In terms of campus operation, during the visit, the review team heard that the University currently envisages running its bachelor provision primarily from the new campus, while its postgraduate provision will continue to be delivered at the

University's current campus. Buses will shuttle staff and students between the two sites during the transition period (2026-2030) until local transport infrastructure is in place. While plans for the new campus are substantial and clearly represent a significant investment, the new campus remains under construction, and no University operations are currently sited in New Tashkent. The review team's conclusions therefore focus on the University's current infrastructure at its site in Tashkent. It will be for future quality activities to explore the actual impact of the new campus on the University's operation.

6.5 The VLE allows students to review their timetable for study, retrieve and review course content, submit assessments, and participate in discussions with faculty and other students. An induction to the VLE, alongside the University's other key systems, is provided as part of the orientation week that is delivered at the start of each academic year by professional support staff. New staff and faculty are similarly provided with support and guidance for navigating the University's systems. A central repository of tutorials and videos explaining how to perform important tasks such as uploading student marks, is also available. Students and student representatives reflected positively on their experiences of the University's comprehensive induction process. During the review visit, the team was provided with a guided tour of the University's key systems, including the Admissions Portal, Executive Decision Control Platform, and VLE, which the team considered to be useful resources for both students and staff.

6.6 Upon enrolment, students are assigned an advisor based in the Academic Affairs Department, whose full-time role it is to be an ongoing source of advice for students in relation to their academic performance. At the time of the review visit, the University employed seven tutors to support students who are currently enrolled meaning that each academic advisor is responsible for around 120-150 students. As the University grows, the review team was informed that there will be further investment in additional tutors to support planned student numbers. Many students also seek guidance from teaching staff and faculty as to potential career paths.

6.7 The University's Career Centre is responsible for supporting students and graduates into work. This is achieved by organising workshops and training for students focusing on non-academic skills, CV editing, and mock interviews. Companies are also invited to give guest lectures and meet staff and students. Additionally, the Career Centre organises career fairs with a view to matching students and graduates with suitable companies. All students at the University are required to complete a certain number of hours in a placement setting in order to graduate from their programme and the matching of students to companies is done by the Career Centre. For those looking for full-time work as their programme comes to an end, companies advertise open positions directly with the Career Centre allowing students and graduates to apply for positions as their programme comes to an end. The review team considered this support offered to students and graduates sufficient for the shape and size of the University at this time.

6.8 At the time of the review, the University employed a total of 171 professional support staff: 128 administrative staff (100.5 FTE) and 43 technical staff (35.75 FTE). This includes lab instructors, supervisors, and technical staff who support the delivery of the University's curriculum. During the visit, the review team met with students and student representatives who reflected positively on the support available both inside the classroom, from technical staff, and outside the classroom, from administrative staff. Although there was evidence of professional support staff undertaking training, the University does not currently have a formal policy for staff development nor a formal staff training policy that covers teaching staff (see recommendation in Standard 1.5).

6.9 The review team concluded that the University has appropriate funding for learning and teaching activities. Therefore, the review team concludes that Standard 1.6, Learning resources and student support, is **met**.

Standard 1.7 Information management

Institutions should ensure that they collect, analyse and use relevant information for the effective management of their programmes and other activities.

Findings

7.1 The University collects and uses a variety of data across the student lifecycle and demonstrated to the review team that they had effective systems for managing and analysing data.

7.2 At the applicant stage, data is held and managed in relation to the profile of the student applicant pool, including gender, demographic information and financial/scholarship status. The review team confirmed that data is analysed appropriately to ensure fairness in the application cycle and was shown data dashboards that included breakdown analyses of applicants allowing effective cohort management from different 'pools' of applicants across different recruitment routes (e.g. via examination, scholarship, direct entrant, etc). Hence the review team was confident that the University has effective systems for managing data at the application stage for its programmes.

7.3 The review team was provided with evidence of an extensive review of admissions data from 2023 and 2024 conducted by the University. In addition, the broad use of dashboards within the systems was presented to the review team as a useful approach to identifying trends and developments. This analysis of admissions data appeared to be effective practice, and the University would be encouraged to continue in the analysis of admissions data and trends in order to best support incoming students. In addition, the review team noted the accessibility of admissions data provided by the University (see section 1.8).

7.4 The review team was informed of multiple ways in which the student voice could be heard and responded to on both academic and broader student experience matters. Course surveys were clearly major points of data collection, and the review team saw evidence of appropriate analysis, use and feedback of outcomes from the collection of this data. In addition to the formal data collection routes, the review team was also informed that a 'Reach out to the Rector' form was available for students to book a meeting with the Rector. Students met by the review team reported that they found the Rector and other senior staff accessible if required. The University conducts student surveys on a regular basis, consisting of two surveys per semester: a Lecture Evaluation and a Course Evaluation. Evidence of analysis being undertaken of the results of these surveys was provided to the review team. While some response rates were low (single digit responses across some subjects) there were clear attempts at a reflective analysis by the Quality Assurance and Accreditation Department.

7.5 The University has an effective student management system which was demonstrated to the review team which held appropriate data on the student population. The University reported to the review team that retention data was reviewed by the Registrar's Office and tutors. It was stated that interventions are implemented for students at risk. The student management system demonstration showed inclusion of flags where students' attendance was falling or reaching critical levels, although the review team was not convinced that identification of 'at risk' students in-year was fully effective within current processes and considered that the University could use the student data that it generates to greater effect (see recommendation under Standard 1.4 Student admission, progression, recognition and certification).

7.6 Staff feedback is obtained through a Faculty Survey to gather feedback on the challenges faced by staff and to identify areas for continuous improvement. Evidence was provided that analysis is undertaken on results and outcomes circulated. These also included evidence of a reflective approach and staff reported to the review team that the process was used effectively.

7.7 The review team concluded that the University ensures that they collect, analyse and use relevant information for the effective management of their programmes and other activities. Accordingly, the review team concludes that Standard 1.7, Information Management, is **met**.

Standard 1.8 Public information

Institutions should publish information about their activities, including programmes, which is clear, accurate, objective, up-to date and readily accessible.

Findings

8.1 The University is committed to publishing information about its activities that is clear, accurate, objective, up-to-date, and readily accessible. Information about the University's higher education offer is available primarily via its website and social media channels. The University participates in school visits, exhibitions, and career fairs to enhance their visibility and connect directly with external stakeholders.

8.2 The Department of Media Relations is responsible for the University's branding, marketing, and channels, coordinating with internal stakeholders in particular to develop and update content, manage social media accounts and, as far as possible, ensure consistent institutional messaging.

8.3 Prospective students, the public, and other external stakeholders can find information on the University's strategies and policies online. Key policies relating to the student academic experience, including the University's admissions regulations and current academic regulations are also available online. Study plans for each of the University's undergraduate and graduate programmes are available via dedicated course pages. The review team reviewed a sample of pages on the University's main website and found them to be accessible and the information accurate. During this sampling process, the review team noted the University publishes a large amount of live data, particularly in relation to admissions. This includes the number of applications for each programme, the student quota, the number of studentships awarded/available and other metrics. Data can be presented in various ways, for example by programme or school, according to user preference. In this way, the University takes a radically transparent approach to the admissions process that is above and beyond other higher education institutions in the country and region. For this reason, the review team recognises as **good practice** the University's transparent approach to publishing admissions data that provides detailed information for prospective and current students as well as for graduates, other stakeholders and the public.

8.4 There are processes by which the University ensures the ongoing accuracy and currency of published information. Historically, this has been a relatively informal process where concerned departments meet with the Department of Media Relations to check published information remains up to date, usually in advance of the application period. The review team saw evidence to confirm that these conversations took place but considered a more formal approach should be considered going forward. Senior staff relayed their aspirations to establish a more robust process for checking the ongoing accuracy of published information, as part of the wider implementation of the University's new Quality Assurance Framework. However, as this project is still very much at the conceptualisation stage, the review team **recommends** that the University develops a formal process for the ongoing checking of public information to ensure clarity, accuracy, objectivity, and accessibility.

8.5 Following enrolment, students are provided with the University's academic calendar, student handbook, and programme-specific handbook. Students can access information relating to University services, including information on student support and counselling, via the University website. Information on these auxiliary services is also available via the VLE.

8.6 On completion of their programme, verified transcripts and certificates are made available to students via the Registrar's Office and Academic Affairs Department (see section Standard 1 for further information). Interim transcripts can be downloaded throughout a student's studies via the University's VLE.

8.7 Overall, the review team concluded that the University publishes information about their activities, including programmes of study, that is clear, accurate, objective, up-to-date and readily accessible. Therefore, the review team concludes that Standard 1.8, Public information, is **met**.

Standard 1.9 Ongoing monitoring and periodic review of programmes

Institutions should monitor and periodically review their programmes to ensure that they achieve the objectives set for them and respond to the needs of students and society. These reviews should lead to continuous improvement of the programme. Any action planned or taken as a result should be communicated to all those concerned.

Findings

9.1 The University sets out its policies and procedures for the monitoring and periodic review of programmes within their recently implemented Quality Assurance Framework. The review team confirmed that staff across both academic and professional support services were aware of these policies and procedures and received examples of how their implementation led to continuous improvement of the programmes.

9.2 The approach to annual monitoring and periodic review includes a process of annual programme monitoring that considers inputs such as assessment outcomes, student and lecturer feedback, student workloads and other factors.

9.3 Course evaluation surveys are completed annually by students and feed in to the annual programme monitoring process. These are also analysed more broadly at an institutional level. Student evaluations of teaching (SETs) relating to individual teaching staff are collected and feed into improvement plans alongside course evaluation surveys. The review team met with students who confirmed that these were used in feedback.

9.4 The University's Academic Regulations also stipulate that monitoring and review of courses should include input from student evaluations and feedback; moderator's checklist for the exams; achievement of learning outcomes; and alignment with programme requirements. Documentation seen by the review team confirmed that programme reviews include analysis of student performance and progression data; feedback from students, alumni, employers, and external examiners; benchmarking against comparable national and international programmes; and assessment of resources, staffing, and facilities. Hence additional data points are also used in the monitoring process.

9.5 Programme modifications arising within or out with the programme monitoring process are regulated through appropriate regulations and processes and require appropriate sign-off by the Dean and the relevant committee chair depending upon whether the changes are classed as major or minor. Minor changes are approved at school level with notification to the Academic Council whilst major modifications require Academic Council approval. The University regulations state that 'all modifications must maintain consistency with international standards and accreditation framework'. The review team encountered broad awareness of these processes and staff could articulate the processes for programme monitoring, review and modification.

9.6 Learning outcomes and competencies are also reviewed regularly as part of programme review and quality assurance processes based on feedback from student, employers and staff. Continuous Quality Improvement Reports (CQIR) for courses include feedback from course instructors and reflections, including recommendations for improvement.

9.7 All Programmes at the University are subject to cyclical review during years 3-5 of delivery. Due to the maturity of the institution no cyclical review has yet occurred. These cyclical programme reviews are planned to incorporate student feedback, graduate outcomes, and employer input according to the Academic Quality Policy. The first cycle of interim reviews is scheduled for 2026-27 although the review team did learn that a preliminary internal review of one School had already taken place with some external input from international partners of the University. This activity was undertaken as part of a separate exercise to the formal cyclical review process.

9.8 The review team noted that there was limited externality formalised within the policies for monitoring and periodic review of programmes. It was not clear from the documentation reviewed that there was a formal expectation to engage with external stakeholders (employers, alumni, accrediting bodies) in providing and analysing information and planning follow-up activities in the programme monitoring and reviews. While University partners, such as TUM, had evidently been involved in programme design, and the institution clearly hoped to maintain these and develop further partnerships, the lack of formalised external input into programme review was a potential weakness within the institution's quality processes. The University would hence benefit from formalising a strategy for ensuring that international and Uzbek externality feeds into all cyclical programme review, building on the progress of having external input into initial programme design and the University's future plans for potentially expanding external professional body accreditation. The review team **recommends** that the University further enhances its approach for the periodic review of programmes to ensure that it includes additional local external stakeholders. This is explored further under section 1.2 Design and approval of programmes and section 1.10 Cyclical review.

9.9 Notwithstanding the recommendation, the review team concluded that the University monitors and periodically reviews their programmes to ensure that they achieve the objectives set for them and responds to the needs of students and society. The review team therefore concludes that Standard 1.9, Ongoing monitoring and periodic review of programmes, is **met**.

Standard 1.10 Cyclical external quality assurance

Institutions should undergo external quality assurance in line with the ESG on a cyclical basis.

Findings

10.1 The institution is not required to undertake external cyclical review as a national regulatory requirement. The University's Quality Assurance Framework makes specific reference to the University engaging with 'recognised national and international accreditation agencies' and undergoing 'external audits and reviews as part of accountability measures'.

10.2 The review team was informed that programme approval mechanisms included submission of initial programme documentation to the NQAAE within Uzbekistan. Hence some national external quality assurance was evident at the programme level. The review team was further informed that while most universities within Uzbekistan would undergo cyclical programme accreditation/review by NQAAE, a number were exempt from this requirement, usually by virtue of details included within specific Presidential Decrees of Uzbekistan. In the case of the University this requirement could be mitigated if the institution obtains international quality assurance benchmarks such as QAA's IQA institutional accreditation.

10.3 The University is currently exploring obtaining international programme-level accreditation from external agencies such as ABET and AMBA. While these are currently exploratory activities, and the institution and programmes are not yet at a maturity to undergo complete accreditation cycles with these organisations, the review team noted the intention of the University to seek this and further accreditation. The University's Programme Proposal form includes a section to note Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Body (PSRB) requirements when developing new programmes confirming this aspiration. The review team understood that such accreditation would replace the cyclical periodic NQAAE programme-level review. The review team encourages the University to continue to develop this activity along with PSRB/Ministry oversight of programmes in new areas such as medicine that are currently under development.

10.4 The University clearly recognised the value of PSRB oversight and external accreditation at the programme level as also providing quality assurance at the school and institutional level. It was articulated to the review team that an institutional strategy of moving towards greater external programme accreditations would also enhance a quality culture across the institution through development of best practice. The review team recognised that this would initially be coordinated through the Quality Assurance Office and hence capacity should be closely monitored. This is explored more fully under section 1.1 Policy for quality assurance.

10.5 While the University does not have a formal requirement to undertake external cyclical review as a national regulatory requirement it has sought to embed this activity within its strategic priorities as outlined earlier, and through engagement with agencies such as QAA.

10.6 The review team recognised that the University has not reached a level of maturity where it is able to make use of any review reports from cyclical external quality assurance to inform internal quality assurance and enhancement, as these have not happened. Indeed, this QAA IQA process is the first step in the University's cyclical review process. However the review team heard from senior level institutional leadership that this institutional commitment to cyclical international/external review was embedded and dictated within the Presidential Decree for the establishment of the University.

10.7 The review team concluded that the University has demonstrated a commitment to undergo external quality assurance in line with the ESG on a cyclical basis and therefore that Standard 1.10, Cyclical external quality assurance, is **met**.

Glossary

Action plan

A plan developed by the institution after the QAA review report has been published, which is signed off by the head of the institution. It responds to the recommendations in the report and gives any plans to capitalise on the identified good practice.

Annual monitoring

Checking a process or activity every year to see whether it meets expectations for standards and quality. Annual reports normally include information about student achievements and may comment on the evaluation of courses and modules.

Collaborative arrangement

A formal arrangement between a degree-awarding body and another higher education provider. These may be degree-awarding bodies with which the institution collaborates to deliver higher education qualifications on behalf of the degree-awarding bodies. Alternatively, they may be other delivery organisations who deliver part or all of a proportion of the institution's higher education programmes.

Condition

Conditions set out action that is required. Conditions are only used with unsatisfactory judgements where the quality cannot be approved. Conditions may be used where quality or standards are at risk/continuing risk if action is not taken or if a required standard is not met and action is needed for it to be met.

Degree-awarding body

Institutions that have authority, for example from a national agency, to issue their own awards. Institutions applying to IQA may be degree-awarding bodies themselves, or may collaborate to deliver higher education qualifications on behalf of degree-awarding bodies.

Desk-based analysis

An analysis by the review team of evidence, submitted by the institution, that enables the review team to identify its initial findings and subsequently supports the review team as it develops its review findings.

Enhancement

See **quality enhancement**.

European Standards and Guidelines

For details, including the full text on each standard, see www.enqa.eu/index.php/home/esg.

Examples of practice

A list of policies and practices that a review team may use when considering the extent to which an institution meets the standards for review. The examples should be considered as a guide only, in acknowledgment that not all of them will be appropriate for all institutions.

Externality

The use of experts from outside a higher education provider, such as external examiners or external advisers, to assist in quality assurance procedures.

Facilitator

The member of staff identified by the institution to act as the principal point of contact for the QAA officer and who will be available during the review visit, to assist with any questions or requests for additional documentation.

Good practice

A feature of good practice is a process or way of working that, in the view of a QAA review team, makes a particularly positive contribution to the institution's higher education provision.

Lead student representative

An optional voluntary role that is designed to allow students at the institution applying for IQA to play a central part in the organisation of the review.

Oversight

Objective scrutiny, monitoring and quality assurance of educational provision.

Peer reviewers

Members of the review team who make the decisions in relation to the review of the institution. Peer reviewers have experience of managing quality and academic standards in higher education or have recent experience of being a student in higher education.

Periodic review

An internal review of one or more programmes of study, undertaken by institutions periodically (typically once every five years), using nationally agreed reference points, to confirm that the programmes are of an appropriate academic standard and quality. The process typically involves experts from other higher education providers. It covers areas such as the continuing relevance of the programme, the currency of the curriculum and reference materials, the employability of graduates and the overall performance of students. Periodic review is one of the main processes whereby institutions can continue to assure themselves about the academic quality and standards of their awards.

Programme of study

An approved course of study that provides a coherent learning experience and normally leads to a qualification. UK higher education programmes must be approved and validated by UK degree-awarding bodies.

Quality enhancement

The process by which higher education providers systematically improve the quality of provision and the ways in which students' learning is supported.

QAA officer

The person appointed by QAA to manage the review programme and to act as the liaison between the review team and the institution.

Quality assurance

The systematic monitoring and evaluation of learning and teaching, and the processes that support them, to make sure that the standards of academic awards meet the necessary standards, and that the quality of the student learning experience is being safeguarded and improved.

Recognition of prior learning

Assessing previous learning that has occurred in any of a range of contexts including school, college and University, and/or through life and work experiences.

Recommendation

Review teams make recommendations where they agree that an institution should consider developing or changing a process or a procedure in order to improve the institution's higher education provision.

Reference points

Statements and other publications that establish criteria against which performance can be measured.

Self-evaluation document

A self-evaluation report by an institution. The submission should include information about the institution as well as an assessment of the effectiveness of its quality systems.

Student submission

A document representing student views that describes what it is like to be a student at the institution, and how students' views are considered in the institution's decision-making and quality assurance processes.

Validation

The process by which an institution ensures that its academic programmes meet expected academic standards and that students will be provided with appropriate learning opportunities. It may also be applied to circumstances where a degree-awarding institution gives approval for its awards to be offered by a partner institution or organisation.

QAA3126 - R15002 - August 26

© The Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education 2026
Southgate House, Southgate Street, Gloucester GL1 1UB
Registered charity numbers 1062746 and SC037786

Email: accreditation@gaa.ac.uk
Website: www.gaa.ac.uk