



This review was conducted in compliance with the Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area (ESG)

# International Quality Review

The British University in Egypt

**Review Report**

July 2024

## Contents

<b>About this review</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>Key findings</b> .....	<b>2</b>
Executive summary .....	2
QAA's conclusions about The British University in Egypt .....	4
European Standards and Guidelines .....	4
Conditions .....	4
Good practice .....	4
Recommendations .....	4
<b>Explanation of the findings about The British University in Egypt</b> .....	<b>5</b>
Standard 1.1 Policy for quality assurance .....	6
Standard 1.2 Design and approval of programmes .....	11
Standard 1.3 Student-centred learning, teaching and assessment .....	15
Standard 1.4 Student admission, progression, recognition and certification .....	23
Standard 1.5 Teaching staff .....	26
Standard 1.6 Learning resources and student support .....	29
Standard 1.7 Information management.....	32
Standard 1.8 Public information .....	35
Standard 1.9 Ongoing monitoring and periodic review of programmes .....	37
Standard 1.10 Cyclical external quality assurance .....	39
<b>Glossary</b> .....	<b>41</b>

## About this review

This is a report of an International Quality Review conducted by the Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education (QAA) at The British University in Egypt. The review took place from 8 to 10 July 2024 and was conducted by a team of three reviewers, as follows:

- Professor Youhansen Eid
- Mr Conrad Heyns
- Mr Matthew Adie (student reviewer)

The QAA Officer for this review was Dr Yue Song.

International Quality Review (IQR) offers institutions outside the UK the opportunity to have a review by the UK's Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education (QAA). The review benchmarks the institution's 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 Review, the QAA review team:

- makes conclusions 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 Review.

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 Review](#) 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

The British University in Egypt (BUE, the University) is a private Egyptian university in Cairo, Egypt. Founded in September 2005 through an inter-governmental agreement, it provides a British education style and awards degrees validated by its partner UK universities and the Egyptian Supreme Council of Universities.

The governance structure of the University is overseen by the Board of Trustees, which consists of the University President and Vice-Chancellor, along with distinguished public figures from both Egypt and the UK. As the highest governing body of the University, the Board approves the University's strategy, oversees the governance of the University's operations and establishes the committee structure for day-to-day leadership and management of the University.

The University's Strategy 2023-2028, approved by the University's Board of Trustees in 2023/4, includes three levels of aspirations. On the macro level, the University believes that universities have a societal responsibility to adopt and champion the United Nations' Sustainability Goals (UN SDGs) as the basis of the University being a 'good public institution' anchored in society. As such, the University places the UN SDGs at the heart of its academic pursuit. On the meso level, the University strives to align its activities with the national goals of Egypt's Vision 2030, including its biggest nationwide initiative - Haya Karima (Decent Life). On the micro level, the University is a student-centred University striving to adopt student-centricity across all of its teaching and learning, research and community activities. These three levels of focus are articulated through the University Strategy's six priorities and supported by three enablers:

The University's six strategic priorities are to:

- support the implementation of the UN SDGs
- become a partner in the implementation of Egypt's Vision 2030
- ensure sustained and managed growth across all faculties
- extend partnerships and internationalisation
- develop lifelong learners and well-rounded citizens with outstanding knowledge, skills and abilities
- support an evolving applied research environment with student-centricity at its core.

The University's three enablers are:

- people: empower our people to achieve our core goals, through good governance and organisational culture
- places: an immersive and engaging lifelong campus life
- systems: maintain operational excellence and financial sustainability.

In reaching conclusions about the extent to which The British University in Egypt meets the 10 ESG Standards, the QAA review team followed the evidence-based review procedure as outlined in the Handbook for International Quality Review (October 2023). The University provided the review team with a self-evaluation and supporting evidence. During the review visit, which took place from 8 to 10 July 2024, the review team held a total of seven meetings with the President and Vice-Chancellor, senior management team, academic staff, professional support staff, students, alumni and external stakeholders. The review team also had the opportunity to observe the University's facilities and learning resources.

In summary, the team found four examples of good practice and was able to make five recommendations for improvement/enhancement. The recommendations are of a desirable rather than essential nature and are proposed to enable the University to build on existing practice that is operating satisfactorily but could be improved or enhanced. The team did not set any conditions that the University must satisfy before achieving QAA accreditation.

Overall, the team concluded that The British University in Egypt **meets** all standards for International Quality Review.

## QAA's conclusions about The British University in Egypt

The QAA review team reached the following conclusions about the higher education provision at The British University in Egypt.

### European Standards and Guidelines

The British University in Egypt meets all of the 10 ESG Standards and Guidelines.

### Conditions

The team did not set any conditions.

### Good practice

The QAA review team identified the following features of **good practice** at The British University in Egypt:

- providing students with the opportunity to develop, applying their theoretical learning and gaining practical experience in a real-life context through the use of the University's innovative learning facilities (ESG Standard 1.3)
- the University's Haya Karima Programme, given the clear and demonstrable impact this has had in partnering the University students with the wider Egyptian communities to match those in need with those with the skillset to make a positive difference (ESG Standard 1.3)
- the University's Framework for Performance Management which drives alignment and direction between the individual focus and objectives of staff and the strategic ambitions, objectives and strategies of the University (ESG Standard 1.5)
- adhering to different quality assurance, validation and accreditation standards and managing to mitigate and align to different accreditation standards and requirements of the different UK validating partners, and the National Quality Assurance Agency (NAQAAE) and the Supreme Council of Universities in Egypt (ESCU) (ESG Standard 1.10).

### Recommendations

The QAA review team makes the following **recommendations** for The British University in Egypt:

- develop systematic approaches to developing and reviewing policies, keep tracked records of the review and approval within the documentation, and publish these policies (particularly the QA policy) on the website (ESG Standard 1.1)
- develop systematic and consistent approaches to engage external stakeholders in quality assurance systems across all faculties (ESG Standard 1.1)
- prioritise access to different floors and rooms across all buildings, making sure all facilities and learning resources are easily accessible for students and staff (ESG Standard 1.6)
- develop a systematic approach to gathering information about graduate employability and feedback from external stakeholders (ESG Standard 1.7)
- ensure the consistency of the level of information detail for all postgraduate programmes on the University's website, to improve public accessibility and information transparency (ESG Standard 1.8).

## Explanation of the findings about The British University in Egypt

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 With the nomination of a new University President, The British University in Egypt (the University) established a new governance arrangement, a new Board of Trustees, a new University Court and a new overall University Strategy (2023-2028). This strategy outlines the history and identifies the purposes and future aspirations of the University. The strategy is aligned with the Egypt Vision 2030, strives to promote the Britishness of the University and foster a distinctly British educational ethos. The University aligns with both local community interests and global community goals, embodying the best of British character within an Egyptian context.

1.2 The strategy identifies the goals of the University on three levels. On the macro level, the University places the UN SDGs at the heart of its academic pursuit. Secondly, on the meso level, it aligns its goals with Egypt's Vision 2030 adopting a big role in the Haya Karima initiative. Finally, on the micro level, it strives to adopt the student-centred approach in all its educational endeavours.

1.3 The University developed a resilient flexible governance model with two layers of governance that are represented in a governing board and executives. These two layers help in aligning and complying with Egyptian and UK requirements for quality assurance. To maintain the agility of this governance, the University consults with the UK partners to improve its governance documents and appoints experts who are familiar with the Egyptian context.

1.4 The University strategy also outlines the values of the University that are categorised as 'Fundamental Values, Institutional Values and Behaviour'. The fundamental values are outlined in the strategy as academic freedom, institutional autonomy, integrity and fairness. Academic freedom is widely supported within the institution. The University takes great measures to guard against fraud and maintain the integrity of the institution. The review team verified this during the visit, where no incidents of fraud, academic misconduct, or discrimination were recorded at the University level.

1.5 Furthermore, the University is intent on coaching students on academic integrity. The academic regulations comprise a section on student misconduct that is also formulated in the academic misconduct procedures. This information is conveyed to the students who are coached on academic integrity, 'from both avoidance of penalty and fairness perspectives'. Students are also required to submit a formal written declaration of the authenticity and academic honesty of work submitted for summative assessment.

1.6 The academic regulations and the Academic Misconduct Procedure define misconduct not only as 'cheating, inappropriate behaviour during examinations, gaining assessment advantage by unfair means, fabrication or falsification of data, plagiarism' but also the inappropriate use of 'Generative Artificial Intelligence (AI)' tools. During the meetings of the Vice-Deans for Teaching and Learnings and at the University Teaching and Learning Committee (UTLC), the use of AI is discussed. Furthermore, the University undertook further preventive steps in this regard during the University's 2nd Teaching and Learning Symposium in September 2023 which embraced the theme of 'Education in the Age of Artificial Intelligence'.



1.7 Due to the unique position of the University as a British learning provider in Egypt, the University abides by and aligns with both local Egyptian and UK/International quality standards and regulations. These include The UUK Quality Code (UKQC), Framework for Higher Education Qualifications (FHEQ), Higher Education Credit Framework, Subject Benchmark Statements and UG/PG Characteristics Statements, Programme bylaw regulations of the Egyptian Supreme Council of Universities, Egyptian Ministry of Higher Education (EMoHE), and the Egyptian National Authority for Quality Assurance & Accreditation of Education (NAQAAE).

1.8 The commitment of the University to the quality assurance provision and delivery of its programmes is evident in the pursuit of establishing UK partnerships, validation and revalidation of its programmes and abiding by the legislation and regulations of the Supreme Council of Universities in Egypt (ESCU), in addition to other agreements and Memoranda of Understanding with UK Universities.

1.9 Overall governance of quality and standards sits with the University Council. The Council receives the minutes of the University and Faculty Learning and Teaching Committees (UTLC/FTLC) and the Postgraduate Studies Committee. The University monitors the periodic review of the validation, accreditation and enhancement of its programmes by maintaining an annual cycle outlined in the Academic Calendar and detailed in the QAE Cycle document. This cycle includes an annual review of programmes, UK validating partners' annual/periodic reviews and (re)validation, and accreditation of programmes and faculties by the National Authority for Quality Assurance and Accreditation of Education (NAQAAE). This cycle includes key dates and events throughout the year. The document is presented at the first University Teaching and Learning Committee meeting of the academic year and is updated mid year.

1.10 The University maintains a robust quality assurance system to achieve the balance of complying with both Egyptian and British quality and accreditation procedures. This is reflected in the structure and organisation of two quality systems that are parallel yet integrated to mitigate between the different quality assurance systems at the institution. This structure is composed of the Quality Assurance Office (QAO) and Senior Assistant Registrars (SARs) in each faculty managed by the Deputy Registrar, and are overseen by the Provost, Office of the Provost office, and the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education).

1.11 At the faculty level, the responsibility of quality assurance lies within the internal structure of the faculty itself. Each faculty has a Vice-Dean for Teaching and Learning, Vice-Dean for Research and Postgraduate Studies, Head of Quality, and the support of a Senior Assistant Registrar (SAR), who is responsible for two faculties at a time. Each of these roles supports aspects of quality assurance and enhancement, bearing responsibility for maintaining the high standards of the University's offerings. In addition, quality assurance is formally distributed across a range of directories within the Academic Services, Student Services, and Quality functions. The quality assurance structure is coordinated centrally through formal fortnightly meetings of the Office of the Provost team, with close collaboration among its senior members.

1.12 The University's 'Arabic-speaking Head of Quality and Accreditation' oversees ongoing compliance with ESCU/NAQAAE accreditation requirements, which is executed through Faculty Quality Units. The Quality Unit Specialists collaborate with the Deputy Registrar and Senior Assistant Registrars (SARs) to ensure that ESCU/NAQAAE-related activities align with UKVP quality standards and expectations and liaise with the QA authority nationally (NAQAAE). This collaborative approach fosters mutual respect, enhances understanding, and helps resolve any regulatory divergences unique to the dual award provision. The review team learned that whenever the standards conflicted, the University would align with the most challenging standards to respect both quality standards.

1.13 The University administers its quality assurance systems through several deliberative and decision-making committee structures, engagement with external stakeholders and active involvement of student representatives. There are about four to five committees at the faculty level where regular monthly meetings are held. One such committee where students are represented is the Student Experience Committee (SEC), where students are invited to give their feedback in the review of several policies and regulations.

1.14 The commitment of the University to the quality of its programmes is also realised with the development of a Quality Assurance Policy. This policy details the University's approach to QA, the governance of quality and standards, and aims to ensure a formal, consistent and universal understanding of how the University runs, monitors and assures the quality and standards of its educational provision.

1.15 The Quality Assurance Policy outlines its purpose, scope, and governance. In addition, it allocates the responsibility for its implementation to the Provost and Senior Vice-President (Teaching and Learning) and the Deputy Vice-Chancellor and Vice President for Research and Enterprise. The Quality Assurance Policy, supported by the Quality Assurance Manual, draws together extant information to demonstrate the University's approach to assuring its internal and external stakeholders of the quality of its academic provision and experience at undergraduate and postgraduate levels.

1.16 The Quality Assurance Policy defines different categories of policies that govern academic and supporting activities. In addition, it provides key information on the quality assurance, accreditation, regulatory and validation perspectives of the Egyptian Supreme Council of Universities and the Egyptian National Authority for Quality Assurance and Accreditation of Education, and through the University's UK validating partners. The policy provides detailed information on the annual quality assurance and enhancement cycle. Finally, it provides a list of all related policies and processes that include (but are not limited to): Academic Regulations, Fitness to Practise policy, Fitness to Study policy, Academic Appeals procedures, Assessment Regulations, Design and Review of Examinations, Students Charter, and Early Identification of At-Risk Students. Detailed accounts of these policies and procedures are available in the Quality Manual and the Academic Regulations document.

1.17 Furthermore, the Quality Manual provides comprehensive information on the University's approach to quality. It also provides information about the structure and governance of quality assurance, quality assurance governance committees and responsibilities, the Annual Quality Assurance and Enhancement Cycle, complaints and appeals procedures, and a list of 21 appendices of relevant policies and procedures.

1.18 The review team wanted to check the effectiveness of the policy development, approval, review and deployment. The team held discussions with faculty and senior staff and scrutinised the documents and the evidence supplied by the University. The review team learned that there is a 'Policy of Policies' which explains the process of the development of all policies. The team also learned that there are two governance tracks for approval: one for quality assurance academic-related policies, and one for operational policies such as the Budget Policy.

1.19 The University maintains a rigorous process for the development, review and implementation of its policies and academic regulations to maintain the quality assurance of its programmes. This process is delineated in the 'Policy on Policies' document. The objective of this policy is to establish a standardised policy governance framework for the development, approval, maintenance, management, and publication of policies. This ensures compliance with laws, the adoption of operational efficiencies and best ethical

practices, and the promotion of mission-centred values and objectives through uniform rules, procedures, and guidelines.

1.20 The process of developing an academic policy starts with a main author who will draft the document and then it is circulated informally between the VDTL and Deans. The document is also circulated to solicit comments and feedback from the University community. Then the document is circulated formally after considering any suggestions and feedback to the University Teaching and Learning Committee (UTLC) and the Senate. The policies are then submitted to the University Council for final approval and are published.

1.21 The operational policies follow a different track. For example, the Budget Planning Policy was developed by the internal auditor responsible for policies and circulated to the relevant stakeholders. It should then be approved by the University Vice-Chancellor Board.

1.22 There is no University-wide standard approach to the development and approval of policies as indicated in the 'Policy of Policies'. Some policies have dates and approvals, while others do not have any approval dates and some policies do not have an approval date but have a drafting date and the owner and contact information. Furthermore, there is no consistent format for all policies. There is no clear documentation of the revision process to the policies. In addition, most policies, including the QA Policy, are not published on the website.

1.23 The institution should have an overview of the agenda of reviewing policies on a periodical basis, to ensure the policies are up-to-date and fit for purpose. The review team **recommends** that the University develops systematic approaches to developing and reviewing policies, keeps tracked records of the review and approval within the documentation, and publishes these policies (particularly the QA policy) on the website.

1.24 The University uses the following quality assurance and enhancement indicators as proof of the University-wide 'celebratory whole-institution quality culture': the competency, experience and expertise of the academic staff including those with professional recognition through Higher Education Academy certification; postgraduate qualifications in learning and teaching; and numbers of staff attending and contributing to the University's Teaching and Learning symposia.

1.25 It was clear during the visit that there is a University-wide quality commitment and engagement at all levels of the internal stakeholders. Faculty members, supporting staff and students are aware of their roles and responsibilities, and what is expected from them for each of the different sets of standards. The quality experts, SARs and the QA unit Director guide the faculty members. New faculty are introduced to the quality cycle during the staff orientation and receive enough guidance from the different QA sectors at the University. The annual staff development plan is aligned with the objectives and goals of the University as a whole and hence quality is an integral part of these plans. These plans and goals cascade from the level of the faculty member to the programme, department, faculty and the University as a whole, and hence the dissemination of a strong quality culture.

1.26 The Provost's strategy has been to develop a strong team of senior quality assurance and academic experts who are responsible for the quality assurance and enhancement tasks. In addition, the Provost relies on 'fortnightly scheduled meetings' as part of the capacity building for the team. The University conducts several workshops and training sessions for quality assurance to disseminate the quality culture. Furthermore, the assimilation visits that are conducted by NAQAAE are part of the capacity-building process.

1.27 Members of the supporting staff reflected the same commitment to quality and embracing the culture of quality. Supporting staff are consulted during the development of policies and procedures. In addition, they are also involved in quality assurance-related

activities, particularly during the NAQAAE accreditation visits. They also conduct several surveys to enhance the quality of their services on supporting students' academic, professional and personal development and on the services of the University community.

1.28 Students are encouraged to participate in all activities taking place. The students who attended the meeting with the team were keen on elaborating this concept. They indicated their involvement in committees and events that take place. Student representatives are invited to sit on committees. These students are selected and receive training and workshops to enable them to fully engage in their roles. A standing SEC agenda item has been established to involve student representatives in the cyclical scrutiny, revision, and dissemination of regulatory processes and policies. This engagement is part of the broader practice of involving students, as demonstrated in the review of the Impaired Performance (IP) Policy.

1.29 Student opinions are also periodically solicited in end-of-term module reviews, parts of which are included in the annual reports. Students are also required to give their feedback on their programme. This involvement was also echoed during the meetings with the team where students confirmed the active engagements of students in module evaluation after each semester, the SSLC meetings for each faculty, and the SEC. Another form of soliciting feedback has been the 'You Said, We Did' campaign initiative. However, the students and alumni who attended the meeting with the review team had only heard of the campaign but did not know any details of it.

1.30 The alumni had a variety of responses since there is no Alumni Office at the University. During the visit, the review team learned that the UC has approved the development of the Alumni Office at the institutional level. There are faculty-level alumni engagements such as the Alumni Experience in Engineering where feedback is solicited in an individual manner. However, there is no proof of the systematic approach to alumni feedback, exit interviews or the like.

1.31 Similarly, there is little evidence of systematic external stakeholder involvement in quality assurance. The University ensures that the composition of the University Council and the Faculty Councils appoint approved external members as per Article 40 of The Universities Organisation Law, No 49, 1972. In addition, the School of Engineering appoints an Industry Faculty Liaison Committee. The School of Engineering solicits their feedback periodically. Similarly, the Faculty of Business Administration Economics and Political Science (BAEPS) sought the input of stakeholders in formulating the strategic goals of the faculty and in their graduate attributes.

1.32 There seems to be very little evidence of stakeholder involvement in QA at the institutional level. The review team **recommends** that the University develops systematic and consistent approaches to engaging external stakeholders in quality assurance systems across all faculties.

1.33 In summary, the University has deployed effective governance and management measures to support the development, implementation and ongoing monitoring of policies for quality assurance and enhancement. There is a quality structure within which all internal stakeholders assume responsibility and engage at all levels of the institution. The review team recommends that the University develops systematic approaches to developing and reviewing policies, and keeps track of records of the review and approval within documentation and publishes these policies on the website. The team also recommends that the University develops systematic and consistent approaches to engage external stakeholders in quality assurance systems across all faculties. 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's approach to handling the design and approval of new, and substantive amendments to existing, programmes is documented within its 'Scrutiny and Approval Process for Proposed New Programmes and Substantive Revision of Existing Programmes', which outlines the end-to-end process through which a new programme is taken from concept to delivery. This policy also explains how the roles and responsibilities of different departments within the University are holistically engaged throughout the development and approval process.

2.2 Any proposal for a new programme of study requires the 'Programme Proposer' to complete an evidence-based business case which will demonstrate the alignment of the proposed programme to the objectives and priorities of appropriate institutional and faculty level strategies (for example University and Faculty Strategies and the Teaching, Learning and Student Experience sub-strategy). Such proposals must also include evidence of appropriate market research, undertaken to confirm the potential viability of the programme, should it be approved for launch. The thoughts and perspective of the University's validating partners and relevant Professional, Statutory, and Regulatory Bodies (PSRBs) is included within this research.

2.3 Additionally, an appropriate appraisal of the strategic positioning of the proposed programme within the University's current portfolio and an evaluation of the current resourcing of the department so that it remains adequate to support delivery is required. Also required is evidence that the proposer has informally confirmed the feasibility of a UK validating partner providing validation for the new programme. The review team was presented with evidence of such considerations being documented within the programme proposal forms. The review team was advised by staff who had recently participated within the programme development and approval process that a focus was placed on ensuring proposals were effectively screened against current market trends and needs.

2.4 The University's scrutiny and approval process also documents the formal process through which all programme proposals will be subject to review and approval by appropriate groups and individuals within the University's Governance and Management structure. Each proposal will undergo initial review at faculty level, via the Faculty Learning and Teaching Committee and Faculty Council, before progressing to the Provost and Senior Vice President (Learning and Teaching) at University level. In reviewing each proposal, these parties may opt to progress the proposal to the University Senate for formal approval, reject the proposal, or request amendments to the proposal from the originating faculty.

2.5 Upon receiving approval from University Council, the proposing faculty will be able to commence work with the respective validating partner to build the structure and content of the programme, ensuring its alignment to international standards and benchmarks. The proposer of the programme holds responsibility for preparing the required documentation, which will formally outline the scope and structure of the programme. This documentation is then subject to further internal review and approval by the Provost and Director of Academic

Services, before the proposed programme documentation is formally endorsed by the Provost as chair of the University's Learning and Teaching Committee.

2.6 Programme proposals are then subject to a layer of external approvals, leveraging a validation event with the proposed validating partner to undertake a formal review of the proposal and supporting programme documentation, with the outcome of the validation event shared with the Egyptian Supreme Council for Universities to enable formal verification of the programme. The review team was provided with access to a range of validation materials from across the University's current validating partners. The review team noted that while the style and content of these documents varied relative to each validating partner, there was clear and consistent evidence of a holistic assessment being made as to viability of a given programme and academic rigour of the proposed programme. The documentation resulting from this process was found to be of a high quality, illustrating considered analysis and judgement throughout the validation process.

2.7 The review team noted that the University's 'Scrutiny and Approval' policy, introduced in May 2019, had been designed to provide a common baseline as to the process for handling the development and internal approval of each programme of study; cognisant of the requirement for each proposal to also undergo external validation and accreditation with the relevant validating partner, PSRBs, and national qualification agency (NAQAAE). The review team considered this to be an example of the University seeking to put in practice an appropriate common framework, through which the viability of each programme can be consistently and holistically assessed internally, while adapting to the complexity of managing multiple external regulatory and validation expectations.

2.8 In developing its programmes, the University requires staff to make reference to a range of external reference points at both a local and international level. Such resources can include the Subject Benchmark Statements published by the Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education UK (QAA UK), the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications (FHEQs) Outcome Descriptors, and the National Academic Reference Standards published by the National Authority for Quality Assurance and Accreditation of Education (NAQAAE). This requirement is evidenced through the University's Standard Template for Programme Descriptors which references a requirement to explain how such reference points have been used to inform the design of programme outcomes. The review team was presented with access to a range of programme specifications that exhibited consistent reference being made to an appropriate range of external resources, which contributed to assuring the comparability of the University's programmes with other institutions, nationally and internationally.

2.9 Furthermore, the University notes its commitment to engaging both internal and external stakeholders within its approach to developing and approving its programmes. The review team was advised of a range of mechanisms through which the University was able to seek the views of staff, students, and employers within the development of its programmes, and the opportunities given to staff and students to contribute to the review and approval of such approaches within the University's core governance framework.

2.10 The University operates a range of workshops and training initiatives that enable the University staff to engage with the programme development process, such as through attending relevant workshops and training initiatives that aim to build capacity within staff to take forward the development of new programmes effectively. Staff who met with the review team commented positively as to their experience and involvement within this process, referencing the University's Scrutiny and Approval Policy as providing a clear overview of both the development and approval process. The University staff are also represented within both the Faculty Learning and Teaching Committee and University Senate, enabling them to contribute within the formal review and approval of programme proposals.

2.11 Students also have the opportunity to contribute within this process, with the expectation that they will be involved in both the initial co-design of the programme proposals, such as through participating in brainstorming sessions, as well as the involvement of student representatives in the formal review and approval within the University's committee structure. Notably, the University provides students participating within this process with formal training and support to ensure they can actively and effectively contribute within decision-making.

2.12 The University also seeks external input and expertise on programme proposals to ensure they remain aligned to the changing needs of society and the emerging practices of industry. The review team noted the University's extensive engagement with its validating partners and, where appropriate, the relevant PSRBs in respect of its programmes. Additionally, the review team learned of instances where external examiners had been consulted on specific programme proposals, or where representatives of industry had been surveyed as to the key skillsets required of future graduates. The review team identified that these practices were typically varied across the University, with each faculty opting for different approaches to partnering with industry. In some cases, faculties had established formal Industry Liaison Panels through which a cross-section of industry and employers were appointed to bring expertise to faculty operations.

2.13 The review team learned of the University's intention to move towards a more consistent framework of practices for partnering with industry. The review team considered this to be a positive step; in doing so, the University seeks to review and learn from current best practice across the University's faculties so as to ensure the adoption of a common framework grounded in current best practice.

2.14 Throughout the programme development and approval process, the University uses several pre-formatted documentation templates to assure the production of consistent and detailed programme information and documentation. This includes the preparation of a formal programme specification which is used to document the specific learning objectives/outcomes of the programme, as well as the subject-specific and transferable skills students are expected to develop through studying each programme. The documents also provide a means of referencing the key Subject Benchmark Statements that have been used in the preparation of the programme.

2.15 The programme specification will detail the structure of the academic programme, including the constituent academic modules, their respective credit weighting and the assessment strategies deployed to evaluate student attainment of the outcomes. An appendix is provided within the programme specification which demonstrates the alignment of each programme learning outcome to the QAA Subject Benchmark Statements and their national academic standards.

2.16 Similar specifications are also provided at module level which, although more concise, provide equivalent information as to the level, structure and content of a given module. Also documented within these specifications are the intended learning outcomes of the module and the teaching and learning assessment strategies that are deployed to evaluate attainment. Students who met with the review team indicated an awareness of the learning outcomes of their programme and attested as to the quality of communication provided by the University to help them understand the scope and structure of their studies.

2.17 In addition to its core academic regulations, the University has established a set of bylaws at faculty level, which are formally documented and made available to students. These bylaws are the primary means of documenting and communicating the specific requirements and structure of each programme; for example, specifying the specific credit load, level, structure, and duration of each programme.

2.18 The review team considered there to be effective documentation produced within the programme development and approval process to assure stakeholders, including students, were clear as to the objectives, structure and assessment of a given programme and the qualification that would result from it.

2.19 In summary, the review team found that the University has effective arrangements in place to manage the design and approval of its programmes. These arrangements were underpinned by the recently developed 'Scrutiny and Approval Process for Proposed New Programmes and Substantive Revision of Existing Programmes' Policy, which has established a clear framework for handling the development and internal approval of proposals for new and amended programmes, reflective of the multifaceted regulatory context in which the University operates. As a result of this process, the University evidenced the creation of robust programme-level documentation, which clearly articulated the intended learning outcomes, evidenced how these would be assessed and indicated the alignment of the resultant qualification to the relevant qualification and credit framework. Throughout the process, the review team noted that appropriate use was made of external reference points, student and staff views. The review team learnt that while the voice of employers is included within the programme design proposals, practices underpinning this vary across faculties. The review team recommends the University to evaluate how existing best practices within the University could be leveraged to establish a more effective common approach to the engagement of industry across the University. Overall, the review team 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 notes that its approach to delivering its programmes is centred around 'driving active engagement, application of knowledge through "learning by doing", interactive and collaborative learning that is accessible to all'. The review team noted throughout its visit that the University creatively utilised its learning resources and environment to support this ambition. A range of facilities were available to students depending on their area of study, including:

- a range of onsite general and specialist Dental Clinics capable of treating 1,000 people per day at peak
- a range of simulation labs, enabling nursing students to gain practical experience on both routine and specialist procedures
- Engineering Labs which provided state of the art aerodynamic testing capabilities via the onsite wind turbine.

3.2 During the development and revalidation of any given programme, the University expects staff to clearly identify the opportunities that exist for practical and experiential learning when completing the necessary programme and module specifications.

3.3 This value of the University's focus on giving students the opportunity to apply their theoretical learning within a practical and real-life context was highlighted by a subset of students who met with the review team as a defining factor in their choice to study at the University. The review team recognised this as a feature of **good practice**, noting the extent to which opportunities for practical learning were embedded across the University's faculties and within the curriculum of the programmes offered by the University, such that this had become a clear and defining factor associated with studying at the University relative to other providers.

3.4 Furthermore, the University has embarked on a programme of cooperation with Egypt's Haya Karima Foundation which has enabled its students to not only gain practical experience but to put this to use within the local and national community for humanitarian purposes. This has resulted in the University, its students and staff, being able to support nearly 6,000 individuals across various Egyptian Governates with Dental, Psychiatric, Nursing and Pharmaceutical assistance. The review team learned of the work undertaken by the Dental Convoys to both carry out routine procedures, such as extractions and dental scaling, free of charge in communities where services were not readily available.

3.5 Awareness sessions had also been provided to members of these communities on aspects of dental and physical health, such as the dangers of COVID-19 and the importance of regular dental hygiene. In meeting with students and staff who had participated in these initiatives, the review team noted the value students had gained from their participation, both professionally and personally. The review team therefore considered the University's Haya Karima work to be a feature of **good practice**, given the scale of this work, the positive benefits it had made to both the University and Egyptian communities clearly expressed through the systematic recording of the outcomes achieved and impact felt by this work.

3.6 The University recognises that within Egypt the transition to higher education can be challenging for many students, given the move from largely teacher-centred education to

study that is increasingly self-led. The University seeks to ensure that expectations with regard to student participation and responsibility are communicated and embedded in the way the University delivers its programmes. This includes explaining the total amount of learning time per academic module, as split between directed teaching and independent study. The University's Student Charter also provides further guidance as to the expectations shared across the University, its students, and their Student Union. Students who met with the review team indicated that a range of information had been made available to them prior to commencing their studies, both pre-arrival and during their formal induction programme. This had also included specific coverage of the mutual expectations the University had of its students, and the expectation they could have of the University.

3.7 Where deemed appropriate, the University will make reasonable adjustments and accommodations within the delivery of its programmes to respond to the specific needs and requirements of students. Such changes may be made on an individual basis, or collectively. For example, the University notes a recent change in which its Faculty of Business, Economics and Political Science leveraged the capabilities of the University's digital learning platform to provide students with a blended learning experience during the Holy month of Ramadan on a pre-scheduled basis. The proposal for such a change realised a number of ambitions, both enabling staff to put into practice new contingency teaching plans and providing a positive enhancement to the student experience in response to longstanding student feedback.

3.8 The introduction of adjustments to the learning experience at an individual level is handled via the University's Reasonable Adjustments and Accommodations Policy. The University notes that this policy enables it to ensure all students have the opportunity to demonstrate their academic capabilities, regardless of any disabilities which may otherwise affect them. The policy defines the University's interpretation of disability, as well as the specific conditions in which an application for reasonable accommodation can be made. The responsibility for disclosing a disability sits ultimately with the individual student themselves, although this can be done at either the point of application to the University or at any time during their study via the Student Hub.

3.9 Reasonable accommodations for a given disability may include physical adjustments to how the student participates within learning and teaching activities; amendments to the arrangements for the student undertaking study with the University, such as extended assessment deadlines; or making exceptional arrangements for the conduct of examinations and assessments. The University notes that data on reasonable adjustments is holistically collated for the purposes of monitoring and evaluating.

3.10 Beyond reasonable adjustments, the University has also adopted a policy on suspension of studies that establishes particular criteria under which a student may suspend their studies with the University, up to a maximum of two or three academic years, depending on the specific programme of study. Applications to suspend studies must be supported by acceptable evidence for the relevant Dean and Provost's approval.

3.11 The University makes available to its students a range of centralised support services designed to assist them across all stages of their academic journey. This includes specialist academic services staff who are responsible for providing students with advice and guidance on the University's academic regulations and the associated procedures and processes stemming from these. For pastoral matters, students are able to access Specialist Student Services staff who are capable of supporting students through the impact of physical and mental health challenges. The University also operates a Student Hub which acts as a common front-facing service through which students can access general information and guidance prior to being referred to more specific services.

3.12 Alongside their centralised support services, the University operates a range of additional support mechanisms designed to ensure all students can participate within the learning experience to the best of their abilities. This includes the allocation of a Personal Academic Tutor who is responsible for supporting the retention and progression of their students from induction to graduation. All students are allocated a Personal Academic Tutor within their preparatory year who will act as a source of advice and guidance for students across all matters that may impact the students learning or progression within the University. Personal Academic Tutors are drawn from within the academic staff of the institution. While the Academic Tutor may be involved in pastoral matters, they will have a responsibility to sign and post the student as necessary to the dedicated University Support Services for specialised assistance. The provision of this service is underpinned by the University's Policy on Personal Academic Tutoring which establishes a formal framework for the operation of this service and defines the core expectations of both parties engaging in the service.

3.13 The University uses a range of formative and summative assessment methodologies to assess the performance of its students, as well as their attainment of the relevant programme-level learning outcomes. Students are provided with transparency on how they will be assessed for a given module via the module specification, which outlines the specific assessment methodologies that will be employed and the weighting prescribed to them within the overall grade for the module. Students who met with the review team indicated that the University made clear the focus and objectives of both their academic programme and the constituent modules within this. Students were also clear as to how the assessment methodologies employed in a given programme would be used to assess their attainment of these outcomes. Students noted that information on this could currently be accessed on the virtual learning environment (VLE) and was also communicated by module leaders at the outset of teaching each module.

3.14 The University has established appropriate procedures for handling the design and approval of instruments of assessments, which are reflective of current sector standards. For example, all instruments of assessment are subject to internal moderation both before and after they have been used on a given module, which ensures consistency in the setting and scope of the assessment. The University's commitment to fair and transparent moderation of assessment marking is set out within its academic regulations, as well as in the individual faculty bylaws. Marking moderation will also be undertaken on a minimum sample equating to 10% of the completed examinations scripts for a given module, drawn from across a range of bandings and boundaries. Actions made as a result of moderation will be documented within the module report and submitted to the module examination board for review.

3.15 External examiners are appointed by the University for the purposes of reviewing draft examination scripts and verifying a sample of completed scripts or assessed student work. This additional layer of review provides the University with additional assurance as to the consistency of marking and the broad comparability between their qualifications/assessment and that of other higher education institutions. External examiners who met with the review team expressed confidence in the academic standards of the programmes they were responsible for validating, and satisfaction with the current arrangements for supporting them to carry out their duties.

3.16 The Module Examination Board is responsible for undertaking the final ratification of student performance and recommending the awarding of marks and credit per student to the Programme Examination Board. It is the responsibility of the Programme Examination Board to receive these reports from the Module Examination Board and to ultimately determine the progression of students to further years of study, and to confer the award of a degree or other awards to students in line with the University's regulations.

3.17 The University's policy on impaired performance assists to document the specific grounds on which a claim may be made by a student for recognition of impaired performance in a given assessment. Students are required to submit a claim for impaired performance within two weeks of the circumstances in which their performance was impaired occurred. All claims are routed via a single online form, with the University's IP Panel convening to consider the merits of each claim. This panel has the power to reject or uphold each claim, on a full or partial basis. A student retains the right to appeal the decision of the IP Panel within five working days of receiving the original decision. Such appeals will be considered via the University's main academic appeals policy.

3.18 While the University commits to providing students with feedback on their assessed work, students who met with the review team noted that the specific practices used to provide this feedback could vary considerably between different University faculties and staff members. This variation in practice was illustrated to the review team through the existence of faculty-specific feedback policies.

3.19 The review team noted, however, that students were satisfied with the quality of feedback they received on their assessed work, and that this feedback had supported them to understand both their areas of strength and potential for development in a given assessment. Furthermore, students noted the receptiveness of University staff to providing further explanation of feedback provided on assessment via one-to-one sessions and open-office hours. A selection of feedback was provided to the review team that affirmed this view and demonstrated a clear alignment back to the criteria of the assessment.

3.20 The review team learned from the University that work was underway to establish a common framework and set of expectations with respect to the provision of assessment feedback to students. A draft of this framework was shared with the review team which would establish a target turnaround time of 15 days for the return of feedback to students and would ensure feedback remained aligned to the criteria of the given assessment. The review team found the implementation of this draft framework would be a positive step towards driving greater consistency in practice within the University and was comfortable with the timeline provided by the University for implementation.

3.21 The University has adopted a formalised definition of academic misconduct that encompasses cheating, contract cheating, plagiarism, and undeclared use of generative AI as defined within its academic regulations and the supporting procedure for handling alleged cases of academic misconduct. Locally, there is existing regulation in place via the Egyptian Universities Organising Act which formally defines academic misconduct within Egyptian law.

3.22 Upon submitting assessed work, students are required to formally attest that the work is their own and that they have not knowingly exercised any form of academic misconduct in preparing it prior to submission. This is formally captured via a 'Coursework Submission and Statement of Academic Honesty' form. Students are also required to submit their work via plagiarism-detection software, Turnitin, so as to determine the degree of similarity between their submission and existing academic literature.

3.23 Given the local legal framework concerning academic misconduct within Egypt, the module leader suspecting academic misconduct must immediately inform the University's legal department. A formal investigation will then be undertaken by the module leader and submitted to the Faculty Academic Misconduct Panel who will adjudicate on the case and determine whether full misconduct or poor academic practice has occurred, or whether the case can be dismissed outright.

3.24 Where the student is found to have committed an act of academic misconduct by the Faculty Panel, a penalty may be applied which is commensurate with the seriousness of the

offence. The penalties available to the panel are stipulated within the University's policy and are drawn from the local Egyptian regulations.

3.25 Students will be informed of the allegations made against them, as well as the outcome of the review by the University's Legal Department. Students have the right to submit both a written defence of their actions and to appeal the judgement of the Academic Misconduct Panel. Such cases will be referred to the Supreme Academic Misconduct Panel, whose judgement on each case will be considered final.

3.26 The University provides coaching to its students on the subject of academic integrity to ensure they are aware of what this is, and the penalties associated with committing an offence. Students are able to access additional guidance and support from Student Services and Academic Services.

3.27 The University is committed to the continuous enhancement of its academic provision and services in response to student feedback, with staff encouraged to respond positively to students who provide feedback. The University also commits within its Student Charter to ensure 'students are at the heart of decision making and that their voices are heard'. To enable this, the University currently seeks out feedback from students via a series of channels.

3.28 The University undertakes routine evaluation of its programmes and modules to secure both quantitative and qualitative feedback from the wider student population as to their experience of studying with the University. These evaluations prompt respondents to provide a Likert-style scoring as to their satisfaction across a range of thematic areas: Organisation & Management; Content & Structure; Delivery & Teaching; Learning Support and Resources; Assessment and Feedback; and Support and Community. Questions are also asked around the performance and conduct of individual members of teaching staff within the module.

3.29 Aggregate reporting of the results from module evaluations is provided at programme level to enable Programme Leaders to quickly compare performance across all active modules. These data points were also made available to appropriate staff within the University's Administrative and Professional Services to support enhancement of their service provision. The review team noted that the results from these surveys were fed into the University's annual programme monitoring exercise and the performance evaluation of teaching staff as an appropriate data point for teaching quality.

3.30 The review team was also provided with access to a range of student surveys that had been used by the University to gather student feedback on wider thematic topics, such as campus life and resources, student induction and the teaching and research environment. The review team noted that for each, a comprehensive analysis of results had been prepared by the University to ensure key themes were understood and potential enhancements could be identified.

3.31 Representatives are nominated from within the student population to formally represent the views and feedback of their fellow students to staff. The University strives for a partnership model, where students work with staff to 'share good practice, explore issues, suggest solutions and bring about positive change'. The role and responsibilities of a programme representative is formally documented within the University's Policy on Student Representation, which provides a comprehensive guide as to the expectations and duties of students holding this role, and the procedure through which elections to the role take place.

3.32 Representatives are provided with formalised training and support by the University's Student Hub to prepare them for undertaking this role. A sample of training materials was shared with the review team that illustrated a comprehensive overview as to the role of a

student representative, the expectations as to their conduct, attendance and maintenance of student confidentiality.

3.33 Faculty Student Staff Liaison Committee (SSLC) meetings are used to support collaboration and discussion between academic staff and students on issues pertaining to the quality of the learning experience students are receiving on a particular programme. Committees are expected to meet and comprise representation from across Programme Directors, Academic Advisors, Academic Staff and Registry Staff, as well as formal student representation from each year of the given programme.

3.34 The responsibilities of each member of the SSLC, as well as the expectations as to their organisation and conduct are specified by the University within formal terms of reference. The review team was provided with access to a sample of minutes which illustrated a wide range of discussions occurring between staff and students relative to the committee's remit. Where action is required in response to a given issue discussed at the committee, this is formally documented and tracked.

3.35 The views of students are also represented within further faculty and University-level committees, through the appointment of formal elected student representatives as full members of the University Senate, University Learning and Teaching Committee, and Student Experience Committee. Students who met with the review team demonstrated an awareness of all three mechanisms and were able to share a number of recent examples where feedback provided by them, or their peers, had resulted in meaningful change within the University, this included changes to resource availability, programme design and delivery.

3.36 The University has attempted to better communicate to students how their feedback has informed enhancement of services through semesterly 'You Said, We Did' campaigns in Student Services. Students who met with the review team noted that attempts had been made by the University to communicate the impact of their feedback back to them but did not reference the 'You Said, We Did' campaign specifically. The review team encouraged the University to continue its work within this space, noting the work that was already being undertaken to put feedback into action.

3.37 The University has established a formal policy through which it considers student complaints pertaining to the quality of its service offering, its academic standards or the way in which it has responded, or not responded, to a particular issue.

3.38 The University's approach to handling student complaints comprises a three-stage process, in which the University will initially attempt to achieve an informal resolution of the complaint with the complainant and the respective University area. Where this is not possible, or accepted, then the complaint will undergo formal investigation by a designated member of University staff. The Complaints Policy appropriately specifies the individuals responsible for undertaking review of a complaint, ensuring that they have had no prior involvement with the matter. Additionally, complaints may be sent for a further stage 3 review by a member of the University senior management. While these reviews will not involve a re-investigation of the case, it will ensure the original outcome achieved at stage 2 remains appropriate.

3.39 Throughout the process students are able to access support within the University's Student Support Services. The University has also provided a concise companion guide to its complaints policy for use by students and staff.

3.40 The complaints process notes that data from complaints may be collected to assist with internal reporting and evaluation. The University has confirmed that it intends to undertake institutional reporting of trends in student complaints each academic year but has

refrained thus far from doing so to enable the dataset to mature and provide a more effective longitudinal analysis of trends. A sample of current data has been shared with the review team which, given the low sample size, supported the University's logic in postponing formalised trend reporting until the data has matured further. Overall, the review team found the University to have appropriate procedures in place to deal with students' complaints in a systematic and fair manner, and supported the University's plans to establish systematic reporting of trends from student complaints when this dataset had reached appropriate maturity.

3.41 Similarly, the University has in place a formal policy governing how it will consider appeals against a prior judgement of the University. The University notes within this policy that while a common appeals process is employed by the University, the specific grounds for appeal may differ between those appeals made against the decision of an examination board, versus a decision made by another university panel (such as the Impaired Performance or Academic Misconduct Panel). The University formally documents the specific grounds for appeal throughout the process.

3.42 Students are required to submit their appeal via the University's online platform, clearly stating the specific grounds on which their appeal is made. Upon receiving an appeal request it will be initially considered by the University's Appeal Review Panel. This panel is responsible for performing an initial review of each appeal to verify those that are eligible to progress to the University's Academic Appeals Committee for formal adjudication. The University's Appeal Committee will opt between upholding or rejecting each appeal. Specific actions may stem from these judgements requiring students the ability to re-attempt assessment or for the prior judgement to be overturned and reconsidered. The outcome of the appeals process will be communicated to students within five working days.

3.43 Similar to the University's Complaints Policy, the membership of both the Appeal Review Panel and University Appeals Committee is formally documented within the policy and involves appropriate representation from across the senior officers/management of the University.

3.44 Students who met with the review team demonstrated an awareness of the University's appeals process and identified appropriate scenarios in which they would be likely to, or had, raised an appeal. Students indicated that they were confident in being able to seek out information on both the University's Appeals and Complaints procedures should they need to during their studies.

3.45 In summary, the review team considered the University to have established an effective student-centred approach to delivering its programmes, with appropriate policies in place to enable it to respond to the diversity of its student body and to ensure individual and collective adjustments could be made to the learning experience to support the participation of all. The review team considered the University to have appropriate mechanisms in place to ensure that students' learning was assessed in a fair and transparent manner, with appropriate procedures in place to govern the design and approval of assessment, and the moderation of marks and awards resulting from these. The University has ensured students are advised as to the importance of academic integrity and the consequences associated with committing an offence of academic misconduct. The review team considered the University to have effective processes in place to gather and act upon student feedback, enabling students to play an active role in both creating and enhancing their learning experience and process.

3.46 The review team identified the University's focus on providing students with the opportunity to develop applying their theoretical learning and gain practical experience in a real-life context through the use of the University's innovative learning facilities as a feature

of good practice. The review team also commended the University's Haya Karima Programme as a feature of good practice given the clear and demonstrable impact this has had in partnering the University students with the wider Egyptian communities to match those in need with those with the skillset to make a positive difference.

3.47 Overall, the review team 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', for example student admission, progression, recognition and certification.**

### **Findings**

4.1 Students are recruited and admitted through a systematic selection process managed by the University's four dedicated directorates: Student Recruitment and Partnerships (SR&P), Marketing and Communications (M&C), Student Affairs; and Academic Services. This process aligns with the Egyptian Vision 2030, the ESCU and the Board of Trustees' priorities, and the University's Strategic Plan, ensuring a well coordinated and strategic approach to student enrolment.

4.2 The University operates several outreach and recruitment initiatives with the intent to attract prospective students to the University. Recruitment activities led by SR&P include the running of specific marketing and social media campaigns by the University's Marketing team, attendance at local schools and operating open taster days to provide prospective students with the opportunity to learn more about studying with the University. Faculties prepare competitive metrics for marketing purposes and actively participate in open days, where knowledgeable representatives engage with prospective students and their parents. For example, the Faculty of Art and Design conducts interviews with prospective students using discipline-specific admission criteria and often includes practical tasks as part of the interview process. Student representatives have expressed that these open days are extremely valuable in helping them decide to enrol at the University and in managing their expectations.

4.3 The University recognises its website as a crucial tool in its recruitment efforts. Students confirmed that they visited the website first before attending open days and commended its clarity and accessibility. Recruitment materials are crafted to meet the standards of the University's validating partners and maintain internal consistency, due to the dedicated efforts of the Marketing and Communications team.

4.4 Admission requirements are fully compliant with the regulations established by the Egyptian Council of Private Universities (ECPU) and are linked to the University's Academic Regulations (ARs). These regulations specify that entrants to UK Validating Partner (UKVP) programmes ('dual awards') must also meet any additional requirements stipulated by the respective UKVP. Undergraduate academic regulations are approved by the University's University Teaching and Learning Committee and University Council. They are aligned with the regulatory framework of Egypt, as stipulated by the Egyptian Supreme Council of Universities (SCU) and the Ministry of Higher Education (MoHE) and are reviewed by the University Council every two academic years and any change must receive University Council approval.

4.5 Entry levels for admissions are prescribed by the ESCU and by UKVPs and the University has established systematic processes to ensure applicants to the University are consistently and fairly assessed against these published entry requirements. Entry requirements are implemented and monitored by Student Affairs with students required to submit appropriate official evidence to verify any claims made of prior educational study. The University notes that its processes for verifying such documentation and handling admissions are subject to regular external audits by the Egyptian Ministry of Higher Education. Students verified these processes and found them to be straightforward to navigate.

4.6 Students are automatically enrolled on the Egyptian Higher Education system, ensuring they fulfil necessary entry requirements, and that the University does not exceed the agreed student number recruitment cap per programme. Most degree programmes recruit students for a September intake for semester one. A second-semester enrolment is possible for a few undergraduate (UG) and postgraduate (PG) programmes where the enrolment cap has not been reached in semester one. All continuing students re-enrol in semester one of each academic year.

4.7 The University has a formal policy on the Recognition of Prior Learning (RPL) to ensure fair and consistent implementation of the recognition of prior learning process. Students must identify prior learning before registering at the University. It is subject to the Faculty Dean's scrutiny and approval to confirm coverage of the relevant material. This process is detailed in the University's Academic Regulations. Modules granted RPL are exempt from grade calculations and receive no formal marks. Exemptions are governed and approved by the Egyptian Supreme Council of Universities (ESCU).

4.8 Successful University applicants are notified via email and in writing, providing detailed instructions on enrolment, the induction programme, and their study timetable. The induction programme outlines the programme structure and expectations, as well as the available welfare and support systems. It is meticulously designed to facilitate the seamless transition from applicant to fully enrolled student. During the induction, information is provided on the British Higher Education system, the Preparatory Year programme, including English language provision, and the importance of assessment and academic honesty. Students have reported finding the induction programme highly informative, useful, and a valuable opportunity to form strong bonds with peers, enhancing their sense of belonging within the University.

4.9 Key information about developing all academic English skills is given to students before the preparatory programme starts. The programme consists of two modules focusing on English for Academic Purposes (EAP), covering all four skills including reading, listening, speaking, and writing. EAP assessments consist of listening with notetaking and summary (20%), a class reading skills test (20%), a one-to-one interview (20%), and a final academic writing assessment (40%). Additionally, ongoing EAP support is available to students as they progress in their main modules, ensuring continuous improvement and success. Students reported to the review team that they found the EAP support provided by the University was useful for their progression.

4.10 Student progression decisions across degree programmes are made by the Programme Examination Board, which considers assessment marks from Module Examination Boards and any extenuating circumstances affecting performance. These decisions adhere to the University's Academic Regulations and the specific requirements of each programme or module. Programme and module specifications are maintained by the faculty's SAR, and students have access to comprehensive module handbooks and additional learning and teaching materials through the e-learning platform.

4.11 Progression is ultimately confirmed at examination boards that are jointly chaired by Deans, senior UKVP representatives and include external examiners. To progress to the next year of study, a student is required to have attempted all assessments and completed modules within the given academic year. However, at the discretion of the Programme Examination Board, up to 20 credits (UKVP)/30 credits (Egypt only) may be carried over and re-attempted in the next academic year. This is not permitted for modules listed as prerequisites to the next academic year. Decisions are based on the student's overall academic performance and profile.

4.12 Student progression is supported through ongoing academic feedback delivered via tutorials, seminars, teaching and learning sessions, and in meetings with Personal Academic Tutors. Additionally, Student Services and Library Services offer guidance and direction on achieving academic success. Student Services extends support for student welfare, well-being, and complaint resolution. Academic Services provides advice on examination schedules, assessment outcomes, support for impaired performance and where necessary, addresses cases of academic misconduct. Students expressed a strong awareness of the available services, highlighting their usefulness and the valuable support they provided in advancing their academic progress.

4.13 Upon completing study with the University, students will be conferred an award by the relevant examination board. Graduates from non-UKVP programmes receive a single transcript and certificate from the University alone. For students graduating from the University with a dual award conferred by both the University and their UK validating partner, students are provided with both transcripts, detailing their academic achievements, and degree certificates awarded by the ESCU and the UKVP.

4.14 When a student earns a compensated pass for any given module, this is indicated on their academic transcript to distinguish it from modules where a full mark was recorded. The review team was provided with access to a sample of degree certificates and transcripts issued by the University. Students receive documentation upon graduation explaining the qualification gained, including achieved learning outcomes and the context, level, content and status of the studies that were pursued and successfully completed.

4.15 In summary, the described practices in the University align with current sector practice which would be expected for an institution working with multiple UK validating partners. The University provides the necessary programmes, systems and support for students to be able to ensure academic progress and mobility. The University's admission processes and policies are effective, consistent, and transparent. Student recruitment and admission decisions are well segmented, and students find the detailed induction programme invaluable for preparing them for their studies. Based on the evidence, 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 has in place a formal policy governing the recruitment of all academic and administrative staff members to the University. This document formalises the University's commitment to objective and merit-based appointments, which are free from discrimination.

5.2 All vacancies arising within the University, for new or back-fill positions, are subject to review and formal approval by the University's President and Vice-Chancellor. Upon receiving approval to proceed with recruitment, the post undergoes internal advertisement and may be subject to external advertising via employment fairs and recruitment agencies.

5.3 All candidates are evaluated against the specific terms of the pre-agreed job description and person specifications. The review team was provided with access to a sample set of job descriptions for a range of academic and administrative roles within the University, all of which were considered to provide a comprehensive view of the associated duties and responsibilities of each post-holder. Candidates are also required to attend a panel-based interview, the composition of which is defined within the University's policy for Staff Recruitment and Selection to ensure consistency.

5.4 The Human Resources Department is responsible for the successful onboarding of new staff to the University, this includes the running of an onboarding induction which provides an overview of the University, its policies and procedures, with new members of staff also issued with a copy of the HR Handbook as part of their onboarding.

5.5 The University assures the competency of its newly appointed staff members by requiring them to complete a three-month probation period, with their direct supervisor responsible for submitting an assessment as to the individual's performance, against which a decision to close out or extend the probation period will be made by Human Resources.

5.6 The University has recently revised its Performance Management framework which formalises how each staff member will contribute towards realising the ambitions and objectives of the University, whilst also embracing the institution's core competencies. The revised framework specifies both the different types of objectives that will exist, as well as the institution's expectation as to how each individual (regardless of job grade or function) contributes towards these at their given level. The review team noted the explicit alignment of the revised framework to the University's suite of institutional strategies (for example University Strategy, Sub-Strategy for Teaching, Learning and the Student Experience, Research and Enterprise) and identified competencies. The review team noted that the development of this revised framework had been driven by a desire to better connect objective setting with the University's purpose and strategic framework, while also ensuring effective and rigorous assessment of individual performance within the context of the University's goals.

5.7 Staff who met with the review team viewed the revised Performance Management Framework positively, noting that it was effective in supporting them to identify their own individual goals and development needs; while also providing a mechanism through which they could more clearly understand and articulate their contribution towards the wider strategic ambitions and objectives of the University.

5.8 University staff members with responsibility for line-management also commented positively as to the new framework, noting that it had enabled them to more effectively organise the objectives of staff within their faculties and services and had supported them to identify trends in development needs which could be addressed through their existing partnership with Human Resources. As a result, staff viewed there to be an improved sense of alignment and consistency across the staff population with respect to objectives.

5.9 The support made available to staff during the implementation of the new framework was also highlighted by staff to the review team, noting that several training sessions had been run with staff and line managers to ensure they were aware of, and comfortable with, the new framework when working to define their objectives. Staff commented that this training had been valuable and effective in preparing them for the upcoming change.

5.10 The review team noted the extent to which the University had sought to align its performance management framework with the strategic context and ambitions of the wider University. While noting the recently revised framework had only been recently introduced, already positive results were being raised by staff in respect of the opportunity it had provided them to draw linkages between individual goals and a sense of collective contribution towards realising the ambitions of the University. Also noted by the review team was the consistently positive strength of feeling from staff, across all levels and departments, as to the personal benefits they had drawn from the revised framework. The review team therefore considered the University's Framework for Performance Management to be an example of **good practice**, with respect to its effectiveness in helping drive alignment and direction between the individual focus and objectives of staff and the strategic ambitions, objectives and strategies of the University.

5.11 The University's Staff Promotion and Internal Transfers policy governs the process through which staff are evaluated for advancement within the University, or potential internal mobility moves. This policy establishes a standardised cycle within which potential promotions are considered (for example annually for administrative staff and biennially for academic staff). To be eligible for promotion, staff must have consistently secured a 'Star,' 'High Performer,' or 'High Potential' rating for at least two consecutive years; additional pre-requisite criteria relative to each specific move are also defined within the policy. Academic staff who met with the review team indicated an awareness of both the criteria for, and the process through which to seek, promotion as well as the alignment between these criteria and the performance management framework.

5.12 The University offers a range of development opportunities which are designed to support the personal and professional needs of both academic and administrative staff, beyond their initial induction to the University. This includes providing formal funding to enable staff to obtain the Higher Education Academy Fellowships from the UK, and enabling staff to undertake further high-level study. The review team noted that the opportunities of obtaining the Higher Education Academy Fellowships continued to grow and was not confined only to academic staff but also for members of the administrative and professional service departments.

5.13 The University also provides an annual programme of internal staff development opportunities. The content of this programme is defined annually, based on the strategic priorities of the institution and the development needs identified from within the performance discussions held in each faculty and department. In some cases, the individual needs of certain staff had been supported by the University and were now being rolled out more broadly within the institution, such as the University's recent investment in establishing a Customer Relationship Management (CRM) system.

5.14 The review team was provided with access to a sample of the training and development programmes run at the faculty level, as well as a range of sample training materials. The review team noted that the sessions offered by the University each year covered a wider variety of topics and skillsets. Staff who met with the review team commented positively as to the range of sessions offered by the University and the value of these in supporting their own development.

5.15 The University systematically records staff attendance at development sessions and, where necessary, will issue formal certification of attendance which can be used by staff for the purpose of building a portfolio for promotion. The University notes that while it does not explicitly undertake the evaluation of staff attendance at development opportunities, longitudinal analysis is undertaken to ensure appropriate participation from staff within these opportunities.

5.16 The University notes the value of collecting feedback from staff on the development opportunities offered to them, providing a range of examples in how such feedback has been analysed by the University. The review team noted that the feedback collected through these systematic evaluations was used by the HR Department to regularly enhance and refine the staff development offering to ensure this remained closely aligned to the needs of staff, while also enabling them to identify opportunities for further improvement in their service.

5.17 The University has established a 'Professional Development Policy' which complements the existing staff development offering open to all staff, with a further offering specific to academic staff which is designed to assure their ongoing motivation, commitment and competency. This policy stipulates the specific responsibilities and expectations placed on the University and its staff members with regards to the provision of, and participation within, professional development opportunities. Activities offered under this policy include: peer observation of teaching; webinars and specific workshop sessions.

5.18 This policy helps further the University's commitment to promoting teaching-related scholarship within the University. Additionally, the University operates a number of initiatives designed to identify and disseminate good and innovative pedagogical practices across the University. For example, the University has recently coordinated a range of teaching and learning symposia to highlight recent innovations within pedagogy. Staff who met with the review team, highlighted their participation within these initiatives, such as the symposia as being a key means of identifying innovative pedagogic practice within the University, with staff encouraged by the University to participate.

5.19 In summary, the review team found the University to have effective arrangements in place to manage the recruitment, selection and development of competent staff members. This includes operating a fair, transparent and merit-based approach to recruitment, through which job responsibilities are formally documented and candidates objectively assessed against these. Where a candidate has been successful in securing a role with the University, appropriate induction arrangements are in place to ensure the staff member can smoothly transition into their role. The University's revised Performance Management Framework ensures all staff, across all areas and levels, are supported to identify individual performance objectives relative to their own strategic ambitions and those of the University. There is an effective interlock between the Performance Management Framework and the work of the Human Resources Department, enabling the individual and collective development needs of staff to be fed into a programme of staff development opportunities to ensure the continuing professional development of the University staff.

5.20 Therefore, the review team 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 is dedicated to enhancing student academic development by offering a comprehensive array of learning resources, specialist facilities, and equipment. Library facilities include extensive collections of print and e-learning materials, including textbooks, journals, research databases, interactive e-books, and multimedia resources. The availability of numerous library training sessions and workshops focusing on essential study skills and techniques reflects a proactive approach to student support. Furthermore, the Academic Advisor's toolkit is a useful resource, equipping students with practical, sustainable tools for effective study habits, time management, goal-setting, and self-awareness, underscoring the University's dedication to fostering academic success.

6.2 There are also digital learning platforms and virtual libraries, allowing students to access resources remotely and engage in self-directed learning activities such as access to the Egyptian Knowledge Bank, Pearson, McGraw Hill and Cengage. Virtual learning platforms are updated and maintained to ensure easy access to programme materials, interactive tools, and communication channels. There is also an online code of conduct to ensure students behave appropriately and experience safety while using online platforms.

6.3 Students can also pursue personal development by participating in workshops on mindset and achievement, time management, goal-setting, and stress management. Additionally, counselling and well-being support sessions are available, with the University providing individualised care and adjusting the number of sessions based on students' progress, therapeutic goals, and ongoing needs.

6.4 Employability Services offer students various opportunities to enhance their professional development and career prospects. Students can book appointments or use the drop-in service to discuss their needs with advisors. Advisors may refer them to resources such as individual sessions, career advice group sessions, talks, workshops, and campus events. They provide information, advice, and guidance to support career development, helping students make informed career decisions, identify self-promotion skills, and prepare for a smooth transition into further study or employment.

6.5 Faculties hold internal departmental meetings to determine their learning support needs, which are then discussed and incorporated into budgets. These budgets are reviewed to ensure alignment with strategic aims, student-to-faculty ratios, and IT requirements. Laboratory meetings are also conducted to inspect laboratory equipment and assess physical and human resources for adequacy. If a need is identified and falls within the budget, an agreement is reached. Budget policies and procedures are well documented and in place.

6.6 The University's campus facilities are designed to ensure equitable access for students with disabilities, with multiple wheelchair-accessible entrances and installed lifts in most buildings. Regular inspections and ongoing maintenance of facilities occur to maintain safety, accessibility, and inclusivity standards and to ensure effective operation. Physical learning environments are equipped with adaptive technologies and suitable furnishings to accommodate diverse abilities and learning styles. Plans are underway to address lift accessibility in all buildings in future construction to ensure the facilities and learning resources are easily accessible for staff and students. The review team affirmed this

initiative and **recommends** the University to prioritise access to different floors and rooms across all buildings, making sure all facilities and learning resources are easily accessible for students and staff.

6.7 Students with special needs are identified when they self-declare when enrolling or they may declare later to their personal tutors or to Academic Services. Reasonable adjustments are made on a case-to-case basis. Medical evidence is reviewed, and Faculty Council then has the authority to act upon recommendations from Academic Services. Extra time reasonable adjustment is in place and if necessary examinations may be moved to more accessible rooms. There is a Student Attendance Policy and in terms of students who may have a genuine need for absence there is the authorised absence application online to request missing a class. Special arrangements are made for students who may miss classes due to observing Ramadan.

6.8 The University's website also provides information on a range of additional support services available to students. Among these are a bus service transporting students to and from the campus from various areas in Cairo and six shuttle golf carts, each with a capacity of 14 people to facilitate movement within the campus. The University offers an ambulance equipped with all necessary medications and equipment to transport emergency cases to the nearest hospital. For those seeking accommodation, student dormitories are available, catering both to local students wishing to be closer to campus and to international students. Additional facilities include a bookshop, a clinic, a photocopy and Express Copy centre, several cafeterias, and a number of ATMs.

6.9 Comprehensive information detailing the learning opportunities and support available to students is communicated through numerous channels. These include the University's website, the induction programme, student/programme handbooks, regular emails, relevant social media posts, programme specifications, and trained student representatives. This multi-faceted approach ensures that students are well informed about various workshops, including those on academic study skills, English language support, employability skills, counselling, academic success coaching, and discipline-specific academic support. Students have positively noted their awareness of these resources, indicating the success of the University's communication strategy.

6.10 Clear guidelines are communicated regarding expectations of student behaviour, academic integrity, attendance policy and engagement with learning resources. These guidelines are made very explicit particularly through the Student Charter. Students are also made aware of these expectations during the induction period.

6.11 All support staff, academic advisors, personal tutors, professional services staff, well-being staff and library services have clearly defined roles and responsibilities in supporting and developing students. Key staff are trained and equipped with the necessary skills and knowledge to assist and guide students effectively. New staff participate in a faculty-specific induction programme to become familiar with the University and the faculty's policies, processes, and practices. Professional development opportunities and ongoing support systems keep staff well informed and confident. By actively using these resources, staff enhance their ability to provide high-quality education and support, which greatly benefits students.

6.12 Staff are also encouraged to engage with teaching innovation, technology enhancement, and simulation facilities, directly benefiting students through activity-based, student-centred learning. Examples include simulation labs in Business and Economics, Nursing, and Dentistry, which provide hands-on experience. Additionally, public clinics and community outreach services in Pharmacy, Psychology, Nursing, and Dentistry allow



students to apply their skills in real-world settings under academic supervision, enhancing their practical knowledge and readiness for professional practice.

6.13 There is ongoing evaluation of learning resources at annual planning and budget reviews within faculties, Teaching and Learning committees, and library services. Responding to a diverse student population, the Academic Services department also reviews services on offer, identifies gaps and then this is considered when allocating, planning and providing the learning resources and student support. There is also a policy to identify at risk and weak students, with robust procedures in place in terms of providing support.

6.14 Students provide feedback regarding learning resources through various surveys, namely admissions team surveys, end-of-semester modular feedback evaluations, online-based learning questionnaires, surveys at career fairs, counselling services, informal feedback through personal tutors, as well as through trained student representatives. Feedback is reviewed and addressed, with responses provided through the 'You Said, We Did' Student Hub campaign. If students would further like to discuss issues, they are encouraged to contact the Student Hub or the Director of Student Services. Students reported that this system is effective and appropriate actions are taken.

6.15 In summary, the University demonstrates a systematic approach to creating an inclusive and supportive learning environment. Appropriate funding for learning and teaching activities is available and put to appropriate use and the University ensures that adequate and readily accessible learning resources and student support are provided. Based on the evidence, 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 has a robust system to collect, manage and analyse its data. The University considers this a vital activity for the generation of Annual Programme Reports (APRs). This reporting process requires the production of comprehensive datasets that comprise statistical information on student recruitment, achievement and progression, voluntary withdrawals, three-year achievement and progression rates, degrees awarded and academic board decisions, employment and first destination, student module and programme evaluation and feedback, SSLC meetings assessment review and staffing.

7.2 The University's Student Records System (SRS), managed by IT Services, tracks students' data. Academic service, faculty members and students each have different privileges to access, extract, and submission of data. The SRS platform monitors and records student achievement and progression, modules taken, attendance, marks, and examination board outcomes. Admissions update the SRS platform annually to ensure graduate certificates are correctly authenticated following examination boards.

7.3 The University gathers different forms on the different levels of the directorates. Through its recruitment team, the University developed a Customer Relationship Management system (CRM). This system has been developed on the portal and admission is online. It captures data and provides information about the University for recruitment purposes.

7.4 To protect student confidentiality, and the integrity and accuracy of the records, there is limited access to the data and documentation provided on the SRS. For example, only SARs and Academic Services colleagues have access to data and documentation pertaining to Impaired Performance, Academic Misconduct, Appeals and Disciplinary records. In addition, there is a two-way authentication process.

7.5 The University manages data and information across all departments and directorates:

- HR manages academic staff information. Staffing information is handled by the Deans to develop recruitment plans that abide with staff/student ratios (SSRs) aligned with ESCU expectations and NAQAAE accreditation standards. Records of academic staff and staff development is stored in the Office of the Provost.
- Financial department manages financial data and records using robust and accurate management and analysis tools, to inform the annual business cycle, and to ensure sufficient human and other resources for delivery of high-quality academic provision.
- Facilities and Campus Planning Committee (FCPC) manages the learning resources, with details of fixed assets, classrooms, lecture halls and laboratories held by the Chief Operating Officer (COO)'s office to elicit informed decisions about rooming and scheduling.

7.6 Sensitive data is stored in control rooms, such as the hard copies of NAQAAE documentation. Other data captured on the system includes key committee minutes, and information on partnerships which are stored digitally on the Office of the Provost OneDrive.

7.7 The University uses surveys and questionnaires on several levels as another source of data gathering. Some samples of this data collected is represented by the Faculty of Energy

and Environmental Engineering Quality Assurance Unit: Online-based learning questionnaire for students within the Faculty, the Institutional Planning & Development Unit (IPDU) Job & Services Satisfaction Survey, and the Teaching Assistant Needs Questionnaire Report.

There is

very little information gathered about the career path of the graduates. A few surveys are available for the graduates, alumni and external stakeholders.

7.8 The review team acknowledges that the University realises that it does not have a systematic approach to internship feedback or alumni feedback. Several remedial steps have been taken, including the approval of the establishment of the Alumni Office. The review team noted this as a positive point and **recommends** that the University develops a systematic approach to gathering information about graduate employability and feedback from external stakeholders.

7.9 During the visit, the University conducted a live demonstration of the information system showing its online system developed to manage data and to support the University's strategic objectives for digital transformation, enhance teaching and learning and to provide fast feedback to students. This demonstration included the Learning Management System (LMS), developed internally for the School of Engineering, the VLE which includes interactive learning, and the SRS which was enhanced internally.

7.10 The IT team provides guidance and technical support to both students and faculty members. This is done during the induction and orientation. In addition, staff faculty and students can use email and phone tickets, and there are live videos and demonstrations they can access easily.

7.11 The University demonstrates a profound understanding of the importance of data gathering and analysis in the decision-making process. The University developed a robust system of data gathering to support decision-making. For example, the University used the information gathered from other institutions to revise and improve all salaries at the University. Furthermore, analysis of the data gathered on admissions, student records, achievement and progression allow the University to plan and improve its admission policies. Admissions analyses the data gathered to identify the increase or decrease in student numbers and benchmark with previous years.

7.12 Faculty members who met with the review team indicated that they make use of data and information gathered in following up attendance of students and notifying students who are not using active learning. In addition both SARs and academic service staff use the data on SRS to support expert decisions and solicit informed advice based on the available analyses of digital and information management available. The faculty members identified these changes as some changes in the pre-requisites, the Faculty of Engineering offering pre-sessions for mathematics and physics to support the students before entry, and extra sessions in English are provided each week for students.

7.13 All data gathered is analysed in the APR which is discussed in the Faculty Councils and then cascaded to the University level. Each department develops an action plan according to the analysis in the APR and reviews this periodically. In the event of students' complaints regarding any modules or their assessment, the faculty will propose any necessary changes.

7.14 In summary, the University realises the significance of data gathering and analysis in the decision-making process. They developed rigorous mechanisms for gathering appropriate datasets, safeguarding them and analysing them. The University demonstrated several instances where this analysis had an impact on policies and procedures. The review team noted the lack of sufficient evidence regarding employment and external stakeholder feedback and acknowledges that the University is aware of this and is taking steps to

improve. The review team recommends that the University develops a systematic approach to gathering information about graduate employability and feedback from external stakeholders. Overall, 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 effectively disseminates key information to prospective students and other stakeholders via its website, printed materials, and social media platforms. This comprehensive communication encompasses the University's 2023-2028 strategy, senior leadership structure, administrative departments, a section for policies, and a dedicated University Impact website. Additionally, it provides details about strategic partnerships, collaborations, academic programmes, student life, and UK validating partners. The University's overall strategy and its three sub-strategies - Teaching, Learning and Student Experience, Research and Enterprise, and Social Responsibility and Community Engagement - are also readily accessible, along with information on all academic provisions.

8.2 The review team noticed that some policies are available on the website, but difficult to navigate. The only policy under 'University Policy' section is the Whistleblowing Policy ([www.the.university.edu.eg/university-policies](http://www.the.university.edu.eg/university-policies)). As mentioned in Standard 1.1, The review team **recommends** that the University publishes more university policies (particularly the QA policy) on the website, making sure these are publicly available and easily accessible.

8.3 The website also offers crucial information about the faculties and their programmes, detailing what students will study, the intended learning outcomes, learning and assessment methods, selection criteria, learning opportunities, qualifications awarded, potential internships, and graduate employment prospects. The faculties' webpages include admissions information, a helpful 'Why Join' section, quality and accreditation details (which include a Quality Assurance guide and structure), various faculty strategies and bylaws, the code of conduct, as well as news and events. It was observed that not all postgraduate degrees clearly articulate their overall mission and intended learning outcomes. The review team **recommends** that to improve public accessibility and information transparency, the University should ensure the consistency of the level of information detail for all postgraduate programmes on the University's website.

8.4 Admission requirements are clearly and accurately detailed on the website. They are fully up to date and comply with the regulations set forth by the Egyptian Council of Private Universities (ECPU). These requirements are also aligned with the University's Academic Regulations (ARs). These regulations specify that entrants to UK Validating Partner (UKVP) programmes ('dual awards') must also meet any additional requirements stipulated by the respective UKVP.

8.5 The responsibility for disseminating information rests with the Marketing and Communication Department, under the oversight of the Chief Marketing Communication Officer. The British University in Egypt utilises both public and private platforms for this purpose. The public platform provides abundant and diverse information designed to inform, engage, and attract website traffic. There are established policies and procedures in place to monitor and evaluate the dissemination of information on both private and public platforms, to ensure its accuracy and accessibility for prospective students, current students, graduates, other stakeholders and the general public.

8.6 Departments have designated Special Points of Contact (SPOCs) to liaise with to ensure that information is compliant and up to date. Additionally, the University is implementing a two-step verification process to guarantee accuracy and consistency across

all faculties. Information undergoes regular review within individual departments and the Marketing and Communication Department, particularly in preparation for new recruitment cycles. Decisions regarding external publication are made collaboratively by the Marketing and Communication Department, faculties and Senior Management.

8.7 The University's website provides comprehensive, step-by-step recruitment information, detailing participation in 'Under the Stars' open days and campus tours, as well as the application and admission processes for its academic programmes. Specific email addresses are provided for inquiries regarding various qualifications, including GCSE/IGCSE, American Diplomas, Arab Certificates, Egyptian Thanaweyya Amma, and International Certificates. This detailed guidance facilitates prospective students in making informed decisions about their module selections and application procedures.

8.8 The website explicitly outlines the English language requirements and tuition fees. All applicants, except those possessing international high school certificates, are required to complete either the University English test (LinguaSkill by Cambridge Assessment English) or achieve an overall IELTS score of six.

8.9 The website prominently features a list of the University's employability partners and community service partners. The faculties of Business Administration, Economics and Political Science, Communication and Mass Media, and Engineering each have dedicated sections showcasing alumni success stories through videos, illustrating potential employment opportunities for students. Additionally, the various prospectuses available on the website include a valuable section entitled 'What career and further education opportunities are open to me when I graduate'.

8.10 In summary, the University provides information about its activities and programmes to students and other stakeholders that is clear, accurate, objective, up-to-date and readily accessible. To ensure the transparency of the University approaches, the review team recommends that the University should consider making more policies publicly available on the website, including the policy for quality assurance. Based on the evidence, 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 One of the main functions of the University Teaching and Learning Committee (UTLC) is the strategic oversight of ongoing monitoring and periodic review of programmes. The UTLC is chaired by the Provost and comprised of the Pro-Vice-Chancellors for Students and for Education, President's advisor, Head of University Quality and accreditation (who advises on ESCU and NAQAAE regulatory issues), Vice-Dean (Teaching and Learning) from each faculty, Senior Advisor for Learning & Teaching Innovations, Director of Academic English, Director of Academic Services, Director of the Library, Director of Student Services, the Deputy Registrar (who both advise on UKVPs and UK quality, standards and regulatory issues), and the SU President (or any other nominee from the SU).

9.2 The UTLC works closely with the programmes and the University senior staff to ensure the periodic review of the programmes and the implementation of the action plans. Each programme prepares its Annual Programme Report (APR) at the end of the academic year complying with the APR guidance. This APR guidance identifies the data that should be included in the report, which includes key data (student recruitment, achievement and progression), three-year achievement and progression trends, feedback from stakeholders (staff, students, external examiners, UKVP's link tutors and subject advisors), any outstanding issues from previous APRs and action plans.

9.3 The University administers a rigorous annual review cycle that is analytic, reflective, and provides trend analysis. Each programme must submit an APR which is comprehensive, evidence-based and data-informed. This report is discussed at the Faculty TLC, SSLC and the Faculty Council. The results of these discussions are cascaded to the UTLC which oversees all these periodic reviews. As a result of these reviews, areas of enhancement will be identified, and the dean discusses these with each department and an action plan will be drafted and implemented.

9.4 The action plans and their progress are considered at both mid-year and the end of the annual process, with actions noted as completed and/or outstanding issues continued over into the next cycle. To guarantee the progress of the action and enhancement plans, the University developed an 'Annual Programme Review Action Plan progress tracker' which is monitored and maintained by SARs and discussed during the academic year with programme teams.

9.5 As a result of the annual review reports changes can be deployed to the respective programmes. The University classified these changes into major and minor changes. Some of these changes can be deployed immediately (minor content changes, reading lists and so on) but others will have to abide by the cyclical changes (changes in LOs). There is a detailed process which changes must go through before they are raised to FTLC, UTLC, and recommendation to the Senate.

9.6 In addition to the APR and action plans, the academic programmes at the University enhance the quality of their performance by receiving feedback from the quality assurance unit. The latter conducts internal audits before the NAQAAE accreditation or simulation

visits. These audits help the programmes to identify their weaknesses and strengths and enable the programmes to improve their performance. In addition, the academic programmes use this feedback as reference points for their continuous development and updates.

9.7 There is an external examiner appointed for each programme by the Provost. The external examiner (EE) reviews samples of students' work and is expected to comment upon the assessments set for modules in terms of alignment to intended learning outcomes, clarity, and capacity to discriminate appropriately between students. Furthermore, the external examiner is expected to report to the University on aspects of the quality of the assessment process, the standards set and the standards achieved, and ensure that University academic regulations are equitably implemented for all students enrolled on a programme. The external examiner acts as a critical friend and ensures that justice is done to individual students and standards are maintained.

9.8 The annual reviews are conducted to guarantee the provision of quality programmes that are updated and fit for purpose. Thus, the University develops and offers programmes that represent a societal need. One such programme is the Nursing programme that was developed to address the need in the job market of competent versatile nursing staff. Another programme is the establishment of the Physiotherapy programme (proposed) which will bridge the gap in this field and respond to a growing societal need.

9.9 Furthermore, the academic programmes rely on the feedback from the external industrial experts, the Industrial Liaison Committee and stakeholder and alumni feedback. Although this is not a University-wide practice, some faculties adhere to this practice. Students who attended the meetings with the review team indicated that the programmes prepared them for employment, that they were satisfied with the level of the programmes, and that they were updated and current. Representatives of the validating partners expressed no concerns on the level of the graduates and were quite satisfied with the progression rates.

9.10 The complex system of the Egyptian regulations and SCU could delay the implementation of programme update and changes. Proposed major changes also need to be scheduled with regard for the University's UKVP revalidation cycles, frameworks and requirements, and major changes proposed to ESCU/NAQAAE correlated with permissible recommendations from LT action plans, EE reports, students (SSLC feedback), staff and APR action plans.

9.11 In summary, the University's commitment to its internal Annual Programme Reviews is reflected in its continuous pursuit of rigorous processes to manage, maintain and enhance quality and standards across its programmes. The review team 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 University demonstrates commitment to the quality of its educational programmes and educational outcomes by adhering to and aligning with local and international standards. This commitment is achieved by applying to local, regional, and international accreditation and recognition agencies. This commitment stems from the conviction that international recognition and accreditation will make the University the leading British-learning provider in the region. For this reason, the University constantly challenges and subjects itself to several reviews and visits from external agencies such as on the local level the ESCU, NAQAAE, on the regional level AQACHIE (Jordan) and internationally the validation by the UKVPs and the current submission to the IQR-QAA.

10.2 The University has an active strategic objective to expand and establish high-quality UKVPs for all UG and PG provision. UK validating partners (UKVPs) usually require the comprehensive alignment and careful adherence to the UK Quality Code. At the same time the University abides by and aligns with the local standards and regulations set by both the ESCU and the accreditation agency NAQAAE. The University demonstrates this compliance by the development of consistent policies and transparent processes of quality management.

10.3 The University subjects most of its programmes to both local and international accreditation. Collectively, 82% of the current UG and PG programmes are validated by UKVPs. Currently the Faculties of Dentistry and Pharmacy, two programmes in Arts and Humanities and a number of PG programmes are non-UK validated. At time of writing, almost 40% of the faculties and programmes are accredited by NAQAAE.

10.4 The University's dedication to the quality of its programmes is reflected in the development of dynamic integrated cycles of both internal and external reviews on the local and the international levels. These cycles start with the internal Annual Programme Review (APR) and are complemented by annual evaluative activities of the external examiners and the Link tutors (EEs and LTs). These are supplemented by the four-to-five-year processes of validation and revalidation by the University's UKVPs and accreditation and re-accreditation by the ESCU and NAQAAE.

10.5 Currently there are three UK validating partners (Queen Margaret University since 2011; London South Bank University since 2014; Manchester Metropolitan University since 2022). These partnerships were established building upon institutional knowledge and experience gained through the University's original partnership with Loughborough University (2005-18). These partnerships are supported by regular online meetings between the Director of Academic Services, the Deputy Registrar, and the most senior UKVP representative(s), as well as through high-level Partnership Management Boards.

10.6 The UKVPs established a rigorous validation process that includes some of the following activities: annual partnership meetings, videoconferencing once every month, Link Tutor visiting twice a year to observe teaching and meet students, external examiners visiting two to three times, access to assessment and overseeing marked work, full access to Moodle site double marking, joint assessment regulations, academic staff visiting the University, and teaching sessions with students. All these activities culminate in the five-year programme review and approval process for validation and revalidation.

10.7 In preparation for the review cycle of the University's UKVPs, all programmes subjected to periodic reviews are required to prepare in compliance with the UKVP's quality and standards a self-evaluation document that contains information on academic rationale, institutional strategic alignment, market appeal and recruitment, engagement with regulatory bodies and external expertise. Also included are programme structure and management, teaching, learning and assessment strategies, career preparation and graduate opportunities, student support and guidance, learning resources, and student engagement expectations.

10.8 The partners acknowledge the constant challenges that the University faces in trying to mitigate between the different sets of Egyptian and UK quality standards and expectations. They conduct ongoing consultation with the University to fit both regulations especially in the School of Nursing.

10.9 Ongoing compliance with the requirements of ESCU/NAQAAE accreditation is ensured by the University's Arabic-speaking Head of Quality and Accreditation and implemented through Faculty Quality Units. Arabic-speaking Quality Unit specialists work with the Deputy Registrar and Senior Assistant Registrars (SARs) to align with ESCU/NAQAAE-related work with UKVP quality and standards expectations.

10.10 The University abides by the five-year cycle for the update of the bylaws for all its programmes. The Faculty of Engineering has updated its bylaws to the four-year graduation plan which was approved and will be implemented from Semester 1, 2024-25.

10.11 Faculty members and programmes benefit greatly from the different reviews and use them as a process to develop and enhance their quality systems and educational outcomes. Programmes submit to the second term of re-accreditation, particularly the Faculty of Engineering that has submitted all its programmes for programme accreditation. Most of the other programmes will develop action plans and implementation procedures to abide by the recommendations that are provided.

10.12 Keeping abreast of international UKVPs, QAA, local ESCU and NAQAAE quality sets and regulations is quite a challenging endeavour. Although quality standards might be similar on the macro-level, the regulations, expectations and KPIs can vary greatly. However, the University manages to navigate between all these standards and succeeds in sustaining its standards of quality. The review team finds this a feature of **good practice**.

10.13 In summary, the University abides by and adheres to different quality assurance, validation and accreditation standards and has managed to mitigate and align to different accreditation standards and requirements of the different validating partners and the National Quality Assurance Agency (NAQAAE) and the Supreme Council of Universities in Egypt (ESCU). Keeping abreast of the different regulations and quality structures between Egypt and the UK is quite challenging, and the University is making a great effort to ensure that it is abiding by both. The University maintains a cyclical review of its programmes both locally and internationally and makes use of the reports to enhance its educational experience. The review team concludes 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 IQR 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](http://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 IQR 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.

**QAA2859 - R14688 - Sep 24**

© The Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education 2024  
Southgate House, Southgate Street, Gloucester GL1 1UB  
Registered charity numbers 1062746 and SC037786

Email: [accreditation@qaa.ac.uk](mailto:accreditation@qaa.ac.uk)  
Website: [www.qaa.ac.uk](http://www.qaa.ac.uk)