ASIIN Seal & EQAS-Food Award

Accreditation Report

Bachelor's Degree Programme
Food Processing Technology

Provided by
Cairo University

Version: 25 September 2026

Table of Content

A About the Accreditation Process 3

B Accreditation Status 4

Result Overview 4

Fulfilment of the Accreditation Criteria 4

Requirements 5

Accreditation History 6

C Characteristics of the Degree Programme 7

D Expert Report for the ASIIN Seal 10

1. The Degree Programme: Concept, Content & Implementation 10

2. Exams: System, Concept and Organisation 23

3. Resources 27

4. Transparency and Documentation 34

5. Quality management: quality assessment and development 37

E Additional Documents 40

F Comment of the Higher Education Institution (16.08.2026) 41

G Summary: Expert recommendations (04.09.2026) 48

H Comment of the Technical Committee 08 – Agriculture, Forestry and Food Sciences (16.09.2026) 50

I Decision of the Accreditation Commission (25.09.2026) 51

Appendix: Programme Learning Outcomes and Curricula 53

A About the Accreditation Process

Name of the degree programme (in original language)	(Official) English translation of the name	Labels applied for [1]	Previous accreditation (issuing agency, validity)	Involved Technical Committees (TC)[2]
Bachelor in Food Processing Technology	/	ASIIN, EQAS-Food	ASIIN, 29.03.2019 – 30.09.2024, prolonged until 30.09.2025	08
Date of the contract: 18.09.2024 **Submission of the final version of the self-assessment report:** 16.02.2026 **Date of the onsite visit:** 16.-17.06.2026 **at: University Campus in Cairo**				
Expert panel: Prof. Dr. Siegfried Bolenz, Neubrandenburg University of Applied Sciences Prof. Dr. Ingy Hashad, German University in Cairo Dr. Oliver Schlüter, Leibnitz Institute for Agricultural Engineering and Bioeconomy Aesha Sadek, student at German University in Cairo				
Representative of the ASIIN headquarter: Johann Jakob Winter, M.Sc.				
Responsible decision-making committee: Accreditation Commission for Degree Programmes				
Criteria used: European Standards and Guidelines as of May 15, 2015 ASIIN General Criteria, as of December 28, 2023 Subject-Specific Criteria of Technical Committee 08 – Agriculture, Forestry and Food Sciences as of March 27, 2015				

[1] ASIIN Seal for degree programmes
[2] TC: TC 08 – Agriculture, Forestry and Food Sciences

B Accreditation Status

Result Overview

The most recent decision for the ASIIN Seal was made by the ASIIN Accreditation Commission on 25.09.2026.

Degree Programmes	ASIIN Seal	Validity	EQAS-Food Label	Validity
Ba Food Processing Technology	Accredited with requirements	25.09.2026 - 16.10.2027	Accredited with requirements	25.09.2026 - 16.10.2027

Fulfilment of the Accreditation Criteria

ASIIN General Criteria / Subject-Specific Criteria	Ba Food Processing Technology
1 Degree programme: Concept, Content & Implementation	
1.1 Objectives and learning outcomes (intended qualification profile)	Fulfilled
1.2 Title of the degree programme	Fulfilled
1.3 Curriculum	Fulfilled
1.4 Admission requirements	**Not fulfilled** Requirement A 1
1.5 Workload and credits	**Not fulfilled** Requirements A 2, A 3
1.6 Didactics and teaching methodology	Fulfilled
2 Exams: System, Concept and Organisation	
2 Exams: System, Concept and Organisation	**Not fulfilled** Requirements A 4, A 5, A 6
3 Resources	
3.1 Staff and staff development	**Not fulfilled** Requirement A 7

ASIIN General Criteria / Subject-Specific Criteria	Ba Food Processing Technology
3.2 Student support and student services	Fulfilled
3.3 Funds and equipment	**Not fulfilled** Requirements A 6, A 8, A 9
4 Transparency and Documentation	
4.1 Module descriptions	**Not fulfilled** Requirement A 10
4.2 Diploma and Diploma Supplement	**Not fulfilled** Requirement A 11
4.3 Relevant rules	**Not fulfilled** Requirements A 9, A 10
5 Quality Management: Quality Assessment and Development	
5 Quality Management: Quality Assessment and Development	**Not fulfilled** Requirement A 12

Requirements

A 1. (ASIIN 1.4) Define and implement adequate rules for the recognition of qualifications achieved externally.

A 2. (ASIIN 1.5) Implement a systematic process to regularly monitor and evaluate student workload. Involve students in the review and adjust credits where necessary.

A 3. (ASIIN 1.5) Ensure that the workload is distributed evenly across the semesters to enable students to complete the programme within the regular study period.

A 4. (ASIIN 2) Offer re-take and make-up exams in the same semester to avoid systematic delays of the study time.

A 5. (ASIIN 2) Abandon the grade cap for re-take exams.

A 6. (ASIIN 2, 3.3) Set up a digital archive for theses/final projects and allow for digital submissions.

A 7. (ASIIN 3.1) Provide a recruitment plan for hiring the necessary support staff for the operation of the equipment.

A 8. (ASIIN 3.3) Provide a concept and a strategic plan for the update and renovation of the equipment for food processing together with approvement and financial commitment by faculty and university management.

A 9. (ASIIN 3.3, 4.3) Implement a digital tool for structured programme and course administration as well as digital teaching and learning applications.

A 10. (ASIIN 4.1, 4.3) Ensure that the module descriptions and all relevant study-related regulations are publicly available and accessible to all stakeholders in a consistent and transparent manner.

A 11. (ASIIN 4.2) Ensure that the Diploma Supplement is factually correct and includes all information set out in the template and required by the ASIIN criteria, including statistical data on the distribution of final grades.

A 12. (ASIIN 5) Ensure that students are represented in university and programme development bodies, and establish a feedback loop between students and academic staff.

Accreditation History

Ba Food Processing Technology

ASIIN Seal	Validity	EQAS-Food Label	Validity
Initial accreditation with requirements	29.03.2019 - 16.04.2020	Initial accreditation with requirements	29.03.2019 - 16.04.2020
Prolongation for fulfilment of requirements	29.03.2019 - 16.10.2020	Prolongation for fulfilment of requirements	29.03.2019 - 16.10.2020
Prolongation for fulfilment of requirements	29.03.2019 - 16.01.2022	Prolongation for fulfilment of requirements	29.03.2019 - 16.01.2022
Full accreditation	29.03.2019 - 30.09.2024	Full accreditation	29.03.2019 - 30.09.2024
Extension for the purpose of reaccreditation	01.10.2024 - 30.09.2025	Extension for the purpose of reaccreditation	01.10.2024 - 30.09.2025

C Characteristics of the Degree Programme

a) Name	Final degree (original/English translation)	b) Areas of Specialization	c) Corresponding level of the EQF[3]	d) Mode of Study	e) Double/Joint Degree	f) Duration	g) Credit points/unit	h) Intake rhythm & First time of offer
Bachelor in Food Processing Technology	Bachelor of Science (B.Sc.)	Food marketing and management; Food safety and hygiene; Nutrition and food catering; Food processing and development	6	Full time	/	8 semesters	240 ECTS	Every semester, since 2006

Contextualisation

Cairo University is the second-oldest university in Egypt, located in the centre of the country's capital Cairo, Giza district. It was officially established as a public university in 1925, although several schools which are nowadays faculties of the university already existed prior to that. Nowadays, Cairo University hosts 26 faculties and institutes with more than 250,000 enrolled students in total, making it the largest university in the country. Moreover, international rankings display Cairo University as the top university in Egypt.

The programme under review is offered by the Faculty of Agriculture, which was first established in 1889 and became part of the university in 1935. It hosts multiple departments, among others the Department of Food Science and Technology, which developed the English-taught Food Processing Technology (FPT) programme in 2006. Although the university is public, the programme has a special status as a special-fee programme, privately operated within the public university framework. Before 2016, the programme was comprehensively restructured in terms of both content and study administration to align it with the European higher education model and adopt the ECTS system. In line with this association

[3] EQF = The European Qualifications Framework for lifelong learning

with the European model, the programme is subject to accreditation by ASIIN already for the second time.

General assessment

Overall, the experts are satisfied with the programme which produces highly qualified and demanded graduates for the growing labour market in food industries in Egypt, which is characterised by not only local producers and retailers but also large multinational corporations. Positive highlights include the broad graduate profile, the English language profile resulting in outstanding language skills of the students, close industry relations, as well as a high degree of practical applications which is reflected in the teaching concept of the structured modules as well as multiple internships, and the practice-oriented Bachelor's project work at the end of the programme. On the other hand, shortcomings are found with regard to some practical facilities which need updating and the availability of support staff to operate the equipment, as well as aspects of credit/workload distribution and assessment, exam regulations, and digitalisation which structurally hinder a timely graduation of the students. Also, the experts point out that multiple critical formal aspects that were noted already in the previous accreditation procedure and had been corrected in the meantime, were not consistently presented and evidenced in this procedure, casting doubt over the implementation of the quality assurance system. Further room for improvement concerns, among others, the development of junior staff, student mobility, and internships as well as research coordination with the industry.

Programme profile

According to the student guidebook, the Bachelor in Food Processing Technology programme "is designed as a mixture of theoretical, practical as well as research skills. The discipline combines elements from many areas such as Mathematics - Physics & electricity & thermodynamics - General & analytical chemistry - Biology -Biochemistry - Genetics - Economics - Statistics; Principles of food science, food processing and Issues related to food processing.

Upon completion, the graduates acquired a combined knowledge in the various scientific disciplines as well as the applications of the knowledge in the various working fields at both theoretical and practical levels. Further, graduates will be able to demonstrate effective communication skills, data mining as well as a good understanding of the ethics of Food Processing Technology and its social implications.

As for job opportunities, this programme is designed for the preparation of wide profile food science specialists both for the food industry and the companies performing research of food products as well as those applying the food safety procedures. It also provides a

degree-level education as for industry (or employment in other sectors of the food chain, or related scientific and marketing sectors) and professionals capable of assisting in the scientific education of food, and analysis of the economics and marketing development of food products.

This programme concentrates on recent technology in the field of food processing as general and in food safety and food product development as specific. The programme is working by ECTS system for specific reasons i.e. to develop the food processing graduation skills (in English) in the field of food science i.e. safety and development and to help the ECTS graduates to work and study in Europe; to change the current education pattern (esp. in post graduate studies) and to improve the graduate skills with relevant training on-site locally or abroad and through the cooperation with food production sector; to upgrade and modernize the postgraduates skills in the field of food processing and safety."

D Expert Report for the ASIIN Seal[4]

1. The Degree Programme: Concept, Content & Implementation

Criterion 1.1 Objectives and Learning Outcomes of a Degree Programme (Intended Qualifications Profile)

Evidence:

- Self-Assessment Report
- Student guidebook
- Module descriptions
- Programme learning outcomes matrix
- Egypt National Academic Reference Standard Agriculture
- Examples of industry survey questionnaires
- Programme report 2024/25
- Graduate employment records
- Discussions during the on-site visit

Preliminary assessment and analysis of the experts:

As outlined in the Self-Assessment Report, the Food Processing Technology (FPT) programme at Cairo University was established as an English-speaking Bachelor's programme in response to the high demand for internationally oriented food industry professionals in 2006. The presence of high-ranking representatives of major international food companies during the audit, including Dr. Oetker Egypt, Mondelez, Nestlé, and Unilever, confirmed the relevance and the close ties of the programme with the food industry. Besides the private industry, the Self-Assessment Report also names ministries, food control authorities, research institutes, academic positions in various universities, as well as the food safety sector.

[4] This part of the report applies also for the assessment for the European subject-specific labels. After the conclusion of the procedure, the stated requirements and/or recommendations and the deadlines are equally valid for the ASIIN seal as well as for the sought subject-specific label.

The programme learning outcomes, as outlined in the student guidebook and the programme learning outcomes matrix, are derived from the programme's objectives which are aligned with the Faculty of Agriculture's vision and mission, and are developed based on the Egyptian National Academic Reference Standard as well as international food education standards. The learning outcomes are displayed in the appendix to this report. At the level of the individual courses, they are further specified into Intended Learning Outcomes (ILOs) which are categorised into the domains of knowledge and understanding, intellectual skills, professional and practical skills, as well as general and transferable skills. The experts are satisfied with the formulation of the learning outcomes at the different levels of the programme administration and confirm that they adequately cover the broad spectrum of food technology programmes prescribed by the Subject-Specific Criteria of ASIIN's Technical Committee 08 – Agriculture, Forestry, and Food Sciences, as well as the EQAS-Food framework. However, the experts cannot find the learning outcomes of the programme at the university's or programme's website, which is a crucial instrument for information distribution. It appears that there is a general problem with the accessibility of the websites, which is why the experts see this as a general problem regarding the transparency of the programme (see chapter 4.3).

During the audit, it becomes clear that the programme fulfils a highly sought graduate profile. The industry representatives report that the food industry in Egypt and the overall market is steadily growing, which creates a demand for highly skilled personnel. The graduates' language and soft skills, as well as their practical skills are highlighted as distinguishing factors compared to graduates of other universities or programmes. Many alumni of the programme also work in these companies, among others in research and development, product development, and quality control. About 90-95% of the students find employment directly after graduation while many of them are recruited while still being enrolled, which is also facilitated by multiple internships that are required to be completed over the course of the programme. The programme tracks the progression of its graduates and as the graduate employment records as well as the industry representatives present at the audit interview confirm, graduates are employed in various companies and positions across the food industry.

The close industry relations also ensure continuous updating of the programme to meet the most recent demands and development in the food industry. External reviews also include benchmarking with related programmes. A comprehensive redesign was completed in 2016, as evidenced by programme assessment sheets. Aspects newly integrated included global trends and innovation in the food sector, topics on small-scale and medium-sized food industries, sensory evaluation, risk management and food safety, global food security challenges, raw materials of plant, animal, and microbial origin, as well as the focus on soft

skills. Since then, minor revisions and adaptations of the programme were made, particularly with respect to green technologies to reduce waste and support sustainable food production, artificial intelligence for food quality control, traceability, and data analysis, and environmental sustainability and clean production principles, all of which the experts consider highly relevant. An analysis of the programme's current state and opportunities for improvements is contained in the annual programme reports. While the experts find the programme up to date, it appears that students are not involved in the programme development process. Based on the students' comments during the audit, this appears to concern all aspects of the quality assurance system, which is why the experts require the involvement of the students at all levels of the university and programme level governance and quality assurance (see chapter 5).

In summary, the experts confirm that the programme offers a highly demanded graduate profile that is in accordance with the desired competence level of EQF 6 for Bachelor's programmes and enables the graduates to successfully take up adequate employment in their respective fields. The programme learning outcomes are briefly and concisely formulated and correspond to the applicable Subject-Specific Criteria as well as the provisions of the EQAS-Food framework. Transparent review processes are in place, although student involvement in the programme development appears to be missing (see chapter 5). Moreover, the inaccessibility of the programme's website is a major deficiency in terms of transparency (see chapter 4.3).

Criterion 1.2 Name of the Degree Programme

Evidence:

- Self-Assessment Report
- Discussions during the on-site visit

Preliminary assessment and analysis of the experts:
As the experts confirm, the programme adequately reflects its respective profile and curricular contents in line with both national and international denomination standards and definitions. As the programme is designed and taught in English, its name is also in English. Based on the provided documentation, the experts confirm that the name is consistently used across all official documents. Graduates are awarded the degree title of Bachelor of Science, and the experts confirm that the degree title also corresponds to the programme.

Criterion 1.3 Curriculum

Evidence:

- Self-Assessment Report
- Student guidebook
- Module descriptions
- Academic calendar for the academic year 2025/26
- Cooperation agreements
- International programme comparison sheet
- Curriculum workshop report
- Exemplary course evaluation sheets
- Cairo University booklet 2025
- Discussions during the audit

Preliminary assessment and analysis of the experts:

Structure and content

The programme under review is designed for a regular full-time study duration of 4 years (8 semesters) and comprises 240 ECTS credit points. The curriculum is organised into four annual levels of study building on each other, in the programme called modules, which reflects the acquisition of competences from basics to advanced topics and application: Basic Sciences, Principles of Food Science, Food Processing, and Issues Related to Food Processing. Across these levels, the programme combines compulsory and elective elements. According to the curricular overview, 192 ECTS are assigned to compulsory units and 48 ECTS to elective units. In addition to the subject-specific modules, the curriculum includes English language, soft skills, summer training, graduation training, a final project, and courses in human rights and international issues. The curricular overview is contained in the appendix to this report.

The first year, “Basic Sciences”, provides the scientific and methodological foundation for the programme. It includes applied mathematics, physics, thermodynamics and electricity, general and analytical chemistry, biochemistry, biology, genetics, statistics, economics, and an introduction to the principles of food processing. These courses establish the basic analytical, quantitative, natural-science and economic knowledge required for later studies in food science and food technology. Elective options at this level allow students to broaden their profile, for example in stored grain and foodstuff pests, business management and food production strategies, computer applications, world food problems, introduction to dairy science, and food additives.

The second year, “Principles of Food Science”, builds on these foundations and introduces the students to the major biological and biochemical bases of food raw materials. The compulsory part covers raw materials of plant, animal and microbial origin as well as the physiology and biochemistry of plant, animal and microbial products. In this way, the curriculum links the scientific foundations of the first year with the later technological and applied processing modules. Elective courses include processing of dairy products, food biotechnology, fast foods, technology risk management, supply chain in food processing, and evaluation of dairy products.

From the third year onward, the curriculum shifts more strongly towards advanced and applied food processing technology. The third year, “Food Processing”, contains a broad range of modules in food engineering, food technology and modern developments in food processing. The compulsory courses cover engineering principles and food properties, food processing operations and equipment, food plant planning, maintenance of food plant machinery, food chemistry and analysis, and the processing of oils and fats, fruits and vegetables, meat and meat products, sugars, special products and functional foods. Further compulsory content includes small-scale food industries and enzymes in food processing, as well as the course on soft skills. Elective modules deepen selected applied topics such as global trends and innovation in food processing, food quality control and sanitation, sensory evaluation and rheological characteristics, special industrial topics, lean production systems, and nanotechnology applications in food and dairy.

The fourth year, titled “Issues Related to Food Processing”, further develops the students’ professional profile and prepares them for employment in the food sector. The core curriculum includes packaging and packaging materials, processing of cereal and cereal products, food laws and legislation, food safety, treatment of water and food processing wastes, human nutrition and applied dietetics, food product development and marketing, and food business, marketing and management. This year also contains a 12 ECTS credit block of related elective courses which constitute the students’ specialisation. The four available specialisation directions are food marketing and management, food safety and hygiene, nutrition and food catering, as well as food processing and development.

Each study year contains one English language module which, as the experts learn from the students, serves mainly to teach the technical and subject-specific terms of the field of food science.

The experts are generally satisfied with the structure and content of the curriculum and confirm that it covers the central areas expected from a Bachelor’s programme in food processing technology. The programme does not focus on one narrow branch of the food industry but prepares graduates for different professional fields and offers the students the

opportunity for individual specialisation according to their interest. During the on-site visit, the experts discuss how dairy-related content is present and learn that there are an introductory course and multiple electives. Advanced dairy technology is not a central focus of the programme, as the university offers this field in a separate Dairy Technology programme which the experts consider unusual but still a feasible approach. Moreover, the programme coordinators explain that emerging topics such as automation, AI applications, food traceability and sustainable processing are addressed within suitable existing courses and student projects rather than through one separate stand-alone course.

As the experts positively acknowledge, the programme contains not only one but a total of four internship periods which amount to a total of 30 ECTS. Between each study year, students have to complete one month of summer training. In addition, the last semester, after the completion of the structured coursework, is reserved for the four-month graduation training, an extended on-site training period in food industries. During the on-site visit, the experts learn that the university has cooperation agreements with more than 20 companies to facilitate the internships which ensure that every student has an internship placement. However, as some of these companies which have structured partnerships with the university are very small, some students prefer to look for internships at larger companies on their own which, however, is an extra effort due to the high demand for these internship placements. As the request for a better management of the internship placements was voiced by both the students and industry representatives, the experts suggest extending the number of partnerships and agreements also with larger companies. A designated internship coordinator of the faculty would be considered highly beneficial for that, and the experts therefore recommend assigning an internship coordinator who manages partnerships and mediates internship placements between the industry and the students. Nevertheless, the experts are very satisfied with the practical training the students receive and also commend the system of the multiple short summer training periods which allows students to gain insights into different companies and/or divisions which benefits their experience and supports them in determining their preferred field of specialisation. Usually, the topic of the final project is also directly linked to the students' internship activities.

In summary, the experts confirm that the curriculum enables students to achieve the intended learning outcomes according to the applicable Subject-Specific Criteria as well as the EQAS-Food framework. The learning outcomes of each course are clearly defined and linked to the overall learning outcomes of the programme. The organisation of modules and courses is a suitable structure of matching learning units, and their order ensures a continuous competence development. Through multiple electives as well as the structured specialisation options in the fourth year, the programme allows for individual focal points and courses of study. Also, internships are suitably integrated into the programme,

although room for improvement is found regarding the management of partnerships and the mediation of internship placements.

Internationalisation and student mobility

Internationalisation activities and student mobility at Cairo University are administered by the university's International Relations Office. The university representatives explain that there are collaborations with multiple institutions, such as more than 70 Erasmus+ agreements. Specifically for the FPT programme, there are agreements with universities in Germany (TU Berlin) and the Netherlands (CAH Dronten). However, the cooperation agreements date back more than 10 years already and appear not to have been used since then. It is explained that the volatile political and economic situation of the past few years has made it more difficult to realise mobility, both for financial reasons as well as because of troubles with national authorities. As the limited places and scholarships for student mobility are administered at the university level, the application is highly competitive. Besides a recent 2-week student workshop in Rotterdam, which was organised at the university-level and was attended by one FPT student, there has been neither outgoing nor incoming student mobility over the past five years in the programme under review although the students show a high interest in joining mobility programmes. The experts acknowledge that funding is a huge challenge for student mobility. However, they deem it critical that the number and updating of collaborations also appear to hinder student mobility from the side of the university. Especially in an internationally oriented, English-speaking programme like the FPT programme, both incoming and outgoing student mobility would be highly beneficial for the students, and the programme structure and the stakeholder network of multinational companies offer also excellent opportunities for realising mobility, e.g. for the internships. If there are mobility offers, students can always also try to find other means of financing it than purely relying on university grants. Therefore, the experts advise the programme to foster both inbound and outbound student mobility through specific programme-level collaborations. It is recommended to establish more international collaborations for student exchange places at the programme level.

In summary, the experts conclude that the structural framework of the programme generally allows for student mobility, but that the lack of funds and specific collaborations hinder it in practice. Therefore, the programme administration should make more use of the excellent prerequisites of the programme to welcome international students, as well as the prerequisites of the own students to facilitate them to go abroad. Specific programme-level collaborations with universities as well as industries would be a good starting point.

Periodic review

As explained in section 1.1, the programme and the curriculum underwent a major review and restructuring in 2016, which was realised in connection with a formal curriculum development workshop. In that regard, the programme was also benchmarked against the curricula of other international universities. Since then, mainly minor changes at the level of individual modules have been incorporated. Regular consultations with industrial stakeholders and alumni ensure the alignment of the curriculum with evolving industry standards and future workforce requirements, including the above-mentioned topics of green technologies to reduce waste and support sustainable food production, artificial intelligence for food quality control, traceability, and data analysis, as well as environmental sustainability and clean production principles. Moreover, the course evaluation sheets show that the individual courses are internally reviewed to ensure the alignment of their content with the targeted learning outcomes. Besides these content-related updates, measures have been implemented to improve sequencing of modules to facilitate timely degree completion. Nevertheless, as explained in later parts of this report, this issue remains problematic, as it appears that the student involvement in the curriculum development is not clear (see chapter 5).

In summary, the experts confirm that the programme has measures in place to keep it up to date. However, while internal and external academics, alumni and industry representatives are incorporated in the quality assurance processes, the students appear not to be represented (see chapter 5).

Criterion 1.4 Admission Requirements

Evidence:

- Self-Assessment Report
- Student guidebook
- Student flyer
- Programme report
- Faculty of Agriculture admission requirements website for English programmes: http://www.agr.cu.edu.eg/langs/index.php/sectors/learningandstudents/conditions-for-admissions-in-english-programs
- Student registration portal: https://eservices.cu.edu.eg/
- Discussions during the on-site visit

Preliminary assessment and analysis of the experts:
The programme's admission regulations are outlined in the student guidebook as well as on the faculty's admission website. The baseline requirement is a secondary school education diploma. The selection of applicants is made competitively based on the GPA, as well as their separate scores in the subjects of biology, chemistry, and English. In the English language module or an equivalent test, a minimum grade of 70% is required to ensure sufficient English language proficiency of the students. In addition, an interview takes place. However, as the experts learn during the on-site visit, the number of applicants and enrolled students varies strongly and the full capacity of the 100 places per annual cohort is rarely used. As the programme report shows, 40 to 50 students have started the programme on average over the past five years. Besides the selective admission criteria, especially in terms of English language, the programme is expensive for students. Despite being hosted at the public Cairo University, this English-speaking programme has a special status and is operated privately (see also chapter 3.3). Therefore, the annual tuition fee is EP 40,000 (approximately EUR 715) which is notably higher than for many other programmes.

The students present during the on-site visit, all of whom had a high level of English language proficiency, reported that the admission procedure is well-suited for selecting students with adequate pre-qualification which is also reflected in the comparatively high success rate of the programme. Still, the programme coordinators explain that a drop in the applicants' performance in the relevant subjects was notable after COVID-19. Despite that, only a few students drop out of the programme, mostly already within the first year of studies, and mostly because of the high English-language standard.

The admission regulations also contain a policy for the transfer of students within the faculty or university, as well as from other universities into the programme. However, this happens only in very rare cases, and, as student mobility is currently non-existent (see chapter 1.3) there is also no recent experience with the recognition of external achievements in practice. Still, the experts recognise and confirm that the transparent module descriptions enable the comparison of course contents and learning outcomes to enable the recognition of credits. However, the regular framework of the programme needs to transparently outline a policy and criteria for the transfer of credits and recognition of externally achieved qualifications, which is why the experts require the university to define and implement adequate rules for the recognition of qualifications achieved externally. All admission and transfer processes are administered via the university's electronic services website.

In summary, the experts confirm that the programme's admission requirements and procedures are binding, transparent, and generally ensure sufficient prior qualification of the students.

Criterion 1.5 Workload and Credits

Evidence:

- Self-Assessment Report
- Student guidebook
- Module descriptions
- ECTS system information sheet
- Exemplary student timetable
- Discussions during the on-site visit

Preliminary assessment and analysis of the experts:

In its major curriculum revision in 2016, the FPT programme adopted the ECTS credit system. The programme has a regular full-time study duration of 4 years (8 semesters) during which 240 ECTS credit points need to be accomplished, which corresponds to the ECTS system's provision of a full-time study load of 60 ECTS per study year on average across the programme. According to the ECTS system information sheet, one ECTS credit is defined as 25 hours of student workload, distributed across lectures, practical contact hours, and independent learning activities. Each semester consists of 14 weeks of structured learning activities, and the majority of the courses has a credit load of 2 to 5 ECTS credits. As the experts confirm, the programme-specific content meets the credit point requirement for a Bachelor's degree.

Overall, the experts consider the credit system well incorporated and find also the credit numbers allocated to the different modules to be generally suitable. However, they wonder about the very uneven credit allocation across the study years which foresees 58 ECTS in the first, 53 ECTS in the second, 61 ECTS in the third, and 68 ECTS in the fourth year. Based on that, it does not surprise that the students consider the workload of the first semesters feasible, but that many delays happen in the final study year, mainly related to the graduation training. Given that this graduation internship accounts for only 15 ECTS to be completed in the eighth semester, achieving the remaining 53 ECTS in the seventh semester appears to be impossible. Consequently, the statistics show that the standard period of study is exceeded by one semester on average. Related to that, the students also report that there is no structured workload evaluation but that the student workload is planned based on the contact hours and the assumptions of each member of the teaching staff about the time required to complete the out-of-class learning assignments and study time. The experts stress that this approach does not meet the need for a structured evaluation

and monitoring of the actual student workload. Therefore, it is required to implement a systematic process to regularly monitor and evaluate student workload which needs to involve the students themselves. Based on this evaluation, the suitability of the credit allocation needs to be revised. In that regard, it must be aimed at more evenly distributing the student workload across the programme to avoid the workload peak in the final study year and the resulting delayed graduations.

In summary, the experts confirm that the programme employs a workload-based credit system that incorporates both the structured and independent study load. All compulsory components of the programme are credited and the credits/workload allocated to each course generally appears to be realistic. However, the workload is very unevenly distributed across the semesters, leading to an overly high workload in the final study year which leads to delays in the graduation of many students. Thus, it is required to distribute the student workload across the semesters more evenly. The basis for that is a realistic workload evaluation system which is currently not in place, as the workload is only accounted for based on the contact hours and lecturers' assumptions about the independent study hours. It is therefore required to implement a systematic process to regularly monitor and evaluate student workload.

Criterion 1.6 Didactic and Teaching Methodology

Evidence:

- Self-Assessment Report
- Student guidebook
- Module descriptions
- Exemplary student timetable
- Exemplary quality evaluation results
- Discussions during the on-site visit

Preliminary assessment and analysis of the experts:

According to the Self-Assessment Report, the teaching activities in the programme are clustered. Every semester is divided into two sub-modules, each of them lasting six weeks plus one week for the final exams. The general structure foresees that every sub-module contains three courses, each of which, distributed over six weekly working days, has one day for lectures and one day for practical learning activities per course per week. However, due to different credit numbers and workload distributions per module, this structure varies over the semesters. Still, the experts deem it generally feasible and commend the high

share of practice which usually amounts to roughly 50% while the other half of the working hours is allocated to lectures and independent study. The experts consider this balance of contact hours and independent work to be adequate.

During the on-site visit, the experts inquire about the design of the practical classes and the respective teaching methods. They learn that, depending on the nature of the respective course, practice can mean demonstrative or experimental work in laboratories, site-visits and field trips, but also seminar-style case studies, projects, in-class discussions or sessions for calculations. Besides the practical parts of each module, the programme has an extensive practical part in form of the multiple internships (see chapter 1.3). As the programme coordinators clarify, the specifics of the teaching contents and methods are explained to the students in the first class, and the corresponding materials and handouts are distributed. All activities are conducted in the form of face-to-face instruction. Generally, the experts do not criticise that as they consider face-to-face instruction much better for training the practical skills which the application-oriented programme profile targets. Nevertheless, given that digitalisation is omnipresent and highly relevant in many different facets of today's industry, they point out that this should be part of not only the teaching content but also of the teaching methodology. Therefore, it is recommended to implement digital and/or hybrid teaching approaches in suitable modules.

The programme does not include a separate research methodology course, but aspects of research methodology are contained in multiple courses. Also, besides the practical research skills transmitted through laboratory work, there are two methodology-oriented mathematics and statistics courses in the programme's first year which lay the groundwork for methodological application. As the lecturers explain, homework assignments which can among others take the form of reports also contribute towards learning academic writing and the work with scientific sources. Judging from the quality of the Bachelor's projects and theses as the final research-related programme component, the experts conclude that the students are sufficiently introduced to independent scientific work.

The quality of the teaching methods is assured by means of continuous staff development (see chapter 3.1) and the module evaluations which take place every semester, which is confirmed by the students and is welcomed by the experts.

In summary, the experts confirm that the programme employs a variety of teaching methods and didactic means to promote achieving the learning outcomes. The focus is on on-site, face-to-face teaching and application. As room for improvement the experts see potential in introducing digital, hybrid, and/or blended teaching approaches in suitable modules to better prepare students for these working methods which are becoming more popular due to the ongoing digitalisation. Students are adequately introduced to the

methodologies and applications of scientific research and, through internships, also gain insights into the practical application outside of the university. The teaching methodology is evaluated every semester as part of the regular module surveys.

Final assessment of the experts after the comment of the Higher Education Institution regarding criterion 1:

Criterion 1.3:

In its statement, the university clarifies that an internship coordinator has already been appointed to manage the cooperation with partner companies and administer and monitor the internships. While the experts are satisfied with that and decide not to formalise the initial recommendation, they stress the importance of actively and transparently informing all relevant stakeholders, including students and (potential) partners, of this appointment to ensure that they know and can make use of the services provided. This appeared not to be the case during the on-site visit.

Likewise, the experts also appreciate the university's commitment towards internationalisation, student mobility and staff exchange. Nevertheless, to support the programme in improving the current situation despite the challenging circumstances, the experts decide to sustain the formal recommendation.

Criterion 1.5:

In the statement, the university claims that average students are able to complete the programme within the designated study period while only few students fall behind. However, this claim is not supported by the cohort statistics that were presented to the experts as these show high shares of students not graduating in time. While delays of the study course can happen and are not considered problematic if attributed to individual causes, the experts stress that the very imbalanced workload distribution as well as the rigidity of the exam system (see chapter 2) are two institutional factors that affect the feasibility of the study trajectory. These need to be addressed as expressed in the respective requirements. The experts appreciate the university's approach to conduct a review for better distributing the workload under consideration of all relevant factors. However, until this has been completed and necessary changes have been implemented, the experts sustain the requirement. Besides that, up-to-date and structured cohort statistics should be submitted as evidence for the development of the graduation times.

Final assessment:

In summary, the experts are satisfied with the content-wise programme design and implementation. The practical integration is positively mentioned, and the appointment of an

internship coordinator is deemed highly beneficial. However, other aspects like the workload evaluation and monitoring system as well as the regulation for recognising externally achieved qualifications, especially in light of the strive for international mobility, need to be addressed. Room for improvement is also seen in fostering international student exchange as well as modern digital and hybrid teaching formats.

Overall, the experts consider this criterion to be **partly fulfilled**.

2. Exams: System, Concept and Organisation

Criterion 2 Exams: System, Concept and Organisation

Evidence:

- Self-Assessment Report
- Student guidebook
- Module descriptions
- University examination regulations academic year 2025/26
- Evaluation sheet for final exams
- Exemplary exam schedule
- Discussions during the on-site visit

Preliminary assessment and analysis of the experts:

The student performance and degree of achievement of the learning outcomes in each course of the FPT programme is measured through multiple assessments. As outlined in the module descriptions, each course has five assessment components with different methods to cover the different aspects of the respective course learning outcomes (see chapter 1.1). For the structured modules, the regular assessment components, their scheduling, and weighting for the overall grade, are listed in the following table taken from the Self-Assessment Report:

Assessment Method	Assessment schedule	Weighting (%)
-Mid-term exam to assess the obtained knowledge, understanding and skills.	Week 3	10 %
-Oral exam to assess knowledge, understanding, and intellectual skills -Class attendance and activities	Week 6	30 %
-Practical exam to assess professional, intellectual, and general skills	Week 6	10 %

-Final exam to assess retained knowledge, understanding and skills	Week 7	50 %
Total		*100%*

Given the programme's structure, there are four final exam weeks per year, as outlined by an exemplary exam schedule provided as part of the materials. The exemplarily provided exam evaluation sheets evidence the internal review of the exams and the suitability of question types to ensure their match with the targeted learning outcomes.

For practical modules like the internships and the Bachelor's project, the assessment scheme deviates but, as transparently outlined in the module description, still consists of multiple components. During the on-site visits, the experts review examples of written final exams at the faculty's examination centre and confirm that they adequately represent the assessment of competencies at the EQF level 6. The experts are also satisfied with the different exam types which ensure that the different competencies are adequately tested.

The final grade of each course is calculated cumulatively according to the weights of the components. The minimum passing grade is 50%, with 65 % "good", 75 % "very good", and 85% "excellent" as grading scale. As a prerequisite for taking the final exam, students have to attend a minimum of 75% of the classes which is tracked via electronic registration and monitored by the faculty's Evaluation Committee. Students who do not meet the prerequisites, miss or fail the exam have to take the course again in full in the next semester or year because, as the experts learn during the on-site visit, there are no remedial examinations. Courses can be repeated up to three times but, as the students explain, the grades are capped at the 50% "pass" in case of a repetition of a course, independently from the reason for re-taking it. What is more, students are not allowed to take the courses to be repeated as an extra, but, because of the per-day teaching structure and attendance requirement, other courses need to be postponed. In that regard, there are also thresholds of minimum credit numbers to be passed before a student can take courses from the next-higher level. This system is seen as highly critical by the experts as this effectively hinders student progress and, as also the students confirm, is a reason for the exceeded graduation times. Also, this procedure punishes students who may miss exams for reasons which are no fault of their own, like illness. The programme coordinators stress that this system corresponds to the university's regulations and therefore cannot be changed. Nevertheless, the experts stress that changes need to be made to avoid the systematic delays of student progress caused by this system. The students confirm this and find the current situation highly challenging for their study progress. Also, it appears not sensible to force students to repeat entire courses if all course requirements except the final exam are met, as a final exam can be easily studied for and re-taken individually. Given these considerations, the

experts see it as a requirement to offer re-take and make-up exams in the same semester to avoid systematic delays of the study time. Moreover, the experts criticise the grade cap for repeated courses which they consider unfair, especially since there is no distinction between repetitions because of failure and repetition for valid reasons. Therefore, the experts additionally require the university to abandon the grade cap for re-take exams.

All decisions regarding academic regulations are taken by the Faculty Council and Programme Supervision Committee (PSC). They are based on the internal statutes of the Faculty and the overarching rules established by the Supreme Council of Higher Education and the Egyptian National Authority for Quality Assurance and Accreditation. In terms of transparency of the exam system and grading, the Self-Assessment Report lists the following student rights:

- Students "have the right to review and recount their marks if necessary.
- In case of any grievance—such as contesting exam results—students can submit complaints through the Faculty Student Affairs Unit, which forwards them to the Faculty Control Committee to verify and confirm the marks.
- Final results are reviewed and analyzed by the Faculty Quality Assurance Unit (FQAU) and presented to the Faculty Council for approval."

These rules apply equally to all students and are enforced consistently to promote fairness, clarity, and accountability across all academic processes. Practical provisions, including a code of conduct for final exams, are contained in the university examination regulations. The experts are satisfied with these policies.

All Bachelor´s students have to conduct a graduation project which fulfils the function of a Bachelor's thesis. The projects are to be carried out in cooperation with relevant food industries and students usually select their company and topic based on their work experience in the summer trainings, which is also confirmed by the industry representatives. The students have to carry out practical work under the supervision of a university staff member, prepare a written scientifically based report about the project, and present and discuss the project to a public audience. According to the module descriptions, students have to work independently; however, as the experts learned based on multiple project presentations during the on-site visit, it is possible for students to work on a more extensive topic like the development of a new product, as a project group. In that regard, the experts positively note that the students' contributions are nevertheless assessed separately, which they stress to be very important. The practical performance of the student is evaluated by the supervisor, while a committee of at least three people, including the supervisor, another professor of the programme, and an industrial member, evaluates the written part.

During the on-site visit, the experts are presented with multiple graduation projects that involved the development of new food products. They highly commend the extensive and very practically oriented work of the students in that regard. Moreover, they also review examples of the written theses and confirm that their overall quality in terms of topics, methodology, and formalities corresponds to the minimum requirement of a Bachelor's level graduation work. However, the experts notice that all theses are submitted and stored only in paper at the examination office which strengthens the experts' impression also mentioned in other parts of this report, that digitalisation is currently still a weakness, but therefore also a great chance, of the university. Thus, they see it as a requirement for the university to set up a digital archive for theses/final projects and allow for soft-copy submissions (see also chapter 3.3).

Related to the theses and examinations, the experts also discuss the topic of artificial intelligence (AI) and its use for exams, presentations, reports, and learning. They learn that, although AI is part of the teaching contents and is practically realised, among others, in the training of AI systems for specific food-related tasks, there is no AI policy and students mostly discover it as a tool on their own. A more structured approach towards AI as a tool would be welcome, and the experts consider an official framework for how to employ AI in teaching, learning, project work, and assessments as a crucial starting point for that. Therefore, it is recommended to implement an AI policy or a framework for students on how to use AI.

In summary, the experts confirm that the programme employs course-specific exams which adequately assess the degree to which the learning outcomes have been met. The programme also includes a final project/thesis with a corresponding oral presentation which demonstrates that the students are able to work independently on a practical, scientific project. However, while the examination processes are regulated at the university level, they point out that the current provisions hinder a smooth study progress and lead to exceeded graduation times. Therefore, the experts require the establishment of a system of re-take/make-up exams to consolidate this fault. Moreover, the unfair grade cap for these re-take attempts needs to be abandoned. In addition, a policy for the structured use of AI should be adopted.

Final assessment of the experts after the comment of the Higher Education Institution regarding criterion 2:

Concerning the examination system, particularly with respect to the opportunity to directly remedial examinations in case of absence or failure, the programme coordinators once more stress that the exam policy is bound to the university's overall examination regulations. While the experts recognise this as an administrative challenge for implementing the

required changes, they still stress these measures to be imperative to create a suitable exam system enabling successful student progression, which is part of the applicable international accreditation standard. The experts therefore formalise the respective requirement to stress the importance of this issue when referring it to the relevant university authorities. At the same time, the experts support the planned measures to support students to manage the studies within the current exam system.

Final assessment:

In summary, the experts consider the lack of remedial examinations and a grade cap for retake courses as highly critical. Moreover, the incorporation and handling of AI in the examination system is recommended to be formalised in an AI policy.

Overall, the experts consider this criterion to be **partly fulfilled**.

3. Resources

Criterion 3.1 Staff and Development

Evidence:

- Self-Assessment Report
- Staff handbook
- Criteria for selection of staff members for teaching
- Student survey report
- Discussions during the on-site visit

Preliminary assessment and analysis of the experts:
According to the Self-Assessment Report, teaching in the FPT programme is mostly realised by the staff of the Food Science Department as well as of other related departments of the Faculty of Agriculture, while the programme also cooperates with other faculties to cover the basic sciences courses. Furthermore, as the industry representatives confirm during the on-site visit, also industry professionals are regularly involved in the teaching activities of the programme, among others the third-year course Special topics in the food industry. The ranks and numbers of academic staff members are displayed in the following table taken from the Self-Assessment Report:

Type of staff	No. of staff members
Professors	27
Associate professors	30
Assistant professors	25
Teaching Assistance	15
Outside university members	14
Food experts	4

A staff handbook lists the staff members with their educational and professional careers and shows that all professors are adequately qualified, as they hold PhD degrees, among others from universities like Kiel University, Bonn Universities, DTU Denmark, University of Maryland, and Cairo University itself. Based on the listed qualifications, the experts also conclude that all relevant disciplines of food science respectively food processing are covered by the staff.

As the programme is financed privately, the teaching hours of the staff members are not included in their regular workload budget according to their university contracts, but the staff members are hired and paid based on the credit hours they deliver in the programme. Therefore, the involvement in the programme is very attractive for the professors and there are no problems in finding suitable staff covering the teaching and supervision duties. A set of criteria regulates the assignment of certain staff members to the courses.

Staff development of the professors is organised with the university's regular HR programme. Opportunities for continuous learning include national and international research and industry trainings, support for academic exchange through scientific conferences, as well as external staff development courses, e.g. regarding didactical methods. However, similar to the students (see chapter 1.3), also the staff mobility has suffered under the current economic conditions, limiting the number of staff who realised international stages or exchanges over the past years. In that regard, also staff mobility is recommended to be fostered at the programme level through respective collaborations and targeted funding.

According to the staff members, about 40% of their regular workload is allocated to research and community service. As the teaching load during the lecturing periods is very high, research work is done mainly in the lecture-free periods. However, despite multiple funding sources including internal grants by the university for different specific topics and national funding administered by the national funding agency for research as well as international grant applications, research funding is generally scarce, and the lecturers would like to have more funds. In that regard, the experts inquire whether and how the industry network is incorporated into the research system of the university. It is explained that the industry involvement mainly regards the students as it is in the interest of the companies

to establish contact to students early on as a recruiting measure. However, the interest in research appears to be low. The experts take note of that but still point out that a closer cooperation with the industry partners also for research purposes would be mutually beneficial and could contribute to reducing the research funding problems.

While the experts confirm that the staff body is sufficient and well-suited for covering the duties in the programme, they notice that the share of very senior staff members is very high, while junior staff members are rare. As the experts consider a diverse staff body very important to ensure continuous updating of teaching, knowledge transfer, and long-term stability of the available human resources, they recommend fostering junior staff development.

Also, while the academic staff body is adequate, it becomes apparent that there is a lack of technical supporting staff for operating some of the more complex machinery (see chapter 3.3). The programme coordinators explain that they used to have technical staff which retired a few years ago. The need for replacing these staff members is known and the positions had already been approved multiple years ago. However, due to administrative complications and delays, the positions have remained vacant. As the experts consider the use of the machinery crucial for the education of the students, they stress the importance of hiring suitable staff members for it and therefore require the university to provide a strategic plan for hiring the necessary support staff for the operation of the equipment.

The staff are annually assigned to the different courses among others based on their respective qualification, English language competencies, and the teaching load in regular programmes of the university. Their performance is reviewed as part of the course surveys and the results are taken into account for the staff selection to the following year.

In summary, the experts confirm that the composition, professional orientation, and qualification of the academic staff are suitable for successfully delivering the programme. However, support staff for the operation of the machinery in some of the labs is missing, which needs to be addressed to ensure the practical teaching in all subjects. Also, there are suitable staff development offers, although there is room for improvement in terms of junior staff development and international staff mobility. Lecturers are also supported in their research activities, which contribute to the teaching in the programme. Establishing industry collaborations could be a way to further enhance the research opportunities. The experts further confirm that the staff qualification and performance are regularly reviewed.

Criterion 3.2 Student Support and Student Services

Evidence:

- Self-Assessment Report
- Student guidebook
- Faculty student survey report
- Cairo University booklet 2025: https://cu.edu.eg/userfiles/CU%20Booklet%202025.pdf
- Cairo University student life website: https://cu.edu.eg/Home
- Faculty of Agriculture student clubs website: http://www.agr.cu.edu.eg/langs/index.php/menuitem795/menuitem796/2015-07-08-10-12-11
- Discussions during the on-site visit

Preliminary assessment and analysis of the experts:

According to the Self-Assessment Report, the university's student support system includes different support offers over the full student lifecycle. The main point of reference in terms of academic support is the system of academic supervisors, who are members of the academic staff assigned to each student at the beginning of their study career at the university. The academic supervisor is the first person of reference, mainly for academic matters but also in case of non-academic issues, and supports the students, among others, with their academic planning, course registration, selection of electives and the specialisation, or the determination of research topics. During the audit, the students confirm that the support offers, especially the academic advisors, are accessible and support them throughout their study career.

At the start of each new cohort of the programme, an orientation day is held where the faculty dean, programme coordinators, and professors present the education system, courses, regulations, and advising structure. Moreover, there is also an introduction day at the beginning of each semester for students to inform themselves and select their courses. Academic guidance regarding specific courses is provided by committee members and professors during their office hours. Special guidance is offered to students who fail and need to re-register for courses. For administrative and regulatory issues, including also complaints, the responsibility lies with the Vice-Dean for Academic Affairs. Furthermore, the designated Students Affairs Department provides all administrative services to students.

Further university and faculty-level services, as listed on the university's website, include support for scholarship applications, student housing, medical services at the university hospital, cafeterias on campus, as well as the offer of student clubs in the domains of

sports, arts, culture, and social services. Furthermore, there is a scientific student committee which fosters extracurricular academic activities such as hosting additional seminars and workshops, organising exhibitions, and participating in scientific competitions. As outlined in the university booklet, there is also a Disability Support Services Centre to facilitate study careers for students with special needs.

In summary, the experts confirm that there are sufficient human resources and organisational structures for both academic and non-academic counselling, which support the students in successfully completing the programme. These services are regularly evaluated through the student surveys.

Criterion 3.3 Funds and equipment

Evidence:

- Self-Assessment Report
- Cairo University central library website: https://cu.edu.eg/page.php?pg=contentFront/SubSectionData.php&SubSectionId=205
- Discussions during the on-site visit

Preliminary assessment and analysis of the experts:

As described in the Self-Assessment Report, the programme is funded primarily through student tuition fees, which are calculated based on the number of credit units registered. As the special English-speaking programmes of Cairo University are operated privately, the tuition fees are considerably higher than in the Arab-speaking programmes and amount to EP 40,000 (approximately EUR 715) per year with full-time study load. The income generated through these tuition fees needs to cover the raw materials and consumables as well as the extra salaries of the teaching staff involved in the programme. As explained in chapter 3.1, the teaching staff is regularly employed by the university and is hired for the teaching duties in the FPT programme on a credit hour basis. The buildings, equipment, and general facilities are also covered by the university, although extra money for investments should also be acquired by the programme. As the programme coordinators explain, these special kinds of programmes even serve to subsidise the Arabic-speaking programmes, as 30% of the tuition fee income goes into the university budget. Nevertheless, the programme coordinators assess the programme to be sustainably funded which the experts view positively. However, as described in the following, the experts note that additional funds for equipment investments are needed.

In terms of facilities, the Department of Food Science and Technology has three buildings at the Faculty of Agriculture, which is located at the university's main campus in the centre of the metropolis of Cairo/Giza. General facilities at the faculty buildings include classrooms, laboratories, reading rooms, meeting rooms, offices, and support facilities. Practical facilities at the department include, among others, a food chemistry lab, a food microbiology lab, a cereal and cereal products lab, a bakery, a meat processing lab, juice-making equipment. Besides that, the programme also makes use of the dairy products facilities of the Dairy Science Department, which includes equipment for processing milk and whey as well as for cheese production. Advanced equipment which is mainly used by the academic staff but can also be employed by students is available at the university's science park. During the on-site visit, the experts visit the mentioned laboratories and positively highlight the dairy facilities, the science park laboratories, and to some extend also the bakery. In general, they also confirm the adequacy of the other labs for the delivery of the teaching activities and for students to get the necessary hands-on experience. However, while a lot of essential equipment and machinery is available, especially the equipment of the juice-making lab and of the meat processing lab is very old and appears to not be used anymore. The programme coordinators explain this with the lack of the necessary technical staff (see chapter 3.1) which impedes the practical use of this complex equipment. In that regard, the experts again stress the need for hiring the staff members to operate the machinery and allow all students to get the relevant practical insights to all domains of food processing. Also, they consider it also necessary to modernise and update the lab equipment which currently does not meet the standard of today's food industry. For example, the dairy facilities are technically up to date, but the pilot plant around them does not meet hygienic standards. The bakery equipment - although functional - is very old and should be partly replaced. Fruit and meat processing equipment is currently fragmented, dirty, and not operational at all. Consequently, the experts require the university to provide a strategic plan together with approvement and financial commitment by the faculty and university management for the update and renovation of the equipment for food processing. Likewise, the experts also take note of the department's computer laboratory which is equipped with 30 computers. While the students confirm the number of computers and workplaces to be adequate, they lament the antiquity of the equipment which matches the expert's impression. Therefore, they additionally recommend updating the computer facilities.

The Faculty of Agriculture has a central library which provides a broad selection of recent journals and academic literature, both online and offline. Moreover, the students can also make use of the university's integrated central library on the main campus located next to the Faculty of Agriculture. The students and staff confirm the adequacy of the provided literature and workspaces which is welcomed by the experts.

As described in chapter 1.6, the experts also discuss the digital facilities and tools to promote digital teaching and learning. They consider it astonishing to hear that there is apparently no digital learning management/academic information system or a similar tool that connects students, teachers, and the university administration to facilitate the class organisation and study management. The students exemplarily mention that course information and class materials are usually distributed via WhatsApp or paper-based in the first class of a course. The experts consider messenger services respectively platforms like WhatsApp as a proprietary and commercial application as unacceptable for official use by the university. This adds to the general impression that the university is still lagging in the aspect of digitalisation which was mentioned in multiple places of this report before. The experts consider a functioning integrated digital system imperative for a modern university and therefore require the university to implement an academic information system as a digital tool for structured programme and course administration as well as digital teaching and learning applications. Likewise, they repeat their request for digital storage and submission of final theses.

In summary, the experts confirm that the financial resources and physical facilities of the faculty and the department generally constitute a sustainable basis for the successful delivery of the study programme. However, the renovation of multiple parts of the machinery is necessary, most urgently for the food processing equipment; and the experts require a concept in that regard. Also, digitalisation needs to be fostered including the provision of up-to-date hardware and software to ensure modern and efficient programme administration, teaching organisation, exam management and learning methods.

Final assessment of the experts after the comment of the Higher Education Institution regarding criterion 3:

Criterion 3.1:

In its statement, the university contradicts the experts' conclusion that technical staff for the operation of certain laboratories is missing, which contradicts the outcome of the discussions on-site. The experts stress that this observation specifically relates to the staff necessary for running multiple laboratory facilities which have clearly not been used in a long time. Given this inconsistency, the experts sustain the initial requirement until evidence, e.g. in form of a HR plan, is provided which demonstrates that all laboratories have adequate support staff.

No comments were made regarding the aspects of junior staff development, staff mobility as well as industry collaborations, which is why the experts sustain the initial recommendations for further improvement.

Criterion 3.3:

The university alleges that the laboratories shown during the on-site visit do not represent the full range of laboratories, facilities, and equipment used for practical teaching. While the experts wonder why, if available, these other laboratories were not presented, they point out that the laboratories shown would generally represent a good basis for the practical teaching if the equipment was fully functional and updated. While some of the laboratories are on a good standard, this is evidently not the case for all of them. In line with the university's continuous modernisation process, the experts sustain the requirement for a concept and a strategic plan for the update and renovation of the critically mentioned facilities and equipment.

In terms of the study programme and course administration, the university explains that work is currently underway to update and further develop and expand the programme website, together with the digital transformation the programme's academic administration, course communication, activity documentation, and student services. The experts commend on these ongoing developments which they consider crucial for the future operation of the programme. However, as the process is still ongoing and the experts want to follow-up on this important topic, they sustain the initial requirement in that regard.

Final assessment:

In summary, the experts appreciate the responsiveness of the university to the comments but still see multiple critical aspects in terms of human, physical, and digital resources which need to be addressed.

Overall, the experts consider this criterion to be **partly fulfilled**.

4. Transparency and Documentation

Criterion 4.1 Module Descriptions

Evidence:

- Module descriptions
- Website of the study programme

Preliminary assessment and analysis of the experts:

In the documentation of the Self-Assessment Report, the university has presented comprehensive module descriptions for all modules, called course specifications. As the experts confirm, they contain the complete required information, including the title, course coordinator, teaching and exam methods and weights, learning outcomes, and contents, as well

as short reading lists. However, besides the statement of the students that the course-related information is distributed in the first class of each course, it remains unclear how the module descriptions are made accessible to all relevant parties, especially given that no academic information system is in place (see chapter 3.3). Therefore, the experts require the university to ensure the completeness and accessibility of the module descriptions for all relevant parties, ideally by openly publishing them on the programme's website (see chapter 4.3).

Criterion 4.2 Diploma and Diploma Supplement

Evidence:

- Self-Assessment Report
- Exemplary Diploma Supplement
- Discussions during the on-site visit

Preliminary assessment and analysis of the experts:
During the on-site visit, graduates of the programme confirmed to have received final documentation including a Diploma Certificate and a Diploma Supplement shortly after their graduation. However, as proof, the university only provided a template of the Diploma supplement based on the model of the European Commission, but no evidence of actually issued final documents. Also, the experts point out that there are many errors within the document, e.g. the information regarding the higher education system relates to Germany, not to Egypt, the programme learning outcomes as well as information on the individual student performance and statistical data to assess it are missing, and multiple pieces of information appear at the wrong section. Therefore, they require the university to ensure that the Diploma Supplement is factually correct and includes all information set out in the template and required by the ASIIN criteria, including statistical data on the distribution of final grades.

Criterion 4.3 Relevant Rules

Evidence:

- Self-Assessment Report
- Discussions during the on-site visit

Preliminary assessment and analysis of the experts:

According to the Self-Assessment Report, all academic educational rules are adopted through the faculty departments, specifically, the programme supervision committee, and the higher-level faculty council. Some regulations were provided as part of the documentation. Although not all regulations were presented, the on-site interviews showed that all university members and students were aware of the regulatory frameworks for studies and the course specifications. Nevertheless, the experts stress the need for transparency in that regard. Currently, it is not possible to judge whether and how the relevant information is distributed and communicated within the programme, which relates to the already formulated requirement for an academic information system (see chapter 3.3), as well as from the university to the public, which relates to the university's website. The experts point out that the websites of all three levels (university, faculty, and programme) provide only very little, and, in many cases, also outdated information. Many sub-websites and links do not work anymore. In general, programme-specific information (e.g., learning outcomes and graduate profile, curriculum, module descriptions) as well as regulatory information (admission requirements, academic regulations, examination regulations, etc.) is very sparse. In line with the multiple comments regarding digitalisation, the experts suggest reviewing and updating the university website, its contents, and in case of the programme, setting up a new and modernised website. In that regard, it must be guaranteed that all relevant regulatory and programme-related information is provided in full and in its up-to-date versions on the university's and programme's website to ensure accessibility for all university members as well as external third parties like industrial stakeholders, authorities, and potential students.

Final assessment of the experts after the comment of the Higher Education Institution regarding criterion 4:

As the statement did not include any comment or additional documentation concerning the critical aspects of the programme documentation, the experts formalise both requirements in that regard.

Final assessment:

In summary, the experts stress the need for a consistent, transparent, and up-to-date documentation of the university processes, programme administration, and study attestation. Improvement in that regard is necessary and needs to be scrupulously evidenced.

Overall, the experts consider this criterion to be **partly fulfilled**.

5. Quality management: quality assessment and development

Criterion 5 Quality management: quality assessment and development

Evidence:

- Self-Assessment Report
- Course evaluation sheets
- Exemplary course report
- Discussions during the on-site visit

Preliminary assessment and analysis of the experts:
According to the Self-Assessment Report, Cairo University has a quality assurance system for its degree programmes which strictly defines the competences and responsibilities for the implementation of the quality assurance processes and instruments. In the first place, the faculty-level Quality Assurance Unit (FQAU) has been formed to follow up, organise and cooperate with all departments and programmes to implement the different evaluation instruments. Apart from the FQAU, there is also the programme-level Programme Quality Assurance Unit (PQAU). While the FQAU is supposed to monitor the implementation of the quality assurance strategy, propose measures to remedy identified weaknesses and follow up the measures taken to improve the quality performance, the PQAU conducts yearly programme evaluations through internal and external evaluators, as evidenced by the exemplarily provided course evaluation sheets. Multiple aspects of the quality assurance system have already been mentioned in earlier parts of this report.

On the programme level, the continuous development mainly relies on a multitude of survey instruments such as course evaluations, student evaluations of the learning outcomes, lecturers, and teaching quality, staff members' evaluations of students' study performance, or graduates' evaluations of the programme outcomes. These instruments appear generally to be adequate to collect meaningful information about whether the programme's educational objectives and contents fit the academic and professional needs of the students, graduates and employers.

Based on the provided documentation and the explanations during the on-site interviews, it becomes clear that an active network of different stakeholders from within and outside the faculty and the university (for instance, evaluators from other faculties and universities, experts from food industry companies, and alumni/graduates of the programme) has been built for the purpose of the re-design of the programme in 2016. The programme also actively benchmarks with comparable study programmes in the domain of food processing.

Since then, these stakeholders have been contributing to the further enhancement and successful updating of the programme which is demonstrated by the high reputation of the programme's graduates among the industry representatives.

Despite this programme-level success rate, the discussions during the audit interviews show that there are still aspects of the quality assurance system that need improvement. The students state that their feedback appears often not to be taken seriously, leading to the status quo of multiple critical aspects that are described in this report and were already voiced by the students before, including make-up exams, graduation delays, digitalisation of teaching and administration, and internship mediation. A major problem in that regard is that the feedback loop is not closed and that students do not receive any information on their survey results and the actions taken or purposefully not taken. Also, the documentation of the programme development activities does not contain any evidence of student involvement in the processes. Corresponding to that, the students present during the on-site interview also do not know of any representation of the students in the programme, faculty, and university governance bodies such as the faculty council or the PQAU. Considering this, the experts see it as imperative to ensure student representation in university and programme development bodies and establish a continuous feedback loop between students and academic staff.

In terms of external quality assurance, both the Faculty of Agriculture and the FPT programme are nationally accredited by the Egypt National Authority for Quality Assurance and Accreditation of Education. Furthermore, the programme aims at manifesting its distinguished position through international programme accreditation and is subject to international accreditation by ASIIN for the second time.

In summary, the experts confirm that the study programme is subject to periodic internal and external quality assurance and that the results of these processes are incorporated in the further programme development. However, the involvement of the students is currently limited to different survey instruments, while an active involvement of the students in decision-making bodies and a structured feedback loop are missing. The experts require the university to address these shortcomings.

Final assessment of the experts after the comment of the Higher Education Institution regarding criterion 5:

In terms of the student involvement in the programme development, the university explains that the regular course evaluations offer the opportunity of contributing to this development. At the same time, the university affirms that the feedback loop back to the students is not yet closed which is planned to be changed, among others by "preparing a

summary of the main student comments and suggestions, documenting the actions taken in response to the evaluation results, informing students about the improvements that have been implemented, and explaining why certain suggestions could not be implemented". Likewise, students should also be represented in the relevant committees which is specifically requested by the experts. Overall, the experts commend on this approach but sustain the requirement until the measures have been implemented.

Final assessment:

In summary, the experts conclude that the measures planned by the university to increase the student involvement in the existing quality assurance system are well suited to address the initial criticism.

Overall, for the moment, the experts consider this criterion to be **almost fulfilled**.

E Additional Documents

Before preparing their final assessment, the panel ask that the following missing or unclear information be provided together with the comment of the Higher Education Institution on the previous chapters of this report:

- University examination regulations
- Updated staff handbook
- Diploma Supplement

F Comment of the Higher Education Institution (16.08.2026)

The following quotes the detailed statement of the institution:

"**1. Technical Staff and Operation of Laboratory Equipment**

Reference: Criteria 3.1 and 3.3, pages 24 to 28

The Food Processing Technology Program is multidisciplinary, and its courses are delivered through several specialized academic departments within the Faculty of Agriculture. Each department is responsible for delivering the practical components of the courses assigned to it and under the supervision of the program supervision committee.

For each practical course, the responsible course professor assigns the appropriate academic support staff and qualified technicians available in the department hosting the course. Accordingly, every practical session is conducted with the participation of the course professor, assistant lecturers, teaching assistants, and the technicians responsible for the respective laboratory.

The Program would therefore like to clarify that there is no general shortage of technical support that disrupts the delivery of practical activities. Practical classes are conducted in the laboratories of the relevant academic departments using functional facilities and equipment appropriate for achieving the intended course learning outcomes.

The observation made by the experts during the onsite visit may have resulted from the condition of certain old or highly specialised pieces of equipment. However, these units do not represent the full range of laboratories, facilities, and equipment used for practical teaching within the Programme.

2. Standard Period of Study and Graduation Delays

Reference: Criterion 1.5, pages 16 and 17

The Programme curriculum is designed to allow students who progress normally through their studies to complete the required 240 ECTS credits within the standard period of eight semesters.

Programme records indicate that students with normal or average academic progression can complete the Programme within the prescribed period. Extended study periods occur mainly among academically challenged students who have accumulated failed, incomplete, or postponed courses, or who have not fulfilled the relevant attendance or progression requirements.

These individual cases are not specific to the Food Processing Technology Programme and may also occur in other programmes within the Faculty.

3. Distribution and Monitoring of Student Workload

Reference: Criterion 1.5, pages 16 and 17

The Programme acknowledges the experts' observation regarding the distribution of ECTS credits, particularly during the third and fourth years.

Although students with normal academic progression can complete the Programme within the standard study period, the Programme recognises that a more balanced distribution of student workload may facilitate academic progression and reduce pressure during the advanced years of study.

The Programme will therefore conduct a systematic review of the curriculum with the objective of reducing the concentration of workload in the third and fourth years. Where academically appropriate, the review will consider transferring selected requirements or courses to the first and second years.

The review will take into consideration course prerequisites, the logical progression of competency development, actual student workload, student feedback, and the requirements of national and international academic standards. Any proposed modifications will be submitted to the relevant Department, Faculty, and University Councils for approval.

4. Programme Website and Digital Communication

Reference: Criteria 3.3 and 4.3, pages 28 to 31

The Food Processing Technology Programme currently has an official page on the Faculty of Agriculture website. The Programme also maintains an official Facebook page used for public communication, student activities, announcements, and Programme promotion.

During the delivery of courses, a WhatsApp group may be created for each course to facilitate rapid communication between the course professor and enrolled students. These groups are used as supplementary communication tools for reminders, instructions, and immediate coordination. They are not intended to replace the official website or the academic information system that is currently being developed.

The Programme recognises the importance of making all official academic and regulatory information available through an institutional platform. Work is currently underway to update and further develop the Programme page on the Faculty website. The updated page will include:

- Programme objectives and learning outcomes.
- Graduate attributes and employment opportunities.
- Curriculum and study plan.
- Approved course specifications.
- Admission and transfer requirements.
- Academic and examination regulations.
- Internship and graduation project requirements.
- Contact details and the Programme governance structure.

Work is also underway to digitally transform the Programme's academic administration, course communication, activity documentation, and student services.

5. Student Participation in Programme and Course Development

Reference: Criteria 1.1 and 5, pages 9, 32, and 33

Students contribute to the continuous development of courses through the periodic course evaluation system. The evaluation form contains a dedicated section that allows students to provide comments and suggestions regarding course content, teaching methods, practical activities, assessment methods, and learning resources.

The responsible course professor reviews the evaluation results and student suggestions as part of the annual course report. Where necessary, course content may be updated by no more than 25%, in accordance with the applicable academic regulations and approval procedures, without affecting the fundamental intended learning outcomes of the course or Programme.

Student feedback therefore represents a direct input into the annual course development process. Nevertheless, the Programme recognises the need to document this contribution more clearly and to inform students about the resulting actions and improvements.

The Programme will strengthen the feedback loop through the following measures:

- Preparing a summary of the main student comments and suggestions.
- Documenting the actions taken in response to the evaluation results.
- Informing students about the improvements that have been implemented.
- Explaining why certain suggestions could not be implemented.

- Formalising and documenting student representation in the Programme's quality assurance and development committees.

6. Coordination of Student Internships

Reference: Criterion 1.3, page 12

The Programe would like to clarify that an Internship Coordinator has already been appointed for the Program by the program administration committee by the program administration committee.

This appointment was made through an official decision of the Programme administration Committee and was subsequently approved by the Faculty Council.

The Internship Coordinator's responsibilities include coordinating with training institutions, announcing available training opportunities to students, assisting in student placement, following up student participation, and coordinating the evaluation and documentation of training activities.

The Programme will provide the official decision of the Programme Steering Committee and the Faculty Council approval, together with documents describing the internship coordination process. The Programme will also continue to expand its cooperation with major food companies to increase the diversity and quality of available training opportunities.

Supporting evidence:

- Decision of the Programme Steering Committee appointing the Internship Coordinator.
- Faculty Council approval of the appointment.
- Description of the Internship Coordinator's responsibilities.
- List of cooperating companies and training institutions.
- Training announcements and student placement records.
- Internship evaluation and follow-up forms.

7. International Cooperation and Student Mobility

Reference: Criterion 1.3, page 13

As indicated in the documentation submitted by the Programme, the Programme has established international cooperation agreements with several international institutions, including universities in Germany, Italy, and other countries. These agreements were intended to provide opportunities for academic cooperation and mobility.

However, the implementation of several activities was interrupted by successive exceptional circumstances, beginning with the COVID-19 pandemic, followed by international travel restrictions, visa difficulties, economic pressures, and ongoing regional and global events.

The interruption of mobility activities therefore does not reflect a lack of institutional interest in internationalisation. Rather, it resulted from external circumstances that made travel and physical exchanges more difficult for students and academic staff.

The Programme recognises the importance of restoring international mobility activities and is currently reviewing previous agreements while exploring new cooperation opportunities with international universities, research institutions, and multinational food companies.

Future cooperation will consider physical mobility, short training visits, international internships, virtual exchanges, joint online activities, and blended mobility as appropriate alternatives when travel remains difficult.

The Programme also has assistant academic staff members who are currently pursuing Master's and doctoral studies through scholarships in European and Asian countries, including China and Ireland. Furthermore, the Faculty supports the research activities and international academic development of its assistant academic staff.

8. Re-take Examinations, Make-up Examinations, and Grade Cap

Reference: Criterion 2, pages 20 to 22

The Programme acknowledges the experts' concern regarding re-take examinations, make-up examinations, and the maximum grade awarded following course repetition.

However, these matters are governed by the unified regulations of the Faculty, the University council, and the special programmes taught in English. These regulations are applied equally to all relevant academic programmes and students at the Department, Faculty, and University levels. The Food Processing Technology Programme does not have the legal or administrative authority to amend these regulations independently.

The consistent application of these regulations is intended to ensure equal treatment of all students within the Faculty. Nevertheless, the Programme recognises the potential effect of course repetition on the academic progression of individual students.

The experts' observations will therefore be formally referred to the competent Faculty and University authorities for consideration within the applicable institutional and national regulatory frameworks.

Until any regulatory amendments are approved, the Programme will strengthen the measures available within its authority through the Programme Steering Committee, including:

- Early identification of students at risk of academic difficulty.
- Provision of individual academic advising.
- Provision of additional academic support for academically challenged students.
- Careful planning of course registration and academic progression.
- Monitoring of failed and postponed courses.
- Guiding students regarding the official procedures for accepted medical excuses or exceptional circumstances.

9. Modernisation of Food Processing Equipment

Reference: Criterion 3.3, pages 27 and 28

The maintenance of teaching laboratories and the modernisation of food processing equipment form part of the Faculty's continuous development plan. The Programme Steering Committee continuously follows up this process to ensure the effective delivery and ongoing development of the Programme's educational activities.

Several development activities have already been completed. For example, the cereal laboratory has been renovated, and several instruments in the chemistry laboratory located in the Programme building have been renewed or upgraded.

The Faculty recognises that equipment modernisation is a continuous process and that additional units may require maintenance, replacement, or upgrading. Accordingly, the Faculty will continue to implement a phased development plan based on teaching priorities, equipment condition, health and safety requirements, and available financial resources.

10. Integrated Digital Academic Information System

Reference: Criterion 3.3, pages 28 and 29

The Programme administration, through the Programme admistration Committee, recognises the importance of providing an integrated digital academic environment.

Work is currently underway to transform and develop the Programme's academic and administrative processes into a comprehensive digital system. The planned system will support student registration, course administration, official announcements, access to learning

materials, academic advising, documentation of assessment processes, collection of student feedback, and the electronic submission and archiving of graduation projects.

Implementation will be carried out in phases to ensure the technical reliability of the system, appropriate training of academic staff, student orientation, information security, and the accurate transfer of academic records.“

G Summary: Expert recommendations (04.09.2026)

Taking into account the additional information and the comments given by Cairo University the experts summarize their analysis and **final assessment** for the award of the seals as follows:

Degree Programme	ASIIN Seal	Maximum duration of accreditation	Subject-specific label	Maximum duration of accreditation
Ba Food Processing Technology	With requirements for one year	30.09.2031	EQAS-Food	30.09.2031

Requirements

A 1. (ASIIN 1.4) Define and implement adequate rules for the recognition of qualifications achieved externally.

A 2. (ASIIN 1.5) Implement a systematic process to regularly monitor and evaluate student workload. Involve students in the review and adjust credits where necessary.

A 3. (ASII 1.5) Ensure that the workload is distributed evenly across the semesters to enable students to complete the programme within the regular study period.

A 4. (ASIIN 2) Offer re-take and make-up exams in the same semester to avoid systematic delays of the study time.

A 5. (ASIIN 2) Abandon the grade cap for re-take exams.

A 6. (ASIIN 2, 3.3) Set up a digital archive for theses/final projects and allow for soft-copy submissions.

A 7. (ASIIN 3.1) Provide a recruitment plan for hiring the necessary support staff for the operation of the equipment.

A 8. (ASIIN 3.3) Provide a concept and a strategic plan for the update and renovation of the equipment for food processing together with approvement and financial commitment by faculty and university management.

A 9. (ASIIN 3.3, 4.3) Implement an academic information system as a digital tool for structured programme and course administration as well as digital teaching and learning applications.

A 10. (ASIIN 4.1, 4.3) Ensure that the module descriptions and all relevant study-related regulations are publicly available and accessible to all stakeholders in a consistent and transparent manner.

A 11. (ASIIN 4.2) Ensure that the Diploma Supplement is factually correct and includes all information set out in the template and required by the ASIIN criteria, including statistical data on the distribution of final grades.

A 12. (ASIIN 5) Ensure that students are represented in university and programme development bodies, and establish a continuous feedback loop between students and academic staff.

Recommendations

E 1. (ASIIN 1.3, 3.1) It is recommended to establish more international collaborations for inbound and outbound student and staff mobility at the programme level.

E 2. (ASIIN 1.6) It is recommended to implement digital and/ or hybrid teaching approaches in suitable modules.

E 3. (ASIIN 2) It is recommended to implement an AI policy or a framework for students and staff on how to use AI.

E 4. (ASIIN 3.1) It is recommended to foster junior staff development.

E 5. (ASIIN 3.1) It is recommended to establish industry collaborations for research purposes.

E 6. (ASIIN 3.3) It is recommended to update the computer facilities.

H Comment of the Technical Committee 08 – Agriculture, Forestry and Food Sciences (16.09.2026)

Assessment and analysis for the award of the ASIIN seal:

The Technical Committee discusses the procedure which is a reaccreditation, following a first accreditation procedure, which was first suspended and only continued based on a special decision by the Accreditation Commission. However, as the experts consider that the programme concept and implementation generally offer a qualitative education which provides graduates with good job perspectives in both the national and international job market, they would recommend the accreditation this time, though with a long list of requirements and recommendations that regard almost every criterion. The Technical Committee discusses the procedure with a specific focus on the requirements A4 and A5. While the Technical Committee deems it not necessarily within the domain of ASIIN to generally criticise that an examination system foresees a certain grade cap for exams that students have to repeat because of failure, they support the experts criticism that this grade cap extends to all cases of repeated exams, even if they were missed for reasons like illness, as explained in the report. In that regard, the Technical Committee also fully supports the requirement for offering the opportunity for re-take and make-up exams in the same semester to avoid unnecessary and ineffective module repetitions that delay the study progress. In conclusion, the Technical Committee confirms the expert proposal without changes.

Assessment and analysis for the award of the EQAS-Food Award:

The Technical Committee deems that the intended learning outcomes of the degree programme do comply with the Subject-Specific Criteria of the Technical Committee 08 – Agriculture, Forestry and Food Sciences.

The Technical Committee 08 – Agriculture, Forestry and Food Sciences recommends the award of the seals as follows:

Degree Programme	**ASIIN Seal**	**Maximum duration of accreditation**	**Subject-specific label**	**Maximum duration of accreditation**
Ba Food Processing Technology	With requirements for one year	30.09.2031	EQAS-Food	30.09.2031

I Decision of the Accreditation Commission (25.09.2026)

Assessment and analysis for the award of the subject-specific ASIIN seal:

The Accreditation Commission discusses the procedure and notes the multitude of critical issues identified by the expert group. Given these partly very significant shortcomings regarding almost all of the accreditation criteria, a suspension of the procedure is considered; however, as the very good labour market prospects and overall quality and satisfaction of the stakeholders and the graduates themselves was stressed multiple times, the Accreditation Commission decides to grant the accreditation with requirements. In conclusion, the Accreditation Commission confirms the vote of the Technical Committee but makes minor editorial changes to the formulation of requirements A6, A9 and A12.

Assessment and analysis for the award of the EQAS-Food Label:

The Accreditation Commission deems that the intended learning outcomes of the degree programme do comply with the Subject-Specific Criteria of the Technical Committee 08 – Agriculture, Forestry and Food Sciences.

The Accreditation Commission decides to award the following seals:

Degree Programme	**ASIIN Seal**	**Maximum duration of accreditation**	**Subject-specific label**	**Maximum duration of accreditation**
Ba Food Processing Technology	With requirements for one year	30.09.2031	EQAS-Food	30.09.2031

Requirements

A 1. (ASIIN 1.4) Define and implement adequate rules for the recognition of qualifications achieved externally.

A 2. (ASIIN 1.5) Implement a systematic process to regularly monitor and evaluate student workload. Involve students in the review and adjust credits where necessary.

A 3. (ASIIN 1.5) Ensure that the workload is distributed evenly across the semesters to enable students to complete the programme within the regular study period.

A 4. (ASIIN 2) Offer re-take and make-up exams in the same semester to avoid systematic delays of the study time.

A 5. (ASIIN 2) Abandon the grade cap for re-take exams.

A 6. (ASIIN 2, 3.3) Set up a digital archive for theses/final projects and allow for digital submissions.

A 7. (ASIIN 3.1) Provide a recruitment plan for hiring the necessary support staff for the operation of the equipment.

A 8. (ASIIN 3.3) Provide a concept and a strategic plan for the update and renovation of the equipment for food processing together with approvement and financial commitment by faculty and university management.

A 9. (ASIIN 3.3, 4.3) Implement a digital tool for structured programme and course administration as well as digital teaching and learning applications.

A 10. (ASIIN 4.1, 4.3) Ensure that the module descriptions and all relevant study-related regulations are publicly available and accessible to all stakeholders in a consistent and transparent manner.

A 11. (ASIIN 4.2) Ensure that the Diploma Supplement is factually correct and includes all information set out in the template and required by the ASIIN criteria, including statistical data on the distribution of final grades.

A 12. (ASIIN 5) Ensure that students are represented in university and programme development bodies, and establish a feedback loop between students and academic staff.

Recommendations

E 1. (ASIIN 1.3, 3.1) It is recommended to establish more international collaborations for inbound and outbound student and staff mobility at the programme level.

E 2. (ASIIN 1.6) It is recommended to implement digital and/ or hybrid teaching approaches in suitable modules.

E 3. (ASIIN 2) It is recommended to implement an AI policy or a framework for students and staff on how to use AI.

E 4. (ASIIN 3.1) It is recommended to foster junior staff development.

E 5. (ASIIN 3.1) It is recommended to establish industry collaborations for research purposes.

E 6. (ASIIN 3.3) It is recommended to update the computer facilities.

Appendix: Programme Learning Outcomes and Curricula

As outlined in the student guidebook of the programme, the following **objectives** and **learning outcomes (intended qualifications profile)** shall be achieved by the Bachelor in Food Processing Technology:

Objectives:

1. Development of food science program to meet the international changes in the field (i.e. modification of the existing foods and development of new products) and educational standards.
2. Introducing new fields of food processing and technologies according to international standards and consumer requirements and acceptability and allow the graduates to compete on the international levels.
3. Development of the graduate skills with relevant training on site, whether locally or abroad, so as to approach international standards in this respect, giving more importance to the costing and engineering aspects of the activity.
4. Graduation of a student having some proficiency in the English language so as to be able to deal with his fellows, expert, whether local or foreign marketing and international commerce.
5. The program should train the student to be able to deal scientifically with other interested partners either interdepartmental, interfaculty of the university and or interuniversity whether locally or internationally.

Graduate Learning Outcomes:

By the end of the programme, graduate should be able to:

1. Recognize Biodiversity and the role of Agriculture in society.
2. Utilize agriculture resources and participate in agriculture business.
3. Select suitable raw materials, methods of processing, packaging materials and storage conditions for different food products.
4. Apply food quality management sanitation practices and safety according to legislation and standards.
5. Discuss the major chemical reactions that occur during food processing and storage.
6. Determine food contaminants & technology risks and food deterioration and spoilage.
7. Use computer facilities to solve food-processing problems.
8. Employ the principles of food science in practical, real world situations and problems.
9. Process different food products.
10. Determine food composition and nutrient requirements across the lifespan.
11. Select the suitable method for treatment of wastewater and food plant wastes and recycling.
12. Apply statistical principles in food science applications.
13. Determine consumer needs and market diversification.
14. Participate in Carrying out feasibility studies business management and food production strategies for food processing projects.
15. Evaluate different food and food products.
16. Use the mass and energy balances for a given food process.
17. Participate in planning operation and maintenance of food plants.
18. Engage in research studies and prepare for self-management and continuous learning.
19. Use recent technologies for development of food processing.

The following **curriculum** is presented:

Module 1: Basic sciences [58 ECTS] (Given in the first year):

1- Compulsory subjects (46 ECTS)

	CODE	Compulsory subjects (46 ECTS)	Lecture	Practical and activities	Total ECTS (46)	Pre-request
Sub module 1:	FPT 112	Applied Mathematics	1	3	4	-
	FPT 118	Physics, thermodynamic and electricity	1	4	5	-
Sub module 2:	FPT 114	General and analytical chemistry	1	4	5	-
	FPT 206	Biochemistry	1	4	5	FPT 114
Sub module 3:	FPT 105	Biology	1	4	5	-
	FPT 208	Genetics	1	3	4	-
Sub module 4:	FPT 107	Statistics	1	2	3	-
	FPT 102	Fundamental of economics	1	2	3	-
	FPT 202	Principles of food processing	1	3	4	-
Sub module 6:	FPT 103	English language (1)	1	2	3	-
Sub module 7:	-	Summer training(1)	-	5	5	-

-Elective subjects (12 ECTS):

-	CODE	Elective subjects (12ECTS)	Lecture	Practical and activities	ECTS (12)	Pre-request
Sub module 5:	FPT 111	Stored grain and food stuff pests	1	3	4	-
	FPT204	Business management and food production strategies	1	3	4	-
	FPT108	Application of computer science	1	3	4	-
	FPT 226	World food problems	1	3	4	-
	FPT 214	Introduction to dairy science	1	3	4	-
	FPT 301	Food additives	1	3	4	-

Module 2: Principles of food science [53 ECTS]

(Given in the second year):

1-Compulsory subjects: (38ECTS)

	CODE	Compulsory subjects (38 ECTS)	Lecture	Practical and activities	ECTS (38)	Pre-request
Sub module1: Functionality	FPT203	Raw materials of plant origin	1	4	5	FPT 105
	FPT205	Raw materials of animal origin	1	4	5	FPT 105
	FPT216	Raw materials of microbial origin	1	4	5	-
Sub module 2: Mechanism	FPT207	Physiology and biochemistry of plant products	1	4	5	FPT 206
	FPT213	Physiology and biochemistry of animal products	1	4	5	FPT 206
	FPT209	Physiology and biochemistry of microbial products	1	4	5	FPT 206
Sub module 4:	FPT 201	English language (2)	1	2	3	-
Sub module 5:	-	Summer training (2)	-	5	5	-

2-Elective courses: (15 Units)

	CODE	Compulsory subjects (15 ECTS)	Lecture	Practical and activities	ECTS (15)	Pre-request
Sub module 3:	FPT309	Processing of dairy products	1	4	5	-
	FPT 210	Food biotechnology	1	4	5	-
	FPT 211	Fast foods	1	4	5	-
	FPT 212	Technology risks management	1	4	5	-
	FPT 305	Supply chain in food processing	1	4	5	-
	FPT 307	Evaluation of dairy products	1	4	5	-

Module 3: food processing [61ECTS] (Given in the third year):

Compulsory subjects	CODE	Compulsory subjects (52 ECTS)	ECTS (52)	-	CODE	Elective subjects (9 ETCS)	ECTS (9)
Sub module 1: Food engineering	FPT 323	Engineering principles and food properties	4	Sub module 4:	FPT 396	Global trends and innovation in food processing	3
	FPT 439	Food processing operation & equipment's	4				
	FPT 440	Food plant planning	4		FPT 441	Food quality control and sanitation	3
	FPT 338	Maintenance of food plants machinery	4				
Sub module 2: Food technology	FPT306	Food chemistry and analysis	4		FPT 354	Sensory evaluation and rheological characteristics	3
	FPT 339	Processing of oils and fats	4				
	FPT 352	Processing of fruits & vegetables	4		FPT 392	Special industrial topics	3
	FPT 445	Processing of meat and meat products	4				
	FPT 313	Processing of sugars, special products & functional food	4		FPT 417	Lean production system	3
Sub module 3: Trends in food biotechnology	FPT 340	Small scale food industries	4				
	FPT 353	Enzymes in food processing	4		FPT 415	Application of nanotechnology in food and dairy	3
Sub module 5:	FPT 393	Soft skills (1)	3				
	FPT 301	English language (3)	-				
Sub module 6:	-	summer training (3)	5				

Module 4: Issues related to food processing [68ECTS]

(Given in the fourth year)

Compulsory subjects	CODE	Compulsory subjects (56ECTS)	ECTS (56)		COD E	Elective subjects (12 ETCS)	ECTS (12)
Sub module 1:	FPT311	Packaging and packages materials	3	Sub module 5:	-	One of the specified option	12
Sub module 2: Food quality and evaluative	FPT 410	Processing of cereal and cereal products	4				
	FPT492	Food laws and legislations	3				
	FPT402	Food safety	4				
	FPT407	Treatment of water and food processing wastes	4				
	FPT303	Human nutrition and applied dietetics	3				
	FPT489	Food product development and marketing	3				
Sub module 3:	FPT 381	Food business, marketing & management	4				
Sub module 4:	FPT393	Soft skills (2)	4				
	FPT 222	Human rights	2				
	FPT 401	English language (4)	-				
Sub module 6:	FPT395	Project	5				
Sub module 7:	FPT397	Graduation training	15				
	FPT 217	International issues	2				