



ASIIN Seal Accreditation Report

**Bachelor Degree Programme
Communication Engineering**

Offered by

Sanjiang University

Version: 26/06/2026

Status: *AC version*

Table of Content

A. About the Accreditation Process	3
B. Context of the Degree Programme.....	5
B-1. Numbers and facts.....	5
B-2. Characteristics and features	5
C. Assessment of the Expert Panel	7
C-1. Objectives and learning outcomes of the degree programme [ASIIN 1.1]	7
C-2. Name of the degree programme [ASIIN 1.2]	9
C-3. Curriculum [ASIIN 1.3]	10
C-4. Admission requirements [ASIIN 1.4].....	13
C-5. Workload and credits [ASIIN 1.5]	14
C-6. Didactics and teaching methodology [ASIIN 1.6].....	16
C-7. Exams: System, concept and organisation [ASIIN 2]	18
C-8. Resources [ASIIN 3].....	20
C-9. Quality management: Quality assurance and development [ASIIN 5]	23
C-10. Transparency and documentation [ASIIN 4].....	25
D. Additionally requested documents	28
E. Statement of the Higher Education Institution (25.11.2025)	29
F. Summary: Expert Recommendations (06.02.2026)	31
G. Comment of the Technical Committees	33
H. Decision of the Accreditation Commission (26.6.2026)	37
Appendix: Learning objectives and curricula	40

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
通信工程	Communication Engineering	ASIIN Seal for degree programmes	/	02, 04
Date of the contract: 09.10.2024 Submission of the final version of the self-assessment report: 20.07.2025 Date of the onsite visit: 22-23.09.2025 at: Sanjiang University				
Expert panel: Prof. Dr. Dirk Dahlhaus, University Kassel Prof. Dr. Lin Wang, Paderborn University Dr. Tao Tao, Nokia Shanghai Bell Co., Ltd Mr. Yuning Yu, Tongji University				
Representative of the ASIIN headquarter: Dr. Xin Jiang, Project manager and consultant international, ASIIN Consult GmbH				
Responsible decision-making committee: Accreditation Commission for Degree Programmes				
Criteria used:				

¹ [Delete as appropriate] ASIIN Seal for degree programmes; EUR-ACE® Label: European Label for Engineering Programmes; Euro-Inf®: Label European Label for Informatics; Eurobachelor®/Euromaster® Label: European Chemistry Label

² TC: Technical Committee for the following subject areas: TC 01 - Mechanical Engineering/Process Engineering; TC 02 - Electrical Engineering/Information Technology; TC 03 - Civil Engineering, Geodesy and Architecture; TC 04 - Informatics/Computer Science; TC 05 - Materials Science, Physical Technologies; TC 06 - Engineering and Management, Economics; TC 07 - Business Informatics/Information Systems; TC 08 - Agriculture, Forestry, Food Sciences, and Landscape Architecture; TC 09 - Chemistry; TC 10 - Life Sciences; TC 11 - Geosciences; TC 12 - Mathematics; TC 13 - Physics; TC 14 - Medicine.

European Standards and Guidelines as of May 15, 2015	
ASIIN General Criteria as of March 28, 2023	
Subject-Specific Criteria of Technical Committee 02 – Electrical Engineering/Information Technology as of December 9, 2011	
Subject-Specific Criteria of Technical Committee 04 – Informatics/Computer Science as of March 29, 2018	

B. Context of the Degree Programme

B-1. Numbers and facts

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
通信工程 Communication Engineering	工学学士 B.Eng.	Electrical Engineering	6	Full time		8 Semester	240 ECTS	Annually / 2006

B-2. Characteristics and features

Sanjiang University (SJU), located in Nanjing, Jiangsu Province, is a private application-oriented higher education institution established in 1992. The university defines its mission as cultivating high-quality, practice-oriented professionals who can serve regional economic and industrial development, particularly within the Yangtze River Delta area. In recent years, SJU has strengthened its cooperation with enterprises and continuously improved its internal quality assurance system in line with national initiatives promoting the transformation of universities toward an application-oriented model.

Within this institutional framework, the Bachelor's Degree Programme in Communication Engineering is positioned as one of the flagship engineering programmes of the *School of Electronic Information Engineering*. The programme follows an application-oriented profile, aiming to integrate theoretical knowledge with practical competence through close collaboration between university and industry. Its curriculum combines a foundation in mathematics, physics, and general engineering with specialized modules in communication systems, networks, signal processing, and embedded technologies. Two *specialization tracks*—Mobile Communications and Internet of Things (IoT)—provide focused pathways for students to develop competences in emerging technological fields.

A feature of the programme is its extensive industry linkage. Partnerships with companies such as *Huawei*, *Bestlink*, and *Ultrawise* have resulted in the establishment of joint laboratories, internship bases, and project-based learning opportunities. These collaborations enhance students' exposure to real-world technologies and contribute to the employability

³ EQF = The European Qualifications Framework for lifelong learning

orientation of the curriculum. The teaching staff consists of a balanced mix of young full-time lecturers, “Silver-Age” professors, and part-time industry experts, collectively ensuring a blend of academic knowledge and professional experience.

5 Overall, the programme seeks to establish a clearly practice-oriented structure that aligns with the mission of the university. Through collegial discussions, the expert panel and the university jointly recognized the programme’s strengths while also identifying several areas for future improvement and refinement.

C. Assessment of the Expert Panel

This accreditation report is based on the preliminary evaluation report for the degree programme(s) under review. As the evaluation report strictly adheres to the relevant general and subject-specific accreditation criteria, no changes have been made to the evaluative chapters. The expert panel considered the statement and additional information of the HEI for its concluding remarks and recommended resolution.

The following sections of the report are based on the audit discussions held by the expert panel with the relevant stakeholder groups, including the Rectorate and College management, programme coordinators, teaching staff, students, and industry (and alumni) representatives. At this stage of the evaluation, the focus lies on assessing the overall quality level and competence profile of the Bachelor's degree programme under review. In addition to the onsite meetings, the expert panel also relies on the documentation provided by Sanjiang University before, during, and after the audit, including programme materials and the relevant regulatory framework.

C-1. Objectives and learning outcomes of the degree programme [ASIIN 1.1]

Description of the current status

Evidence

- SAR 1.1
- Appendix 02.1 Degree Programme for Undergraduates Majoring in Communication Engineering for 2021-2024
- Appendix folder 05 Objective-Module Matrix
- Additional files: SWOT analysis
- Onsite visit discussion

According to the *Self-Assessment Report* (Section 1.1) and supporting documents (Appendices 02.1, 05.1–05.5), the Bachelor's Degree Programme in Communication Engineering at *Sanjiang University* defines six Programme Educational Objectives (PEOs) and twelve Intended Learning Outcomes (ILOs).

The PEOs aim to cultivate application-oriented communication engineers capable of software/hardware design, system integration, operation, and management, reflecting the

university's mission as a regional, practice-oriented private institution. The twelve ILOs, which follow the structure of the *Chinese Engineering Education Accreditation* framework.

Appendix 05.1 demonstrates the correspondence between the ILOs and the SSC 02 ability requirements. Appendices 05.2 and 05.3 link the learning outcomes to the curriculum and individual modules, confirming that each outcome is supported by multiple courses and practice components. Appendix 05.4 presents quantitative evidence of achievement for the 2020 cohort, showing average attainment values between 0.67 and 0.85, all exceeding the internal benchmark of 0.7. Appendix 05.5 records teaching-schedule optimisations (2022–2023) based on annual reviews.

Objectives and outcomes are published in the *Programme Handbook* (Appendix 02.1) and the university information system. Although feedback from employers, alumni, and curriculum committees is gathered, it is not specified which formal regulations define the review frequency, responsibilities, and approval process.

Analysis and assessment of the expert panel

The expert panel finds that the objectives and learning outcomes are comprehensive. The learning outcomes are described in terms of competences required for professional practice and employability, and the programme attempts to use the intended learning outcomes as the overarching framework for structuring the curriculum.

However, the correspondence analysis in Appendix 05.1 remains descriptive rather than analytical, lacking critical discussion of the depth and cognitive level of the outcomes relative to the SSC 02 benchmarks and the European Qualifications Framework (EQF Level 6).

Furthermore, the wording of ILOs 1–4, all centred on “complex engineering problems” through the sequence of *application, analysis, design, and research*, raises a question of orientation. These formulations reflect a research-oriented approach, whereas the programme itself defines its mission as application-oriented. The panel therefore encourages the programme to reflect carefully on whether these outcome statements genuinely express the competencies of an application-oriented bachelor's degree, or whether they follow the terminology of research-oriented universities without contextual adaptation.

The monitoring system for learning-outcome achievement demonstrates an initial step toward an outcome-based-education (OBE) model, but the connection between assessment results and systematic curriculum improvement (the PDCA loop) is still developing, which will be analysed together in Section C-9.

Final assessment of the experts after the statement of the Higher Education Institution regarding Criterion 1.1:

Based on the preliminary assessment and considering the statement of the university, the panel concluded Sanjiang University to be *partially fulfilled* with the standard.

As no clarification or additional information has been provided by the university, the panel understands this as an acceptance of the findings of the Initial Evaluation Report. Consequently, the panel maintains its original assessment.

Accordingly, the panel confirms the requirement and the recommendation associated with this criterion (see below, chapter F, A1 and E1).

C-2. Name of the degree programme [ASIIN 1.2]

Description of the current status

Evidence:

- SAR 1.2
- Appendix 06.1 Catalogue of Undergraduate Degree Programmes in General Colleges and Universities (2012 and 2024)
- Onsite visit discussion

According to the *Self-Assessment Report* (Section 1.2) and the Appendix 06.1, the programme under review is officially titled “Communication Engineering (通信工程)” (080703). It is classified within the Electronic Information category and leads to the Bachelor of Engineering degree after four years of full-time study. The designation and degree type have remained consistent between the 2012 and 2024 national catalogues, confirming the programme’s stable disciplinary affiliation.

Analysis and assessment of the expert panel

The expert panel confirms that the title “Communication Engineering” (080703) and the corresponding degree Bachelor of Engineering fully comply with the national catalogue of undergraduate degree programmes.

The name(通信工程) clearly represents the disciplinary field and level of qualification, and the English translation used in official documents is consistent and appropriate. No deviation from the official degree title or its classification has been identified.

Final assessment of the experts after the statement of the Higher Education Institution regarding Criterion 1.2:

Based on the preliminary assessment and considering the statement of the university, the panel concluded Sanjiang University to be *fully fulfilled* with the standard. The panel therefore confirms its original assessment.

C-3. Curriculum [ASIIN 1.3]

Description of the current status

Evidence:

- SAR 1.3
- Appendix 02.1 Degree Programme for Undergraduates Majoring in Communication Engineering for 2021-2024
- Appendix folder 07 Module Descriptions (and combined Module Handbook)
- Appendix folder 08 Student Mobility
- Appendix 09.01 Statistics on Student Mobility
- On-site discussions with coordinators, faculty, students, and university leadership

According to the *Self-Assessment Report* (Section 1.3) and *Appendix 02.1*, the Bachelor's Degree Programme in Communication Engineering is designed as a four-year programme with a total workload of 240 ECTS.

The curriculum structure is described inconsistently across documents. As indicated in the SAR (pp. 11 and 14) and Appendix 07, different numerical classifications of course groupings are used (three, seven, and eight modules/categories respectively).

The programme also offers two possible specialisation areas (tracks), namely "Mobile Communications" and "Internet of Things (IoT)", which students may select in the later stage of study. Both tracks share a common foundation in communication theory and signal processing, and diverge through elective courses and project topics reflecting their respective application domains.

Each course is described in the *Module Handbook* (Appendix 07), which currently totals 428 pages and provides detailed information on course objectives, contents, and assessment. The SAR mentions that the curriculum undergoes regular review and improvement led by

the teaching committee, with feedback collected from students, teachers, and employers serving as input for curriculum adjustment.

Appendix 08 and Appendix 09.01 show that student mobility is limited but present, mainly involving short-term exchanges or internships with overseas institutions as well as partners in Hong Kong, Macao, and Taiwan.

Analysis and assessment of the expert panel

The expert panel notes that the curriculum generally follows the typical structure of a Communication Engineering degree, combining fundamentals in mathematics, natural sciences, and engineering with specialised training in communication systems and practical engineering experience. The overall workload and progression of study are formally appropriate for a bachelor's programme equivalent to 240 ECTS.

However, in line with the observations under Criterion 1.1, the mapping between the curriculum and the ASIIN Subject-Specific Criteria (SSC 02) lacks critical depth. The analysis presented in the SAR and Appendix 05.2 does not sufficiently demonstrate to what extent the curriculum reflects the full breadth of SSC 02 competence areas. During the on-site discussions, it remained unclear whether certain key topics—such as information theory, analytical methods, ordinary and partial differential equations, and higher-layer OSI protocol topics—are systematically integrated and sufficiently covered in the current course design.

The curriculum structure is described inconsistently across documents, reflecting a certain ambiguity in the understanding of the curriculum framework. The experts also note that the use of the term “module” varies across the SAR and appendices, reflecting inconsistent classification and documentation. The module descriptions, while detailed, are extensive and not fully harmonised in structure, which complicates transparency.

At the same time, the panel acknowledges that the university has established a mechanism for regular curriculum review and improvement, including the collection of feedback from students, teachers, and employers. While this process supports ongoing enhancement, evidence of a data-driven, systematic linkage between course evaluation results and curriculum adjustments is still limited. These aspects are further addressed under C-9 (Criterion 5 Quality Management).

Regarding internationalisation, the panel appreciates initial mobility initiatives through external cooperation, but participation remains low and could be further expanded.

Final assessment of the experts after the statement of the Higher Education Institution regarding Criterion 1.3 :

Based on the preliminary assessment and considering the statement of the university, the panel concluded Sanjiang University to be *partially fulfilled* with the standard.

In the originally submitted documentation, it remained unclear whether several key subject areas—such as information theory, analytical methods, ordinary and partial differential equations, as well as higher-layer OSI protocol topics—are systematically integrated and sufficiently covered in the curriculum.

Based on the additionally provided documents, the expert panel confirms that these contents are indeed present within the curriculum and can be identified in specific modules. For example, topics related to information theory and communication fundamentals are mainly addressed in *Principles of Communication and Communication Circuits and Systems*. Analytical methods are reflected in modules such as *Signals and Systems*, and *Digital Signal Processing*, while mathematical foundations including ordinary differential equations are covered in *Higher Mathematics (I & II)*. Network-related contents are included in modules such as *Modern Switching Technology*, *Mobile Communication System*, and *Network Planning and Optimization*.

However, despite this coverage, the panel notes that these subject areas are not always explicitly structured or sufficiently visible as coherent knowledge domains within the curriculum. In particular, aspects such as partial differential equations, advanced analytical methods, and higher-layer communication protocols are either only implicitly addressed or lack sufficient depth and systematic integration.

From the perspective of the Subject-Specific Criteria of TC 02, this limits the transparency and completeness of the curriculum with regard to essential disciplinary foundations. At the same time, based on the additionally provided documents, the panel concludes that the curriculum as a whole corresponds to the qualification level of EQF Level 6. However, it is recommended to further strengthen the coverage and structuring of these subject areas in order to better align with the sample learning outcomes of SSC 02. Therefore, it is required that the programme ensures a more explicit, systematic, and comprehensive integration of these key subject areas in order to fully meet the expectations of SSC 02.

Accordingly, the panel maintains its original assessment and confirms the requirements and recommendations associated with this criterion, with the exception that item A2 has been revised (see below, chapter F, A2, A3, E2 and E3).

C-4. Admission requirements [ASIIN 1.4]

Description of the current status

Evidence:

- SAR 1.4
- Appendix folder 11 Admission Work and Regulation
- Appendix 12.1 Admission Rate Statistics
- Appendix folder 10 Recognition of Externally Acquired Academic Qualifications
- Onsite visit discussion

According to the *Self-Assessment Report* (Section 1.4) and *Appendix Folder 11*, admission to the Bachelor's Degree Programme in Communication Engineering follows the procedures defined by the *Ministry of Education of China* and implemented by *Sanjiang University*.

Applicants are admitted through the National College Entrance Examination (Gaokao), meeting the provincial threshold for engineering programmes. Required entrance subjects include Mathematics, Physics, and English (Appendix 11.4). Admission is managed through the national unified system, ensuring transparency, fairness, and equality of opportunity. The *Admission Rate Statistics* (Appendix 12.1) show a stable enrolment of approximately 60–70 students per year, with full occupancy of available seats in recent years.

The *Admission Regulation* (Appendix 11.2) defines eligibility, procedures, and documentation requirements. *Appendix 11.3* regulates the recruitment of international students, requiring a high-school diploma and sufficient Chinese-language proficiency (HSK Level 3 or above).

For recognition of externally acquired academic qualifications, *Appendices 10.1 and 10.2* specify the process for credit transfer and validation of prior learning, covering students from Hong Kong, Macao, Taiwan, and overseas institutions.

Analysis and assessment of the expert panel

The expert panel confirms that the admission policy, criteria, and procedures are transparent, rule-based, and in full conformity with national higher-education regulations. Entrance requirements ensure that admitted students possess adequate preparation in mathematics and physics for engineering studies.

The process for recognising prior learning and transfer credits is clearly documented and appropriately implemented. Admission numbers are stable and aligned with institutional capacity. Regulations for international students are established and consistent with national standards, though participation remains limited.

Overall, the admission framework ensures fair access, academic suitability, and consistent quality control at programme entry.

Final assessment of the experts after the statement of the Higher Education Institution regarding Criterion 1.4:

Based on the preliminary assessment and considering the absence of a specific statement from the university regarding this criterion, the panel concluded Sanjiang University to be *fully fulfilled* with the standard.

C-5. Workload and credits [ASIIN 1.5]

Description of the current status

Evidence:

- SAR 1.5
- Appendix 13.1 Conversion from Credit Point to ECTS Credits
- Appendix 14.1 the student workload in local CP and ECTS in every semester
- Onsite visit discussion

According to the *Self-Assessment Report* (Section 1.5) and supporting documents (*Appendices 13.1* and *14.1*), the Bachelor's Degree Programme in Communication Engineering is structured for four academic years with a total of 170 local credits, corresponding to approximately 240 ECTS.

Appendix 13.1 defines the conversion principle as 1 local credit $\approx$ 1.4 ECTS, based on a workload of 25–30 hours per ECTS. The average semester workload amounts to around 30 ECTS, which is consistent with the standard structure of a four-year bachelor's programme.

Appendix 14.1 provides detailed tables showing contact hours, self-study time, and total workload for each semester. The SAR states that workload allocation is reviewed periodically by the teaching committee, and adjustments are made when discrepancies between planned and actual student workload are observed.

Analysis and assessment of the expert panel

The expert panel acknowledges that the total workload and credit volume are formally consistent with international expectations for a bachelor's programme. The conversion between local credits and ECTS is clearly documented, which facilitates transparency and comparability.

However, the mechanical use of a fixed conversion ratio (1 local credit $\approx$ 1.4 ECTS) does not fully comply with the conceptual foundation of the ECTS system. The ECTS framework is intended to reflect the *actual student workload* required to achieve the defined learning outcomes, which may vary across courses and semesters. As such, the current one-to-one proportional conversion can be accepted only as a transitional arrangement during the initial phase of ECTS implementation.

In the long term, the ECTS allocation must be empirically verified and continuously supported by student workload data collected through systematic surveys. When significant deviations between planned and actual workload occur, timely correction and reallocation of credits are required to maintain validity. Therefore, a formal institutional mechanism to monitor and adjust ECTS distribution is indispensable.

During the on-site discussions, students and teaching staff confirmed that the perceived workload is generally reasonable, but variations exist across modules, particularly those involving laboratory work and project assignments. The panel concludes that sustainable implementation of ECTS requires consistent data collection, analysis, and feedback procedures embedded in the programme's quality management system.

Final assessment of the experts after the statement of the Higher Education Institution regarding Criterion 1.5:

Based on the preliminary assessment and considering the statement of the university, the panel concluded Sanjiang University to be *partially fulfilled* with the standard.

The panel acknowledges the explanations provided by the university and the illustrative examples indicating that the conversion from local credits to ECTS is not intended to be applied in a strictly mechanical "1 local credit $\approx$ 1.4 ECTS" ratio. In this context, the panel also clarifies that the reference made during the evaluation process to an "approximately 1:1.4" relationship does not appear as an explicit or formalised rule in the university's official documentation, including the Self-Assessment Report and the appendices. This analytical reference was made solely due to the lack of sufficient empirical evidence demonstrating how the actual student workload corresponds to the assigned credits.

More importantly, the core concern under Criterion 1.5 remains insufficiently addressed. In particular, the panel notes that the submitted evidence, including the folder “14 Workload Verification”, does not originate from a systematic investigation of students’ actual workload. The documentation provided therefore does not constitute empirical evidence based on student workload surveys or comparable data formats reflecting real study effort. Furthermore, the university has not yet established a formalised and institutionalised procedure to regularly collect, analyse and use student workload data as a basis for workload verification and subsequent improvement measures.

Accordingly, the panel maintains its original assessment and confirms the requirement associated with this criterion (see below, chapter F, A4).

C-6. Didactics and teaching methodology [ASIIN 1.6]

Description of the current status

Evidence:

- SAR 1.6
- Combined Module Handbook
- Appendix folder 17 Teaching Method and modes
- Onsite visit discussion
- On-site review of student theses and graduation projects

According to the *Self-Assessment Report* (Section 1.6), the *Module Handbook*, and *Appendix Folder 17*, the Bachelor’s Degree Programme in Communication Engineering employs diverse teaching and learning formats, including lectures, laboratory experiments, project-based learning, practice training, internships, and the final-year thesis. Examples from the *Module Handbook* (e.g., *Mobile Communication System*, *Fundamentals of Circuit Analysis*, *C Language Programming*) specify a combination of “lectures + experiments + practice exercises,” while the *Professional Practice Syllabus* (Appendix 07.1) emphasises project-oriented and hands-on training.

The SAR highlights cooperation with Huawei, Bestlink, and Ultrawise as part of industry-supported practical teaching. *Appendix 17.1* illustrates the use of online and blended-learning formats; *Appendix 17.2* documents school–enterprise cooperation agreements for internship and training; *Appendices 17.3–17.4* record student achievements in innovation and entrepreneurship projects and national-level competitions.

During the on-site visit, the panel observed that students are actively involved in extracurricular research groups and innovation teams, presenting prototypes and projects in laboratory and maker-space environments.

Analysis and assessment of the expert panel

The expert panel confirms that a wide variety of teaching methods is applied, combining theoretical and practice-oriented formats consistent with the programme's learning outcomes. Laboratory training, design courses, and internships provide opportunities for experiential learning and strengthen professional skills.

At the same time, the documentation does not yet demonstrate a systematic and consistent integration of active-learning approaches (such as group projects, seminars, or case studies) across all modules. While examples of project-based and research-oriented learning were observed, these practices appear to depend on the initiative of individual instructors rather than an overarching didactic framework.

The panel positively notes that students are encouraged to engage independently in scientific and engineering research, with many demonstrating their outcomes during the campus tour. These activities effectively foster analytical, creative, and communication competencies.

Industry partners—particularly Huawei, Bestlink, and Ultrawise—contribute to internships, guest lectures, and project mentoring, thereby supporting the practical orientation of teaching.

Overall, the applied didactic approaches are appropriate and effective, though their institutional coordination and documentation can be further strengthened. Issues concerning the overall quality management of teaching methods are addressed under C-9 (Quality Management).

Final assessment of the experts after the statement of the Higher Education Institution regarding Criterion 1.6:

Based on the preliminary assessment and considering the absence of a specific statement from the university regarding this criterion, the panel concluded Sanjiang University to be *fully fulfilled* with the standard. The panel therefore confirms its original assessment.

C-7. Exams: System, concept and organisation [ASIIN 2]

Description of the current status

Evidence:

- SAR 2
- Appendix folder 19 Course Assessment Regulations
- Appendix folder 21 Course Assessment Organisation
- Appendix folder 22 Graduation Project
- On-site discussions with coordinators, staff members and students
- On-site review of examination papers and grading records

According to the *Self-Assessment Report* (Section 2) and the supporting regulations (*Appendix Folders 19, 21, and 22*), the Bachelor's Degree Programme in Communication Engineering follows the university's overall framework for course assessment and examinations.

The university regulations provide clear procedures for course assessment, make-up and retake examinations, invigilation and inspection, and performance review and appeal. Each module specifies its assessment methods, which are communicated to students at the beginning of the semester. Assessment types include written exams, laboratory reports, project work, oral defenses, and continuous evaluation components.

Students can access examination schedules, results, and feedback through the university's educational administration system and digital learning platforms. Course-level assessment reviews and achievement analyses are documented and used for internal reflection.

The graduation project represents the final, comprehensive assessment stage of the programme. Its organisation and evaluation are regulated by institutional documents contained in *Appendix Folder 22*, which define the workflow, supervision, defense procedures, scoring criteria, and implementation of a dual academic–industry supervision system.

Analysis and assessment of the expert panel

The expert panel confirms that the assessment and examination framework of the programme is clearly structured and transparent, providing well-defined procedures for course-level and final assessments. The assessment types adequately reflect the diversity of learning outcomes, combining theoretical and practical evaluation methods.

However, it remains to be demonstrated how systematically examinations at both course and programme level assess the full range of intended learning outcomes, particularly higher-order competences such as problem analysis, system design, and teamwork. The aggregation of outcome achievement data at cohort level provides useful monitoring information, but does not yet ensure that each student's achievement is verified individually.

The graduation project is well managed, following a standardised workflow from topic selection and proposal to mid-term inspection, thesis submission, and oral defense. The dual-supervisor system enhances the practical orientation of the thesis work, while random inspections and defense procedures ensure quality control and comparability.

Final assessment of the experts after the statement of the Higher Education Institution regarding Criterion 2:

Based on the preliminary assessment and considering the statement of the university, the panel concluded Sanjiang University to be *substantially fulfilled* with the standard.

The panel acknowledges the supplementary materials submitted by the university, which demonstrate that examination data are used to support the calculation of the achievement of course objectives as well as the aggregation of learning outcomes at the programme level. These materials provide evidence that assessment results are, in principle, suitable to contribute to an outcomes-based evaluation of student achievement.

However, the panel notes that the overall achievement of programme-level learning outcomes, as a key element of the outcomes-based education (OBE) feedback loop, is not explicitly addressed in any section of the Self-Assessment Report. While assessment data are used at course level, the aggregation and interpretation of these results at programme level are not systematically documented.

In addition, the relationship between course objectives and programme-level learning outcomes is currently reflected mainly in examination-related materials, whereas this linkage is not consistently embedded in the corresponding module descriptions. From the panel's perspective, these aspects represent remaining limitations and could be more coherently addressed and consolidated under the framework of Criterion 1.3 and/or Criterion 4.1 in future revisions.

In light of the evidence provided and the remaining limitations, the panel revises its previous assessment and confirms a recommendation associated with this criterion (see below, chapter F, E4).

C-8. Resources [ASIIN 3]

Description of the current status

Evidence:

- SAR 3.1, 3.2, 3.3
- Appendix 25.1 Staff Handbook.pdf
- Appendix 26.1 Faculty Team Building Plan of Communication Engineering in the 14th Five-Year Plan Period
- Appendix folder 24 Teachers and Development
- Appendix 27.1 Process Materials for Typical Case of Student Support and Services
- Appendix folder 28 Capital and Equipment
- Appendix folder 23 Cooperation Agreement
- onsite visit conversations, campus tour

Staff and staff development [ASIIN 3.1]

According to the *Self-Assessment Report* and *Appendix Folders 24–26*, the teaching staff of the Bachelor's Degree Programme in Communication Engineering consists of three main categories: full-time teachers directly employed by the university, "Silver Age" teachers (experienced retired professors engaged on a contractual basis), and part-time staff from industry or other departments. A number of courses are delivered by teachers affiliated with other faculties, reflecting interdisciplinary collaboration.

The SAR reports five staff members holding doctoral degrees, whereas the *Staff Handbook* lists seven. Based on the latter, only two of these doctoral teachers are explicitly linked to module development or review activities in the *Module Handbook*. The university has also established several mechanisms for staff training and academic development, including the "533 Cultivation Mode," visiting-scholar and doctoral-study schemes, and internal teaching-ability enhancement programmes. Cases of research feeding back into teaching are illustrated in the staff development materials.

Student support and student services [ASIIN 3.2]

According to the *Self-Assessment Report* (Section 3.2) and supporting evidence in *Appendix Folder 27*, Sanjiang University provides a comprehensive system of student support and services designed to assist students academically, personally, and financially throughout

their studies. Academic advising is provided at both faculty and programme level, complemented by mentoring arrangements and counselling services.

The university maintains a multi-layered assistance framework including academic consultation, psychological counselling, financial aid (“Green Channel” and national grants), and career guidance. Orientation sessions and information platforms ensure that students are aware of the available services. A documented case presented in *Appendix 27.1* illustrates how coordinated interventions between faculty, counsellors, and the student affairs office help students overcome learning and financial difficulties while maintaining academic progress.

Funds and equipment [ASIIN 3.3]

According to the *Self-Assessment Report* (Section 3.3) and the supporting documents in *Appendix Folders 23 and 28*, the programme’s financial resources are stable, deriving mainly from tuition fees, complemented by provincial “Degree Programme Construction Sites Projects” and dedicated investment plans for laboratory renewal. The university provides specific teaching and research facilities for the Communication Engineering programme within the School of Electronic Information Engineering, including laboratories for communication networks, IoT systems, and embedded technology.

Additional funding and equipment have been secured through formal cooperation agreements with industry partners such as Bestlink Technologies Co., Ltd., Ultrawise Inc., and ZTE-related enterprises. These partnerships contribute to the co-development of courses (e.g., *Harmony OS IoT Development Foundation*, *5G Mobile Communication Network Test and Analysis*) and the establishment of corresponding experimental platforms. The university’s library, digital learning systems, and student facilities are also well maintained and regularly upgraded to support a conducive learning environment.

Analysis and assessment of the expert panel

Staff and staff development

The expert panel recognises that the programme benefits from a relatively stable full-time core complemented by experienced “Silver Age” and part-time teachers, providing both academic and practical perspectives. However, the documentation does not yet present a unified and verifiable picture of the teaching capacity and composition. Different sources use varying counting approaches, and the relation between individual teachers and their respective teaching or curriculum contributions is not systematically documented. For a clear understanding of resources and competence coverage, a consolidated presentation

based on Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) calculation and a mapping of each staff member to courses or other academic contributions is required.

Student support and student services

The expert panel confirms that the student support system is well established and accessible to all students. Academic and non-academic advising services are clearly defined and integrated into the institutional management framework. During the on-site visit, students expressed satisfaction with the availability and responsiveness of support mechanisms, and examples demonstrated effective coordination among academic advisors, counsellors, and administrative units.

The panel finds that the student support and guidance system sufficiently contributes to the achievement of learning outcomes and timely completion of studies.

Funds and equipment

The expert panel confirms that the financial basis of the programme is stable and that the existing infrastructure adequately supports teaching and practical training. Laboratory capacity, accessibility, and supervision meet the requirements of an undergraduate programme in Communication Engineering. The enterprise-based cooperation laboratories significantly enhance students' exposure to current industrial technologies and standards.

However, several laboratories still rely on equipment that is approaching obsolescence, and the research environment for faculty members — particularly access to international journals and conference databases — could be further improved to foster academic development and international connectivity.

Final assessment of the experts after the statement of the Higher Education Institution regarding Criterion 3:

Based on the preliminary assessment and considering the statement of the university, the panel concluded Sanjiang University to be *substantially fulfilled* with the standard (holistic judgment on Standard 3; 3.1: *fully fulfilled*; 3.2: *fully fulfilled*; 3.3: *substantially fulfilled*).

With regard to Criterion 3.1, the panel acknowledges that the university has provided the additionally requested documentation. Based on the supplementary evidence submitted, the panel concludes that the requirements related to staff qualifications and allocation are adequately met. Accordingly, Criterion 3.1 is considered to be *fully fulfilled* with the standard.

Criterion 3.2 was not subject to any recommendations in the Initial Evaluation Report, and no specific statement was provided by the university. The panel therefore confirms its previous assessment and considers Criterion 3.2 to be *fully fulfilled* with the standard.

With regard to Criterion 3.3, the university did not provide additional information or clarification. Consequently, the panel maintains its original assessment and considers this criterion to be *substantially fulfilled* with the standard. The recommendation associated with this aspect therefore remains unchanged (see below, chapter F, E5).

C-9. Quality management: Quality assurance and development [ASIIN 5]

Description of the current status

Evidence:

- SAR 5
- Appendix folder 18 Quality Management
- Appendix folder 03 Surveys and Results
- Additional Doc: SWOT Analysis for Programme Development
- On-site discussions with university leadership, quality office, faculty and students

According to the *Self-Assessment Report* (Section 5) and the supporting documents in *Appendix Folders 18 and 03*, Sanjiang University has established a multi-layered internal quality assurance (QA) framework covering university, school, and programme levels. Responsibilities for quality monitoring are distributed among the Academic Affairs Office, the Teaching Quality Monitoring and Evaluation Center, and the School of Electronic Information Engineering.

The principal regulatory documents include the *Implementation Opinions on Strengthening Teaching Quality Assurance* (Appx 18.1), the *Implementation Plan for Classroom Teaching Quality Evaluation* (Appx 18.2), and the *Quality Management Handbook* (Appx 18.4). These documents outline procedures for regular course evaluations, student and graduate surveys, teaching inspections, thesis sampling, and follow-up reviews. The *Handbook* explicitly refers to a continuous “evaluation–feedback–improvement–re-evaluation” process, echoing the PDCA concept.

Quality data are collected through a wide range of instruments, including student, graduate, employer, and external-expert surveys (*Appendix 03*), classroom observations, and annual *Teaching Evaluation Analysis Reports*. Examples of feedback analyses (Appx 18.5) show that results are reviewed by programme committees and discussed in staff meetings. The SWOT Analysis of the programme serves as an additional reflective tool in identifying internal strengths and weaknesses.

Analysis and assessment of the expert panel

The expert panel recognises that the institution has established a comprehensive and transparent QA structure with clearly defined responsibilities and a variety of survey instruments. The system effectively gathers feedback from multiple stakeholders and demonstrates a growing quality culture among staff and management.

However, the panel notes that while the institutional framework is well documented through numerous regulations and guidelines, the practical implementation of improvement actions derived from quality evaluations remains limited. In several areas—such as the periodic review of programme objectives (C-1), learning outcomes and curriculum alignment (C-3), teaching methodology (C-6), and examinations (C-7)—evaluation activities are regularly conducted, yet evidence of their systematic translation into corrective measures is weak. The results are often summarised but not consistently followed by documented improvement actions, monitoring, and re-evaluation.

As a result, the PDCA cycle, although formally introduced, is only partially functional. The process still lacks strong institutional enforcement and traceable documentation showing how identified deficiencies lead to specific corrective actions and measurable outcomes.

The *Quality Management Handbook* articulates the PDCA principle, but concrete examples—demonstrating how findings from internal audits or student evaluations have resulted in targeted reforms and subsequent re-assessment—are not sufficiently presented. Similarly, while student and graduate surveys are conducted regularly, mechanisms ensuring that the outcomes and resulting actions are systematically communicated back to the students remain underdeveloped.

The inclusion of a SWOT Analysis in the SAR reflects an encouraging awareness of institutional reflection. However, the analysis remains mainly descriptive rather than analytical, identifying issues without providing corresponding strategic measures. Compared with higher-performing peer institutions, this approach could be further developed into a structured tool for strategic quality enhancement and programme positioning.

Overall, the panel concludes that a functioning quality assurance system exists, but the link between evaluation and improvement is not yet operationalised into a fully closed PDCA loop at the programme level.

Final assessment of the experts after the statement of the Higher Education Institution regarding Criterion 5:

Based on the preliminary assessment and considering the statement of the university, the panel concluded Sanjiang University to be *partially fulfilled* with the standard.

As no additional information has been provided that would substantively alter the findings of the Initial Evaluation Report, the panel maintains its original assessment.

Accordingly, the requirement associated with this criterion remains unchanged (see below, chapter F, A5).

C-10. Transparency and documentation [ASIIN 4]

Description of the current status

Evidence:

- SAR 4.1, 4.2, 4.3
- Appendix folder 09 Module Descriptions (combined Module Handbook)
- Appendix folder 29 Graduation Certificates
- Appendix folder 20 Student Handbook
- Official website: <https://www.sju.edu.cn/dzxx/home/main.psp>
- Onsite visit conversation

Module descriptions [ASIIN 4.1]

According to *Section 4.1 of the Self-Assessment Report* and *Appendix 07 (Module Descriptions / Module Handbook)*, the university has prepared detailed module descriptions for most courses of the Communication Engineering programme. Each module generally contains basic information such as course title, credit points, weekly hours, prerequisites, objectives, main contents, assessment methods, and teaching approaches.

However, the module descriptions are overly lengthy and do not fully reflect the elements required by the recommended ASIIN template, such as the “date of last amendment” and

the explicit correspondence between the intended learning outcomes (ILOs) and the course content—these items are often missing or incomplete.

Diploma and Diploma Supplement [ASIIN 4.2]

According to SAR Section 4.2 and Appendix Folder 29, samples of the Diploma Certificate, the Bachelor's Degree Certificate, and the EUROPASS-compliant Diploma Supplement are provided by the university. The Diploma Supplement follows the European standard format, consists of eight sections, and is presented in English. It includes a transcript listing all completed courses with the corresponding ECTS credits, and Section 8 contains an explanatory note on the Chinese Higher Education System.

Relevant rules [ASIIN 4.3]

According to SAR Section 4.3 and the evidence provided in *Appendix Folder 20 (Student Handbook 2024, pp. 2 and 108–114)*, the university has made available comprehensive information on the rights and obligations of students, the management of student status, and institutional academic regulations. The *Student Handbook* outlines student rights such as fair academic evaluation, access to learning resources, participation in student organizations, and the right to appeal institutional decisions. It also includes details on disciplinary procedures, examination management, and the principles governing academic integrity.

In addition, the university's official website (<https://www.sju.edu.cn/dzxx/home/main.psp>) provides public access to regulatory and procedural information regarding academic policies, degree management, and student services.

Analysis and assessment of the expert panel

Module descriptions

The expert panel acknowledges the efforts made by the university in compiling course documentation but finds that the current module descriptions have not yet achieved a uniform and standardised structure. The compilation mixes courses and modules of different levels and uses inconsistent terminology, which reduces clarity and comparability.

Overall, the module descriptions are generally too long and not yet formatted in line with the official ASIIN module description template. To enhance transparency and clearly demonstrate the correspondence among learning outcomes, contents, workload, and assessment methods, a more concise and standardised format is needed.

Diploma and Diploma Supplement

The expert panel acknowledges that the university has adopted the EUROPASS format for the Diploma Supplement, thereby enhancing the international transparency and mobility of graduates' qualifications. However, similar to the degree and diploma issuance procedures, the preparation and distribution of the Diploma Supplement should also be governed by a clear institutional regulation to ensure consistency, standardisation, and sustainability of implementation.

Relevant rules

The expert panel commends the university for maintaining transparency and for providing easily accessible institutional regulations through both printed and online means. The *Student Handbook* and university website effectively inform students of their legal rights, obligations, and the general structure of the Chinese higher education system.

However, during the on-site visit, the experts observed that the campus is equipped with a large number of surveillance cameras in public areas. While this may be motivated by administrative or safety considerations, the panel expressed concern that such extensive camera coverage might risk infringing upon the privacy rights of students and staff.

Final assessment of the experts after the statement of the Higher Education Institution regarding Criterion 4:

Based on the preliminary assessment and considering the statement of the university, the panel concluded Sanjiang University to be *partially fulfilled* with the standard (holistic judgment on Standard 4; 4.1: *partially fulfilled* 4.2: *substantially fulfilled*; 4.3: *substantially fulfilled*).

With regard to Criterion 4.1, the panel acknowledges that the university has provided supplementary materials. The panel notes, however, that the analysis and conclusions related to this aspect have already been comprehensively addressed under Criterion 1.3. Accordingly, the panel maintains its original assessment and considers Criterion 4.1 to be *partially fulfilled* with the standard. The associated requirement therefore remains unchanged (see below, chapter F, A3, in conjunction with ASIIN 1.3).

Criterion 4.2 is considered to be *substantially fulfilled* with the standard. While further development is encouraged, the panel maintains its original assessment and confirms the recommendation associated with this aspect (see below, chapter F, E6).

Criterion 4.3 is considered to be *substantially fulfilled* with the standard. The panel maintains its original assessment and confirms the recommendation associated with this aspect (see below, chapter F, E7).

D. Additionally requested documents

1. **[ASIIN 1.3/4.1]** Please re-provide the module descriptions in accordance with the ASIIN template (version 2025.3.3), ensuring that each module/course is concise and consistently structured.
2. **[ASIIN 3.1]** As can be seen from the SAR and the on-site evaluation, the teaching staff of the programme consists of three categories: self-employed (full-time), “Silver Age” teachers, and part-time staff. In addition, a distinction exists between teachers directly affiliated with the programme and those from other departments. Please provide the number of teaching staff on the basis of a unified statistical approach, namely the Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) teaching capacity, and use this basis to present the composition of academic degrees and professional titles. In addition, the HEI should indicate the specific courses or other academic contributions associated with each member of the teaching team.

E. Statement of the Higher Education Institution (25.11.2025)

The supplementary materials and feedback submitted by the Higher Education Institution are summarized below, and the consideration and analysis of these materials are reflected in the experts' final assessment at the end of each chapter (grey boxes).

Supplementary materials submitted by the Institution

In the Initial Evaluation Report, the expert panel explicitly requested the submission of additional documents in relation to the following points:

[ASIIN 1.3/4.1] *Please re-provide the module descriptions in accordance with the ASIIN template (version 2025.3.3), ensuring that each module/course is concise and consistently structured.*

[ASIIN 3.1] *As can be seen from the SAR and the on-site evaluation, the teaching staff of the programme consists of three categories: self-employed (full-time), "Silver Age" teachers, and part-time staff. In addition, a distinction exists between teachers directly affiliated with the programme and those from other departments. Please provide the number of teaching staff on the basis of a unified statistical approach, namely the Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) teaching capacity, and use this basis to present the composition of academic degrees and professional titles. In addition, the HEI should indicate the specific courses or other academic contributions associated with each member of the teaching team.*

The Higher Education Institution submitted materials addressing these requests. The expert panel examined the submitted documents in the context of the respective criteria. The extent to which the additional documents sufficiently address the requests of the panel is reflected in the final assessment of the experts at the end of the corresponding chapters (grey boxes).

Statement of the Institution

In its statement, the Higher Education Institution does not raise objections concerning factual inaccuracies in the Initial Evaluation Report, nor does it submit substantial new factual evidence that would fundamentally challenge the experts' original analyses. Overall, the institution accepts the assessments and recommendations formulated by the expert panel and expresses its willingness to follow the proposed directions for further development.

The statement primarily provides clarifications, illustrative explanations, and initial responses to the issues identified, and outlines planned or initiated measures intended to

address the experts' concerns. In several areas, these measures are described as ongoing or forthcoming and therefore cannot yet be assessed in terms of their full implementation or effectiveness.

The expert panel has carefully considered the statement and the supplementary materials provided. The evaluation of these responses, including their relevance for maintaining, modifying, or withdrawing individual recommendations, is reflected in the final assessment of the experts at the end of each chapter (grey boxes).

List of supplementary documents submitted by the Higher Education Institution

07.8 Module handbook.pdf

24.1 Information on Members of the Staff.pdf

25.1 Staff Handbook.pdf

the section 1.3 Curriculum.pdf

the section 3.1.1- Composition of the Faculty Team.pdf

02.1 Degree Programme for Undergraduates Majoring in Communication Engineering for 2021-2024.pdf

07.2 Example-1 of Course Syllabus for Selected Courses of this Degree Programme.pdf

07.8 Module handbook-original version.pdf

07.8 Module handbook.pdf

109362 Module Handbook of Network Technology and Applications.pdf

13.1 corresponding relationship between local CP and ECTS.pdf

14.1 the student workload in local CP and ECTS in every semester.pdf

18.7 Notice on Regularly Conducting Evaluations on the Achievement Degree of Learning Outcomes.pdf

21.8 Example of Archived Data of Teaching Management of Courses in this Degree Programme.pdf

F. Summary: Expert Recommendations (06.02.2026)

Taking into account the additional information and the statement given by institution, the experts summarize their analysis and **final assessment** as follows:

Degree Programme	ASIIN Seal	Maximum duration of accreditation	Subject-specific label	Maximum duration of accreditation
Ba Communication Engineering	With requirements for one year	30.09.2031	–	-

Requirements

- A1. [ASIIN 1.1] It is required to provide a more thorough mapping of the programme learning objectives and outcomes with the SSC 02 sample learning outcomes to clarify to what extent the programme attains the Bachelor level as defined by the SSC.
- A2. [ASIIN 1.3] It is required that the modules and overall programme structure ensure comprehensive coverage of key subject area, thereby better supporting alignment with the SSC 02 sample learning outcomes as discussed under Criterion 1.1 (C-1). In addition, all modules should be described in a consistent manner across the SAR and all appendices.
- A3. [ASIIN 1.3/4.1] It is required to significantly shorten the module descriptions and to clearly demonstrate the correspondence among learning outcomes, contents, workload, and assessment methods. The revised version of these descriptions should be made accessible to the relevant stakeholders.
- A4. [ASIIN 1.5] It is required that the introduction of the ECTS system to the programme be supported by formal rules and accompanied by systematic surveys of students' actual learning time, with the resulting data used to make the necessary adjustments.
- A5. [ASIIN 5] It is required that the results of quality surveys be systematically translated into improvement actions in order to complete the PDCA cycle. Furthermore, this quality assurance loop should be formalised and anchored through written institutional regulations.

Recommendations

- E 1.[ASIIN 1.1] It is recommended that the programme carefully review whether the current formulation of its Intended Learning Outcomes—particularly ILOs 1 to 4 referring to “complex engineering problems”—accurately reflects the competencies expected of an application-oriented bachelor’s degree as declared in the institutional profile.
- E 2.[ASIIN 1.3] it is recommended that depth of some specialized courses should be improved especially for students who wish to continue their studies.
- E 3.[ASIIN 1.3] It is recommended that student mobility and internationalisation of the Bachelor Communication Engineering programme be further strengthened.
- E 4.[ASIIN 2] It is recommended to demonstrate how the examinations assess the extent to which each student has achieved the intended objectives at the programme level.
- E 5.[ASIIN 3.3] It is recommended that certain laboratories and other facilities of the university be considered for timely renewal and replacement. Also, it is recommended that the research environment for faculty members be further strengthened, in particular regarding access to international journals and conference databases relevant to the discipline.
- E 6.[ASIIN 4.2] It is recommended that formal rules be established to better support the preparation and issuance of Diploma Supplements.
- E 7.[ASIIN 4.3] It is recommended that the privacy right of students and staff should be respected and implemented

G. Comment of the Technical Committees

Technical Committee 02 – Electrical Engineering/Information Technology

Assessment and analysis for the award of the ASIIN seal (10.03.2026):

The Technical Committee discusses the procedure, paying particular attention to Recommendation E1. Based on the information provided in the report, the Committee considers the issue to be more fundamental. The report states that, while the programme content is appropriate for EQF Level 6, the intended learning outcomes appear to describe a higher level of competence, which is more typical of a Master's programme. In the Technical Committee's view, this indicates a discrepancy between the level of the intended learning outcomes and the competencies actually conveyed by the programme. To ensure proper alignment between the programme level and its learning outcomes, the Committee believes that adjusting the intended learning outcomes is not optional, but necessary. The Committee therefore suggests that Recommendation E1 should be converted into a requirement. Furthermore, the TC recommends simplifying the wording of the final part of the sentence by referring to EQF level 6, as this is the key indicator that the ILOs must match.

Assessment and analysis for the award of the ASIIN seal (17.06.2026):

The TC discusses the procedure and follows the vote of the experts.

The Technical Committee 02 – Electrical Engineering/Information Technology recommends the award of the seals as follows:

Degree Programme	ASIIN Seal	Maximum duration of accreditation	Subject-specific label	Maximum duration of accreditation
Ba Communication Engineering	With requirements for one year	30.09.2031	EUR-ACE®	30.09.2031

Vote: unanimous

Requirements

- A1. [ASIIN 1.1] It is required that the institute reviews the current formulation of its Intended Learning Outcomes—particularly ILO 1 to 4 referring to “complex engineering problems” —appropriately refers to EQF level 6.

- A2. [ASIIN 1.1] It is required to provide a more thorough mapping of the programme learning objectives and outcomes with the SSC 02 sample learning outcomes to clarify to what extent the programme attains the Bachelor level as defined by the SSC.
- A3. [ASIIN 1.3] It is required that the modules and overall programme structure ensure comprehensive coverage of key subject area, thereby better supporting alignment with the SSC 02 sample learning outcomes as discussed under Criterion 1.1 (C-1). In addition, all modules should be described in a consistent manner across the SAR and all appendices.
- A4. [ASIIN 1.3/4.1] It is required to significantly shorten the module descriptions and to clearly demonstrate the correspondence among learning outcomes, contents, workload, and assessment methods. The revised version of these descriptions should be made accessible to the relevant stakeholders.
- A5. [ASIIN 1.5] It is required that the introduction of the ECTS system to the programme be supported by formal rules and accompanied by systematic surveys of students' actual learning time, with the resulting data used to make the necessary adjustments.
- A6. [ASIIN 5] It is required that the results of quality surveys be systematically translated into improvement actions in order to complete the PDCA cycle. Furthermore, this quality assurance loop should be formalised and anchored through written institutional regulations.

Recommendations

- E 1.[ASIIN 1.3] it is recommended that depth of some specialized courses should be improved especially for students who wish to continue their studies.
- E 2.[ASIIN 1.3] It is recommended that student mobility and internationalisation of the Bachelor Communication Engineering programme be further strengthened.
- E 3.[ASIIN 2] It is recommended to demonstrate how the examinations assess the extent to which each student has achieved the intended objectives at the programme level.
- E 4.[ASIIN 3.3] It is recommended that certain laboratories and other facilities of the university be considered for timely renewal and replacement. Also, it is recommended that the research environment for faculty members be further

strengthened, in particular regarding access to international journals and conference databases relevant to the discipline.

E 5.[ASIIN 4.2] It is recommended that formal rules be established to better support the preparation and issuance of Diploma Supplements.

E 6.[ASIIN 4.3] It is recommended that the privacy right of students and staff should be respected and implemented

Technical Committee 04 – Informatics/Computer Science (09.03.2026)

Assessment and analysis for the award of the ASIIN seal:

The TC discusses the procedure and proposes only a minor editorial amendment to recommendation E5; otherwise, it follows the experts' assessment without any changes.

The Technical Committee 04 – Informatics/Computer Science recommends the award of the seals as follows:

Degree Programme	ASIIN Seal	Maximum duration of accreditation	Subject-specific label	Maximum duration of accreditation
Ba Communication Engineering	With requirements for one year	30.09.2031	EUR-ACE®	30.09.2031

Requirements

- A 1. [ASIIN 1.1] It is required that the institute reviews the current formulation of its Intended Learning Outcomes—particularly ILO 1 to 4 referring to “complex engineering problems” —appropriately refers to EQF level 6.
- A 2. [ASIIN 1.1] It is required to provide a more thorough mapping of the programme learning objectives and outcomes with the SSC 02 sample learning outcomes to clarify to what extent the programme attains the Bachelor level as defined by the SSC.
- A 3. [ASIIN 1.3] It is required that the modules and overall programme structure ensure comprehensive coverage of key subject area, thereby better supporting alignment with the SSC 02 sample learning outcomes as discussed under Criterion 1.1 (C-1). In addition, all modules should be described in a consistent manner across the SAR and all appendices.

- A 4. [ASIIN 1.3/4.1] It is required to significantly shorten the module descriptions and to clearly demonstrate the correspondence among learning outcomes, contents, workload, and assessment methods. The revised version of these descriptions should be made accessible to the relevant stakeholders.
- A 5. [ASIIN 1.5] It is required that the introduction of the ECTS system to the programme be supported by formal rules and accompanied by systematic surveys of students' actual learning time, with the resulting data used to make the necessary adjustments.
- A 6. [ASIIN 5] It is required that the results of quality surveys be systematically translated into improvement actions in order to complete the PDCA cycle. Furthermore, this quality assurance loop should be formalised and anchored through written institutional regulations.

Recommendations

- E 1. [ASIIN 1.3] it is recommended that depth of some specialized courses should be improved especially for students who wish to continue their studies.
- E 2. [ASIIN 1.3] It is recommended that student mobility and internationalisation of the Bachelor Communication Engineering programme be further strengthened.
- E 3. [ASIIN 2] It is recommended to demonstrate how the examinations assess the extent to which each student has achieved the intended objectives at the programme level.
- E 4. [ASIIN 3.3] It is recommended that certain laboratories and other facilities of the university be considered for timely renewal and replacement. Moreover, it is recommended that the research environment for faculty members be further strengthened, in particular regarding access to international journals and conference databases relevant to the discipline.
- E 5. [ASIIN 4.2] It is recommended that formal rules be established to better support the preparation and issuance of Diploma Supplements.
- E 6. [ASIIN 4.3] It is recommended that the privacy right of students and staff should be respected and implemented.

H. Decision of the Accreditation Commission (26.6.2026)

Assessment and analysis for the award of the ASIIN seal (27.03.2026):

The commission reviews the procedure and adopts the same modifications regarding Requirement A1 as in procedure 09.03 (i.e. reverting it to a recommendation). In addition, it gives particular attention to Requirement A3, which appears to suggest that fundamental issues concerning alignment with the SSC of TC 02 may not have been adequately addressed. This raises the question of whether accreditation can be granted in the presence of such significant deficiencies.

However, the formulation of the requirement remains somewhat ambiguous. It is unclear whether the issue arises from a lack of transparency in the documentation—thereby preventing experts from conducting a sufficiently thorough assessment of the programmes—or whether it reflects substantive shortcomings in the curricula themselves.

In light of this uncertainty, the commission decides to postpone its decision in order to seek clarification from both the experts and the university as to whether additional documentation is required for a final assessment, or whether a conclusive assessment can be made on the basis of the materials already submitted.

The Accreditation Commission decides to postpone the decision for this procedure.

Assessment and analysis for the award of the subject-specific ASIIN seal (26.06.2026):

The Accreditation Commission resumes the procedure previously postponed on 27.03.2026 and takes note of the clarifications obtained from the expert panel. On this basis, the Commission concludes that no further documentation is required and that a conclusive assessment can be made on the basis of the materials already submitted.

With regard to Recommendation E1, the Commission discusses the proposal of the Technical Committees to convert it into a requirement. For reasons of consistency with comparable procedures, the Commission decides to retain E1 as a recommendation.

Concerning the coverage of the key subject areas defined in SSC 02, the Commission reformulates Requirement A2 in substantive terms in order to state unambiguously which subject areas are to be strengthened.

The Commission further decides that Requirement A5 be extended to make explicit the closing of the feedback loop, in particular with regard to the systematic use of student feedback. In view of Requirement A1, which concerns the still pending demonstration of

alignment with the SSC 02 sample learning outcomes, the Commission decides to suspend the EUR-ACE® label until this requirement has been fulfilled.

The Accreditation Commission decides to award the following seals:

Degree Programme	ASIIN Seal	Accredited by German Engineers	Maximum duration of accreditation	Subject-specific label	Maximum duration of accreditation
Ba Communication Engineering	With requirements for one year	With requirements for one year	30.09.2031	EUR-ACE®, suspended till A1 fulfilled	30.09.2031

Vote: unanimous

Requirements and recommendations for the applied labels

Requirements

- A 1. [ASIIN 1.1] It is required to provide a more thorough mapping of the programme learning objectives and outcomes with the SSC 02 sample learning outcomes to clarify to what extent the programme attains the Bachelor level as defined by the SSC.
- A 2. [ASIIN 1.3] It is required that the programme strengthen the depth and breadth of coverage in the key subject areas—information theory, advanced analytical methods, differential equations, and communication network architectures (including higher-layer protocols)—to ensure clearer, more systematic alignment with SSC 02.
- A 3. [ASIIN 1.3/4.1] It is required to significantly shorten the module descriptions and to clearly demonstrate the correspondence among learning outcomes, contents, workload, and assessment methods. The revised version of these descriptions should be made accessible to the relevant stakeholders.
- A 4. [ASIIN 1.5] It is required that the introduction of the ECTS system to the programme be supported by formal rules and accompanied by systematic surveys of students' actual learning time, with the resulting data used to make the necessary adjustments.
- A 5. [ASIIN 5] It is required that the results of quality surveys be systematically translated into improvement actions in order to complete the PDCA cycle, including student feedback. Furthermore, this quality assurance loop should be formalised and anchored through written institutional regulations.

Recommendations

- E 1.[ASIIN 1.1] It is recommended to review whether the current formulation of the Intended Learning Outcomes—particularly ILOs 1 to 4 referring to “complex engineering problems”—appropriately reflects the application-oriented competence profile.
- E 2.[ASIIN 1.3] it is recommended that depth of some specialized courses should be improved especially for students who wish to continue their studies.
- E 3.[ASIIN 1.3] It is recommended that student mobility and internationalisation of the Bachelor Communication Engineering programme be further strengthened.
- E 4.[ASIIN 2] It is recommended to demonstrate how the examinations assess the extent to which each student has achieved the intended objectives at the programme level.
- E 5.[ASIIN 3.3] It is recommended that certain laboratories and other facilities of the university be considered for timely renewal and replacement. Moreover, it is recommended that the research environment for faculty members be further strengthened, in particular regarding access to international journals and conference databases relevant to the discipline.
- E 6.[ASIIN 4.2] It is recommended that formal rules be established to better support the preparation and issuance of Diploma Supplements.
- E 7.[ASIIN 4.3] It is recommended that the privacy right of students and staff should be respected and implemented.

Appendix: Learning objectives and curricula

Learning objectives based on SAR 1.1.2.

1.1.2 Learning Outcomes

Under the guidance of the above objectives of the degree programme, taking into account its characteristics and the positioning of the University, puts forward the following 12 learning outcomes for graduates based on the three dimensions of "knowledge, competence and quality" as the specific

learning outcomes:

- (1) Engineering knowledge: Relevant mathematics and natural science knowledge required for technical work in the field of communication, and the ability to apply engineering fundamentals and specialized knowledge to solve complex engineering problems related to the Degree Programme of communication engineering.
- (2) Problem analysis: the ability to apply basic principles of mathematics, natural science, and engineering science to identify, express, and analyze complex engineering problems in communication systems through literature research in order to reach valid conclusions.
- (3) Solution design/development: to design communication application systems or product functional components and processes to meet specific needs and provide solutions to complex engineering problems in the field of communication engineering by comprehensively applying specialized communication theories and technological means, and to be able to reflect a sense of innovation in designing, taking into account factors in relation to society, health, safety, law, culture, and the environment.
- (4) Research: the ability to conduct research on complex engineering problems within the field of communication engineering using scientific principles and methodologies, including designing simulation or experimental plans, analyzing and interpreting data, and synthesizing information to draw valid and effective conclusions.
- (5) Use of modern tools: to be able to select appropriate electronic instruments, equipment, computer simulation tools, etc., to simulate, predict, model and test complex engineering problems in the field of communication and to understand their limitations.
- (6) Engineering and Society: to be able to conduct rational analysis based on background knowledge of the communication industry, to evaluate the social, health, safety, legal, and cultural impacts of communication informatization process and product development, and to understand the responsibilities involved.

(7) Environment and sustainable development: to be able to understand the importance of environmental protection issues for the sustainable development of society, and to be able to evaluate the impact of engineering practices in communication engineering and related fields on the environment and sustainable development of society.

(8) Professional ethics: Have humanistic and social sciences literacy, social responsibility, and the ability to understand and comply with the ethics and norms of the engineering profession and fulfill the responsibilities in engineering practices in the field of communication.

(9) Individual and team: to be able to understand the meaning and importance of teamwork and to be able to assume the roles of individual and team member as well as organiser in a multidisciplinary team.

(10) Communication: have the ability to effectively communicate and interact with industry peers and the public on complex engineering issues in the field of communication, including writing reports and design manuscripts, presenting statements, and articulating or responding to instructions. They should also possess a global perspective and the ability to engage in cross-cultural communication.

(11) Project Management: understanding and knowledge of engineering management principles and economic decision-making methods, and the ability to apply them in the practice of communication engineering or in a multidisciplinary environment.

(12) Lifelong learning: awareness of self-directed and lifelong learning and the ability to continuously learn and adapt to development.

[illegible]

III. Matrix for “Specific Indicators of Learning Outcomes - Curriculum”

Within the comprehensive curriculum, 50 compulsory courses have been selected based on their relevance to the learning outcomes. These courses form a matrix relationship with each indicator of the learning outcomes, as illustrated in Table 3.

Table 3 Matrix for “Specific Indicators of Learning Outcomes - Curriculum”

No.	Learning Outcomes Course Weight	Learning Outcome 1			Learning Outcome 2			Learning Outcome 3			Learning Outcome 4			Learning Outcome 5			Learning Outcome 6		Learning Outcome 7		Learning Outcome 8		Learning Outcome 9		Learning Outcome 10			Learning Outcome 11		Learning Outcome 12		
		1.1	1.2	1.3	2.1	2.2	2.3	3.1	3.2	3.3	4.1	4.2	4.3	5.1	5.2	5.3	6.1	6.2	7.1	7.2	8.1	8.2	9.1	9.2	10.1	10.2	10.3	11.1	11.2	12.1	12.2	
1	Ideological and Moral Cultivation and Legal Basis															0.4			0.2			0.4										
2	The Outline of Modern Chinese History																0.2				0.2											
3	The Basic Principles of Marxism																		0.2											0.2		
4	An Outline of Xi Jinping Thought on Socialism with Chinese Characteristics for a New Era															0.1		0.1	0.1													
5	Introduction to Mao Zedong Thought and the Theoretical System of the Socialism with Chinese Characteristics																	0.1	0.2													
6	Introduction to Mao Zedong Thought and the Theoretical System of the Socialism with Chinese Characteristics (Practice)															0.1		0.1														
7	Current Affairs and Policies																0.3		0.2											0.4		
8	College English																									0.6					0.3	
9	College Physical Education I-VI																			0.2		0.4										
10	Military Skill Training																				0.1		0.3									
11	Military Theory																					0.1		0.3								
12	Health Education of College Students																															
13	College Chinese																				0.2		0.2		0.2	0.2						

[illegible]

[illegible]