

Doc. 300.1.1

Date:

...04/06/2019.....

External evaluation report

- **Higher education institution:** Neapolis University
- **Town:** Pafos
- **Programme of study (Name, ECTS, duration, cycle)**

In Greek:

.....

In English: ... MSc in Information Systems and Digital Innovation (90 ECTS, Postgraduate, 3 academic semesters) Distance Learning.

- **Language of instruction:** ...English.
- **Programme's status**
New programme: ...New Programme
Currently operating:

The present document has been prepared within the framework of the authority and competencies of the Cyprus Agency of Quality Assurance and Accreditation in Higher Education, according to the provisions of the “Quality Assurance and Accreditation of Higher Education and the Establishment and Operation of an Agency on Related Matters Laws of 2015 and 2016” [N. 136 (I)/2015 and N. 47(I)/2016].

A. Introduction

First of all the committee members would like to thank the Cyprus Agency of Quality Assurance and Accreditation in Higher Education as well as colleagues at Neapolis University Pafos for efficiently and effectively responding to our queries. Everyone has been very helpful and supportive when it came to facilitating the program evaluation.

The committee consisted of 3 senior academics who are research active and teach in areas related to the core part of the program under evaluation and one senior academic with specific expertise in the development and delivery of distance learning programmes. The committee also included a student who offered valuable insights related to the national context. The committee met with a representative of the Agency of Quality Assurance and Accreditation in Higher Education before starting the evaluation and a member of the Agency was present throughout the day.

The agenda for the day included the following presentations:

1. Neapolis University Pafos Presentation
2. Programme Presentation
3. Distance Learning Unit Presentation
4. Moodle- Our Platform
5. Moodle – Distance Learning
6. Library
7. Quality Assurance Unit
8. Programme Feasibility Study

The committee were given the opportunity to meet with two undergraduate students and to meet with academic staff for a roundtable discussion. They were also provided with a campus tour and given ample opportunities for committee discussions related to the progress of the evaluation.

Further information on quality processes, staff support and development (including the research policy) and the dissertation were provided on request during the site visit. Additional study guides were also provided. It would have been helpful to the committee if this information had been provided in a single document before the visit.

B. External Evaluation Committee (EEC)

<i>Name</i>	<i>Position</i>		<i>University</i>
David K Allen	(Chair) Professor		Leeds University, UK
Panos Constantinides	(Member) Professor	Associate	The University of Warwick, UK
António Lucas Soares	(Member) Professor	Associate	University of Porto, Portugal
Stylios Hatzipanagos	(Member-DL) Professor	Expert)	University of West London, UK
Antonina Panagiotou,	(Member) Mrs		Graduate Student, Cyprus University of Technology

1. Study programme and study programme's design and development (ESG 1.1, 1.2, 1.8, 1.9)

Quality indicators/criteria		1 - 10
1.1	Academic oversight of the programme design is ensured	8
1.2	The guide and / or the regulations for quality assurance provide the adequate information and data for the support and management of the programme of study for all the years of study.	6
1.3	Internal Quality Assurance processes safeguard the quality and the fulfillment of the programme's purpose, objectives and the achievement of the learning outcomes. Particularly, the following are taken into consideration:	
1.3.1	The disclosure of the programme's curricula to the students and their implementation by the teaching staff	7
1.3.2	The programme webpage information and material	7
1.3.3	The procedures for the fulfillment of undergraduate and postgraduate assignments / practical training	8
1.3.4	The procedures for the conduct and the format of the examinations and for student assessment	8
1.3.5	Students' participation procedures for the improvement of the programme and of the educational process	9
1.4	The purpose and objectives of the programme are consistent with the expected learning outcomes and with the mission and the strategy of the institution.	7
1.5	The following ensure the achievement of the programme's purpose, objectives and the learning outcomes:	
1.5.1	The number of courses	8
1.5.2	The programme's content	7
1.5.3	The methods of assessment	7
1.5.4	The teaching material	8
1.5.5	The equipment	10
1.5.6	The balance between theory and practice	8
1.5.7	The research orientation of the programme	6
1.5.8	The quality of students' assignments	n/a

1.6	The expected learning outcomes of the programme are known to the students and to the members of the teaching staff.	10
1.7	The teaching and learning process is adequate and effective for the achievement of the expected learning outcomes.	4
1.8	The content of the programme's courses reflects the latest achievements / developments in science, arts, research and technology.	7
1.9	New research results are embodied in the content of the programme of study.	7
1.10	The content of foundation courses is designed to prepare the students for the first year of their chosen undergraduate degree.	n/a
1.11	Students' command of the language of instruction is appropriate.	10
1.12	The programme of study is structured in a consistent manner and in sequence, so that concepts operating as preconditions precede the teaching of other, more complex and cognitively more demanding, concepts.	9
1.13	The learning outcomes and the content of the courses are consistent.	7
1.14	The European Credit Transfer System (ECTS) is applied and there is correspondence between credits, workload and expected learning outcomes per course and per semester.	8
1.15	The higher education qualification awarded to the students corresponds to the purpose, objectives and the learning outcomes of the programme.	10
1.16	The higher education qualification and the programme of study conform to the provisions for registration to their corresponding professional and vocational bodies for the purpose of exercising a particular profession.	n/a
1.17	The programme's management in regard to its design, its approval, its monitoring and its review, is in place.	7
1.18	The programme's collaborations with other institutions provide added value and are compared positively with corresponding collaborations of other departments / programmes of study in Europe and internationally.	9
1.19	Procedures are applied so that the programme conforms to the scientific and professional activities of the graduates.	8
1.20	The admission requirements are appropriate.	10
1.21	Sufficient information relating to the programme of study is posted publicly.	8
1.22	The teaching methodology is suitable for teaching in higher education.	7

Findings

1.2 There's no evidence of provision of the adequate information and data for the support and management of the programme.

Quality procedures seem to be documented and in place, however, the Committee was unable to gain a holistic view of the processes or of information and data to support the management of the programme through, for example, a Quality Manual.

1.3.1 The programme curricula and their implementation (of running programmes) are disclosed to the current students through the institutional LMS (Moodle). However, prospective students seem unable to examine the courses' syllabus.

1.5.7 The programme doesn't provide a separate training course in research methods. The team indicated that this would be done in the dissertation. The dissertation handbook provided described a traditional quantitative approach and did not provide appropriate support for students undertaking a project rather than a research dissertation. We noted that the 30 ECTS seems too short for including both research methods training and the dissertation project itself.

1.7 The documentation provided did not make evident that the teaching and learning process is adequate and effective for the achievement of the expected learning outcomes. The information is provided on teaching methods in the study guides, however, the needed to have been a lot more specific. The oral presentation, however, reassured the Committee that this had been considered and was adequate and effective.

Strengths

The study programme is innovative and up-to-date. The mixing disruptive technologies knowledge with digital innovation skills seems to be a strong educational offer. The development and management of the programme, and in this case its deployment, seems to be guaranteed by an enthusiastic and skilled team and a supportive management.

Areas of improvement and recommendations

Documentation on Quality procedures should be organized and easily accessed. A Quality Manual should be put in place.

Courses syllabus should be available for prospective students.

The programme should train the students on basic research methods. A core module on this should be offered in the programme.

The study guides should be updated to detail the teaching methods adequate to each course. Project based learning, active learning, case studies analysis, research paper analysis and discussion, etc. should be used appropriately.

Please circle one of the following for:

Study programme and study programme's design and development

Substantially compliant

2. Teaching, learning and student assessment (ESG 1.3)

Quality indicators/criteria		1 - 10
2.1	The actual/expected number of students in each class allows for constructive teaching and communication.	9
2.2	The actual/expected number of students in each class compares positively to the current international standards and/or practices.	9
2.3	There is an adequate policy for regular and effective communication with students.	7
2.4	The methodology implemented in each course leads to the achievement of the course's purpose and objectives and those of the individual modules.	7
2.5	Constructive formative assessment for learning and feedback are regularly provided to the students.	7
2.6	The assessment system and criteria regarding student course performance are clear, adequate, and known to the students.	7
2.7	Educational activities which encourage students' active participation in the learning process are implemented.	7
2.8	Teaching incorporates the use of modern educational technologies that are consistent with international standards, including a platform for the electronic support of learning.	10
2.9	Teaching materials (books, manuals, journals, databases, and teaching notes) meet the requirements set by the methodology of the programme's individual courses and are updated regularly.	7
2.10	It is ensured that teaching and learning are continuously enriched by research.	6
2.11	The programme promotes students' research skills and inquiry learning.	7
2.12	Students are adequately trained in the research process.	6

Findings

The committee noted a number of areas of good practice including a strong approach to induction of students. While the committee agreed that it was substantially compliant we also agreed that there were a number of areas which need to be developed (as outlined below).

Strengths

- A blended learning approach (using a variety of learning technologies) has been implemented that allows for flexible delivery and integrates the face to face and the online environment.
- The individual needs of the students are met by having a commendable staff to student ratio (based on the projected figures that the course team used in their presentation).
- There is a student-centred approach that could potentially enhance self-regulated learning and the guidance and support from the tutor seems to be adequate.
- Good induction approaches and materials, particularly the online ones to allow students to acquire the skills and competencies they need to succeed.

Areas of improvement and recommendations

- A more explicit link between the learning outcomes and the assessment methods (constructive alignment) would ensure that learning outcomes are directly linked to the assessment methods used in the programme. The formative assessment methods that were presented to the Committee should play an important role in this. Good practice dictates that learning outcomes are explicitly mentioned ahead of every activity, assessment task. E.g. 'Next activity will help you to achieve learning outcome X.'
- The use of case studies to enrich learning and teaching materials would ensure practical and theoretical studies are interconnected. There was no clear evidence from the materials and presentations to the Committee that there was strong connection between the two.
- NUP has policies in place to address students' different abilities and needs. It is recommended that the programme team makes sure these are implemented in design of the online resources and environment rather than by exception (e.g. video transcripts, web page design for students with visual or other impairments, etc).
- There is no evidence that students are actively involved in research, before the dissertation module.
- Deficiencies in the research training process are noted in the previous section.

Please circle one of the following for:

Teaching, learning and student assessment

Substantially compliant

3. Teaching Staff (ESG 1.5)

Quality indicators/criteria		1 - 10
3.1	The number of full-time teaching staff, occupied exclusively at the institution, and their fields of expertise, adequately support the programme of study.	8
3.2	The members of teaching staff for each course have the relevant formal and fundamental qualifications for teaching the course, including the following:	
3.2.1	Subject specialisation	7
3.2.2	Research and Publications within the discipline	7
3.2.3	Experience / training in teaching in higher education	8
3.3	The programme attracts visiting professors of recognized academic standing.	9
3.4	The specialisations of visiting professors adequately support the programme of study.	8
3.5	Special teaching staff and special scientists have the necessary qualifications, adequate work experience and specialisation to teach a limited number of courses in the programme of study.	9
3.6	In the programme of study, the ratio of the number of courses taught by full-time staff, occupied exclusively at the institution, to the number of courses taught by part-time staff, ensures the quality of the programme of study.	8
3.7	The ratio of the number of students to the total number of teaching staff supports and safeguards the programme's quality.	10
3.8	The teaching load allows for the conduct of research and contribution to society.	7
3.9	The programme's coordinator has the qualifications and experience to coordinate the programme of study.	9
3.10	The results of the teaching staff's research activity are published in international journals with the peer-reviewing system, in international conferences, conference minutes, publications etc.	7
3.11	The teaching staff is provided with adequate training opportunities in teaching methods, adult education and new technologies.	9
3.12	Feedback processes for teaching staff in regard to the evaluation of their teaching work, by the students, are satisfactory.	10

Findings

Overall, the programme was judged to be substantially compliant. The committee, however, identified a number of areas which need addressing as detailed below.

Strengths

The programme has been developed and delivered by an enthusiastic and informed team within the University.

Teaching staff do collaborate in the fields of teaching and research within the HEI and with partners outside. They noted particularly strong links with industrial partners through an advisory board and strong dyadic relationships with particular companies underpinned by formal agreements to support collaboration.

They described fair, transparent and clear processes for the recruitment and development of the teaching staff. The University provides a conventional professional skills programme for staff and has developed online resources to train staff in the use of particular tools to support teaching and learning. New posts are openly advertised on the University website and in other fora.

Areas of improvement and recommendations

The teaching staff were all qualified to doctoral level and had the knowledge, skills and expertise to achieve the objectives and planned learning outcomes of the study programme, and to ensure quality and sustainability of the teaching and learning. While the Committee judged that the staff had the relevant formal and fundamental qualifications to teach on the course they also noted the need for staff with additional skills and knowledge. The University has also recognized the need to recruit additional staff with a specific expertise in Information Systems and is in the process of recruiting one additional member of staff. This is a critically important position as, with the core staff undertake research and publish in the allied fields of computer science and informatics not within the field of information systems research or digital innovation. We would have expected to see staff, for example who published in the Association of Information Systems Senior Scholars' Basket of Journals or associated conferences or on topics which could be published in these outlets. The biographical details provided to us indicated that only Dr Masouras fits within this profile.

The University has a Research Policy which facilitates staff accessing scientific leave and staff described the amount of time provided to support research as being adequate. The Committee noted that the normal workload of staff provides only a relatively limited amount of time to support research activities. It is to their credit that staff have been able to continue to publish work with this workload.

Special teaching staff support one eighth of content and did not exceed 30% of the permanent teaching staff.

Please circle one of the following for:

Teaching Staff

Substantially compliant

4. Students (ESG 1.4, 1.6, 1.7)

Quality indicators/criteria		1 - 10
4.1	The student admission requirements for the programme of study are based on specific regulations and suitable criteria that are favourably compared to international practices.	9
4.2	The award of the higher education qualification is accompanied by the diploma supplement which is in line with European and international standards.	10
4.3	The programme's evaluation mechanism, by the students, is effective.	8
4.4	Students' participation in exchange programmes is compared favourably to similar programmes across Europe.	8
4.5	There is a student welfare service that supports students in regard to academic, personal problems and difficulties.	8
4.6	Statutory mechanisms, for the support of students and the communication with the teaching staff, are effective.	8
4.7	Mentoring of each student is provided and the number of students per each permanent teaching member is adequate.	9
4.8	Flexible options / adaptable to the personal needs or to the needs of students with special needs, are provided.	9
4.9	Students are satisfied with their learning experiences.	10

Findings

The two students interviewed during the onsite visit indicated that they were very satisfied with the student support provided by the University.

Students felt that the University was responsive to their concerns and that staff provided feedback.

Students noted a propensity to use external social media (Facebook and Whatsapp) to communicate with peers rather than the tools provided by the University (Moodle).

Strengths

The student representatives recognized that the University had a psychological and counselling service, however, also indicated that they would be willing to approach their Personal Advisor or other members of staff.

It was noted that students have the ability to have a one-to-one meeting with academic staff 1-2 times per week.

While the material is challenging the pacing of the material is such that the students indicated it was easily accessible.

The students noted that pastoral support was provide as needed and they felt able to access this support.

Students are encouraged to participate in the Erasmus programme.

Areas of improvement and recommendations

Students indicated a difficulty in balancing full time work and a full time course. The Committee were unsure about the extent to which this issue was one experienced by only these students or more generally across the potential cohort. We would recommend that, following market research, the University considers more flexible approaches to delivery to support students that work full-time.

Please circle one of the following for:

Students

Fully compliant

5. Resources (ESG 1.6)

Quality indicators/criteria		1 - 10
5.1	Adequate and modern learning resources are available to the students.	8
5.2	The library includes the latest books and material that support the programme.	7
5.3	The library loan system facilitates students' studies.	8
5.4	The laboratories adequately support the programme.	7
5.5	Student welfare services are of high quality.	9
5.6	Statutory administrative mechanisms for monitoring and supporting students are sufficient.	8
5.7	Suitable books and reputable journals support the programme of study.	7
5.8	An internal communication platform supports the programme of study.	8
5.9	The equipment used in teaching and learning (laboratory and electronic equipment, consumables etc.) are quantitatively and qualitatively adequate.	7
5.10	Teaching materials (books, manuals, scientific journals, databases) are adequate and accessible to students.	7
5.11	Teaching materials (books, manuals, scientific journals, databases) are updated regularly with the most recent publications.	7

Findings

The committee has found resources (teaching and learning environments, teaching materials, teaching aids and equipment, financial, physical and human support resources) to be adequate and readily accessible to students in support of the objectives in the study programme. When asked about access to information systems journals, the library personnel assured us that the list of AIS (Association of Information Systems) journals is accessible to students. These resources seem to be adequate for potential change in circumstances (e.g. change in student numbers).

Strengths

The committee was impressed with the counseling support provided to students (e.g. SKEPSIS).

The Committee were impressed with the technical capability within the University available to adapt and customize the on-line learning environment.

Areas of improvement and recommendations

We noted that whilst relevant materials are available for teaching the ones that students are directed towards in the study guides were not mainstream information systems or management. We recommend, therefore, that students are signposted to a wider range of up-to-date books and other materials in the field of Information Systems and Digital Innovation within the study guides.

Please circle one of the following for:

Resources

Fully compliant

6. Additional for distance learning programmes (ALL ESG)

Quality indicators/criteria		1 - 10
6.1	The pedagogical planning unit for distance learning supports the distance learning unit and addresses the requirements for study materials, interactive activities and formative assessment.	7
6.2	The institution safeguards the interaction:	
	6.2.1 Among students	7
	6.2.2 Between students and teaching staff	7
	6.2.3 Between students and study guides/material of study	7
6.3	The process and the conditions for the recruitment of teaching staff ensure that candidates have the necessary skills and experience for distance learning education.	7
6.4	Training, guidance and support are provided to the teaching staff through appropriate procedures.	8
6.5	Student performance monitoring mechanisms are satisfactory.	7
6.6	Adequate mentoring by the teaching staff is provided to students through established procedures.	7
6.7	The unimpeded distance learning communication between the teaching staff and the students is ensured.	8
6.8	Assessment consistency is ensured.	

6.9	Teaching materials (books, manuals, scientific journals, databases) comply with the requirements provided by the distance learning education methodology and are updated regularly.	7
6.10	The programme of study has the appropriate and adequate infrastructure for the support of distance learning.	7
6.11	The supporting infrastructures are easily accessible.	7
6.12	Students are informed and trained with regards to the available educational infrastructure.	7
6.13	Procedures for systematic control and improvement of the supportive services are set.	7
6.14	Infrastructure for distance education is comparable to corresponding university infrastructure in the European Union and internationally.	8
6.15	Electronic library services are provided according to international practice in order to support the needs of the students and the teaching staff.	9
6.16	The students and the teaching staff have access to the necessary electronic sources of information, relevant to the programme, the level, and the method of teaching.	7
6.17	Students' weekly assignments are appropriate for the level of the programme.	7
6.18	Feedback on students' assignments is regular through concrete and published procedures.	7
6.19	The quality of students' final exams is ensured and evidenced.	6
6.20	The teaching e-learning material has been sufficiently enriched with electronic sources, updated research publications and other electronic learning resources that support students' work and learning.	9

Findings

NUP have established a range of resources to support distance learning delivery of the programme. The online environment and linked resources are adequate. We have provided some recommendations for further improvement of the distance learning mode of the programme

Strengths

The nature of the programme is compatible with distance learning delivery.

The Distance Learning unit at NUP addresses the requirements for study materials, interactive activities and formative assessment in accordance to international standards.

Teacher training programmes focusing on interaction and the specificities of distance learning are offered

There are in place policies to establish the job description of an academic personal advisor for Distance Learning students and training is offered which is focused on interaction and requirements for teaching a distance learning cohort.

The establishment of Online Societies is commendable and their relation to online welfare, however the programme team would need to articulate how the programme, materials, facilities, and guidelines safeguard the interaction between students, students and teaching staff, students and the material.

Areas of improvement and recommendations

There needs to be greater consistency between the distance learning and conventional delivery of the programme:

(1) Assessment approaches in the distance learning mode include the use of formative tasks that complement the student support aspect of the programme. The panel has seen two module study guides that implement this approach.

(2) There seem to be two different approaches in providing student support for the conventional course (Quizzes, Project-assignment and oral presentation) and the distance learning mode (discussion boards, group projects, peer assessment and oral presentations). While the use of peer assessment is commendable in the distance learning delivery, there is no justification for this approach to ensure that distance learning students are not disadvantaged.

(3) Re: assessment, there is a need to establish a consistent approach across the programme. Is it 30% for assignments and 70% for exams or 40% for assignments and 60% for exams?

(4) The establishment of Online Societies is commendable and their relation to online welfare, however the programme team would need to how the programme, materials, facilities, and guidelines safeguard the interaction between students, students and teaching staff, students and the material.

The panel has not seen examples of final exam papers (the programme is new).

Please circle one of the following for:

Additional for distance learning programmes

Substantially compliant

7. Additional for doctoral programmes (ALL ESG)

Standards

- *Specific criteria that the potential students need to meet for admission in the programme, as well as how the selection procedures are made, are defined.*
- *The following requirements of the doctoral degree programme are analysed and published:*
 - *the stages of completion*
 - *the minimum and maximum time of completing the programme*
 - *the examinations*
 - *the procedures for supporting and accepting the student's proposal*
 - *the criteria for obtaining the Ph.D. degree*
- *Specific and clear guidelines for the writing of the proposal and the dissertation are set regarding:*
 - *the chapters that are contained*
 - *the system used for the presentation of each chapter, sub-chapters and bibliography*
 - *the minimum word limit*
 - *the binding, the cover page and the prologue pages, including the pages supporting the authenticity, originality and importance of the dissertation, as well as the reference to the committee for the final evaluation*
- *There is a plagiarism check system. Information is provided on the detection of plagiarism and the consequences in case of such misconduct.*
- *The composition, the procedure and the criteria for the formation of the advisory committee (to whom the doctoral student submits the research proposal) are determined.*
- *The composition, the procedure and the criteria for the formation of the examining committee (to whom the doctoral student defends his/her dissertation), are determined.*
- *The duties of the supervisor-chairperson and the other members of the advisory committee towards the student are determined and include:*
 - *regular meetings*
 - *reports per semester and feedback from supervisors*
 - *support for writing research papers*
 - *participation in conferences*
- *The number of doctoral students that each chairperson supervises at the same time are determined.*
- *The process of submitting the dissertation to the university library is set.*

You may also consider the following questions:

- *How is the scientific quality of the PhD thesis ensured?*
- *Is there a link between the doctoral programmes of study and the society? What is the value of the obtained degree outside academia and in the labour market?*
- *Can you please provide us with some dissertation samples?*

Findings

A short description of the situation in the higher education institution (HEI), based on elements from the application for external evaluation and on findings from the onsite visit.

Strengths

A list of strengths, e.g. examples of good practices, achievements, innovative solutions etc.

Areas of improvement and recommendations

A list of problem areas to be dealt with, followed by or linked to the recommendations of how to improve the situation.

Mark from 1 to 10 the degree of compliance of each quality indicator/criterion

1 – 4: Non-compliant

5 or 6: Partially compliant

7 or 8: Substantially compliant

9 or 10: Fully compliant

	Quality indicators/criteria	1 - 10
7.1	The provision of quality doctoral studies is ensured through doctoral studies regulations, which are publicly available.	
7.2	The structure and the content of a doctoral programme of study ensure the quality provision of doctoral studies.	
7.3	The doctoral studies' supervisors have the necessary academic qualifications and experience for the supervision of the specific dissertations.	
7.4	The number of doctoral students, under the supervision of a member of the teaching staff, enables continuous and effective feedback to the students and it complies with the European and international standards.	
7.5	The research interests of academic advisors and supervisors adequately cover the thematic areas of research conducted by the doctoral students of the programme.	
7.6	Research equipment, laboratories, workshops and existing bibliographic material support the programme of study.	
7.7	The quality of the doctoral theses of the programme in this field is in line with international standards.	
7.8	Doctoral candidates have publications in scientific journals and/ or participate in international conferences.	

7.9	The institution has mechanisms and funds to support writing and attending conferences of doctoral candidates.	
7.10	The candidates demonstrate skills in designing and in conducting productive self-directed research.	
7.11	Candidates are aware of the ethical implications of their research and of their responsibilities as scientists.	
7.12	Suitable procedures of monitoring and periodic assessment of students' research progress are set.	
7.13	There is a clear policy on authorship and intellectual property.	

Justify the numerical scores provided for the quality indicators (criteria) by specifying (if any) the deficiencies.

Please circle one of the following for:

Additional for doctoral programmes

Non-compliant

Partially compliant

Substantially compliant

Fully compliant

8. Additional for joint programmes (ALL ESG)

Standards

- *The joint programme is offered in accordance with legal frameworks of the relevant national higher education systems.*
- *The partner universities apply joint internal quality assurance processes.*
- *The joint programme is offered jointly, involving all cooperating universities in the design, delivery and further development of the programme.*
- *The terms and conditions of the joint programme are laid down in a cooperation agreement. The agreement in particular covers the following issues:*
 - *Denomination of the degree(s) awarded in the programme*
 - *Coordination and responsibilities of the partners involved regarding management and financial organisation, including funding, sharing of costs and income, resources for mobility of staff and students*
 - *Admission and selection procedures for students*
 - *Mobility of students and teaching staff*
 - *Examination regulations, student assessment methods, recognition of credits and degree awarding procedures*
 - *Handling of different semester periods, if existent*
- *Aims and learning outcomes are clearly stated, including a joint syllabus, language policy, as well as an account of the intended added value of the programme.*
- *Study counselling and mobility plans are efficient and take into account the needs of different kinds of students.*

You may also consider the following questions:

- *Does the joint study programme conform to the requirements of a study programme offered at the specific level?*
- *Is there a system that assures the quality of joint provision and guarantees that the aims of the programme are met?*
- *Do the mechanisms for ensuring the quality of the joint study programme take into consideration the European Standards and Guidelines (ESG)? Are they adopted by all the universities involved?*
- *Is the division of responsibilities in ensuring quality clearly defined among the partner universities?*
- *Is relevant information about the programme, e.g. admission requirements and procedures, course catalogue, examination and assessment procedures, well documented and published by taking into account the specific needs of students?*
- *What is the added value of the programme of study?*
- *Is there a sustainable funding strategy among the partner universities? Explain.*

Findings

A short description of the situation in the higher education institution (HEI), based on elements from the application for external evaluation and on findings from the onsite visit.

Strengths

A list of strengths, e.g. examples of good practices, achievements, innovative solutions etc.

Areas of improvement and recommendations

A list of problem areas to be dealt with, followed by or linked to the recommendations of how to improve the situation.

Mark from 1 to 10 the degree of compliance of each quality indicator/criterion

1 – 4: Non-compliant

5 or 6: Partially compliant

7 or 8: Substantially compliant

9 or 10: Fully compliant

Quality indicators/criteria		1 - 10
8.1	The joint study programme promotes the fulfilment of the mission and achievement of the goals of the partner universities.	
8.2	The joint study programme has been developed by all the partner universities, which are also involved in its further development.	
8.3	The partner universities have defined the responsibility of the parties in the common agreement.	
8.4	The joint study programme conforms to the requirements and directions of national and international legislation.	
8.5	The joint study programme is based on the needs of the target group and of the labour market.	
8.6	Students are provided with advisory and support systems concerning learning and teaching at the partner universities.	
8.7	The cooperation contract sets out the procedure for resolving disputes concerning the execution of the joint study programme, which ensures the protection of the rights of students and teaching staff.	
8.8	The partner universities have agreed on how to seek feedback from students regarding the organisation and process of their study.	

8.9	The partner universities ensure the economic sustainability of the joint study programme.		
8.10	The degree awarded is justified by:		
	8.10.1	The learning outcomes	
	8.10.2	The collaboration between/among the institutions delivering the programme	
8.11	The jointness of the programme development is effective.		
8.12	The students' mobility between/among the collaborative institutions provide students with rewarding experiences that facilitate employability in Europe.		

Justify the numerical scores provided for the quality indicators (criteria) by specifying (if any) the deficiencies.

Please circle one of the following for:

Additional for joint programmes

Non-compliant *Partially compliant* *Substantially compliant* *Fully compliant*

C. Conclusions and final remarks

Strengths

The study programme is innovative and up-to-date with an effort to combine multiple disciplines, including computer science and information systems, as well as management and innovation. The development and management of the programme, and in this case its deployment, seems to be guaranteed by an enthusiastic and skilled team and a supportive management.

There is a student-centred approach that could potentially enhance self-regulated learning and the guidance and support from the tutor seems to be adequate. Good induction approaches and materials, particularly the online ones to allow students to acquire the skills and competencies they need to succeed.

The technical capability within the University is impressive in relation to adapting and customizing the online learning environment.

Areas of Improvement

There is an overlap in the panel's recommendations as most apply to both the conventional and the distance learning delivery of the programme.

There is a challenge in understanding the profile of incoming students and how the programme will be able to adapt to different educational and skills backgrounds. Attracting potential candidates from both business and computer science requires a better understanding of the market potential of the program in relation to employability prospects for the students.

The programme structure and content is sufficiently compliant, but the committee recommends that the program should provide options for diverse students. Options could be considered in the form of electives, but also pathways towards either more business or technology skills that could be supported by different types of dissertation projects.

Attracting staff from information systems that span both computer science and management disciplines would go a long way in ensuring that the program meets its multidisciplinary objectives.

In relation to this, there should be a separate research methods module that covers both qualitative and quantitative skills and which prepares students to take on different dissertation projects. This should also give students the skills to better understand innovation processes and apply their knowledge beyond the program.

The program should make an effort to embrace diverse types of teaching methods such as, project-based learning, active learning, case studies analysis, research paper analysis and discussion. A more explicit link between the learning outcomes and the assessment methods (constructive alignment) would ensure that learning outcomes are directly linked to the assessment methods used in the programme.

In relation to the distance learning delivery, the panel recommends a greater consistency between the distance learning and conventional delivery of the programme to ensure that the distance learning students are not disadvantaged. This applies to assessment approaches (formative and summative), student support and engagement, distribution of marks across the various assessment tasks and online safeguarding of students. In addition, the programme team should consider a more flexible approach to delivery to support students taking the course while in full employment.

D. Signatures of the EEC

<i>Name</i>	<i>Signature</i>
David K Allen	
Panos Constantinides	
António Lucas Soares	
Stylianos Hatzipanagos	
Antonina Panagiotou,	

Date: 04/06/2019.....