

Doc. 300.1.1

Date:

External evaluation report

- **Higher education institution:**
NEAPOLIS UNIVERSITY

.....

- **Town:**

...PAFOS.....

- **Programme of study (Name, ECTS, duration, cycle)**

In Greek:

.....

In English: LLM IN FINANCIAL CRIME AND
CRIMINAL JUSTICE

- **Language of instruction:**

.....GREEK/ENGLISH.....

- **Programme's status**

New program:

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

The EEC plus supporting members from the ENQA attended a site visit 9 May 10.00 – 18.00 and were in discussions with various members of the programme team, students and academic and management staff of NUP. The EEC team greatly enjoyed the visit and meeting staff and students. We would thank NUP and the Rector for their hospitality during the day.

B. External Evaluation Committee (EEC)

<i>Name</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>University</i>
Joanna Gray	Professor	University of Birmingham, UK
Jannemieke Ouwerkerk	Professor	Leiden, The Netherlands
Vanessa Bettinson	Professor	De Montfort University, UK

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

Findings

Since the programme has yet to be approved it has no formal status as yet beyond a proposal and cannot yet be marketed and advertised as having a formal status and is publicly available.

The programme has already been through an Internal Quality Assurance Evaluation system and NUP and each of its constituent Schools maintains a robust internal quality assurance system through University and School Committees and regular evaluations, feedback mechanisms all of which were fully explained to us.

We found that NUP does indeed support teaching, administrative staff and students to take on their responsibilities in quality assurance

TURNITIN is used in order to safeguard academic integrity and freedom and is vigilant against academic fraud however as explained below we see room for improvement and refinement in its use.

No evidence whatsoever of any kind of discrimination was found.

The EEC was assured in discussions that external stakeholders were involved in NUP's strategy and in developing programmes but see below where we recommend more formal recognition of their role within the Law School.

The programme of study appears to have been designed with overall programme objectives that are in line with the institutional strategy and mission of excellence in teaching, research and service and have explicit intended learning outcomes as do the modules.

The programme appears to have been designed by involving students and other stakeholders and its genesis lay in discussions a few years ago revealing market demand for such a programme in Cyprus.

The programme will benefit from external expertise of both expert visiting staff and ad hoc lectures and sessions with external stakeholders. For example, while we were there a former Minister of Justice was visiting to lecture that day.

The proposal for this certainly reflects the four purposes of higher education of the Council of Europe (preparation for sustainable employment, personal development, preparation for life as active citizens in democratic societies, the development and maintenance, through teaching, learning and research, of a broad, advanced knowledge base). The growing geopolitical and financial hub importance of Cyprus makes these values all the more imperative and this programme should support them well.

Overall the programme appears to be designed so that it enables smooth student progression although as we comment later in this report a part-time route to this programme would be a useful and recommended option.

The Programme defines the expected student workload in ECTS

The work of NUP Business Placement Office appears to provide well-structured placement opportunities where appropriate and there is clear potential to do even more with Cypriot financial sector employers as well as the legal profession which the team were well aware of.

The programme (as are all new Programmes at NUP) is indeed subject to a formal institutional approval process

To the best of our knowledge the programme should result in a qualification that is clearly specified and communicated, and refers to the correct level of the National Qualifications Framework for Higher Education and, consequently, to the Framework for Qualifications of the European Higher Education Area. The qualification is based on 90 ECTS and the learning outcomes map to those of the NQFHE. NUP has well established ERASMUS links which are also testament to this broader commitment compliance.

The site visit meetings and module content discussions revealed that the programme is regularly monitored in the light of the latest research in the given discipline, thus giving assurance that the programme is up-to-date and will remain so.

We discussed the extent of public information that would be available for this programme if approved, and whether it would be clear, accurate, objective, up-to date and readily accessible as to the following matters:

- about the programme of study offered
- the selection criteria
- the intended learning outcomes
- the qualification awarded
- the teaching, learning and assessment procedures
- the pass rates
- the learning opportunities available to the students
- graduate employment information.

We were assured that all of the above would be the case with this programme as is the practice with all other programmes so students are clear as to their expectations of programme, NUP's expectations of them and opportunities available to them.

Strengths

A strength of this programme is that it provides and offering not widely available in Europe at the moment within Law Schools and for which there is much industry and public sector demand as well as a broader societal need insofar as it addresses fundamental values which will enhance the reputation of Cyprus and its governance.

Areas of improvement and recommendations

The paperwork provided for this application has at times confused the name of this programme. We recommend that consistency be adopted to avoid potential student confusion, by ensuring that the title of the programme is confirmed as Financial Crime and Criminal Justice.

The programme would be improved by and we therefore recommend :

A part-time route for taking this degree (in addition to the full time route proposed) would be of benefit to those students in full time work who struggle with 8 modules in one year and then have to interrupt studies having started. It would provide them with more flexibility from the start and ease pressures on them.

For those non-law graduates accepted for this degree who have not had any exposure or experience in handling legal sources and working with legal texts and lack basic knowledge of legal institutions and principles we suggest the inclusion of a non-mandatory preliminary optional summer school type short course BEFORE the main taught programme starts in order that they can benefit straightaway from the content of the modules. Such a course should include an opportunity to do formative legal writing tasks and embed adequate referencing skills. We understand that help with legal writing and legal research skills comes in Semester 2 prior to the dissertation but in our view this is too late to be of assistance to students taking substantive semester 1 modules who will be engaging in summative assessments through written assignments in Semester 1.

With respect to safeguards against plagiarism we fail to see any value in using TURNITIN in such a way to allow students the chance to re-submit work three times via TURNITIN before the submission becomes a final one. We believe that allowing students such a facility does not incentivise academic integrity on the part of students and responsible behaviour on their part. There are better ways to teach students unfamiliar with referencing standards and academic honesty the importance of these standards. We therefore recommend students taking this programme have the opportunity to submit work once and do not see their TURNITIN report.

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.	10
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	10

1.3.2	The programme webpage information and material	N/A
1.3.3	The procedures for the fulfillment of undergraduate and postgraduate assignments / practical training	10
1.3.4	The procedures for the conduct and the format of the examinations and for student assessment	7
1.3.5	Students' participation procedures for the improvement of the programme and of the educational process	10
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.	10
1.5	The following ensure the achievement of the programme's purpose, objectives and the learning outcomes:	
1.5.1	The number of courses	10
1.5.2	The programme's content	10
1.5.3	The methods of assessment	10
1.5.4	The teaching material	10
1.5.5	The equipment	10
1.5.6	The balance between theory and practice	10
1.5.7	The research orientation of the programme	8
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.	10
1.8	The content of the programme's courses reflects the latest achievements / developments in science, arts, research and technology.	9
1.9	New research results are embodied in the content of the programme of study.	9
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.	10
1.13	The learning outcomes and the content of the courses are consistent.	10
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.	10
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.	10
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.	8
1.19	Procedures are applied so that the programme conforms to the scientific and professional activities of the graduates.	10
1.20	The admission requirements are appropriate.	10
1.21	Sufficient information relating to the programme of study is posted publicly.	10
1.22	The teaching methodology is suitable for teaching in higher education.	10

We have been asked to provide information on:

1. Employability records
2. Pass rate per course/semester
3. The correspondence of exams' and assignments' content to the level of the programme and the number of ECTS .

However since this is a new programme therefore we are unable to form any judgements at this stage in respect to these three areas.

However the other scores given above reflect the following areas of concern

1.1 was scored 8 because of lack of moderation (second marking) and external examiner involvement in the programme.

1.34 was scored 7 because of the use of TURNITIN – see previous comments above.

1.5.7 was scored 8 because of our concerns as to the capacity of teaching staff for research given heavy teaching loads and lack of formal institutional commitment to a sustained regular period of study leave over a four to five year cycle.

1.8 and 1.9 were scored at 9 for the same reasons as aforementioned – there is a risk of research time being squeezed out as the programme grows and becomes more successful and it is important for workload management policies to recognize the value of research informed teaching at Masters level.

1.18 – was scored at 8 since the programme offers greater potential that can be explored in the future as to collaboration with NUP Business School programmes (joint offerings) and offers scope for both formal and informal collaboration a broader range of employers beyond and outwith the Greek and Cypriot legal profession. However the existing collaboration with other HE institutions offering 30% of the staffing component for this programme is laudable and a great start.

The N/A scores were awarded where the questions had no application or relevance at this proposal stage.

Study programme and study programme's design and development

Substantially compliant

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

FINDINGS

Our perusal of documentation, meetings with team and above all, our discussions with students assured us that most certainly the process of teaching and learning supports students' individual and social development and respects their needs.

Likewise we judged the process of teaching and learning to be flexible, to employ different modes of delivery, where appropriate, and to use a variety of pedagogical methods and thereby facilitates the achievement of planned learning outcomes.

Students most certainly seem to be encouraged to take an active role in creating the learning process. Hence the implementation of student-centered learning and teaching appears to encourage a sense of autonomy in the learner, while ensuring adequate guidance and support from the teacher.

Teaching methods, tools and material used in teaching seem to be at least as modern, effective as many other institutions and support the use of modern educational technologies which are regularly updated.

Practical and theoretical studies are interconnected in the programme and module conceptualization and design and hence the organisation and the content of practical training when it is to be used ought to support the achievement of planned learning outcomes and meet the needs of the stakeholders.

There was most certainly mutual respect within the learner-teacher relationship is promoted.

The modes of assessment is appropriate, transparent, objective and supports the development of the learner.

The criteria for and method of assessment, as well as criteria for marking, we assume to be made transparent to students and published in advance but we did not have sight of those criteria and did not discuss them specifically. We assume they are as for the current LLM programme and therefore must have passed internal and external assurance in approval. But we note that this is one area where the continuing and annual involvement of an external examiner would benefit the assessment processes of the programme in the future.

Assessment allows students to demonstrate the extent to which the intended learning outcomes have been achieved. Students are indeed given generic feedback to whole class and informally orally on request, which is linked to advice on the learning process. Individualized feedback ought to be given as a matter of course in written form clearly linking to areas which need improvement before the second stage of assessment takes place. This enables all students to learn and benefit from feedback.

Assessment however appears not be carried out by more than one examiner and we recommend that a process of internal moderation of marking criteria application be adopted at the least - this is less onerous than second marking and provides some assurance as to standards.

However we recommend (see below) dissertation work to be marked twice internally.

Strengths

Flexibility of teaching staff and high degree of concern demonstrated that students learn and engage. Meetings with students showed their appreciation for this as well as student awareness of the positive value of staff contact and approachability at NUP as well as expertise and professionalism shown towards them. The students remarked at how much management and organisation of the Law Programmes and NUP as a whole had improved since new management team put in place.

Students appreciated highly interactive teaching methods employed on their programme and we were confident these same strengths will imbue the proposed programme.

Areas of improvement and recommendations

We recommend the adoption of tighter assessment processes insofar as internal moderation be adopted as well as external examiner oversight of assessment processes on an annual basis.

We also recommend a bank of previous examination papers set be made available to all students with the caveat of course that each examination will differ from year to year and past papers are not necessarily a guide to their own assessment but nonetheless they may find them to be a useful medium for practising their writing and revision base.

We recommend that the processes for the conduct of the dissertation be made clear and standard for all students so all students receive the same baseline level of supervision and how exactly the dissertation marks are awarded be clearer to all.

Quality indicators/criteria		1 - 10
2.1	The actual/expected number of students in each class allows for constructive teaching and communication.	10
2.2	The actual/expected number of students in each class compares positively to the current international standards and/or practices.	10
2.3	There is an adequate policy for regular and effective communication with students.	8
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.	10
2.5	Constructive formative assessment for learning and feedback are regularly provided to the students.	8
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.	10
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.	10
2.10	It is ensured that teaching and learning are continuously enriched by research.	8
2.11	The programme promotes students' research skills and inquiry learning.	7

2.12 Students are adequately trained in the research process.

7

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

2.3 and 2.5 were scored at 8 since we see room for improvement in standardization of feedback proffered to students and enhancing its value to their learning – see comments above. There is no room currently planned into module design and assessment design for specifically formative written assessment prior to the summative mid-term assessment although we understand that some modules may use quizzes etc but there might be scope for practice of essay writing skills in class and peer marking for example to show students how marking criteria be employed. Students ought to understand how these criteria will be used when their work is marked summatively.

We also believe that past papers ought to be available as stated above.

2.6 – scored at 7 due to comment above – we have not seen marking criteria and this point was not addressed with the LLB students we met. We also did not see examples of student work on LLM programmes to date.

2.10 – scored at 8 due to our concerns set out in Section 1 above in relation to Staff Capacity going forward for research informed teaching is time is too squeezed..

2.11 and 2.12 scored at 8 due to our concerns that students may not be pushed enough during the taught element of the Masters course to do their own independent reading and research beyond reading lists proffered. While we recognize not all students on this programme will be receptive to such an approach to M level learning it may be to their intellectual benefit to move beyond and outside their intellectual comfort zone to develop a more inquiring outlook and capacity by reading more widely.

Teaching, learning and student assessment

substantially compliant

3. Teaching Staff (ESG 1.5)

Findings

During the meeting with management and teaching staff the EEC team explored the degree to which the recruitment and development of the teaching staff conducted at NUP and the extent to which these can be said to seem fair, transparent and clear. While the quality of staff we met was testament to the robustness of hiring processes to date we would recommend that the processes for both internal promotion and hiring of new staff be made more distinct – they appeared to be same with clear criteria for each.

Diversity and equal opportunity should inform all hiring processes and necessitate broader and more proactive search processes than open advertisement alone can ensure to encourage as broad as possible a field of candidates.

Internal promotion processes may well differ from new hiring processes and the ability to engage meaningfully with clear internal promotion criteria be made part of formal staff development for existing teaching staff. We noted the lack of staff at Associate Professor level within the Law School and, while this may well be a consequence of the fact that NUP is still a relatively newly established institution we would expect a University, in order to mature and grow its intellectual capacity and leadership pipeline to have a solid middle tier of future senior leaders.

Teaching staff qualifications appeared adequate to achieve the objectives and planned learning outcomes of the study programme, and to ensure quality and sustainability of the teaching and learning. All had PhDs and were given ad hoc continuous essential training in use of new teaching methodologies.

The teaching staff had opportunities for collaboration in teaching and research within NUP itself and with partners outside but we did not discuss any in great depth.

Recognised visiting teaching staff most certainly do participate in teaching the study programme.

We were assured the teaching staff is regularly engaged in professional and teaching-skills training and development and the experience we had of IT support staff and Library staff in their presentations showed this supportiveness to staff training.

Formal annual assessment of the teaching staff with the Dean takes place and takes into account the quality of their teaching, their research activity, the development of their teaching skills. Our discussion with students showed they felt listened to and action was taken where staff teaching performance was sub-optimal.

We are asked to consider staff mobility and are unclear as to the exact meaning of this but, assuming it means availability to students we would expect this aspect of staff performance be kept under review. If indeed it means staff retention issues should staff wish to leave for better opportunities elsewhere then we refer to comments above on Internal Promotion.

Strengths

Commitment, enthusiasm, sharpness and acuity of the teaching team. We were especially impressed by their commitment to their students. Great fit between proven subject expertise of staff and teaching delivered and to be delivered.

Areas of improvement and recommendations

Greater engagement of staff in career development through use of internal promotion mechanisms as and when appropriate. Expansion of staff resource in order to ease workload of existing staff (thereby maintaining research capacity) if the programme develops successfully. See comments above in relation to new hires and importance of diversity and equality of opportunity.

Transparent and consistent workload allocation model so that all staff have equal opportunity so all staff have a chance at career progression.

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.	10
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	10
3.2.2	Research and Publications within the discipline	10
3.2.3	Experience / training in teaching in higher education	10
3.3	The programme attracts visiting professors of recognized academic standing.	10
3.4	The specialisations of visiting professors adequately support the programme of study.	10
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.	10
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.	10
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.	8

3.9	The programme's coordinator has the qualifications and experience to coordinate the programme of study.	10
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.	10
3.11	The teaching staff is provided with adequate training opportunities in teaching methods, adult education and new technologies.	10
3.12	Feedback processes for teaching staff in regard to the evaluation of their teaching work, by the students, are satisfactory.	10

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

3.8 was scored at 8 due to the EEC's concerns the risk of overload on teaching staff if the programme succeeds and expands without both new hires and a formal system of study leave to enable staff to maintain intellectual and research capital.

:

In this proposed programme of study the special teaching staff does not exceed 30% of the permanent teaching staff.

:

Teaching Staff

substantially compliant

4. Students

Findings

Given this programme has not yet run the EEC did not specifically enquire as to information on students, like key performance indicators, profile of the student population, student progression, success and drop-out rates, students' satisfaction with their programmes, learning resources and student support available, career paths of graduates, is collected, monitored and analysed. This is not yet relevant.

The EEC were satisfied following discussions with team that there would be fair recognition of higher education qualifications, periods of study and prior learning, which should promote mobility.

We assume that students receive certification explaining the qualification gained, including achieved learning outcomes and the context, level, content and status of the studies that were pursued and successfully completed. We did not ask to see degree certificates though.

NUP are proud of the communication they have between staff and students and on the visit of the EEC to the university this was visible. The Law School is small with a healthy staff to student ratio of 1:11/12. Students are informed of regulations and policies via the university website and there is good library and IT infrastructure to support students' study.

NUP provided the EEC with its numerous policies. These include pre-defined criteria regarding student admission, progression and quality assurance.

Policies are available on NUP's website and Moodle for students. There is a clear complaints procedure enabling a consistent and transparent approach for student complaints and a separate one for appeals.

Students complete evaluation questionnaires mid-term and have representation on several university boards.

Retention rates at NUP are high providing firm evidence that the Law School supports students to complete their programmes of study.

Strengths

Student evaluation of teaching staff is regular and appears to have an impressive response rate of around 80%. Students also feel they are listened to through these evaluations and where they

have

further issues, they have support of a committed student union, founded by student members of the Law School. Students' views were provided to the EEC stating high regard for the teaching and learning experience at NUP Law School.

Skills support is available throughout the academic year via the library staff. They provide general courses including how to write a dissertation, which is particularly useful to potential students undertaking this programme. Videos are placed on Moodle of these sessions and are therefore accessible by all students and are inclusive. Library staff also offer one to one sessions, which can include skills on legal writing.

Student welfare is catered for with central university facilities, including the Counselling centre for Psychological support and a dedicated Special Educational Needs and Disabilities team

The EEC was impressed with the financial support provided by NUP to students in the form of scholarships , discounts and in-course hardship funding. For those students unable to complete the course they are fairly reimbursed in the event that they have paid fees in advance.

Areas of improvements and recommendations

As NUP's postgraduate student numbers increase, the staff may wish to consider introducing a specific postgraduate representative to its Advisory Board and evaluation processes. We would support the School's vision of developing a PhD programme in the future, which may be attractive to potential students taking the proposed programme (LLM in Financial Crime and Criminal Justice) or who have taken it in the past and wish now to contribute to the research community.

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.	10
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.	10
4.4	Students' participation in exchange programmes is compared favourably to similar programmes across Europe.	10

4.5	There is a student welfare service that supports students in regard to academic, personal problems and difficulties.	10
4.6	Statutory mechanisms, for the support of students and the communication with the teaching staff, are effective.	10
4.7	Mentoring of each student is provided and the number of students per each permanent teaching member is adequate.	10
4.8	Flexible options / adaptable to the personal needs or to the needs of students with special needs, are provided.	10
4.9	Students are satisfied with their learning experiences.	10

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

Students

Fully compliant

5. Resources (ESG 1.6)

FINDINGS

Adequate and readily accessible resources are indeed provided to students and support the achievement of objectives in the study programme. These compare well to those elsewhere and, while the students raised concerns about the shabbiness of the estate and buildings but one of the members of the EEC found these far superior to those of her own place of employment! We understand an exciting new building development project is planned and underway that will include the Law School.

Adequacy of resources is ensured for changing circumstances as strategic planning is underway. Staff were able to requisition new books via the library procurement processes and open access and subscription services and sources were excellent and of international standard.

All resources seemed fit for purpose and students are informed about the services available to them.

While teaching staff clearly do not manage specific budgets of NUP or School they appeared to be involved in the management of financial resources regarding the proposed programme of study.

Strengths

Use of new technology and the extent to which it was updated was very good and students commented on good connectivity throughout campus. We found the learning environment to be pleasant, not overcrowded and was conducive to staff/student mixing the formation of a University community.

Areas of improvement and recommendations

Given current size of student cohort we saw no areas of real concern here but would comment that if expansion continues completion of the new site for NUP will be important to maintain quality of learning environment .

Quality indicators/criteria		1 - 10
5.1	Adequate and modern learning resources are available to the students.	10
5.2	The library includes the latest books and material that support the programme.	10
5.3	The library loan system facilitates students' studies.	10

5.4	The laboratories adequately support the programme.	N/A
5.5	Student welfare services are of high quality.	10
5.6	Statutory administrative mechanisms for monitoring and supporting students are sufficient.	10
5.7	Suitable books and reputable journals support the programme of study.	10
5.8	An internal communication platform supports the programme of study.	10
5.9	The equipment used in teaching and learning (laboratory and electronic equipment, consumables etc.) are quantitatively and qualitatively adequate.	10
5.10	Teaching materials (books, manuals, scientific journals, databases) are adequate and accessible to students.	10
5.11	Teaching materials (books, manuals, scientific journals, databases) are updated regularly with the most recent publications.	10

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

Please circle one of the following for:

Fully compliant

6. Additional for distance learning programmes (ALL ESG) **THIS IS NOT APPLICABLE TO THIS EXERCISE**

7. Additional for doctoral programmes (ALL ESG) **THIS IS NOT APPLICABLE TO THIS EXERCISE**

8. Additional for joint programmes (ALL ESG) **THIS IS NOT APPLICABLE TO THIS EXERCISE**

Conclusions and final remarks

Most of the areas identified for review by the Cypriot ENQA standards are addressed in the course of our findings of fact and our judgments which are set out in Sections 1 – 5 above. We found many strengths in this proposal and the rationale, business case and employer demand for it are all made out to our satisfaction. The undoubted enthusiasm and expertise of the young teaching team that have collaborated on this proposal is testament to the intellectual coherence and momentum behind this initiative. It largely conforms to internationally recognized best practice and academic standards on similar Masters programmes subject to the improvements identified to assessment processes in particular (TURNITIN, Feedback, Internal Moderation etc.) and pre-course preparation for non-law graduates that we recommend. We hope and trust that the NUP management will continue to support the teaching staff as the programme grows and expands in order to enable them to keep the programme fresh, relevant and above all informed by the latest research and thinking – both of others in the field of financial crime and indeed in development of their own research and academic careers. This will be to the ultimate benefit of the programme’s future graduates and to NUP’s academic reputation.

We recommend conditional approval subject to the issues identified above being addressed fully and an interim external review of the programme after it has run for three years..

C. Signatures of the EEC

<i>Name</i>	<i>Signature</i>
Joanna Gray	
Vanessa Bettinson	
Jannemieke Ouwerkerk	

Date: ...10 May 2019.....