

Doc. 300.3.1

Date: 2/10/2021

# External Evaluation Report (Departmental)

- **Higher Education Institution:**

European University of Cyprus (EUC)

- **Town:** Nicosia

- **School/Faculty:** School of Humanities, Social and Educational Sciences

- **Department:** Humanities

- **Department's Status:** Existing

- **Programme(s) of study under evaluation:**  
**Name (Duration, ECTS, Cycle)**

**Programme 1**

**In Greek:**

Programme Name

**In English:**

Programme Name

**Programme 2**

**In Greek:**

Programme Name

**In English:**

Programme Name

**Programme 3**

**In Greek:**

Programme Name

**In English:**

Programme Name



**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 to 2019” [N. 136 (I)/2015 to N. 35(I)/2019].**

Department's programmes (to be filled by the CYQAA officer and verified by the EEC):

DEPARTMENT	PROGRAMMES OF STUDY
Department of Humanities	N/A (Departmental Evaluation)

## **A. Introduction**

*This part includes basic information regarding the onsite visit.*

The panel met on-line with staff from the EUC and the Department and were able to engage in productive discussion and questioning with them, which filled many gaps and unanswered questions which had arisen in reading the documentation. It must be said that the documentation itself was not well presented, with out-of-date information on staffing and student numbers and lacking in a contents page to orient the reader to what the 1060 page report contained. Additionally, diagrams were printed too small to read easily or in landscape which made them very hard to read on-screen. Fortunately, the panel also received a comprehensive briefing from relevant staff on the structure, environment and goals of the university, of the Faculty and then the Department, which somewhat corrected the original impression. It was clear that EUC is an outward looking and proactive institution, compliant with European norms and benchmarking well with universities world-wide. The panel noted recent achievements such as the 2020 acceptance into the Utrecht Network. Following this there was a meeting with departmental staff at which the panel were able to have a full and wide ranging discussion of the research activity of the group, their approach to teaching and curriculum, their student-centred approach to their work. The panel also heard of their community service approach in promoting the arts across the island in a range of interesting ways, including sponsoring performances and festivals and publications. The panel formed the impression of a highly qualified, engaged and enthusiastic team who work well across the different areas of English Language and Literature, Media Studies and Hellenic Studies, adopting a common approach. The next meeting was with students at different stages (BA, MA and Alumni) who provided eloquent perspectives on their study experience in the Department and at EUC more generally. The international make-up of the student body was in evidence, with students from Cyprus, Greece and further afield. The panel then had a useful meeting with administrative staff who were able to throw more light on admissions procedures, the induction and support of students up to and including graduation. The panel gained useful insights into library provision, IT support and other forms of student support. Videos provided, in the absence of the opportunity for an actual site visit, allowed the panel to gain an impression of the campus, the department and its facilities.

## B. External Evaluation Committee (EEC)

<i>Name</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>University</i>
Mike Baynham	Professor of TESOL	University of Leeds
Kirsti Bohata	Professor of English Literature	Swansea University
Iakovos Michailidis	Professor of Modern and Contemporary History	Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Greece
<b>George Christodoulou</b>	student	Open University Cyprus

## C. Guidelines on content and structure of the report

- *The external evaluation report refers to the Department as a whole (programmes offered, teaching staff, administrative staff, infrastructure, resources, etc.).*
- *The external evaluation report follows the structure of assessment areas and sub-areas.*
- *Under each assessment area there are quality indicators (criteria) to be scored by the EEC on a scale from one (1) to five (5), based on the degree of compliance for the above mentioned quality indicators (criteria). The scale used is explained below:*

1 or 2:	Non-compliant
3:	Partially compliant
4 or 5:	Compliant

- *The EEC must justify the numerical scores provided for the quality indicators (criteria) by specifying (if any) the deficiencies.*
- *It is pointed out that, in the case of indicators (criteria) that cannot be applied due to the status of the Department, N/A (= Not Applicable) should be noted and a detailed explanation should be provided on the Department's corresponding policy regarding the specific quality indicator.*
- *In addition, for each assessment area, it is important to provide information regarding the compliance with the requirements. In particular, the following must be included:*

### **Findings**

*A short description of the situation in the Department based on evidence from the Department's application and the site - 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 followed by or linked to the recommendations of how to improve the situation.*

- *The EEC should state the compliance for each sub-area (Non-compliant, Partially compliant, Compliant), **which must be in agreement with everything stated in the report.***
- **The report may also address other issues which the EEC finds relevant.**
- The EEC was struck by the excessively long periods of work experience required for promotion to senior positions such as professor (12 years) This has the effect of preventing

the possibility of fast tracking very gifted and high achieving staff until they have served their time and is out of keeping with EUC's obvious desire to achieve in terms of research and in other ways in global rankings and not characteristic of aspirational universities. The top universities worldwide do not restrict themselves in this way. While this is clearly a university-wide and indeed a country-wide phenomenon it will impact on the capacity of the Department to develop to its full potential. When this was raised it was pointed out that the time-requirement for promotions is a matter of law and thus outside university control. The EEC noted however that special cases such as in medicine have been made. It suggests that the university, perhaps in consort with other Cypriot universities, should make appropriate representations to national decision-makers concerning the limitations on growth, particularly in research capacity, but more generally in international visibility, in the HE sector that this produces.



**1. Department's academic profile and orientation**  
(ESG 1.1, 1.2, 1.4, 1.5, 1.6, 1.7, 1.8, 1.9)

**Sub-areas**

- 1.1 Mission and strategic planning (including SWOT analysis)**
- 1.2 Connecting with society**
- 1.3 Development processes**

Mark from 1 to 5 the degree of compliance for each quality indicator/criterion

- 1 or 2: Non-compliant*
- 3: Partially compliant*
- 4 or 5: Compliant*

Quality indicators/criteria		
1. Department's academic profile and orientation		
<b>1.1 Mission and strategic planning (including SWOT analysis)</b>		<b>1 - 5</b>
1.1.1	The Department has formally adopted a mission statement, which is available to the public and easily accessible.	5
1.1.2	The Department has developed its strategic planning aiming at fulfilling its mission.	4
1.1.3	The Department's strategic planning includes short, medium-term and long-term goals and objectives, which are periodically revised and adapted.	4
1.1.4	The programmes of study offered by the Department reflect its academic profile and are aligned with the European and international practice.	5
1.1.5	The academic community is involved in shaping and monitoring the implementation of the Department's development strategies.	5
1.1.6	Stakeholders such as academics, students, graduates and other professional and scientific associations participate in the Department's development strategy.	4
1.1.7	The mechanism for collecting and analysing data and indicators needed to effectively design the Department's academic development is adequate and effective.	3
Justify the numerical scores provided for the quality indicators (criteria) by specifying (if any) the deficiencies.		

Ratings of 4 suggest good but not exceptional. So the Department has processes in place for strategic planning and involving stakeholders but these are capable of improvement. With regard to 1.1.7 the panel considers there is a potential to improve the collection of demographic data in order to ensure wide participation of students from different backgrounds. If the Department is aspirational along the lines of the University as a whole it should consider these as areas for improvement.

Additionally, provide information on the following:

1. Coherence and compatibility among programmes of study offered by the Department.
2. Coherence and compatibility among Departments within the School/Faculty (to which the Department under evaluation belongs).

The panel found considerable compatibility of ethos and approach across the programmes of study. The fact that they are all delivered in distance mode is obviously a unifying factor, but the panel found a general and noteworthy commitment to student-centred learning that went across all the programmes of study. The Department appeared broadly compatible with other departments in the Faculty.

Provide suggestions for changes in case of incompatibility.

[Click to enter text.](#)

## 1. Department's academic profile and orientation

### 1.2 Connecting with society

**1 - 5**

1.2.1	The Department has effective mechanisms to assess the needs and demands of society and takes them into account in its various activities.	4
1.2.2	The Department provides sufficient information to the public about its activities and offered programmes of study.	4
1.2.3	The Department ensures that its operation and activities have a positive impact on society.	5
1.2.4	The Department has an effective communication mechanism with its graduates.	4

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

The EEC felt that, while the overall performance was good, in some aspects excellent, there is still room for improvement in assessing societal needs and communicating with stakeholders outside the university and its graduates. These activities are clearly ongoing but could be pursued more systematically.

1. Department's academic profile and orientation		
<b>1.3 Development processes</b>		<b>1 - 5</b>
1.3.1	Effective procedures and measures are in place to attract and select teaching staff to ensure that they possess the formal and substantive skills to teach, carry out research and effectively carry out their work.	5
1.3.2	Planning teaching staff recruitment and their professional development is in line with the Department's academic development plan.	5
1.3.3	The Department applies an effective strategy of attracting high-level students from Cyprus and abroad.	3
1.3.4	The funding processes for the operation of the Department and the continuous improvement of the quality of its programmes of study are adequate and transparent.	5

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

With regard to 1.3.3, the EEC is aware of threats to enrolment of Humanities subjects which are wider than EUC, but nevertheless considers that the department should work to develop its strategies for attracting students from Cyprus and abroad. The EEC thinks that at least in the case of MA in Hellenic Studies there is a student pool in the Greek communities abroad who definitely could be reached to join the Department. No reflection is intended on the quality of current students which seems to benchmark well with other universities.

Additionally, write:

- Expected number of Cypriot and international students
- Countries of origin of international students and number from each country

We have not so far been provided with this data.

### Findings

Evidence from the Department's application was rather out of date and not well organized, however the EEC was able to get more up to date supplementary information during the site visit and colleagues in the Department were prompt to send the additional documentation requested. The EEC found the Department to be located in a dynamic, outward looking university and to embody these characteristics in its academic profile and orientation. The EEC found that the Department's programmes benchmarked well with other comparable departments internationally and noted the considerable contribution of the Department to the cultural and artistic life of Cyprus. With a more strategic approach to its development it could certainly aspire to excellence.

### Strengths

- Excellent connectivity with European initiatives in both teaching and research as well as mobility;
- Innovative and committed staff both academic and administrative;
- A student-centred approach to teaching and learning and the broader student experience;
- Excellent student support.

### Areas of improvement and recommendations

While the overall impression in most areas is of work that is good and sometimes excellent, in one or two areas the EEC felt that a more systematic approach is needed:

- If the Department wishes to fulfil its strategic objective to reach out to a wide range of potential students of different backgrounds and profiles it needs to take a more proactive role to collecting and interpreting the demographic data available from current students to see where the gaps are and use this as a basis for its recruitment strategy to embrace diversity;
- In a challenging environment for recruiting to humanities degrees, the Department needs to continually review its recruitment strategies, drawing on findings from demographic analysis recommended above, in order to maximize enrolment.
- If the Department aspires to be more than good, it should regard all ratings less than 5 to be indicative that more work is required.

**Please select what is appropriate for each of the following sub-areas:**

<b>Sub-area</b>	<b><i>Non-compliant / Partially Compliant / Compliant</i></b>
1.1 Mission and strategic planning	Compliant
1.2 Connecting with society	Compliant
1.3 Development processes	Compliant

## 2. Quality Assurance

(ESG 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.6, 1.7, 1.8)

### Sub-areas

**2.1 System and quality assurance strategy**

**2.2 Quality assurance for the programmes of study**

Mark from 1 to 5 the degree of compliance for each quality indicator/criterion

*1 or 2: Non-compliant*

*3: Partially compliant*

*4 or 5: Compliant*

Quality indicators/criteria		
2. Quality Assurance		
<b>2.1 System and quality assurance strategy</b>		<b>1 - 5</b>
2.1.1	The Department has a policy for quality assurance that is made public and forms part of the Institution's strategic management.	5
2.1.2	Internal stakeholders develop and implement a policy for quality assurance through appropriate structures and processes, while involving external stakeholders.	5
2.1.3	The Department's policy for quality assurance supports guarding against intolerance of any kind or discrimination against students or staff.	3
2.1.4	The quality assurance system adequately covers all the functions and sectors of the Department's activities:	
2.1.4.1	Teaching and learning	5
2.1.4.2	Research	5
2.1.4.3	The connection with society	5
2.1.4.4	Management and support services	5
2.1.5	The quality assurance system promotes a culture of quality.	5
2.1.6	Students' evaluation and feedback	4

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

Quality assurance systems are clearly articulated in the paperwork provided. With regards to 2.1.3. there is evidence of systems to guard against discrimination and address instances that may arise, and verbal and documentary evidence suggests expertise in this area, however some more emphasis on ongoing promotion of equality via proactive measures and training would enhance this, as would explicit equalities representation across *all* committees. Student evaluation and feedback is collected, though see suggestions for improvement below.

## 2. Quality Assurance

### 2.2 Quality assurance for the programmes of study

1 - 5

2.2.1	The responsibility for decision-making and monitoring the implementation of the programmes of study offered by the Department lies with the teaching staff.	5
2.2.2	The system and criteria for assessing students' performance in the subjects of the programmes of studies offered by the Department are clear, sufficient and known to the students.	5
2.2.3	The quality control system refers to specific indicators and is effective, which have been presented and discussed.	4
2.2.4	The results from student assessments are used to improve the programmes of study.	4
2.2.5	The policy dealing with plagiarism committed by students as well as mechanisms for identifying and preventing it are effective.	4
2.2.6	The established procedures for examining students' objections/ disagreements on issues of student evaluation or academic ethics are effective.	4
2.2.7	The Department publishes information related to the programmes of study, credit units, learning outcomes, methodology, student admission criteria, completion of studies, facilities, number of teaching staff and the expertise of teaching staff.	5
2.2.8	Names and position of the teaching staff of each programme are published and easily accessible.	5
2.2.9	The Department has a clear and consistent policy on the admission criteria for students in the various programmes of studies offered.	5
2.2.10	The Department flexibly uses a variety of teaching methods.	4

2.2.11	The Department systematically collects data in relation to the academic performance of students, implements procedures for evaluating such data and has a relevant policy in place.	4
2.2.12	The Department analyses and publishes graduate employment information.	3
2.2.13	The Department ensures adequate and appropriate learning resources in line with European and international standards and/or international practices, particularly:	
2.2.12.1	Building facilities	4
2.2.12.2	Library	4
2.2.12.3	Rooms for theoretical, practical and laboratory lessons	N/A
2.2.12.4	Technological infrastructure	4
2.2.12.5	Academic support	4
2.2.14	There is a student welfare service that supports students in regard to academic, personal problems and difficulties.	4
2.2.15	The Department's mechanisms, processes and infrastructure consider the needs of a diverse student population such as mature, part-time, employed and international students as well as students with disabilities.	4
2.2.16	Mentoring of each student is provided and the number of students per each permanent teaching member is adequate.	3
2.2.17	The provision of quality doctoral studies is ensured through doctoral studies regulations, which are publicly available.	N/A?
2.2.18	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.	N/A?
2.2.19	The Department has mechanisms and funds to support writing and attending conferences of doctoral candidates.	N/A?
2.2.20	There is a clear policy on authorship and intellectual property.	5

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

The assurance policies are generally robust. 2.2.7: not all the links from the staff list to staff web pages are working smoothly; 2.2.12: verbally the department is clearly aware of the type of graduate destinations and thinking about them during programme planning, but there needs to be more systematic data capture, publication and analysis. With regard to 2.2.16 information was not available to ascertain this properly. 2.2.17-19: the EEC was not made aware of a doctoral programme.

### Findings

*A short description of the situation in the Department based on evidence from the Department's application and the site - visit.*

The documentation provided a clear overview of quality assurance frameworks and the EEC found the department's permanent staff and the administrative staff to be highly informed and articulate about the implementation of quality assurance processes and procedures. They are active and diligent members of the various committees which carry out many of the quality assurance processes and there is evidence of ongoing and proactive work in enhancement as well as accountability.

### Strengths

- The high emphasis on reflective practice and ongoing enhancement which is to be commended.
- Staff commitment to student-centred provision.

### Areas of improvement and recommendations

- Improve embedding of anti-discrimination measures in all aspects of Department's work.
- Systematise the capture and analysis of graduate employment data. Given many of the students are already in employment, capturing the professional motivations for study may also help refine the provision of the department.
- Student Evaluation Questionnaire: Consider the equality/non-discriminatory implications of the invitation to students in C3 to provide "two positive characteristics of the instructor of this course". This is very general and open to interpretation as a comment on personality (which is very subjective and likely to be influenced by subconscious bias). Question C4. asks for "one or two ways the instructor can improve his/her teaching". Consider rephrasing question C3 to direct attention to professional practices / teaching rather than 'characteristics'.

Please ✓ what is appropriate for each of the following sub-areas:

Sub-area	<b>Non-compliant / Partially Compliant / Compliant</b>
2.1 System and quality assurance strategy	Compliant
2.2 Quality assurance for the programmes of study	Compliant



**3. Administration**  
(ESG 1.1, 1.3, 1.6)

Mark from 1 to 5 the degree of compliance for each quality indicator/criterion

*1 or 2: Non-compliant*  
*3: Partially compliant*  
*4 or 5: Compliant*

Quality indicators/criteria		
3. Administration		1 - 5
3.1	The administrative structure is in line with the legislation and the Department's mission.	5
3.2	The members of the teaching and administrative staff and the students participate, at a satisfactory degree and on the basis of specified procedures, in the management of the Department.	4
3.3	The administrative staff adequately supports the operation of the Department.	5
3.4	Adequate allocation of competences and responsibilities is ensured so that in academic matters, decisions are made by academics and the Department's council competently exercises legal control over such decisions.	4
3.5	The Department applies effective procedures to ensure transparency in the decision-making process.	4
3.6	Statutory sessions of the Department are held and minutes are kept.	4
3.7	The Department's council operates systematically and autonomously and exercise the full powers provided for by the law and / or the constitution of the Department without the intervention or involvement of a body or person outside the law provisions.	5
3.8	The manner in which the Department's council operates and the procedures for disseminating and implementing their decisions are clearly formulated and implemented precisely and effectively.	5
3.9	The Department applies procedures for the prevention and disciplinary control of academic misconduct of students, teaching and administrative staff, including plagiarism.	5
3.10	The Department has appropriate procedures for dealing with students' complaints.	5

3.11

Internationalization of the Department and external collaborations.

3

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

The administrative structure of the Department is adequate. It would be useful in the following years to support the library with digitalized archival material, giving thus, through the web, access to it to MA students, A more systematic cooperation with Universities and Institutions abroad should be developed in order to enhance the extroversion of the Department (3.11).

### Findings

*A short description of the situation in the Department based on evidence from the Department's application and the site - visit.*

The EEC found that the administrative organization of the Department is in line with international standards, and academic and administrative staff are actively involved in the operating mechanisms of the department. In addition, the Department has developed adequate mechanisms to address the problems of students related to their studies.

### Strengths

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

- High commitment of academic and administrative staff.
- Sufficient procedures to prevent academic misconduct.

### Areas of improvement and recommendations

*A list of problem areas followed by or linked to the recommendations of how to improve the situation.*

-There is a reluctance of students to participate in the administrative operation of the Department. At the present, the Department has not found satisfactory ways to deal with this problem.

-The International profile of the Department needs to be strengthened. This is very important, especially in the newly established MA in Hellenic Studies.

**Please select what is appropriate for the following assessment area:**

Assessment area	<i>Non-compliant / Partially Compliant / Compliant</i>
3. Administration	Compliant

**4. Learning and Teaching**  
(ESG 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.9)

**Sub-areas**

- 4.1 Planning the programmes of study**
- 4.2 Organisation of teaching**

Mark from 1 to 5 the degree of compliance for each quality indicator/criterion

- 1 or 2: Non-compliant*
- 3: Partially compliant*
- 4 or 5: Compliant*

Quality indicators/criteria		
<b>4. Learning and Teaching</b>		
<b>4.1 Planning the programmes of study</b>		<b>1 - 5</b>
4.1.1	The Department provides an effective system for designing, approving, monitoring and periodically reviewing the programmes of study.	4
4.1.2	Students and other stakeholders, including employers, are actively involved on the programmes' review and development.	4
4.1.3	Intended learning outcomes, the content of the programmes of study, the assignments and the final exams correspond to the appropriate level as indicated by the European Qualifications Framework (EQF).	5
4.1.4	The programmes of study are in compliance with the existing legislation and meet the professional qualifications requirements in the professional courses, where applicable.	5
4.1.5	The Department ensures that its programmes of study integrate effectively theory and practice.	4
<p>Justify the numerical scores provided for the quality indicators (criteria) by specifying (if any) the deficiencies.</p> <p>Although the panel were evaluating the department rather than its individual programmes, the panel judged the department to be delivering high quality programmes which are appropriately documented, designed and assessed.</p>		
<b>4. Learning and Teaching</b>		

4.2 Organisation of teaching		1 - 5
4.2.1	The Department establishes student admission criteria for each programme, which are adhered to consistently.	5
4.2.2	Recognition of prior studies and credit transfer is regulated by procedures and regulations that are in line with European standards and/or international practices.	5
4.2.3	The number of students in the teaching rooms is suitable for theoretical, practical and laboratory lessons.	n/a
4.2.4	The teaching staff of the Department has regular and effective communication with their students, promoting mutual respect within the learner-teacher relationship.	5
4.2.5	Student-centred learning and teaching plays an important role in stimulating students' motivation, self-reflection and engagement in the learning process.	5
4.2.6	The teaching staff of the Department provides timely and effective feedback to their students.	4
4.2.7	The criteria and the method of assessment as well as the criteria for marking are published in advance.	5
4.2.8	The assessment allows students to demonstrate the extent to which the intended learning outcomes have been achieved.	5
<p>Justify the numerical scores provided for the quality indicators (criteria) by specifying (if any) the deficiencies.</p> <p>4.2.6 While most students testified to the usefulness of the feedback they received, there are sometimes issues with accessibility of feedback (a technical issue, not necessarily a matter directly for the department). One student mentioned not always receiving feedback from an assessment before the main/final exam.</p>		

### Findings

*A short description of the situation in the Department based on evidence from the Department's application and the site - visit.*

The enthusiasm and commitment of the staff to their disciplines, students and wider mission of the department (as articulated in the departmental strategy and in person) is outstanding. The taught programmes are supported by routine but rigorous regulations and thorough dissemination of information. The effectiveness of the student-centred approach rests on the reactivity and approachability of staff as well as the wider administration and student support services. The team clearly maintains a high morale and an active commitment to the department's ethos.

### Strengths

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

- The practical application of cultural literacy and services to the community via Cultural Month, *Cadences* is to be commended.
- Integrating contemporary Cypriot literature alongside world literatures (and viewed through the lenses of postcolonialism and queer studies).

*Areas of improvement and recommendations*

*A list of problem areas followed by or linked to the recommendations of how to improve the situation.*

- Distance learning is dependent on good technological support. Mechanisms for quick resolution of any barriers to participation need not only to be in place but known and accessible to students.
- The excellent level of student support is based on relatively low numbers. If the Department scales up its numbers as it wishes to, better systems will need to be in place to maintain this.

**Please select what is appropriate for each of the following sub-areas:**

<b>Sub-area</b>	<b><i>Non-compliant / Partially Compliant / Compliant</i></b>
4.1 Planning the programmes of study	Compliant
4.2 Organisation of teaching	Compliant

## 5. Teaching Staff (ESG 1.5)

Mark from 1 to 5 the degree of compliance for each quality indicator/criterion

- 1 or 2: *Non-compliant*  
 3: *Partially compliant*  
 4 or 5: *Compliant*

Quality indicators/criteria		
5. Teaching Staff		1 - 5
5.1	The number of teaching staff - full-time and exclusive work - and the subject area of the staff sufficiently support the programmes of study.	4
5.2	The teaching staff of the Department has the relevant formal and substantive qualifications for teaching the individual subjects as described in the relevant legislation.	5
5.3	The visiting Professors' subject areas adequately support the Department's programmes of study.	N/A
5.4	The special teaching staff and special scientists have the required qualifications, sufficient professional experience and expertise to teach a limited number of programmes of study.	5
5.5	The ratio of special teaching staff to the total number of teaching staff is satisfactory.	4
5.6	The ratio of the number of subjects of the programme of study taught by teaching staff working fulltime and exclusively to the number of subjects taught by part-time teaching staff ensures the quality of the programme of study.	3
5.7	The ratio of the number of students to the total number of teaching staff is sufficient to support and ensure the quality of the programme of study.	4
5.8	Feedback processes for teaching staff in regard to the evaluation of their teaching work, by the students, are satisfactory.	5

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

[Click to enter text.](#)

Also, write the following:

- Number of teaching staff working full-time and having exclusive work
- Number of special teaching staff working full-time and having exclusive work
- Number of visiting Professors
- Number of special scientists on lease services

The EEU has not been provided with this data.

### Findings

The quality, dedication and enthusiasm of the teaching staff is a real strength. They are well qualified and engage in research-led and research-informed teaching, The Department professed itself to be satisfied with the balance between full-time Faculty, Special Teaching Staff and Special Scientists and Part-time teachers. However it should be aware that relying too much on part-time teaching staff, which it was argued leads to curriculum diversity, also has certain drawbacks: if part time teaching can be consolidated into a Faculty position, this will enhance the research profile. In MA in Hellenic Studies, e.g. there is only one full-time staff member.

### Strengths

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

- A well qualified and enthusiastic teaching staff
- Up-to-date curriculum

### Areas of improvement and recommendations

*A list of problem areas followed by or linked to the recommendations of how to improve the situation.*

- In Hellenic Studies at least, despite the recent appointment of a faculty member, the balance is still too weighted towards part time teachers.

**Please ✓ what is appropriate for the following assessment area:**

<b>Assessment area</b>	<b><i>Non-compliant / Partially Compliant / Compliant</i></b>
Teaching staff number, adequacy and suitability	Compliant
Teaching staff recruitment and development	Compliant
Synergies of teaching and research	Compliant

## 6. Research

(ESG 1.1, 1.3, 1.5, 1.6)

Mark from 1 to 5 the degree of compliance for each quality indicator/criterion

1 or 2: *Non-compliant*

3: *Partially compliant*

4 or 5: *Compliant*

Quality indicators/criteria		
<b>6. Research</b>		<b>1 - 5</b>
6.1	The Department has a research policy formulated in line with its mission.	4
6.2	The Department consistently applies internal regulations and procedures of research activity, which promote the set out research policy and ensure compliance with the regulations of research projects financing programmes.	4
6.3	The Department provides adequate facilities and equipment to cover the staff and students' research activities.	4
6.4	The Department has the appropriate mechanisms for the development of students' research skills.	4
6.5	The results of the teaching staff research activity are published to a satisfactory extent in international journals which work with critics, international conferences, conference proceedings, publications, etc. The Department also uses an open access policy for publications, which is consistent with the corresponding national and European policy.	5
6.6	The Department ensures that research results are integrated into teaching and, to the extent applicable, promotes and implements a policy of transferring know-how to society and the production sector.	5
6.7	The Department provides mechanisms which ensure compliance with international rules of research ethics, both in relation to research activity and the rights of researchers.	5
6.8	The external, non-governmental, funding of research activities of teaching staff is similar to other Departments in Cyprus and abroad.	4
6.9	The policy, indirect or direct of internal funding of the research activities of the teaching staff is satisfactory, based on European and international practices.	5
Justify the numerical scores provided for the quality indicators (criteria) by specifying (if any) the deficiencies.		



Click to enter text.

### Findings

The EUC has an explicit research policy. EUC research policy aligns with European norms. It has adopted the HR strategy for research: HRS4R. It has endorsed European charter and code for researchers. The Department benefits from this achievement oriented and outward looking approach to research but of course could further enhance this through strategic research collaborations, for example via the recent membership of the Utrecht Network. A workload model is in place which rewards publication and grant applications. Funding is available year by year for conference attendance, this is available both for Faculty and non-Faculty teaching staff. Facilities and research support thus benchmark well with universities internationally.

### Strengths

- A clear vision of the department's research goals. There is an emphasis in research on three principles which relates to teaching: interdisciplinarity, relevance and ethical concerns. All of these are approached with a view to enriching the curriculum.
- Appropriate systems in place to support research: a workload allocation that recognizes research, regular funding for conference attendance.

### Areas of improvement and recommendations

- The department has a research policy and it benefits from the overall framing of the research policy of the university, however it could be more ambitious and targetted in its strategic research planning, aiming at international research excellence, along the lines that the university has set itself.

Please ✓ what is appropriate for the following assessment area:

<b>Assessment area</b>	<b><i>Non-compliant / Partially Compliant / Compliant</i></b>
Research mechanisms and regulations	Compliant
External and internal funding	Compliant
Motives for research	Compliant
Publications	Compliant

## 7. Resources (ESG 1.6)

Mark from 1 to 5 the degree of compliance for each quality indicator/criterion

*1 or 2: Non-compliant*

*3: Partially compliant*

*4 or 5: Compliant*

Quality indicators/criteria		
7. Resources		1 - 5
7.1	The Department has sufficient financial resources to support its functions, managed by the Institutional and Departmental bodies.	4
7.2	The Department follows sound and efficient management of the available financial resources in order to develop academically and research wise.	4
7.3	The Department's profits and donations are used for its development and for the benefit of the university community.	4
7.4	The Department's budget is appropriate for its mission and adequate for the implementation of strategic planning.	3
7.5	The Department carries out an assessment of the risks and sustainability of the programmes of study and adequately provides feedback on their operation.	4
7.6	The Department's external audit and the transparent management of its finances are ensured.	5
7.7	The fitness-for-purpose of support facilities and services is periodically reviewed.	5

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

The EEU understands that funding for the Humanities is limited not just in the case of EUC, but worldwide. Nevertheless, It points out its importance for further improvements in the operation of the Department in the near future. European programs such as HORIZON could be used as a resource for research funding and improvement of the international performance of the Department through research collaboration. In addition, various public and private institutions both in Cyprus and Greece could be interested in funding research programs, especially submitted by the MA programme in Hellenic Studies.

### Findings

*A short description of the situation in the Department based on evidence from the Department's application and the site - visit.*

The distribution of money in each Department is done by the University on an annual basis. There are three pillars that define the policy of money sharing by the Department. Providing quality education to students, promoting Research and engaging in activities to disseminate knowledge and science to the society.

Click to enter text.

### Strengths

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

- Transparent use of financial resources.

### Areas of improvement and recommendations

*A list of problem areas followed by or linked to the recommendations of how to improve the situation.*

- Limited financial resources available for research.
- Limited funding from European programs.

Please ✓ what is appropriate for the following assessment area:

Assessment area	<b>Non-compliant / Partially Compliant / Compliant</b>
7. Resources	Compliant

## **D. Conclusions and final remarks**

*Please provide constructive conclusions and final remarks, which may form the basis upon which improvements of the quality of the Department under review may be achieved.*

The EEC finds the Department to be effectively organized and to provide high quality education which benchmarks well with similar departments world wide. It has particular strengths in its student-centred approach and up to date and responsive curriculum. Its research is engaged and innovative and it provides an important focus for cultural and literary activity in Cyprus, through events and publications. It was made clear to the EEC that the Department is located in a university with ambitions to significantly improve its performance and international standing over the next period and is clearly on track to do so. While the overall picture is one of compliance and therefore a pleasing result, the Department and the University would be wise to look carefully at the relatively few areas where the sub standards were judged partially compliant and indeed at those where the sub standards were judged numerically at 4 rather than 5. One of the issues that must be noted is a need for more careful documentation of relevant demographic data on students and tracking of graduate destinations which can then inform strategic policy development. One of the reasons for the relative lack of systematicity in collecting this data lies perhaps in the quite small student numbers so far in the core programmes. However if the Department is successful in increasing student numbers as it aims to, it will have to be more systematic in all aspects of its work and strategic planning to preserve the attractive and friendly student-centred approach with scaled up numbers. With regards to the preponderance of 4s over 5s, it might be tempting to take the overall compliance rating as a message to carry on as before. However the EEC is of the view that, if the Department is to contribute fully to EUC's strategic goals it needs to be sharper in its strategic planning and systems, while not losing the friendly student centred ethos. So it should be looking carefully at all areas rated 4 rather than 5 and considering strategies for improving them through its ongoing strategic planning. Quality is not an either/or or yes/no attribute but rather a zone of continuous improvement. This said, the EEC wishes to congratulate the Department on its work so far and wish it well in its future development.

**E. Signatures of the EEC**

<i>Name</i>	<i>Signature</i>
Michael Baynham	
Kirsti Bohata	
Iakovos Michailidis	
<b>Giorgos Christodoulou</b>	

**Date:** 2/10/2021

