

Doc. 300.1.1

Date: 04 June 2021

# External Evaluation Report (Conventional-face-to-face programme of study)

- **Higher Education Institution:**  
Larnaca College
- **Town:**
- **School/Faculty (if applicable):** School of Business
- **Department/ Sector: Postgraduate Department**
- **Programme of study - Name (Duration, ECTS, Cycle)  
In Greek:**

Μεταπτυχιακό στη Δημόσια Διοίκηση και Διακυβέρνηση  
Μεταπτυχιακό στην Εκπαιδευτική Διοίκηση (12 μήνες/3  
Εξάμηνα/90 ECTS, Μεταπτυχιακό).

#### **In English:**

Master of Arts in Public Management and Governance  
(MA, 12 Months, 90 ECTS)

Master of Arts in Education Management (MA, 12  
Months, 90 ECTS)

- **Language(s) of instruction:** English and Greek
- **Programme's status:** New
- **Concentrations (if any):**



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].

**In Greek:** Concentrations

**In English:** Concentrations

## A. Introduction

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

The site visit to Larnaca College, Cyprus took place, remotely, on 3 June 2021. The meeting began with the Committee meeting with the Rector, the Head of the Institution and the Vice Rector of Academic Affairs who provide an introduction of the college. This followed with meeting with the internal evaluation committee, Pambos Neophytou (President of the College Council) Dr Evanthis Mavrokordator (Rector), Dr Nick Demos (Head of Postgraduate and Research), Georgia Nirou (Education Affairs).

The following academic staff members were unavailable to attend the meeting Dr Stalo Markou (Head of Business School) and Dr Despoina Varnava Marouchou (Program Coordinator of the Education Management).

In relation to the *Public Management and Governance programme*, the Committee had the opportunity to speak Dr Andreas Kirlappos (Program Coordinator) and Georgia Nirou (Academic Affairs).

In relation to *Education Management* the Committee had the opportunity to speak with Georgia Nirou (Education Affairs) and Dr Evie Poyiatzi (Head of Education).

In its meeting with administrative staff, the Committee discussed the operations of the Larnaca College with: Stella Nicolaou and Chryso Christofi, Admissions Officer; and Panikos Vorkas & Sarkis Karauant IT support persons.

Finally, the Committee met two students attending the college both enjoying their learning experiences.

The Committee had the opportunity to analyse documentation including the Application for Evaluation-Accreditation for the proposed Master Program with the two specialized areas, their respective module outlines, & faculty cv's.

The documentation provided was useful in part in orienting the Committee to the Larnaca College and its programme proposal. However, there were significant gaps in the documentation provided prior to the Evaluation which complicated the work of the Committee and which made it more difficult to build a picture of the College and its proposal. It was frustrating to receive additional documentation (including for example the site tour video) only after the Evaluation meetings.



## B. External Evaluation Committee (EEC)

<i>Name</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>University</i>
<b>Kevin Orr</b>	Professor (Chair)	University of St Andrews, Scotland
<b>Steven Van de Walle</b>	Professor (Member)	KU Leuven, Belgium
<b>Sirkka-Liisa Uusimaki</b>	Associate Professor (Member)	University of Gothenburg, Sweden
<b>Margarita Panagi</b>	Student Member	Cyprus University of Technology
<b>Name</b>	Position	University
<b>Name</b>	Position	University

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

- *The external evaluation report follows the structure of assessment areas.*
- *At the beginning of each assessment area there is a box presenting:*
  - (a) sub-areas*
  - (b) standards which are relevant to the European Standards and Guidelines (ESG)*
  - (c) some questions that EEC may find useful.*
- *The questions aim at facilitating the understanding of each assessment area and at illustrating the range of topics covered by the standards.*
- *Under each assessment area, it is important to provide information regarding the compliance with the requirements of each sub-area. In particular, the following must be included:*

### **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.*

- *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. It is pointed out that, in the case of standards that cannot be applied due to the status of the HEI and/or of the programme of study, N/A (= Not Applicable) should be noted.*
- *The EEC should state the conclusions and final remarks regarding the programme of study as a whole.*
- **The report may also address other issues which the EEC finds relevant.**

## **Master of Arts in Education Management (MA,12 Months, 90 ECTS)**

## **Master of Arts in Public Management and Governance (MA,12 Months, 90 ECTS)**

### **1. Study programme and study programme's design and development**

*(ESG 1.1, 1.2, 1.7, 1.8, 1.9)*

#### **Sub-areas**

- 1.1 Policy for quality assurance**
- 1.2 Design, approval, on-going monitoring and review**
- 1.3 Public information**
- 1.4 Information management**

#### **1.1 Policy for quality assurance**

##### **Standards**

- *Policy for quality assurance of the programme of study:*
  - *has a formal status and is publicly available?*
  - *supports the organization of the quality assurance system through appropriate structures, regulations, and processes.*
  - *supports teaching, administrative staff and students to take on their responsibilities in quality assurance.*
  - *ensures academic integrity and freedom and is vigilant against academic fraud.*
  - *guards against intolerance of any kind or discrimination against the students or staff*
  - *supports the involvement of external stakeholders.*

#### **1.2 Design, approval, on-going monitoring and review**

##### **Standards**

- *The programme of study:*
  - *is designed with overall programme objectives that are in line with the institutional strategy and have explicit intended learning outcomes.*
  - *is designed by involving students and other stakeholders.*
  - *benefits from external expertise*
  - *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)*

- *is designed so that it enables smooth student progression.*
- *is designed so that the exams and assignments' content correspond to the level of the program and the number of ECTS.*
- *defines the expected student workload in ECTS.*
- *includes well-structured placement opportunities where appropriate.*
- *is subject to a formal institutional approval process.*
- *results 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*
- *is regularly monitored in the light of the latest research in the given discipline, thus ensuring that the programme is up to date.*
- *is periodically reviewed so that it takes into account the changing needs of society, the students' workload, progression and completion, the effectiveness of procedures for assessment of students, student expectations, needs and satisfaction in relation to the program.*
- *is reviewed and revised regularly involving students and other stakeholders.*

### 1.3 Public information

#### Standards

- *Regarding the programme of study, clear, accurate, up-to date and readily accessible information is published about:*
  - *selection criteria*
  - *intended learning outcomes.*
  - *qualification awarded.*
  - *teaching, learning and assessment procedures.*
  - *pass rates*
  - *learning opportunities available to the students*
  - *graduate employment information*

### 1.4 Information management

#### Standards

- *Information for the effective management of the programme of study is collected, monitored and analysed:*
  - *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*
  
- *Students and staff are involved in providing and analysing information and planning follow-up activities.*

*You may also consider the following questions:*

- *What is the procedure for quality assurance of the programme and who is involved?*
- *Who is involved in the study programme's design and development (launching, changing, internal evaluation) and what is taken into account (strategies, the needs of society, etc.)?*
- *How/to what extent are students themselves involved in the development of the content of their studies?*
- *Please evaluate a) whether the study programme remains current and consistent with developments in society (labour market, digital technologies, etc.), and b) whether the content and objectives of the study programme are in accordance with each other?*
- *Do the content and the delivery of the programme correspond to the European Qualifications Framework (EQF)?*
- *How is coherence of the study programme ensured, i.e., logical sequence and coherence of courses? How are substantial overlaps between courses avoided? How is it ensured that the teaching staff is aware of the content and outputs of their colleagues' work within the same study programme?*
- *How does the study programme support development of the learners' general competencies (including digital literacy, foreign language skills, entrepreneurship, communication and teamwork skills)?*
- *What are the scope and objectives of the foundation courses in the study programme (where appropriate)? What are the pass rates?*
- *How long does it take a student on average to graduate? Is the graduation rate for the study programme analogous to other European programmes with similar content? What is the pass rate per course/semester?*



- ***How is it ensured that the actual student workload is in accordance with the workload expressed by ECTS?***
- *What are the opportunities for international students to participate in the study programme (courses/modules taught in a foreign language)?*
- *Is information related to the programme of study publicly available?*
- *How is the HEI evaluating the success of its graduates in the labor market? What is the feedback from graduates of the study programme on their employment and/or continuation of studies?*
- *Have the results of student feedback been analysed and taken into account, and how (e.g., when planning in-service training for the teaching staff)?*
- *What are the reasons for dropping out (voluntary withdrawal)? What has been done to reduce the number of such students?*

## 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.*

We refer here to the Larnaca College Application for Evaluation – Accreditation Document: 200.1 and Annex 4. Quality Standards and Indicators.

The quality standards and indicator self-assessment completed by the committee of Lanarca College was surprising. To suggest that there is no need to involve a systematic review of educational provision to maintain and improve its quality, equity, and efficiency review, suggest a lack of understanding of EQF and how,

Policies and processes are the main pillars of a coherent institutional quality assurance system a system that, forms a cycle for continuous improvement and contributes to the accountability of the institution. It supports the development of quality culture in which all internal stakeholders assume responsibility. for quality and engage in quality assurance at all levels of the institution. To facilitate this, the policy has a formal status and is publicly available. (ESG, 2015, p. 11).

Policies enshrine the importance of quality assurance, and the processes are to be mapped clearly and understood by faculty members.

The Committee was surprised that the internal quality assurance documentation (Annex 4) was not self critical (e.g. every category was scored as a 5).

## Strengths

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

The Programme aims to address an important market need for provision in these areas.

## 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.*

Immediate areas:

College Webpage needs to be updated and maintained, including to reflect the profile of Faculty.

Policies and processes regarding plagiarism should be strengthened, and more responsibility placed in the hands of the College.

The Committee heard that there was a zero drop out rate for students, which is surprising given the tight re-sit and resubmission processes stated in the documentation.

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

Sub-area		<i>Non-compliant/ Partially Compliant/Compliant</i>
1.1	Policy for quality assurance	Non-compliant
1.2	Design, approval, on-going monitoring and review	Partially compliant
1.3	Public information	Non-compliant
1.4	Information management	Non-compliant

## 2. Student – centred learning, teaching and assessment (ESG 1.3)

### Sub-areas

#### **2.1 Process of teaching and learning and student-centred teaching methodology**

#### **2.2 Practical training**

#### **2.3 Student assessment**

### **2.1 Process of teaching and learning and student-centred teaching methodology**

#### Standards

- *The process of teaching and learning supports students' individual and social development.*
- *The process of teaching and learning is flexible, considers different modes of delivery, where appropriate, uses a variety of pedagogical methods and facilitates the achievement of planned learning outcomes.*
- *Students are encouraged to take an active role in creating the learning process.*
- *The implementation of student-centered learning and teaching encourages a sense of autonomy in the learner, while ensuring adequate guidance and support from the teacher.*
- *Teaching methods, tools and material used in teaching are modern, effective, support the use of modern educational technologies and are regularly updated.*
- *Mutual respect within the learner-teacher relationship is promoted.*
- *The implementation of student-centred learning and teaching respects and attends to the diversity of students and their needs, enabling flexible learning paths.*
- *Appropriate procedures for dealing with students' complaints regarding the process of teaching and learning are set.*

### **2.2 Practical training**

#### Standards

- *Practical and theoretical studies are interconnected.*
- *The organisation and the content of practical training, if applicable, support achievement of planned learning outcomes and meet the needs of the stakeholders.*

### **2.3 Student assessment**

#### Standards

- *Assessment is consistent, fairly applied to all students and carried out in accordance with the stated procedures.*

- *Assessment is appropriate, transparent, objective and supports the development of the learner.*
- *The criteria for the method of assessment, as well as criteria for marking, are published in advance.*
- *Assessment allows students to demonstrate the extent to which the intended learning outcomes have been achieved. Students are given feedback, which, if necessary, is linked to advice on the learning process.*
- *Assessment, where possible, is carried out by more than one examiner.*
- *A formal procedure for student appeals is in place.*
- *Assessors are familiar with existing testing and examination methods and receive support in developing their own skills in this field.*
- *The regulations for assessment take into account mitigating circumstances.*

*You may also consider the following questions:*

- *How is it monitored that the teaching staff base their teaching and assessment methods on objectives and intended learning outcomes? Provide samples of examination papers (if available).*
- *How are students' different abilities, learning needs and learning opportunities taken into consideration when conducting educational activities?*
- *How is the development of students' general competencies (including digital skills) supported in educational activities?*
- *How is it ensured that innovative teaching methods, learning environments and learning aids that support learning are diverse and used in educational activities?*
- *Is the teaching staff using new technology in order to make the teaching process more effective?*
- *How is it ensured that theory and practice are interconnected in teaching and learning?*
- *How is practical training organised (finding practical training positions, guidelines for practical training, supervision, reporting, feedback, etc.)? What role does practical training have in achieving the objectives of the study programme? What is student feedback on the content and arrangement of practical training?*
- ***Are students actively involved in research? How is student involvement in research set up?***
- *How is supervision of student research papers (seminar papers, projects, theses, etc.) organised?*
- ***Do students' assessments correspond to the European Qualifications Framework (EQF)?***
- *How are the assessment methods chosen and to what extent do students get supportive feedback on their academic progress during their studies?*
- *How is the objectivity and relevance of student assessment ensured (assessment of the degree of achievement of the intended learning outcomes)?*

### 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.*

The proposed Masters in educational management offer 4 specialized modules: 1. Leading, Managing and Developing People, 2. Globalization and Educational Policy, 3. Leadership and Context in Education and 4. Quality and Improvement in Education. It would have been of benefit to understand the reason for the large amount of content in each of the modules, how each of the module related to each other and the programs learning objectives/ outcomes.

The teaching and learning process was unclear in all four modules and it appeared that each module's teaching method was the same across all modules. Each module included far too much content that needed to be covered to ensure deep learning. A clearer explanation of student-centred teaching methodology is necessary.

Combining theoretical perspectives with practical concerns about staff management and development is underdeveloped and needs to be clarified.

The process of assessment tasks is unclear. It is not acceptable to write that *there are several assessment tasks used e.g., Class assessment, oral presentation, discussion, and coursework to be followed by 2 assessment tasks e.g., midterm assessment 40% and final assessment 60%. Unfortunately there was not a discussion about assessment or the importance of criterion during the site visit.*

The Learning Outcomes appeared to the Committee to read as quite a generic list. It was not clear how each of the Learning Outcomes were to be translated in practice in the modules. For example, in Education Management, it was ambiguous as to whether the Learning Outcome of 'project management' meant the management of a student project or essay; or it referred to the way in which the program would equip students to develop their capacity to manage and lead significant projects of organisational change. In the latter case, the Committee did not see examples of how the modules and the pedagogy would support this outcome.

Regarding the Public Management and Governance stream, there was insufficient differentiation between the new program and the existing specialist MBA. We acknowledge the change to the structure/ time frame proposed but the module content seems to be directly transposed from the MBA, despite the philosophy and objectives of an MBA and of a specialist Masters being somewhat distinct from each other. The Committee was not satisfied that the distinctive purpose of the new programme had been sufficiently considered and articulated.

The Committee recognises the introduction of the concept of 'governance' to the title of the new programme. However, it is not clear how this new element will be approached and how its introduction has re-shaped the programme and its modules.

### Strengths

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

The programme would allow working/ post-practice students to study in a modular programme.

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.*

Articulate a clearer set of outcomes and relate these systematically to individual modules.

The relative weight of research methods training should be increased in both programmes.

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

Sub-area		<i>Non-compliant/ Partially Compliant/Compliant</i>
2.1	Process of teaching and learning and student-centred teaching methodology	Non-compliant
2.2	Practical training	Non-compliant
2.3	Student assessment	Non-compliant

### 3. Teaching staff (ESG 1.5)

#### Sub-areas

- 3.1 Teaching staff recruitment and development**
- 3.2 Teaching staff number and status**
- 3.3 Synergies of teaching and research**

#### **3.1 Teaching staff recruitment and development**

##### Standards

- *Institutions ensure the competence of their teaching staff.*
- *Fair, transparent and clear processes for the recruitment and development of the teaching staff are set up.*
- *Teaching staff qualifications are adequate to achieve the objectives and planned learning outcomes of the study programme, and to ensure quality and sustainability of the teaching and learning.*
- *The teaching staff is regularly engaged in professional and teaching-skills training and development.*
- *Promotion of the teaching staff takes into account the quality of their teaching, their research activity, the development of their teaching skills and their mobility.*
- *Innovation in teaching methods and the use of new technologies is encouraged.*
- *Conditions of employment that recognise the importance of teaching are followed.*
- *Recognised visiting teaching staff participates in teaching the study programme.*

#### **3.2 Teaching staff number and status**

##### Standards

- *The number of the teaching staff is adequate to support the programme of study.*
- *The teaching staff status (rank, full/part time) is appropriate to offer a quality programme of study.*
- *Visiting staff number does not exceed the number of the permanent staff.*

#### **3.3 Synergies of teaching and research**

##### Standards

- *The teaching staff collaborate in the fields of teaching and research within the HEI and with partners outside (practitioners in their fields, employers, and staff members at other HEIs in Cyprus or abroad).*
- *Scholarly activity to strengthen the link between education and research is encouraged.*
- *The teaching staff publications are within the discipline.*



- *Teaching staff studies and publications are closely related to the programme's courses.*
- *The allocation of teaching hours compared to the time for research activity is appropriate.*

*You may also consider the following questions:*

- *How are the members of the teaching staff supported with regard to the development of their teaching skills? How is feedback given to members of the teaching staff regarding their teaching results and teaching skills?*
- *How is the teaching performance assessed? How does their teaching performance affect their remuneration, evaluation and/or selection?*
- *Is teaching connected with research?*
- *Does the HEI involve visiting teaching staff from other HEIs in Cyprus and abroad?*
- *What is the number, workload, qualifications and status of the teaching staff (rank, full/part timers)?*
- *Is student evaluation conducted on the teaching staff? If yes, have the results of student feedback been analysed and taken into account, and how (e.g., when planning in-service training for the teaching staff)?*

### 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.*

The organisation of the site visit by the College was inadequate to learn about the teachers working at the college. The teachers present did not have access to their own computer. Instead, they took turns to meet with the EEC Committee via one computer, and that made the entire process of learning about the teaching staff and about their thoughts about teaching and research and about the postgraduate program difficult and unnecessarily stressful. Also, not all listed teachers were present, and in particular the absence of one of the proposed programme coordinators made it difficult to evaluate the plans.

The College website did not provide accurate information about the schools current teaching staff, or about the recruitment process. Several of the CVs or bios that were provided to the EEC Committee were not up to date making it hard to learn about each teacher's background. In addition, the committee found several discrepancies between the information provided in the application form and the information on teaching staff on the website and the CVs. Additional revised documents were sent to the Committee after the meeting. On the one hand it was helpful to have these. On the other not having them in advance undermined the ability of the Committee to approach the meetings in a fully informed way.

Given that there already is an MBA Public Management, and the courses for the new programme are the same, there appears to be a sufficient quantity of lecturing staff, though the same cannot be said about the quantity for the programme in educational management.

There are serious issues in relation to the quality of the teaching staff, in particular their academic background. A majority of the teaching staff appear to be disconnected from the wider international academic debate in their respective disciplines. This has consequences for the content and quality of the courses. This points to the strategic need for the College to invest in staff development, including research activities in the College. The documentation provided little evidence of the strategy for doing so.

Little to no evidence was found in relation to activities of teachers' development or teaching innovation.

### Strengths

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

The committee observed a high level of commitment among some of the core teaching staff of the proposed programmes when they explained their approach to designing and teaching their courses.

Some more recently hired individual teaching staff have stronger academic qualifications.

### 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.*

The college needs to develop a policy to strengthen the research profile of the teaching staff and to provide sufficient resources for teaching staff to participate in the scholarly debates in their discipline.

The College needs to invest in staff by providing opportunities for teaching staff to attend courses on teaching development, and by reducing the precarious nature of the position of some of the teaching staff.

Credential checks of teaching staff and senior (academic) leadership need to be improved, with particular attention for the quality of the PhD awarding institution, and the quality of publication outlets where they publish their scholarly work.

The overall academic level and in particular the research profile of the teaching staff, especially in education management, needs to be brought up to a level that is expected in a master-degree granting institution.

It is important that new appointees are integrated into the College and supported to influence policies, practices and standards as part of a wider culture of improvement.

A formal policy for the allocation of courses and on the division of time between research and teaching needs to be developed. Such a policy also needs to address the principles of academic autonomy in the grading process.

The system for teaching staff evaluation needs to be formalised, including the use of course and programme evaluations.

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

Sub-area		<i>Non-compliant/ Partially Compliant/Compliant</i>
3.1	Teaching staff recruitment and development	Partially compliant
3.2	Teaching staff number and status	Partially compliant
3.3	Synergies of teaching and research	Non-compliant

#### 4. Student admission, progression, recognition and certification (ESG 1.4)

##### Sub-areas

- 4.1 Student admission, processes and criteria
- 4.2 Student progression
- 4.3 Student recognition
- 4.4 Student certification

##### 4.1 Student admission, processes and criteria

###### Standards

- *Pre-defined and published regulations regarding student admission are in place.*
- *Access policies, admission processes and criteria are implemented consistently and in a transparent manner.*

##### 4.2 Student progression

###### Standards

- *Pre-defined and published regulations regarding student progression are in place.*
- *Processes and tools to collect, monitor and act on information on student progression, are in place.*

##### 4.3 Student recognition

###### Standards

- *Pre-defined and published regulations regarding student recognition are in place.*
- *Fair recognition of higher education qualifications, periods of study and prior learning, including the recognition of non-formal and informal learning, are essential components for ensuring the students' progress in their studies, while promoting mobility.*
- *Appropriate recognition procedures are in place that rely on:*
  - *institutional practice for recognition being in line with the principles of the Lisbon Recognition Convention*
  - *cooperation with other institutions, quality assurance agencies and the national ENIC/NARIC centre with a view to ensuring coherent recognition across the country*

## 4.4 Student certification

### Standards

- *Pre-defined and published regulations regarding student certification are in place.*
- *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.*

*You may also consider the following questions:*

- *Are the admission requirements for the study programme appropriate? How is the students' prior preparation/education assessed (including the level of international students, for example)?*
- *How is the procedure of recognition for prior learning and work experience ensured, including recognition of study results acquired at foreign higher education institutions?*
- *Is the certification of the HEI accompanied by a diploma supplement, which is in line with European and international standards?*

### 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.*

The Committee talked to several administrative staff involved in the admissions procedure. The committee also talked with two current students in the College, who expressed satisfaction with the quality of teaching and infrastructure. The Committee would have liked to talk to a larger selection of students. However, the Committee expresses concern about the freedom of the students and graduates to express themselves freely during the meeting we had with them.

A student Handbook was provided that explains the main rules and regulations that apply to students who (wish to) participate in the programme.

The committee is concerned about the information it received from Academic Affairs that there is no drop-out and that all admitted students eventually finish the programme, especially in light of the procedures for retake described in the student handbook. This raises concerns about academic standards.

The policy on plagiarism puts all responsibility for avoiding plagiarism on the students, but the college does not appear to use any plagiarism detection software.

Insufficient documentation on student recognition and certification is included in the application for accreditation, and so we have found these to be non-compliant.



### Strengths

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

The college has a dedicated administrative team to manage admissions.

### 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.*

The College is urged to develop a good monitoring system to track student progress.

Credential checks of students applying to be admitted need to further formalise the recognition of the earlier obtained bachelor degrees or equivalent qualification.

Even though the proposed programme will be in Greek, the documentation that was provided to the committee detailed the English proficiency standards expected from students. These standards are relatively low, and we also suggest a stricter application of the language requirements, in particular for applicants who are not required to pass a formal exam or test.

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

Sub-area		<i>Non-compliant/ Partially Compliant/Compliant</i>
4.1	Student admission, processes and criteria	Partially compliant
4.2	Student progression	Partially compliant
4.3	Student recognition	Non-compliant
4.4	Student certification	Non-compliant

## 5. Learning resources and student support (ESG 1.6)

### **Sub-areas**

#### **5.1 Teaching and Learning resources**

#### **5.2 Physical resources**

#### **5.3 Human support resources**

#### **5.4 Student support**

### **5.1 Teaching and Learning resources**

#### **Standards**

- *Adequate and readily accessible teaching and learning resources (teaching and learning environments, materials, aids and equipment) are provided to students and support the achievement of objectives in the study programme.*
- *Adequacy of resources is ensured for changing circumstances (change in student numbers, etc.).*
- *All resources are fit for purpose.*
- *Student-centred learning and flexible modes of learning and teaching, are taken into account when allocating, planning and providing the learning resources.*

### **5.2 Physical resources**

#### **Standards**

- *Physical resources, i.e. premises, libraries, study facilities, IT infrastructure, are adequate to support the study programme.*
- *Adequacy of resources is ensured for changing circumstances (change in student numbers, etc.).*
- *All resources are fit for purpose and students are informed about the services available to them.*

### **5.3 Human support resources**

#### **Standards**

- *Human support resources, i.e. tutors/mentors, counsellors, other advisers, qualified administrative staff, are adequate to support the study programme.*
- *Adequacy of resources is ensured for changing circumstances (change in student numbers, etc.).*



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

## 5.4 Student support

### Standards

- *Student support is provided covering the needs of a diverse student population, such as mature, part-time, employed and international students and students with special needs.*
- *Students are informed about the services available to them.*
- *Student-centred learning and flexible modes of learning and teaching, are taken into account when allocating, planning and providing student support.*
- *Students' mobility within and across higher education systems is encouraged and supported.*

*You may also consider the following questions:*

- *Evaluate the supply of teaching materials and equipment (including teaching labs, expendable materials, etc.), the condition of classrooms, adequacy of financial resources to conduct the study programme and achieve its objectives. What needs to be supplemented/ improved?*
- *What is the feedback from the teaching staff on the availability of teaching materials, classrooms, etc.?*
- *Are the resources in accordance with actual (changing) needs and contemporary requirements? How is the effectiveness of using resources ensured?*
- *What are the resource-related trends and future risks (risks arising from changing numbers of students, obsolescence of teaching equipment, etc.)? How are these trends taken into account and how are the risks mitigated?*
- *Evaluate student feedback on support services. Based on student feedback, which support services (including information flow, counselling) need further development?*
- *How is student learning within the standard period of study supported (student counselling, flexibility of the study programme, etc.)?*
- *How students' special needs are considered (different capabilities, different levels of academic preparation, special needs due to physical disabilities, etc.)?*
- *How is student mobility being supported?*

### 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.*

The site visit had to happen remotely, making it difficult for the committee to assess the resources available to students. A video of campus facilities was promised, but only arrived in the middle of the day following the Evaluation visit. Meantime, the Committee consulted a number of pictures available on Google to get a basic impression of the facilities.

Larnaca College has a basic physical library, and provides access to a limited number of academic databases, in particular EBSCO. Access to other ‘databases’ provided on the library website mainly consists of links to open access databases and other websites.

The College uses Moodle as an online teaching tool.

The Committee has the impression ICT resources for teaching staff are insufficient based on the fact that all participants in the site visit used the same laptop to join the zoom meeting from a single room.

**Strengths**

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

The College has moved to new premises.

The Committee was told that the College has recently hired additional administrative support staff.

The two students we talked to appeared to be satisfied with classes.

**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.*

The library resources need to be upgraded to reflect a new programme on education management.

Overall library resources are very limited across both programmes and the College needs to put a policy in place to expand its collections.

The Committee is not able to provide further specific recommendations due to a lack of access to the facilities.

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

Sub-area	<b><i>Non-compliant/ Partially Compliant/Compliant</i></b>
----------	--



<b>5.1</b>	Teaching and Learning resources	Partially compliant
<b>5.2</b>	Physical resources	Partially compliant
<b>5.3</b>	Human support resources	Partially compliant
<b>5.4</b>	Student support	Partially compliant

## 6. Additional for doctoral programmes (ALL ESG)

### Sub-areas

- 6.1 Selection criteria and requirements**
- 6.2 Proposal and dissertation**
- 6.3 Supervision and committees**

### **6.1 Selection criteria and requirements**

#### 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*

### **6.2 Proposal and dissertation**

#### Standards

- *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 process of submitting the dissertation to the university library is set.*

### **6.3 Supervision and committees**

#### Standards

- *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.

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.

Click or tap here to enter text.

### Strengths

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

Click or tap here to enter text.

### 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.

Click or tap here to enter text.

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

Sub-area		<i>Non-compliant/ Partially Compliant/Compliant</i>
6.1	Selection criteria and requirements	Choose answer
6.2	Proposal and dissertation	Choose answer
6.3	Supervision and committees	Choose answer

## 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 programme of study under review may be achieved, with emphasis on the correspondence with the EQF.*

The process for conducting this Evaluation was made more difficult by a number of factors. There were significant gaps in the documentation provided in advance to Committee members. In the case of faculty biographies, there was a mismatch between the profile of staff we were given and the colleagues we met on the day. Very often staff who spoke to us sat together at the same computer, making it difficult for us to see people, and to manage the conversation effectively (e.g. one 'screen name' appeared though several people shared that screen). Indeed the evident lack of social distancing was uncomfortable to witness. Remote meetings are inevitably challenging but were made more so, unnecessarily, by these elements.

As some elements above might suggest, the proposal seems premature and somewhat 'undercooked' at this stage, and we suggest it would be better to take a longer period to consider the design, content, pedagogy, and resourcing of the programme. It appeared to the Committee that different staff members had different understandings of the programme. This suggests a failure to involve staff more collectively in the design of the programme.

The market needs analysis was insufficient and sometimes contradictory (in particular, for example, whether the programme aims to attract international students).

In the case of the Public Management and Governance programme, the Committee understand that some post-practice students have indicated a preference for a programme of shorter duration than the existing specialist MBA. The Committee was unclear about how the College more systematically had involved wider stakeholders (including public sector organisations) in the design of the programme. In addition, the goals and objectives of the new Masters (in relation to the existing MBA) could be better articulated in terms of the distinctive principles, ethos and aims of the specialist Masters.

In the case of the Education Management programme, notwithstanding some recent recruitment, the Committee identifies a significant gap between the profile and expertise of core faculty and the demands of the new programme.

The Committee also suggests that the Aims and Objectives and the Learning Outcomes of the programme are insufficiently articulated. Sometimes the objectives and outcomes are very dense, which would make it challenging to translate these into practice. In addition, it was not entirely clear how individual modules and pedagogical practices (including assessment strategies) support the achievement of these objectives and outcomes. The balance and relationship between theory and practice was not fully explained.

As detailed in Section 1, the Committee has some reservations about how aspects of quality assurance have been embedded in the new proposal. This extends to issues such as the internal quality assurance and the extent to which stakeholders and staff have been involved in the design of the new programmes, but there was a lack of evidence presented to us about wider processes (as per Section 1).



---

ΦΟΡΕΑΣ ΔΙΑΣΦΑΛΙΣΗΣ ΚΑΙ ΠΙΣΤΟΠΟΙΗΣΗΣ ΤΗΣ ΠΟΙΟΤΗΤΑΣ ΤΗΣ ΑΝΩΤΕΡΗΣ ΕΚΠΑΙΔΕΥΣΗΣ  
CYPRUS AGENCY OF QUALITY ASSURANCE AND ACCREDITATION IN HIGHER EDUCATION





## E. Signatures of the EEC

Name	Signature
Kevin Orr	
Steven Van de Walle	
Liisa Uusimaki	
Margarita Panagi	
Click to enter Name	
Click to enter Name	

**Date:** 04 June 2021