

Doc. 300.3.1

Date: 1st March 2021

External Evaluation Report (Departmental)

Higher Education Institution:

Cyprus University of Technology (CUT)

- **Town:** Limassol
- **Faculty:** Fine and Applied Arts
- **Department's Status:** Department of Fine Arts
- **Programmes of study under evaluation:**

Programme 1

In Greek:

Programme Name

In English:

MA History of Art & Theory, Level 7 90 ECTS, Second Cycle

Programme 2

In Greek:

Programme Name

In English:

PhD History of Art & Theory, Level 8, (n/a) ECTS, Third Cycle



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





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
Fine Arts	BA Fine Arts Level 6 Fine Arts, ?? ECTS, First Cycle
	MA Art History & Theory, Level 7 90 ECTS, Second Cycle
	PhD Art History & Theory, Level 8, (n/a) ECTS, Third Cycle

A. Introduction

Due to Covid-19 travel restrictions, the EEC conducted the site visit online. We met with a wide range of academic and para-academic faculty responsible for teaching, research, quality enhancement, student support, information technology and the library.

We were also able to meet groups of MA and PhD students - since we were primarily reviewing the MA and PhD programmes.

The Dept. Chair took us on a virtual visit that enabled us to see the current studios and workshops, the studios, workshops and gallery spaces being built and the residential space in the mountains close to the main city campus.

External Evaluation Committee (EEC)

<i>Name</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>University</i>
Prof Neil Mulholland	EEC Chair	Chair of Contemporary Art Practice & Theory, The University of Edinburgh, Scotland.
Prof Jan von Bonsdorff	EEC Member	Professor of Art History in the Department of Art History, Faculty of Arts, Uppsala Universitet, Sverige.
Prof Ulrich Pfisterer	EEC Member	Professor of Art History in the Institut für Kunstgeschichte, Ludwig Maximilian University and Director of Zentralinstitut für Kunstgeschichte, München, Deutschland.
Katerina Niic	EEC Member	Student, University of Cyprus, Republic of Cyprus.

B. 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:	<i>Non-compliant</i>
3:	<i>Partially compliant</i>
4 or 5:	<i>Compliant</i>

- *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.*

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		
1.1 Mission and strategic planning (including SWOT analysis)		1 - 5
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.	5
1.1.3	The Department's strategic planning includes short, medium-term and long-term goals and objectives, which are periodically revised and adapted.	5
1.1.4	The programmes of study offered by the Department reflect its academic profile and are aligned with the European and international practice.	4
1.1.5	The academic community is involved in shaping and monitoring the implementation of the Department's development strategies.	4
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.	4
Justify the numerical scores provided for the quality indicators (criteria) by specifying (if any) the deficiencies.		

n/a

Provide suggestions for changes in case of incompatibility.

n/a

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.

5

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.

n/a

1. Department's academic profile and orientation

1.3 Development processes

1 - 5

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.

4

1.3.2 Planning teaching staff recruitment and their professional development is in line with the Department's academic development plan.

4

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.

4

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

Findings

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

While new, the Fine Arts Department already has graduates and has maintained very good alumni relations. It's clearly engaging its alumni in the growth and development of the Department and its vital contribution to the Cypriot art scene. The Fine Arts Department is a clear catalyst for revitalising the Cypriot artworld.

Strengths

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

The newness of the Fine Arts department is one of its USPs. Being new means that the Department can rewrite the rulebook of Fine Arts provision from the ground up. This is an enviable position in the EHEA wherein there have been few new Fine Arts departments for some time (Malmö Art Academy now having been founded some time ago). Beginning with the MA and PhD and working towards BFA provision is an innovative solution to founding such a department.

CUT and the Cypriot Government have clearly invested heavily in their new Fine Arts department. The facilities under construction in this city and at the residency site are excellent and compare very favourably with what might be found in other urban art schools. Students have access to a broad range of fabrication facilities and there's bespoke technical support for the workshops. The lack of specialist sub-disciplinary programmes (such as painting, sculpture, etc.) is a boon to the department - it enables the forms of flexibility that are germane to contemporary art and is the best way of deploying its rich resources.

Coherence and compatibility among programmes of study offered by the Department/ among Departments within the School/Faculty (to which the Department under evaluation belongs). The Fine Arts Department is still very new. It only offers three programmes, one at each Cycle. That it already covers each of the three cycles is impressive considering that it was only founded four years ago. The 2nd and 3rd Cycle programmes are coherent and compatible (since they are focused on Art History & Theory). Art History & Theory are core components of the 1st cycle BAFA across the EHEA and, thus, are also coherent and compatible.

There's a very clear affinity with the Department of Multimedia and Graphic Arts. The Department of Multimedia and Graphic Arts and the Department of Fine arts collectively constitute the Faculty of Fine and Applied Arts. This is clear, consistent and coherent.

1.2 Connecting with society The Fine Arts department has developed an impressively foresighted vision that focuses staff and students on how they can all integrate with and impact upon Cypriot life . This vision is particularly well suited to Cyprus wherein the public profile of contemporary art is lower than the faculty would like. The faculty and para-academics are all committed to this important vision; indeed the academic appointments have been well chosen in this respect. The department is porous to its surroundings in the city and at its mountain residency. This is a marked contrast with studio-based fine art programmes elsewhere in the EHEA which tend to hermetically seal off the studios and workshops from such public scrutiny and participation.

The programmes that are run for the more general are as generous as they are varied: Open Lectures; CUT Faculty Art Project; Open Workshops for young artists; Open Studio events.

Areas of improvement and recommendations

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

1.3.3 The Department is attracting high-level students from Cyprus, but - as yet - very few from abroad. It's not clear what CUT's bigger strategy is here but it is perhaps early days in terms of international exchanges for students and staff alike. Clearly the EUt+ consortium will be vital in ensuring exchanges for the department (Dublin Technical University being the key partner as the only other art school in EUt+ and leading HEI in the GradCam consortium for artistic research in the Republic of Ireland.)

We discussed the importance of Erasmus+ in bringing students (and staff) into Cyprus (all levels - BA. MA. PhD). Once they have experienced study in Cyprus they are likely to return for the next Cycle of their studies. Staff exchanges create their own research opportunities and are good way of engaging like minds. We discussed short term and virtual exchanges (the Norden model of KUNO being one to look at here.) We also discussed the importance of MENA (Middle East North Africa) staff and students - creating links with MENA countries offering up the Mountain Arts Residency Centre as an important lure here. MENA representation and presence in the Department's mountain residency and in its curriculum is vital if the Department is to become the 'melting pot' of Med. cultures it claims to be.

Expected number of Cypriot and international students; Countries of origin of international students and number from each country: MA - 42 [37 Cyprus + 5 Greece]; PhD- 1 [Cyprus]

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

Sub-area	<i>Non-compliant / Partially Compliant / Compliant</i>
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		
2.1 System and quality assurance strategy		1 - 5
2.1.1	The Department has a policy for quality assurance that is made public and forms part of the Institution's strategic management.	4
2.1.2	Internal stakeholders develop and implement a policy for quality assurance through appropriate structures and processes, while involving external stakeholders.	4
2.1.3	The Department's policy for quality assurance supports guarding against intolerance of any kind or discrimination against students or staff.	4
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	4
2.1.4.2	Research	4
2.1.4.3	The connection with society	5
2.1.4.4	Management and support services	4
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.

n/a

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.	4
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.	4
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.	4
2.2.10	The Department flexibly uses a variety of teaching methods.	3
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.	4

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	5
2.2.12.2	Library	4
2.2.12.3	Rooms for theoretical, practical and laboratory lessons	4
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.	4
2.2.17	The provision of quality doctoral studies is ensured through doctoral studies regulations, which are publicly available.	4
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.	4
2.2.19	The Department has mechanisms and funds to support writing and attending conferences of doctoral candidates.	4
2.2.20	There is a clear policy on authorship and intellectual property.	3

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

See below:

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.

The Quality Assurance System (QAS) at CUT appears to be robust. The QAS team are drawn from around CUT and represent a diverse body of expertise and academic practices. The

Department has its own Internal Quality Committee. The QAS team have conducted an extensive mapping exercise of best practice in their Faculty - for which they should be highly commended.

Areas of improvement and recommendations

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

2.2.3 The QAS Committee seem somewhat overstretched due to the fact that so many programmes are either undergoing validation or are undergoing their 5 yearly CyQAA review.

The QAS Committee seem to have to *react* to CyQAA requirements on-the-fly rather than play an active role in standard *setting* and in supporting quality *enhancement* in partnership with their sector. CUT's QAS Team should have a more discursive relationship with the CyQAA. An advantage of being a small nation of 1.2m is that you can have such meaningful dialogue. (Scotland, a nation of over 5m, has a Quality Enhancement Framework that is run, collectively, by its Universities see: <https://www.qaa.ac.uk/scotland/quality-enhancement-framework> Cyprus could gain a great deal from adapting this method.) Following EHEA protocol, the CyQAA, ideally, should have a Stakeholder Executive staffed by QAS representatives from each of the Universities that they validate. It's also important that CUT's QAS representatives hold the CyQAA to account - for example, checking that the CyQAA policies fully align with those of the EHEA (they do not appear to with respect to the Third Cycle). This would ensure that the CyQAA's policies are aligned with those of the sector and would help the CyQAA and Universities to plan and manage their workflow more effectively.

2.2.10 Teaching and assessment methods in History and Theory of Art are not as varied as they should be; especially so given that the MA predominately attracts lifelong learners returning to higher education after a gap (both established art professionals and K-12 educators) in addition to recent BA graduates.

2.2.18 There is only one PhD student in the Department presently, so the answer is currently affirmative (4). The number of doctoral students (singular), 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.

The Department's staffing resources are such that it would be wise to set limits (cap) on how many PhDs are supported at any given time. A good model here would be that pursued by art academies / technological universities in Finland and Norway where a limit of 3 PhDs is the norm (perhaps too low, but a limit rather than a target is useful nevertheless). This enables the Department to form supervisory teams (no solo supervisors) both internally and via their Erasmus connections. It also ensures that PhDs are adequately resourced and that they are treated as early career researchers who input into teaching (effectively they are early career staff).

2.2.20 We are sure this exists; but the EEC could not find it easily. MA and PhD students need to be taught the ethics of authorship and intellectual property, so the policy here needs to be more centre stage. It should be linked to where it needs to be implemented (in the website and in the curriculum).

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



Sub-area	<i>Non-compliant / Partially Compliant / Compliant</i>
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.	5
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.	5
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.	4
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.	4
3.9	The Department applies procedures for the prevention and disciplinary control of academic misconduct of students, teaching and administrative staff, including plagiarism.	4
3.10	The Department has appropriate procedures for dealing with students' complaints.	4

3.11

Internalization of the Department and external collaborations.

4

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

Findings

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

These elements are all very clearly in place.

Strengths

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

n/a

Areas of improvement and recommendations

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

n/a

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		
4. Learning and Teaching		
4.1 Planning the programmes of study		1 - 5
4.1.1	The Department provides an effective system for designing, approving, monitoring and periodically reviewing the programmes of study.	5
4.1.2	Students and other stakeholders, including employers, are actively involved on the programmes' review and development.	3
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).	3
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.	n/a
4.1.5	The Department ensures that its programmes of study integrate effectively theory and practice.	5
Justify the numerical scores provided for the quality indicators (criteria) by specifying (if any) the deficiencies. See below..		
4. Learning and Teaching		
4.2 Organisation of teaching		1 - 5

4.2.1	The Department establishes student admission criteria for each programme, which are adhered to consistently.	4
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.	3
4.2.3	The number of students in the teaching rooms is suitable for theoretical, practical and laboratory lessons.	4
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.	4
4.2.6	The teaching staff of the Department provides timely and effective feedback to their students.	5
4.2.7	The criteria and the method of assessment as well as the criteria for marking are published in advance.	4
4.2.8	The assessment allows students to demonstrate the extent to which the intended learning outcomes have been achieved.	4

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

Findings

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

4.1.4 Not applicable. There are no professional requirements.

Strengths

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

4.2.5 From what the students have to say about teaching, it is student-centred. The students are clearly well supported on an individual level. However, in the overall departmental vision, the pedagogy of student-centred learning and teaching isn't as central as might be expected. The positive experiences of the students may be understated here?

Areas of improvement and recommendations

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

4.1.2 It's not entirely clear how students and stakeholders are involved in the curriculum design and validation process. The course content doesn't reflect such involvement (e.g. there are no examples of non-academic partnership based teaching or explicit knowledge exchange). A

curriculum design sprint or similar *design thinking* approach would need to be implemented to achieve this. The EEC are not sure if such an approach is common in Cyprus.

4.1.3 The MA programme is compliant; the PhD programme is not. The EQF for the PhD needs to be applied to the composition of the Learning Outcomes for the whole PhD programme. Please see the Programme Evaluation Document for details.

4.2.2 Credit transfer in the MA is compliant; in the PhD programme it is not. The RPL ECTS accreditation of the PhD is not correct. It's not possible to attribute any Level 7 Credits to a Level 8 PhD. This should be removed. Additionally, the EQF is clear that credits do not normally apply in the Third Cycle.¹ Removing all of the credits from the PhD programme is highly recommended. Please see the Programme Evaluation Document for details.

4.2.8 While assessment currently allows students to demonstrate the extent to which the intended learning outcomes have been achieved, the fact that assessment methods in History and Theory of Art are not as varied as they should be means that students are being denied a range of means by which to demonstrate the extent to which the intended learning outcomes have been achieved (see feedback on **2.2.10**) Given that the fine art department is an art school, and that art schools use a wide range of assessment methods, it would be appropriate to include a broader range of assessment methods in the MA History of Art programme.

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

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

¹“Third cycle qualifications do not necessarily have credits associated with them.” (FQEHEA 2005: 72)

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.	3
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.	4
5.3	The visiting Professors' subject areas adequately support the Department's programmes of study.	4
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.	4
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.	4
Justify the numerical scores provided for the quality indicators (criteria) by specifying (if any) the deficiencies.		

Findings

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

5.1 Staffing levels are not yet adequate (at the time of our visit) but this appears to have been fixed with imminent new appointments. This will rise to a 4 when the appointments begin.

Strengths

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

Click to enter text.

Staff are well qualified; they are working on research highly relevant to teaching fine art in Cyprus. The staff:student ratio is very good; students get a lot of personal attention and this was evident in our discussion with students.

Areas of improvement and recommendations

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

5.3 It's not clear how the Visiting Professor programme functioned during Covid (albeit it clearly ran). Did it make use of e-visits? Perhaps the online pivot can enable more virtual visits to continue in the future, thus increasing the international diversity of the BA, MA and PhD programmes?

Please ✓ what is appropriate for the following assessment area:

Assessment area	<i>Non-compliant / Partially Compliant / Compliant</i>
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		
6. Research		1 - 5
6.1	The Department has a research policy formulated in line with its mission.	3
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.	3
6.4	The Department has the appropriate mechanisms for the development of students' research skills.	3
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.	4
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.	4
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.	3
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.	4

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

Findings

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

Both programmes that the EEC were reviewing (MA and PhD) clearly reflect the research and knowledge exchange focus of the faculty. The BA Fine Arts programme has emerged since 2018. It is a intermedial fine art programme that draws upon the expertise of artists working with a range of media and methods and from the expertise of the art historians and art theorists in the department.

The Department seems to be able to support faculty research activity both in terms of policy and financing.

Strengths

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

6.6 The Fine Arts Department is located in a technological university (CUT). This places it in an educational environment that will be familiar to art students in Britain and Ireland where the polytechnic and technical university traditions are strong and wherein most fine art departments are found. Due to how they were funded and due to their focus on professional and vocational qualifications, technological universities have tended to be more focused on teaching than on research. The benefit of starting a brand new Fine Arts Department in such an educational environment is that it enables teaching to be research-led from day one. The curriculum in the Fine Arts Department is very clearly the product of the faculty's *research* in this sense. Students are thus engaged with a curriculum that is fresh and constructed from the ground up rather than a residual curriculum that has been inherited from previous generations.

Areas of improvement and recommendations

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

6.1 The Department does not yet offer either an MA or PhD programme in Fine Arts that is examined by practice. The research policy of a Fine Art Department that offers instruction in artistic practice should include a PhD by practice as part of its vision; its mission should thus be formulated or updated to set out to achieve such a goal. In this sense, the Fine Art Department needs to strike a balance with the History of Art programmes (which are offered at MA and PhD level). This would be a long term ambition but, since it is strategic, it should be present now in its research policy.

6.3 The Department should ensure that the PhD students have a dedicated study space (just like a member of staff or a BA student would). The new building doesn't seem to include space that's set aside for or dedicated to PhDs. They need a dedicated space.

6.4 The Department seems to be able to support early career research activity (PhD, post-doc) in terms of policy and supervision but it doesn't engage enough with research training via ETNs and ITNs. In particular, it should engage with GRADCAM via it's consortium partnership with TU Dublin in Ireland. Moreover, it isn't clear how it supports PhDs from a broader range of backgrounds. The current response to this question is inadequate (that the cohort are professionals so this is not an

issue!) There needs to be a clear strategy for widening participation in the PhD programme and a very clear system of scholarship support and ongoing financial support for training provision. It is not entirely clear what sort of transparent financial support is offered; is this support means-tested? Please clarify this publicly.

6.7 *Vis a vis* research ethics; it's not obvious how this is managed. Research ethics need to be taught at every stage and every Level of all programmes (BA, MA, PhD) since Fine Art students conduct research with human subjects and/or non-human animals throughout their studies (not the case in all academic subjects). Research ethics is actually very poorly understood in Fine Art programmes and is seldomly formally taught due to the prevalence of the 'Aesthetic Alibi' (Jay 1992). Founding a new Fine Art Department is a perfect opportunity to rectify this misonomner by integrating research ethics into every level of the curriculum.

Ethical approval can be made at a course level (most taught courses in BA and MA studies should support pre-approval of their assignments). This "blanket consent" approach is common. Specific ethical review has to be carried out in research projects at BA, MA and PhD level where students, individually, have good reason to work with human subjects and/or non-human animals.

Please ✓ what is appropriate for the following assessment area:

Assessment area	<i>Non-compliant / Partially Compliant / Compliant</i>
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.	5
7.4	The Department's budget is appropriate for its mission and adequate for the implementation of strategic planning.	4
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.	4
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.		

Findings

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

The financial resources and the management of these resources appears to be sound.

Strengths

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

7.7 The CUT's support services are very good and there's a good awareness of how fine art students are disproportionately likely to experience learning difficulties or learning disabilities.

Areas of improvement and recommendations

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

n/a

Please ✓ what is appropriate for the following assessment area:

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

C. 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 Fine Arts Department is still very new. It is of vital importance since it is the only public Fine Arts Department in the Republic of Cyprus. It has been formed around postgraduate provision in art history and theory. The MA art history and theory programme was the first to intake students in 2016 and has grown quickly. The PhD programme, also started in 2016, is very small and niche. The Fine Arts Department has come a long way in a very short space of time and during a period in Cyprus that has been fraught with unimaginably difficult conditions. The staff and students should be very proud of what they have achieved here.

The institutional fleetness of foot that circumstances have afforded here is a great gift - it's something that the Fine Arts Department should be very careful to retain if it wants to ensure that its innovations in research are centre stage in what, and how, it teaches. To achieve this, the Fine Arts Department may wish to commit to being a learning organisation (Senge 1992) and formally embed the values of research-led teaching in its Vision and Mission.

As noted above, the department does not yet offer either an MA or PhD programme in Fine Arts that is examined by practice. Establishing both - to run alongside the existing MA and PhD - should be an aim since there are no MA or PhD programmes that support artistic practice in the Republic. The lack of MA and PhD programmes for fine artists in Cyprus is an issue since it disadvantages artist-scholars employed as academic faculty within Higher Education and forces them to study abroad (something that is completely impractical for graduate students due to their family and caring commitments). Increasingly artist-scholar faculty have acquired PhDs through artistic research routes in order to be able to take part in larger funding bids. It's also becoming Fine Art PhDs have existed since the early 1990s - so this is long overdue.

The balance between the Fine Art Department is - understandably - uneven for now (BA is practice-based, MA and PhD are art historical). The balance will emerge over time as the BA grows and develops. Long-term, achieving this balance would be a worthwhile goal for the Department.

D. Signatures of the EEC

<i>Name</i>	<i>Signature</i>
Prof Neil Mulholland	
Prof Jan von Bonsdorff	
Prof Ulrich Pfisterer	
Katerina Niic	

Date: 22nd March 2021

