

Doc. 300.3.1

Date: 16<sup>th</sup> December 2020

# External Evaluation Report (Departmental)

- **Higher Education Institution:**  
European University Cyprus
- **Town:** Nicosia
- **School/Faculty:** School of Life Sciences
- **Department:** Life Sciences
- **Programme(s) of study under evaluation**  
Name (Duration, ECTS, Cycle)

## Programme 1

**In Greek:**

Programme Name

**In English:**

Sport Science and Physical Education (Bachelor of Science)

## Programme 2

**In Greek:**

Programme Name

**In English:**

Applied Sport Science (Master of Science)

## Programme 3

**In Greek:**

Programme Name

**In English:**

Programme Name

- **Department's Status:** Choose status

**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].**

## A. Introduction

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

The Covid-19 pandemic postponed an on-site visit scheduled for earlier 2020. The pragmatic decision to proceed to a 'virtual', on-line evaluation resulted in a less interactive and difficult engagement with the University environs, Department, Faculty staff, students and support staff. The original schedule was for a 2-day, on-site visit of the EEC to cover the evaluation agenda. What transpired was an exhausting day of video conference meetings and discussions with relevant staff and students from the University, Faculty and Department. The difficulty was compounded further by the intermittent connectivity of panel members. Conditions aside, the EEC Panel were able to expedite a Departmental and 2 programme reviews due, in no small measure, to the internal organization of the pre-circulated documentation and timely attendance of persons required. The EEC panel found the meetings to be interactive, with full engagement from all sections of the community, productive and receptive to discussion of existing, and recommendations for review of current practice. Conducting a periodic review by virtual means presented some challenges but the EEC were able to gain sufficient information to make informed judgement in the key areas of assessment. Some areas could not be assessed fully by an on-line, virtual process, but these are relatively few. At this phase of the report the EEC wish to extend their thanks to all who engaged in the evaluation process.

## B. External Evaluation Committee (EEC)

<i>Name</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>University</i>
<b>Phil Jakeman</b>	Professor of Sport and Exercise Sciences	University of Limerick, Ireland
<b>J. Alfredo Martinez</b>	Professor of Food Science and Nutrition	University of Navarra, Spain
<b>John Saxton</b>	Professor of Clinical Exercise Physiology	University of Northumbria, UK
<b>Panagiota Papaionnou</b>	Student, MSc Cognitive Neurorehabilitation	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 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 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
- 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		
<b>1. Department's academic profile and orientation</b>		
<b>1.1 Mission and strategic planning</b>		<b>1 - 5</b>
1.1.1	The Department has formally adopted a mission statement, which is available to the public and easily accessible.	5
1.1.2	The Department has developed its strategic planning aiming at fulfilling its mission.	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.	5
1.1.5	The academic community is involved in shaping and monitoring the implementation of the Department's development strategies.	5
1.1.6	Stakeholders such as academics, students, graduates and other professional and scientific associations participate in the Department's development strategy.	5
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.		

1.1.7 Breakdown of employment of graduates was not available for evaluation. Consider an audit of career pathways to relate to area(s) of specialization within the degree programmes.

Additionally, provide information on the following:

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

1. The academic programmes evaluated are compatible with the broad range of activity within the Department and have benefitted from the subject expertise provided by the Faculty in these areas.

2. It is apparent from the strategic partitioning of the Department of Life Sciences from within the School of Sciences that the connectivity and coherence between the Departments within the School has been retained.

3. Coordination of future programmes with the Department of Health Sciences may be advantageous.

Provide suggestions for changes in case of incompatibility.

[Click to enter text.](#)

## 1. Department's academic profile and orientation

1.2 Connecting with society		1 - 5
1.2.1	The Department has effective mechanisms to assess the needs and demands of society and takes them into account in its various activities.	5
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.	5

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

The Department provided evidence of a substantive programme of engagement with society at-large within the term of evaluation. There was clear evidence of a well-developed engagement with, and of, the Alumni in the promotion and development of the Department and the University

## 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.	5
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.	4
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.	3

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

Faculty based in Greece have gained recognized international experience and qualification. Few Faculty originate from outside of the homeland, understandable given the potential language barrier. Faculty profile could be enhanced by further international recruitment.

Recruitment to target numbers remains an issue for the BSc and MSc programme which, given the saturated market within Cyprus, suggests greater effort should be made to attract international students to these programmes.

Information regarding the 'process' of funding to the Department was deflected to the representative from the Department of Enrollment who provided the basis for the fees structure only. There was no information provided on the operational budget, its adequacy or future planning provided by the School/Department.

Additionally, write:

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

These data are sourced from the School/Department

### Findings

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

This was a 'virtual' site visit, so no first-hand, direct engagement was possible. The impression of the panel of the 'virtual' tour and on-line engagement with all sections of the Department was extremely positive. We find this to be a modern, vibrant and supportive community for undergraduate and graduate education.

### Strengths

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



Though only 4 core Faculty in this discipline, there is evidence of an integrated School structure with the potential to exploit further interdisciplinary and interdepartmental teaching and research activity.

Overall, a supportive environment to student-centred learning, but there are areas of improvement as stated later in these evaluations.

Fully committed and engaged Faculty and Support Staff whom appear flexible to adapt effectively, receptive to the opinion of the EEC and to the changing environment within and without the higher education system.

### Areas of improvement and recommendations

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

Recruitment and finance– as indicated in 1.3 above

Research. Though there is evidence of research competency within the Faculty, there is an apparent inability to attract research (PhD) students. This is surprising considering the ‘attractive’ subject area and level of facility within the School/Department. One solution may be to promulgate a research ‘focus’ and research ‘Centre’ to coordinate research activity and develop around this research focus a scheme of externally-funded research Scholarships and Fellowships.

Does a Departmental Research Committee have a role?

**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	Partially Compliant

## 2. Quality Assurance

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

### Sub-areas

- 1.1 System and quality assurance strategy
- 1.2 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		
<b>2. Quality Assurance</b>		
<b>2.1 System and quality assurance strategy</b>		<b>1 - 5</b>
2.1.1	The Department has a policy for quality assurance that is made public and forms part of the Institution's strategic management.	5
2.1.2	Internal stakeholders develop and implement a policy for quality assurance through appropriate structures and processes, while involving external stakeholders.	5
2.1.3	The Department's policy for quality assurance supports guarding against intolerance of any kind or discrimination against students or staff.	5
2.1.4	The quality assurance system adequately covers all the functions and sectors of the Department's activities:	
2.1.4.1	Teaching and learning	5
2.1.4.2	Research	5
2.1.4.3	The connection with society	5
2.1.4.4	Management and support services	5
2.1.5	The quality assurance system promotes a culture of quality.	5
Justify the numerical scores provided for the quality indicators (criteria) by specifying (if any) the deficiencies.		
<b>No issues identified</b>		

## 2. Quality Assurance

2.2 Quality assurance for the programmes of study		1 - 5
2.2.1	The responsibility for decision-making and monitoring the implementation of the programmes of study offered by the Department lies with the teaching staff.	5
2.2.2	The system and criteria for assessing students' performance in the subjects of the programmes of studies offered by the Department are clear, sufficient and known to the students.	4
2.2.3	The quality control system refers to specific indicators and is effective.	5
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.	5
2.2.6	The established procedures for examining students' objections/ disagreements on issues of student evaluation or academic ethics are effective.	5
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	The Department has a clear and consistent policy on the admission criteria for students in the various programmes of studies offered.	5
2.2.9	The Department flexibly uses a variety of pedagogical methods.	3
2.2.10	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.	5
2.2.11	The Department analyses and publishes graduate employment information.	5
2.2.12	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	5
2.2.12.3	Rooms for theoretical, practical and laboratory lessons	4

	2.2.12.4	Technological infrastructure	5
	2.2.12.5	Academic support	5
2.2.13	There is a student welfare service that supports students in regard to academic, personal problems and difficulties.		5
2.2.14	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.		5
2.2.15	Mentoring of each student is provided and the number of students per each permanent teaching member is adequate.		5
2.2.16	The provision of quality doctoral studies is ensured through doctoral studies regulations, which are publicly available.		N/A
2.2.17	The number of doctoral students, under the supervision of a member of the teaching staff, enables continuous and effective feedback to the students and it complies with the European and international standards.		N/A
2.2.18	The Department has mechanisms and funds to support writing and attending conferences of doctoral candidates.		N/A
2.2.19	There is a clear policy on authorship and intellectual property.		N/A

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

*2.2.2 Not wholly transparent to the EEC that students are adequately informed in all programmes of the assessment criteria pertaining to the programme of study.*

*2.2.4 Student evaluations (on-line) are collected at end of module only. No indication of 'within' module evaluation to correct deficiency. Unclear to what extent these evaluations are considered, and acted upon, by Programme Committees.*

*2.2.9 More could be achieved to promote great exposure to empirical learning and translation from theoretical and practical application – and visa versa.*

*2.2.12.3 Questionable whether, by international comparison, the number of laboratory/practical areas is sufficient to accommodate empirical science and practical teaching components of the programmes.*

### Findings

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

This was a 'virtual' site visit, so no first-hand, direct engagement was possible. The impression of the panel was generally favourable to the attainment of compliance in these areas

### Strengths

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

Policies, responsibilities and procedures of enactment are in good order within the department

### Areas of improvement and recommendations

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

As per comments regarding sections 2.2.4 and 2.2.9 above

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		
<b>3. Administration</b>		<b>1 - 5</b>
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.	5
3.5	The Department applies effective procedures to ensure transparency in the decision-making process.	5
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.	5
3.8	The manner in which the Department's council operates and the procedures for disseminating and implementing their decisions are clearly formulated and implemented precisely and effectively.	5
3.9	The Department applies procedures for the prevention and disciplinary control of academic misconduct of students, teaching and administrative staff, including plagiarism.	5
3.10	The Department has appropriate procedures for dealing with students' complaints.	5

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

No issues were identified in this section

### Findings

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

This was a 'virtual' site visit, so no first-hand, direct engagement was possible. The impression of the panel was generally favourable to the attainment of compliance in these areas

### Strengths

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

Evidence committed and supportive administrative structures to the T&L environment

### Areas of improvement and recommendations

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

Click to enter text.

Please select what is appropriate for the following assessment area:

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



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

##### Sub-areas

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

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

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

Quality indicators/criteria		
<b>4. Learning and Teaching</b>		
<b>4.1 Planning the programmes of study</b>		<b>1 - 5</b>
4.1.1	The Department provides an effective system for designing, approving, monitoring and periodically reviewing the programmes of study.	5
4.1.2	Students and other stakeholders, including employers, are actively involved on the programmes' review and development.	5
4.1.3	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).	4
4.1.4	The programmes of study are in compliance with the existing legislation and meet the professional qualifications requirements in the professional courses, where applicable.	5
4.1.5	The Department ensures that its programmes of study integrate effectively theory and practice.	3
Justify the numerical scores provided for the quality indicators (criteria) by specifying (if any) the deficiencies.		
4.1.3. and 4.1.5 are related issues in which a deficiency in the integration of theory into practice was apparent, and pronounced by the students, in discussion with the EEC		
<b>4. Learning and Teaching</b>		
<b>4.2 Organisation of teaching</b>		<b>1 - 5</b>



4.2.1	The Department establishes student admission criteria for each programme, which are adhered to consistently.	5
4.2.2	Recognition of prior studies and credit transfer is regulated by procedures and regulations that are in line with European standards and/or international practices.	5
4.2.3	The number of students in the teaching rooms is suitable for theoretical, practical and laboratory lessons.	5
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.	4
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.	3

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

There is a caveat to these comments in that the evaluation was conducted at a time of great challenge caused by the extant Covid-19 pandemic.

4.2.5 It is clear that the Faculty adopt a student-centred learning approach but consideration should be given to a wider range of pedagogical approaches and greater emphasis on self-directed and reflective practice.

4.2.6 Not fully supported by the students' response during the review. Faculty offer and publish office hours for student consultation and feedback, but it is not clear as to how supportive this avenue for potential feedback is in practice. Maybe consider a template rubric for feedback to all students on all components of their T&L programme.

4.2.8 Linking to 4.2.6, consider whether students' facility to provide this feedback is adequate and timely. Communication to students of how their view is considered/acted upon by the Department/Programme management is warranted.

### Findings

Click to enter text.

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

This was a 'virtual' site visit, so no first-hand, direct engagement was possible. The impression of the panel was generally favourable to the attainment of compliance in these areas

### Strengths

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

As per comments above plus

Overall, the department demonstrates good practice in course management and implementation

### Areas of improvement and recommendations

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

As per comments above plus

Key areas for consideration are assessment and feedback

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

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

## 5. Teaching Staff (ESG 1.5)

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

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

Quality indicators/criteria		1 - 5
<b>5. Teaching Staff</b>		<b>1 - 5</b>
5.1	The number of teaching staff - full-time and exclusive work - and the subject area of the staff sufficiently support the programmes of study.	4
5.2	The teaching staff of the Department has the relevant formal and substantive qualifications for teaching the individual subjects as described in the relevant legislation.	5
5.3	The visiting Professors' subject areas adequately support the Department's programmes of study.	5
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.	5
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.	3
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.

5.7 The EEC was informed that 4 FT Faculty form the core staff base to these programmes. This would appear low by European norms. Furthermore, from the data provided, the Staff:Student Ratio (SSR) appears to be 1:40. This is despite non-attainment of projected student numbers! The high demands on the teaching Faculty impact on the overall quality of delivery of current, and development of future, degree programmes.

5.8 This was addressed in 2.2.4

Also, write the following:

- 
- Number of teaching staff working full-time and having exclusive work : 4
- Number of special teaching staff working full-time and having exclusive work : 4
- Number of visiting Professors : 7
- Number of special scientists on lease services: unknown

These data are provided by the Department

### Findings

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

This was a 'virtual' site visit, so no first-hand, direct engagement was possible. The impression of the panel was generally favourable to the attainment of compliance in these areas

Discussion with the teaching staff throughout was honest and very constructive. The impression was of a young, vibrant staff base that would benefit from appointment of and engagement with senior Faculty.

### Strengths

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

The teaching staff are highly capable. Several are active research scientists. The engagement of all Faculty in establishing U/G and P/G programmes in this subject area is commendable.

### Areas of improvement and recommendations

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

The number of full-time special teaching staff exclusively appointed for teaching in this subject area is relatively low. Recruitment of academic staff may be necessary, especially as the Departmental strategy is to increase student numbers on these programmes.

If it is the case that resources follow numbers, then allocation of additional resources to this programme is overdue.

Please ✓ what is appropriate for the following assessment area:

Assessment area	<i>Non-compliant / Partially Compliant / Compliant</i>
5. Teaching Staff	Partially Compliant

## 6. Research

(ESG 1.1, 1.3, 1.5, 1.6)

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

1 or 2: *Non-compliant*

3: *Partially compliant*

4 or 5: *Compliant*

Quality indicators/criteria		
<b>6. Research</b>		<b>1 - 5</b>
6.1	The Department has a research policy formulated in line with its mission.	5
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.	5
6.3	The Department provides adequate facilities and equipment to cover the staff and students' research activities.	4
6.4	The Department has the appropriate mechanisms for the development of students' research skills.	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.	5
6.6	The Department ensures that research results are integrated into teaching and, to the extent applicable, promotes and implements a policy of transferring know-how to society and the production sector.	3
6.7	The Department provides mechanisms which ensure compliance with international rules of research ethics, both in relation to research activity and the rights of researchers.	5
6.8	The external, non-governmental, funding of research activities of teaching staff is similar to other Departments in Cyprus and abroad.	Choose mark
6.9	The policy, indirect or direct of internal funding of the research activities of the teaching staff is satisfactory, based on European and international practices.	5
Justify the numerical scores provided for the quality indicators (criteria) by specifying (if any) the deficiencies.		

6.4 Of those students who have graduated only a few have chosen to do a dissertation. Consider whether the level of practical elements are providing the necessary empirical research skills  
6.6 The overall research activity seemed low with Faculty finding difficulty in the recruitment of PhD researchers. In that context it is difficult to evaluate the extent to which research is integrated into the teaching and learning policy

### Findings

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

This was a 'virtual' site visit, so no first-hand, direct engagement was possible.

The EEC panel were not able to assess areas of activity in relation to Cypriot Universities (6.8) However, the impression of the EEC panel was generally favourable to the attainment of compliance in these areas

### Strengths

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

Evidence of research activity in a comparatively 'young' subject area by a comparatively young staff.

The stated Departmental output of 2.4 articles/ PhD graduation appears appropriate as a target for PhD registrations in the Sport Science and PE discipline.

### Areas of improvement and recommendations

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

Student research opportunities;

Increase the exposure/integration of undergraduate students to engage in empirical research.

Students' 'research' engagement is primarily through Structured Literature Review or similar. Low level of experimental project work. Students should be encouraged to engage greater in dissertation rather than elective courses. Should be informed by destination of student employment and presents an opportunity to broaden the opportunity for final year, or capstone, projects in the Life Sciences.

(see: <https://mymedia.leeds.ac.uk/Mediasite/Play/a3add1c5d3b34120ae9899c30bb67b6b1d>)

Departmental Research Ethos;

Limited evidence of a programme of activity directed to the development of a research culture e.g. seminar series, departmental research day etc.

Low number of PhD students. Major initiative is required to increase the number of research postgraduates.

No evidence of research staff (postdoctoral etc.) engagement.

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

**Note: Based only on that which could be assessed by the EEC**

Assessment area	<i>Non-compliant / Partially Compliant / Compliant</i>
6. Research	Partially 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		
<b>7. Resources</b>		<b>1 - 5</b>
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.	N/A
7.4	The Department's budget is appropriate for its mission and adequate for the implementation of strategic planning.	N/A
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.	N/A
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.		
Click to enter text.		

### Findings

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

This was a 'virtual' site visit, so no first-hand, direct engagement was possible.

The EEC panel were not able to assess areas of activity in relation to 7.3, 7.4 and 7.6 nor was information reported as to the policy of internal funding (7.6).

However, the impression of the EEC panel was generally favourable to the attainment of compliance in these areas



### Strengths

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

The 'virtual 360 degree tour' depicted a modern, highly technologically advanced campus housing excellent facilities.

The Department has approval for a structured PhD degree – a welcome addition – but this will need to be suitably marketed and resourced to succeed.

The EEC found the response from the 'support' sections of the University to be very encouraging

### 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 did question the viability of the MSc degree with such low numbers of applicants, current students and completions. Clearly, the Department will review and act accordingly.

Please ✓ what is appropriate for the following assessment area:

**Note: Based only on that which could be assessed**

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

## D. Conclusions and final remarks


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

**Note: This was a ‘virtual’ site visit, so first-hand, direct engagement was not possible. There was also a technical difficulty that limited engagement of one of the EEC panel members during the virtual on-site visit. These remarks are based only on that which could be assessed in the circumstances.**

1. The EEC panel were very impressed by the commitment and engagement of all members of the Department who represented their component area(s) under evaluation. The Committee wish to thank and praise all for their cooperation, patience, honesty and integrity in the conduct of a difficult, and somewhat extraordinary, virtual ‘on-site’ evaluation. That we achieved so much over the course of the day is a credit to all, and bodes well for the future of the Department. Worthy of special mention are the student representatives who were exemplary and outstanding ambassadors for the Department and University.
2. Overall, the EEC gained a favourable impression of the policies and procedures adopted by the Department to manage a relative new and expanding portfolio of teaching and learning in the discipline of Sport and Exercise Sciences. For the most part these were judged compliant with the rules and regulations governing these activities.
3. It is evident that areas of overlap and synergy remain following the restructuring of Departments within the School of Sciences. It would appear advantageous for the Department of Life Sciences to exploit these synergies, particularly in the area of health, in future developments.
4. The EEC panel is confident that deficiencies identified within this evaluation will be considered by Departmental management in a timely and appropriate manner and in full consultation and engagement with the Faculty, support staff and student body.
5. Resources, deficient throughout most of the higher education sector around the globe, also pertain to this Department. We hope the University will react favourably to any request from the Department for additional resource to maintain and improve the current degree programmes and in the development of new postgraduate research degrees.

Finally, this has been a difficult year for all sectors of society. The University’s response, exemplified by the Department, is worthy of commendation. The student body are highly appreciative of the efforts of the Department to secure an accommodation to the disruption to their studies and engagement in the life and function the University experience has to offer. The EEC wish you all the very best for the festive season and a safe and prosperous exit from these challenging times.

**E. Signatures of the EEC**

<i>Name</i>	<i>Signature</i>
<b>Professor Phil Jakeman</b>	
<b>Professor John Saxton</b>	
<b>Professor J. Alfredo Martinez</b>	
<b>Panagiota Papaionnou</b>	
FullName	
FullName	

**Date:** December 21<sup>st</sup> 2020

