

Doc. 300.3.1

# External Evaluation Report (Departmental)

**Date:** Date

- **Higher Education Institution:**

Philips University

- **Town:** Nicosia

- **School/Faculty:** Law

- **Department:** Law

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

**Programme 1**

**In Greek:**

Πτυχίο Νομικής

**In English:**

LLB Law

**Programme 2**

**In Greek:**

N/A

**In English:**

N/A

**Programme 3**

**In Greek:**

N/A

**In English:**

N/A

- **Department's Status:** PENDING

**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.*

We have studied the application file, which included the planned programme outline, course outlines, faculty CVs, and general information about university policies and procedures. We were also given powerpoint presentations on the Department and the LLB. Owing to the COVID-19 pandemic, we met with all members of staff of the Department remotely via Zoom, as well as members of the University's Executive. We also heard a number of thorough presentations and discussed all aspects of the programme with the faculty. We requested access to the law library and talked with members of the admin team. We were shown a video of the University buildings and available resources.

We recognise the work that has gone into the submitted application. We have pointed out some omissions in our comments in the sections that follow.

All participating members made every effort to address our questions. We thank them for their co-operation.

## B. External Evaluation Committee (EEC)

<i>Name</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>University</i>
Professor Ilias Bantekas	Professor	Hamad bin Khalifa University, Qatar Foundation, and Georgetown University, Edmund A Walsh School of Foreign Service
Professor Olympia Bekou	Professor of Public international Law and Acting Head, School of Law	University of Nottingham
Nicholas Tsagourias	Professor and Director of the Sheffield Centre for International and European Law	University of Sheffield
George Kyriakou	lawyer	member of the PanCypriot Lawyers' Association
IRENE ANDREOU	STUDENT	University of Cyprus
Name	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		
1. Department's academic profile and orientation		
1.1 Mission and strategic planning		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.	4
1.1.4	The programmes of study offered by the Department reflect its academic profile and are aligned with the European and international practice.	2
1.1.5	The academic community is involved in shaping and monitoring the implementation of the Department's development strategies.	2
1.1.6	Stakeholders such as academics, students, graduates and other professional and scientific associations participate in the Department's development strategy.	2
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.	N/A
Justify the numerical scores provided for the quality indicators (criteria) by specifying (if any) the deficiencies.		

1.1.4: Although the programme of study in question reflects that of a Greek Law School, it is not in line with other European and international practice in its current form.

1.1.5: There was no evidence that the wider academic community is involved in the shaping and monitoring of the implementation of the strategies.

1.1.6: No evidence has been provided as to the involvement of such stakeholders in the development of the Department's strategy. In particular, there does not appear to be any input from the Cypriot Bar.

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).

As the Department currently proposes only an LLB, issues of coherence/compatibility do not arise. Similarly, as the Law department appears to be the sole School in the Law School/Faculty, this is not currently an issue.

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.	2
1.2.2	The Department provides sufficient information to the public about its activities and offered programmes of study.	1
1.2.3	The Department ensures that its operation and activities have a positive impact on society.	3
1.2.4	The Department has an effective communication mechanism with its graduates.	N/A

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

1.2.1 It is unclear which society is in question here. Given that the law school operates in Cyprus, Cypriot society is not served here to a great degree, since its intended audience is predominantly, if not wholly, from mainland Greece.

1.2.2 There was a lot of confusion as to what precisely the offering was. The submitted application said one thing (i.e. programme offered also in English), the discussion and subsequent additional materials provided following the discussion another (i.e. it is a Greek law degree offered in Greek), the discussion with the head of admissions yet a different approach (when questioned if someone speaking English alone could do the degree, we were reassured that this was the case). Whilst we are confident that the confusion lies in the design of the programme and not with the relevant administrator, it would be remiss of us not to comment that in our judgement, the information available to the public is confusing, if not misleading.

1.2.3 See response to Question 1.2.1

## 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.	1
1.3.2	Planning teaching staff recruitment and their professional development is in line with the Department's academic development plan.	2
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.	5

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

1.3.1 There are formal procedures for the selection and appointment of staff, it however became clear that these had not been thoroughly followed in the appointment of the staff in place. An open and transparent process is required in order to attract staff of the highest calibre. Publication of the vacancies in local newspapers and the University's website alone is not sufficient. It is standard practice for all universities in Europe open announcement on major academic law sites, such as jobs.ac.uk which is highly recommended if indeed the University was seeking to make a pool of the best possible candidates from across Europe (even Greek speakers).

1.3.2 Insufficient to-the-point guidance was provided regarding the professional development of teaching staff. Although there does exist a paper trail, consisting of policies and guidelines, as we demonstrate in other sections, there is far too much information about professional development that one is lost about how exactly effective professional development is to take place. We do not feel there is sufficient research mentoring for mid-tier and junior staff and there is no clear plan (apart from personal statements to the contrary) about how they can progress in their research and skills at levels higher than presently. With few exceptions there is a significant gap between Emeriti staff at the higher end and junior staff at the lower end, with very few full time staff in between these ranks.

Additionally, write:

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

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 appears to be an ambitious law school with a lot of raw energy at the mid and junior level, which clearly is its driving force and this should be reinforced and assisted as much as possible. Overall, the law school is attempting to replicate almost to the letter the model of a typical Greek law school curriculum, which itself is mostly out of touch with European legal education. The program is addressed almost exclusively to Greek applicants and its only originality is the infusion of several modules on Cypriot law.

**Strengths**

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

There exists a very enthusiastic core of junior and perhaps (although less so) mid-tier academics, who are the driving force of the law school, and who will hopefully carry its banner and lead it in the near future but also maintain its research and teaching quality. The Committee was impressed by the fact that the aforementioned are forward thinking colleagues who, besides their teaching, are trying to foster a culture of research, which will give credence and credibility to the law school.

**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's view is that the law school lacks a clear focus as regards its offerings. There is an attempt to present the degree as international and administrative staff made the point that the degree is advertised to prospective applicants as being offered in both English and Greek. This is a far cry from what the Committee was told by key academic and senior management staff. The way this degree is structured makes it a Degree on Greek law only (with some optional modules on Cypriot law). It cannot be offered in any language other than Greek and in any event there is insufficient expertise to offer it in English. Even if that was the case, CYQAA would have to be asked to assess and validate a Degree on Greek law in English, which is not the case here. Hence, no student who does not possess Greek language qualifications should be admitted and equally no student who simply has excellent English language qualifications should be admitted. Again, this should be spelt out in VERY CLEAR TERMS in all documentation, publicity materials and should be conveyed by the admissions staff to prospective applicants and QYCAA should monitor this.

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

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

- 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		
<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.	4
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	4
2.1.4.2	Research	2
2.1.4.3	The connection with society	2
2.1.4.4	Management and support services	5
2.1.5	The quality assurance system promotes a culture of quality.	3

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

2.1.4.2: Quality assurance pertaining to research is limited to a self-evaluation form. There is little to no group expertise between 2 and more faculty members to ensure clusters and appropriate mentoring. Far more detailed provisions are needed.

2.1.4.3: The Department and its proposed programme aims to cater primarily for the Greek market. Therefore, connection with the Cypriot society, where it is physically situated, needs to be clarified. The inclusion of the sustainable development goals goes some way in assuaging concerns with respect to the global society. Our concerns relate to the local connection and civic mission every University should aspire to deliver.

2.1.5 The paper trail is there and certainly it will help to some degree with quality assurance.

## 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.

3

2.2.3 The quality control system refers to specific indicators and is effective.

3

2.2.4 The results from student assessments are used to improve the programmes of study.

n/a

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.

3

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.

4

2.2.8 The Department has a clear and consistent policy on the admission criteria for students in the various programmes of studies offered.

1

2.2.9 The Department flexibly uses a variety of pedagogical methods.

5

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.

4

2.2.11 The Department analyses and publishes graduate employment information.

n/a

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	4
	2.2.12.2	Library	2
	2.2.12.3	Rooms for theoretical, practical and laboratory lessons	5
	2.2.12.4	Technological infrastructure	4
	2.2.12.5	Academic support	4
2.2.13	There is a student welfare service that supports students in regard to academic, personal problems and difficulties.		4
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.		n/a
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 Although there is a good paper trail, consisting of guidance and policies, it is unclear what assessments exactly relate to. What is a good research paper? What does the grading scale of a research paper in Year 4 reflect or should reflect, as opposed to a research paper in Year 1. What does a grade 50 in an exam reflect? What are the standards which an examiner seeks in giving a grade of 50? Apart from the grading scale, qualitative indicators are insufficient.

2.2.3 Such things do not exist in Greek public law schools, so it is not surprising that they have not been incorporated here. However, these are common features in European and North American Universities and there are detailed policies on this at University and college level. They are weak here and need to be supplemented with best practices from top tier law schools.

2.2.6 There is an excellent policy on plagiarism, but this is just one ethical issue. The policies do refer to other issues and we are satisfied there is a very good array of measures as concern student complaints on academic matters

2.2.8 This low grade is consistent with the Committee's finding that there is significant confusion for the LLB Admissions Policy. Our recommendation is that the program should not run unless it is made explicit that this is a degree on Greek law, which requires proof of Greek native language skills and that proficiency in English is irrelevant for admission purposes.

Moreover, it has to be made clear that only ONE degree is on offer, namely that which is taught in Greek and that there is no alternative degree in English. Finally, there needs to be some remedial measures for the type of degree/apolytirio or other qualification required for admission. The maths test seems completely irrelevant and there is no law school that the Committee knows of that requires this. While we understand that Philips law school cannot demand grades similar or close to Greek public law schools, nonetheless, if the program is to retain some quality and retention rates (in line with its sustainability aims) the overall grade for admission must be no less than that required for admission to good social sciences degrees in Greece and Cyprus. By way of illustration, a overall GPA of 10/20 is wholly insufficient. The Committee was not clear what was the desired grade.

2.2.12 Although the University has made considerable progress in building its library and the President telling us that it is expected that 30% of the budget will go into this, it is not clear what volume of books in the library are devoted to law. The IT specialist referred to a software system that no member of the Committee was aware of and we have served in academia in the UK and USA at the highest level for several decades. When asking the librarian what databases were available, he mentioned JSTOR and others, but when he sent us the list it was clear that the University had no subscription. We would have expected the librarian to be knowledgeable about law-specific databases (Greek, Cypriot and other) and to provide a straight response as to whether these were available, and if not when they would become available. No law school can possibly survive, let alone function without key legal databases.

### Findings

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

Lack of focus and orientation, as well as lack of leadership as to the aims, objections and admission criteria to the program, which is the raison d'être of the department.

### Strengths

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

Excellent facilities, good policies

### Areas of improvement and recommendations

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

Please see above where we have pointed out serious deficiencies and the recommendations made by the Committee to remedy these.

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	Partially Compliant
2.2 Quality assurance for the programmes of study	Non-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		1 - 5
<b>3. Administration</b>		<b>1 - 5</b>
3.1	The administrative structure is in line with the legislation and the Department's mission.	4
3.2	The members of the teaching and administrative staff and the students participate, at a satisfactory degree and on the basis of specified procedures, in the management of the Department.	4
3.3	The administrative staff adequately supports the operation of the Department.	4
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.	2
3.6	Statutory sessions of the Department are held and minutes are kept.	n/a
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.	n/a
3.10	The Department has appropriate procedures for dealing with students' complaints.	4

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

3.5 Despite the existence of a detailed regulatory framework, it is not clear that some of the decisions taken to date have been transparent. This particularly applies to the procedure followed in order to recruit and appoint staff.

### Findings

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

It is clear that there exists a sound mechanism within the University, which links the Council to the various schools and departments and there are sufficient mechanisms within the law school to carry out its mission. There are sufficient detailed policies in place.

### Strengths

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

People understand and know their place well within the organisation of the law school and the University and we were particularly impressed with the skills and work of the University's administrative personnel and Registrar.

### Areas of improvement and recommendations

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

Transparency is an issue. Schools need not be transparent unless the law says so, which we are guessing it does not. Transparency breeds trust and people generally work better and more efficiently in a workplace dominated by transparent mechanisms. In our experience, there is not a single law school in the UK that is not run by transparent means in its internal and its external relations.

**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.	3
4.1.2	Students and other stakeholders, including employers, are actively involved on the programmes' review and development.	n/a
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.	4

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

4.1.1 and 4.1.4 The curriculum reflects and reproduces similar law degree curricula offered by Greek Universities in Greece. In this respect, it satisfies the legal and professional requirements laid down by the Greek educational and professional authorities. It is not clear whether it satisfies the professional requirements for entry into the Cyprus bar. During the online discussion it was said that courses on Cypriot law are optional. This concerns the identity of the offered programme of study which was raised repeatedly during the online visit. If the ambition of the programme is to cater for the needs of

Greek and Cypriot lawyers , it may be preferable for the programme to have two streams; one stream complying with the Greek educational and professional requirements whereas the other complying with the Cypriot ones. Moreover, this should be reflected in the programme description and design and in the offered courses. It should also be communicated clearly in publicity materials, admissions and in the course of the study.

4.1.2 There are mechanisms for designing, approving, monitoring and periodically reviewing the programme where students and employers are also involved. However, their effectiveness can be enhanced by the willingness to ask searching questions and scrutinise the programme in all its dimensions but, above all, by the willingness and ability of the Department and its leadership to listen and act upon any recommendations. During the onsite visit, we have been impressed by the willingness and ability of certain members of staff, in particular younger ones, to respond effectively to questions and suggestions and their ability to demonstrate understanding of the modern educational experience that a student should receive, however a cultural shift is required across the board.

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. However, the department should set out grade descriptors and, more critically, set out the criteria according to which continuous performance is to be assessed. It should also institutionalise mechanisms to guarantee impartiality and fairness in assessment. The institution of external examiners is helpful as well as a process of internal moderation. Student complaint mechanisms should be independent.

4.1.5 The programme of study integrates theory and practice in its programme design and teaching and learning as it appears from the course description. It remains to be seen how this will unfold in practice. However, if internationalisation, europeanisation and multidisciplinary are part of the aims of the Department as mentioned in the application and during the online visit , they are not sufficiently reflected in the curriculum or in the teaching and learning methods.

## 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.	2
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.	3
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.	n/a
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.	3
4.2.7	The criteria and the method of assessment as well as the criteria for marking are published in advance.	2
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.

4.2.1 The Department has set out its admissions criteria however it has not set out any minimum requirement for applicants having completed secondary education in Greece or Cyprus. In order to ensure the quality of the programme and its market value it is important to set out minimum requirements of entry and/or minimum requirements in certain subjects such as in Greek language. In our opinion, the required IELTS scores are quite low for entry into a Law School. During the online visit it was established that no teaching will be offered in English and that the programme leads to a Greek law degree; therefore it is not suitable for non-Greek speaking students. For this reason, the IELTS requirement for entry cannot be justified. The School can however offer courses on foreign languages which students can attend.

4.2.2 The recognition of prior studies and credit transfer is compliant with European standards.

4.2.3 The number of students in the teaching rooms seem to be suitable for the law teaching needs. If the number of incoming students increases then new arrangements should be made and the Department should review its estate provision for teaching.

4.2.4 It is important to maintain effective communication between students and teaching staff. The Department has set out certain mechanisms in this respect but our main concern is the number of non-resident staff who are employed by other Universities or who are in private practice. It is inevitable that this will pose a serious challenge to effective and timely communication which is unfair to students and in particular to fee paying students and will undermine their educational experience. It may also increase the workload and responsibilities of resident staff in particular younger ones which will be unfair, unprofessional and will undermine their academic and professional progress.

4.2.5 The Department has procedures and rules on professional standards and ethics in the relations between staff and students but not adequate mechanisms regarding unconscious bias and it seems not to be even aware of unconscious bias. The answer 'we are experienced teachers' is not sufficient and more training is needed.

4.2.6 There should be clear deadlines regarding the provision of feedback. In order for feedback to be effective, there should be clear criteria and these criteria should be reflected in the grade descriptors and in particular in relation to continuous assessment. This will ensure transparency, fairness and impartiality. It will also allow students to reflect upon and improve their performance. The Department should ensure that assessment is fair and impartial against the assessment criteria; for this reason it should introduce monitoring mechanisms. Continuous assessment which counts for 30% of the final grade needs to be based on clear criteria and on quantifiable processes in order to be fair.

4.2.7 The teaching and learning methodology as described in the course descriptions is student-centred and in principle can motivate students and lead to critical engagement with the learning process.

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

The Department provides a programme of study leading to a Greek law degree and satisfying the relevant professional requirements. The teaching and learning process is student oriented and ensures critical engagement. It combines theory and practice. It is compliant with the European Qualifications Framework. However there are certain weaknesses as identified above and in this section..

**Strengths**

complete Greek law degree curriculum leading to relevant qualification  
student-led teaching

**Areas of improvement and recommendations**

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

State clearly the academic and professional qualifications acquired by students;

Lay down clear admissions criteria with minimum requirements;

Lay down clear assessment criteria and grade descriptors;

Provide assessment monitoring mechanisms;

Provide continuous training in teaching and learning methodology and assessment;

Establish mechanisms to ensure effective and timely communication between staff and students;

Establish effective and independent quality assurance reviewing and monitoring mechanisms;

If internationalisation and europeanisation are part of the Department's aims as stated in the application, it should be reflected in the curriculum and in the teaching content and learning methods.

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

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

## 5. Teaching Staff (ESG 1.5)

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

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

Quality indicators/criteria		
<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.	2
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.	n/a
5.5	The ratio of special teaching staff to the total number of teaching staff is satisfactory.	n/a
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.	n/a
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.	5
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.

5.1 It was not clear to the Committee who exactly were the 10 full time staff and who were part-time or visiting faculty. It was not also clear which of the full time staff were in fact resident on Cyprus. People on a full time contract but not resident on Cyprus are not fully integrated in the life of the law school and emulate many of the deficiencies of flying faculty law schools.

Also, write the following:

- Number of teaching staff working full-time and having exclusive work

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

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.*

Much care has been taken to ensure a healthy staff-student ratio. The projected 1:14 is excellent even by top standards in UK universities and the law school and Philips University should be commended for this.

### Strengths

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

As per our prior observation on excellent staff-student ratio.

### Areas of improvement and recommendations

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

Care must be taken so that full time staff actually reside in Cyprus and that there is a collegiate atmosphere in the department. The Committee and CYQAA should be informed about staff contracts and which full time staff reside in Cyprus, in order to ensure consistency under Cypriot law.

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		
6. Research		1 - 5
6.1	The Department has a research policy formulated in line with its mission.	2
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.	3
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.	2
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.	N/A
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.	2
6.8	The external, non-governmental, funding of research activities of teaching staff is similar to other Departments in Cyprus and abroad.	N/A
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.	2
Justify the numerical scores provided for the quality indicators (criteria) by specifying (if any) the deficiencies.		

6.1: The research policy submitted is descriptive and somewhat vague. A more clearly articulated research vision with enablers, inhibitors, indicators of success and suitable milestones is needed.

6.2. Whilst emphasis is placed on participation in funding projects, it was not clear what support there will be available within the department in that respect. More generally, how the delivery of high-quality research is to be facilitated is not clear.

6.3. Although some provision is made re conference travel and some publication costs, the provision of sufficiently ring-fenced research time, research leave, research assistance and adequate library resources (particularly through subscription to expensive proprietary databases) are distinctly lacking.

6.4 There is no formal research element nor training envisaged in the proposed curriculum.

6.6 This is ensured by research-led teaching, but the teaching outlines we have seen do not fully take research and knowledge transfer into account.

6.7 There seemed to be confusion in terms of what research ethics entails, which, in the relevant presentation seemed to refer to plagiarism. When this point was queried, we were given assurances that relevant provisions exist in the regulations. No mention was made to copyright, intellectual property and ownership of intellectual property rights in the documentation and discussion. Also, no consideration has been taken of recent developments in open access publications and how the Department is planning to adhere to such requirements.

6.9 Research time was not explicitly budgeted for, and as such it does not comply with European and international standards

## Findings

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

It is hard to over-emphasise the significance of resources that need to be allocated to research. A successful research strategy requires time, resources and appropriate mentoring support. Despite reassurances that the personal development of the faculty is at the heart of the research strategy (as indicated by the provision for self-evaluation processes in particular), the provision of research time and resources should be more clearly articulated. Having a specified research time allocation is important, as staff time is likely to be taken by teaching and admin duties. When questioned on the research time allocation, we received conflicting responses: we were told that by law staff should teach no more than 12 hours per week (which in reality is 9 hours), whereas another member of staff mentioned that this may be 4-6 hours per week. No account was provided of time expected to be spent on admin duties. We would strongly emphasise the need for ring-fencing research time, if a thriving research culture is to be instilled. There was no mention of research leave available to staff (both in the application, and in the discussion), and as such, we can only presume that such leave is not envisaged. Too much emphasis is placed on the Departmental Law Journal. Whilst this can be an important marketing tool, staff should be encouraged and supported to publish in internationally ranked peer-reviewed journals in order to raise the University's profile nationally and internationally.

## Strengths

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



On the positive side, it seems that the University is prepared to fully cover conference attendance as well as publication expenses and a research bonus given to those who publish was also mentioned (the details of which were not fully explained, nor included in the documentation provided). A clear research budget and how this is going to be spent is needed (i.e. would staff get a personal research allowance, is there any seedcorn money to prepare research grants/workshops/explore collaborations, can they hire research assistants, and if so, what are the relevant procedures?)

### Areas of improvement and recommendations

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

Whilst mention was made to multi-disciplinarity in the debate, there is no evidence that this is embedded in the wider research policy (as detailed in the research plan), which focuses around establishing a research centre and fostering research networks. Great emphasis is placed on the self-evaluation of research, which could be a useful management tool. A clearly defined research policy, with research goals set for staff commensurate to their level as well as clear and precise rules on mentoring, research development and support would further enhance the existing emphasis on self-assessment. 'Management by objectives' was mentioned in the discussion, but this is not articulated in the paperwork submitted. Fostering a vibrant research culture should be a priority in order to harness the experience of the more experienced members of staff and encourage the development of younger colleagues.

Please ✓ what is appropriate for the following assessment area:

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.	5
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.	5
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
<p>Justify the numerical scores provided for the quality indicators (criteria) by specifying (if any) the deficiencies.</p> <p>Click to enter text.</p>		

### Findings

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

The University has excellent budgetary planning to support all its departments and the law school in particular. The Committee is fully satisfied in this regard.

### Strengths

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

Excellent premises that will ensure student and staff satisfaction and budgetary planning to the highest standard.

*Areas of improvement and recommendations*

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

None.

Please ✓ what is appropriate for the following assessment area:

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.*

We would like to thank the Agency and Ms Prokopa for their guidance and remain at their disposal for any clarifications that may be required in the review process.

## E. Signatures of the EEC

Name	Signature
FullName: ILIAS BANTEKAS	
FullName: OLYMPIA BEKOU	
FullName: NICHOLAS TSAGOURIAS	NT
FullName: GEORGE KYRIAKOU	
FullName: IRENE ANDREOU	

FullName

**Date:** 19 August 2020

