

Doc. 300.1.2

Higher Education Institution's Response

Date: *Date.*

- **Higher Education Institution:**
The Cyprus Institute
- **Town:** Nicosia
- **Programme of study**
Name (Duration, ECTS, Cycle)

In Greek:

Επιστήμη και Τεχνολογία στην Αρχαιολογία και την
Πολιτιστική Κληρονομιά (3 χρόνια, 180 ECTS,
Διδακτορικό)

In English:

Science and Technology in Archaeology and Cultural
Heritage (3 years, 180 ECTS, Doctoral Degree)

- **Language(s) of instruction:** English
- **Programme's status:** New



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. Guidelines on content and structure of the report

- *The Higher Education Institution (HEI) based on the External Evaluation Committee's (EEC's) evaluation report (Doc.300.1.1 or 300.1.1/2 or 300.1.1/3 or 300.1.1/4) must justify whether actions have been taken in improving the quality of the programme of study in each assessment area.*
- *In particular, under each assessment area, the HEI must respond on, without changing the format of the report:*
 - *the findings, strengths, areas of improvement and recommendations of the EEC*
 - *the conclusions and final remarks noted by the EEC*
- *The HEI's response must follow below the EEC's comments, which must be copied from the external evaluation report (Doc.300.1.1 or 300.1.1/2 or 300.1.1/3 or 300.1.1/4).*
- *In case of annexes, those should be attached and sent on a separate document.*

1. Study programme and study programme's design and development (ESG 1.1, 1.2, 1.7, 1.8, 1.9)

Findings

A short description of the situation in the Higher Education Institution (HEI), based on elements from the application for external evaluation and on findings from the onsite visit.

The study programme has a formal status and corresponds to the EQF. It is well designed and offers students an overview about Archaeological Science and computational and digital developments in Cultural Heritage. The mandatory course is designed for the PhD programme while the elective courses can be chosen from a variety of options from both the MSc and the PhD programmes. It offers much flexibility (tailor-made programs) and the students are able to pursue their PhD research and studies according to their interests in specific specializations. Most of the workload is assigned to the writing of the dissertation. The programme has clear objectives and students have easy access to the relevant information. Expectations are clearly communicated to the students. There is a policy of quality assurance as well as institutional monitoring and review. Students are able to proceed smoothly and well-supervised. Students receive support and guidance for their respective career paths.

Strengths

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

The major strength of the PhD programme is its unique interdisciplinarity in Archaeological Science and (digital and science-based) Cultural Heritage, the research focus, the excellent staff/student ratio and the dedication of the teachers to communicate with the students. A very low drop-out rate of students attests to the excellent admission criteria and the guidance throughout the study programme. The laboratory facilities assure a very strong practical component in the programme and cutting-edge scientific methodologies. The study programme attracts many students from abroad.

Areas of improvement and recommendations

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

A mandatory course in research ethics and scientific integrity should be considered for integration into the programme (**response 1**).

The Cyprus Institute response:

1. The recommendation for the inclusion of a course in research ethics and scientific integrity is well received and will be appropriately addressed in the program's course offerings. To better address the specific needs, an introduction to key issues in research ethics and scientific integrity will be properly integrated in the mandatory course, ACH500. Furthermore, the available offering of courses in research reading and writing, DCH404, will be properly enriched to address these topics. Additionally, another tool for addressing this matter, is the transferrable skills course that will be offered once a year and will be flexible in content. The

transferrable skills course could accommodate the needs of students regarding the aforementioned topics.

2. Student – centred learning, teaching and assessment

(ESG 1.3)

Findings

A short description of the situation in the Higher Education Institution (HEI), based on elements from the application for external evaluation and on findings from the onsite visit.

Cyl has a strong research-led teaching and learning ethos and is well placed to train the next generation of scholars in the field of cultural heritage and scientific archaeology. The staff is highly interdisciplinary, cutting across multiple fields, but we note that cultural-historical specialisations (compartmented to applied heritage studies), such as ancient history, art history (apart from architectural history) and historical archaeology, are somewhat underrepresented (**response 1**).

Strengths

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

The teaching and learning of the STARC programme offer a highly successful model for an interdisciplinary PhD programme in the field of scientific archaeology and Digital Cultural Heritage. There is an excellent suite of practical training (both practicals in the labs and hands-on training with materials, methods and models), and availability of cutting-edge research infrastructure and tools.

Areas of improvement and recommendations

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

We note that the Comprehensive Examination at the end of the first year is the main requirement that must be met for progression. We were told that all students pass this exam, due to the extensive preparation of the Supervisory Committee. We advise them to review the form, status and role of this exam, and to consider whether a more substantive pass/fail model would be appropriate in practice to assure quality (**response 2**).

The Cyprus Institute response:

1. We would like to note that the primary focus of the program is science and technology enhanced research in archaeology and cultural heritage, as part of a school with a general strong orientation in science and technology. As highlighted in the report, our interdisciplinary staff address the needs of the program with all of our faculty having solid backgrounds and activity in humanities and archaeological research. As such, cultural-historical approaches are well embedded in the programme. Responding to the recommendation, we will further enhance and emphasize these perspectives in the content of our courses and in the overall descriptions of the programme. At the same time, we will continue to strengthen and enrich our capacity to engage a range of faculty and instructors with strong humanities focus. We also need to underscore that the structure of our programme allows for the proper

engagement of external experts in advisory committees (suited to the needs of students' research) and also permits students to enhance their doctoral studies experience benefitting from opportunities in Cyprus and abroad.

2. Firstly, we would like to note that apart from the Comprehensive Examination, the Dissertation Advisory Committee (DAC) has to fill a research evaluation report at the end of every year as part of the continuous student assessment. In the research evaluation report, the DAC members are asked to review the student's progress. If the student has not made satisfactory progress, then the issue is further discussed by the Academic Committee that will decide about the future of the student.

Furthermore, the Comprehensive Examination is conducted at the end of the first year in order to review the students' proposal, ideas, originality of research, research questions, objectives and methodology. On the 'PhD Comprehensive Examination Report', the DAC members are asked to comment on the originality of the project, its feasibility (including a timeline), the structure and any recommendations they may have. Although the majority of our students pass this exam due to their high academic level, their preparation and the support they receive, the outcomes of the exam can be the following (stated on our 'PhD Comprehensive Examination Report'):

- i. Advancement of the student to the PhD candidacy level.
- ii. Revision and re-submission of the proposal within maximum 6 months for reviewing.
- iii. Rejection of the advancement of the student to the PhD candidacy level and the candidacy is terminated.

Therefore, we do include a Pass/Fail model (represented by n. 1 and n.3) but we also give a second opportunity to students that their proposal might need a few revisions to resubmit for a second review.

The small number of students and the highly selective admission process lead to a very high student success rate. Additionally, the very close relationship with their DAC and the support and guidance they receive from the committee and the supervisor set the foundations for a successful comprehensive exam.

3. Teaching staff (ESG 1.5)

Findings

A short description of the situation in the Higher Education Institution (HEI), based on elements from the application for external evaluation and on findings from the onsite visit.

The teaching staff is adequately qualified to implement the objectives and planned learning outcomes of the study program, and to ensure the quality and sustainability of the teaching and learning. Overall, the quality of both the program and staff involved is considered to be high. The scientific staff of Cyl STARC forms a close community of engaged scholars and colleagues who perform in an excellent way – in research, teaching, and integrating these tasks within Cyl STARC.

Strengths

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

The teaching staff of STARC is diverse, international and interdisciplinary. They form a strong team of colleagues who collaborate closely to offer a high-quality program to their students. Scientific staff are furthermore very successful in obtaining research grants (Horizon Europe, Marie Curie ITN etc.) which is necessary for offering PhD students a research-intensive learning environment and (where possible) a position as research assistant. Research output is of high quality and clearly related to STARC's program, of which the students profit as well. The staff's network of international partnerships is well-developed so that students have ample opportunities to supplement their studies and research abroad. The committee furthermore classifies the synergy of teaching and research within STARC as excellent.

Areas of improvement and recommendations

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

The only reason why "teaching staff recruitment and development" is considered "partially compliant" is the apparent lack of an explicit career development plan for scientific staff. The staff members themselves seem to be satisfied and confident with their position (as the interviews show), but a transparent and fair career development plan and corresponding HR policy, is of crucial importance to attract young talent and ensure work and career satisfaction for experienced staff. In particular, the EEC was not able to ascertain whether teaching excellence is fully reflected in Cyl's promotion and tenure procedures. Such a transparent development plan is also necessary to ensure the scientific and social sustainability of the successful STARC community in the long term. The committee therefore strongly advises to develop such policies, including criteria for promotion, possibilities for tenure track positions and conditions for offering young academics a good starting position on the (international) job market (**response 1**).

The Cyprus Institute response:

1. At the Cyl we do have a well-established career development plan for all categories of the staff including faculty. The career development plan was created as an official HR policy and is clear, transparent and known to all staff.

There are three academic ranks within the Cyl Academic Job Ladder, following the most prevalent system internationally: Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor. Each rank requires different and increasing levels of qualifications and achievements. The rank of Assistant Professor is tenure-track, the rank of Associate Professor may be tenured or tenured track depending on the faculty member's credentials and the rank of Professor is tenured. In certain cases, an Assistant Professor may be promoted to Associate Professor but remain in a tenure-track (non-tenured Associate Professor).

Assistant Professors are required to be considered for promotion to any higher-level, no later than seven (7) years after their appointment as faculty members at the Institute, while Associate Professors are required to be considered for promotion to Professor no later than

five (5) years after their appointment or promotion. Non-tenured Associate Professors are considered for tenure no later than three (3) years after their appointment. Applications for promotion prior to the aforementioned 7, 5 and 3-year milestones are encouraged, provided that the criteria for promotion are met, but not earlier than 1 year since the individual's last promotion or appointment.

In deciding whether to promote an individual, the Institute takes into account contributions to: (A) Research, (B) Education, (C) Leadership and Management, and (D) Profession and Practice. The four criteria are interrelated and candidates are expected to demonstrate achievements in all of them. Each individual case is judged on its own merits. Indicators of achievement are set for each category and they are used against the achievements and overall work of the faculty during the promotion process.

Regarding the activities in education and training these include creative and clear teaching; innovative and flexible methods of delivery; supervision of postgraduate students; advising PhD and other postgraduate research projects, a well-developed understanding of how students learn effectively; the development and design of appropriate curricula and/or courses; organisation and coordination of complex postgraduate programmes; organisation and delivery of training workshops; design of appropriate assessment methods; course evaluation; incorporating change to meet the changing needs of students and the profession; tutoring; student support, welfare, pastoral care; outreach work.

For promotions to Associate Professor an individual is expected to demonstrate among others, significant evidence of contributions to teaching and practical training that have led to improvements and/or innovation in courses/module design and delivery. For promotions to Professor, among others, it is expected that individuals show clear evidence of excellence in training and teaching delivery and/or innovative practice which has greatly enhanced and/or changed the nature of training, learning and teaching in the applicant's field.

Finally, we are currently working on the final stages of a new HR policy, specifically designed for the newly recruited faculty members. This policy is of utmost importance for the Institute as it will help attract young talent of high-calibre as the EEC suggests.

4. Student admission, progression, recognition and certification

(ESG 1.4)

Findings

A short description of the situation in the Higher Education Institution (HEI), based on elements from the application for external evaluation and on findings from the onsite visit.

Normal international standards of PhD admission apply, i.e. a Masters degree in an appropriate area is needed. Access policies are clear, transparent, and were available in the published handbook. There is a process of evaluation of incoming applications where two assessments of each are made, and a committee makes a recommendation to accept, request clarification, or reject. At the end of the first year the Comprehensive Examination assesses the student's progress, and

at the end of the programme there is a formal viva examination. The assessment criteria are published in the handbook.

Students are admitted with both MA and MSc degrees. This fosters a culture of interdisciplinarity in Cyl.

The present proposal entails a reduction in the taught component of the programme from 20 ECTS to 10 (**response 1**).

Strengths

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

The remarkably high completion rate suggests the process is functioning well; although we reiterate our observation above (Section 2) about the Comprehensive Examination being passed by everyone. All standards are publicly available. We were able to ascertain that students have a clear understanding of what is expected of them in terms of their progression and certification. The committee structure which oversees certification and progression means that staff from different areas can input directly into a student's supervision, giving different disciplinary perspectives from which the students clearly benefit.

Areas of improvement and recommendations

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

We explored in some detail the limitations of the conventional humanities PhD thesis for a programme of this kind. We received a clear message from our visit that the exact form of the dissertation, and the role of published papers, is a "work in progress" but should remain flexible (depending on the nature of the research and the PhD's career perspective), and we would urge all members of the Cyl community to continue the conversation about what interdisciplinary assessment should look like in an archaeological science and cultural heritage programme (**response 2**).

We would also urge Cyl to clarify whether publication of an article in a peer-reviewed journal and submission of a second paper is a necessary requirement for completion of the programme. We understood this to be the case from our visit, but could find no reference to this requirement in the documentation (**response 3**).

While we acknowledge the remarkably high level of student satisfaction with the programme, we remain concerned that there is not a clear mechanism for dealing with student complaints or resolving disputes. Formal and informal relationships with supervisors are clearly central to this programme, and we understood that most problems are raised and solved with the supervisor in the first instance. The risk of a complaint about a supervisor arising in the future should, we feel, be addressed (**response 4**).

As with many other administrative areas of the programme, we feel the arrangements for admission, progression and certification function well at the present scale, but would struggle to cope with any further expansion (**response 5**).

The Cyprus Institute response:

1. Through the courses offered in this programme, students have the opportunity to gain skills and knowledge necessary for their research. There is one mandatory course of 10 ECTS that is obligatory for all PhD students. The mandatory course introduces the students to all essential approaches and methodologies. We thus, consider it vital for all PhD students to attend it; especially because students from the Science and Technology in Archaeology and Cultural Heritage come from various fields and have different backgrounds. The remaining 10 ECTS (coming from courses) are gained through either one elective course of 42 hours (10 ECTS) or two elective courses of 21 hours each (5 ECTS). These elective courses (including the Master's and PhD courses of the other programmes) aim to equip the doctoral students with not only more specialized skills but also more interdisciplinary skills and methodologies. In consequence, we consider both the mandatory course as well as the electives as vital components in the formation of our doctoral students.
2. As discussed during the visit, this particular issue is addressed in direct relation to particular topics, research fields, approaches and methodologies focusing on the needs, interests and plans of doctoral students. As mentioned, interdisciplinary assessment remains a central matter of conversation which our programme is well-designed to properly address through its flexible capacity to provide tailor-made focus to the doctoral work of individual students.
3. In the Student Handbook, it is clearly stated that: *'The PhD thesis must be accompanied by at least two scientific publications, of which one is either published or accepted for publication and the other one is submitted for publication'*. In the handbook, we also provide clarifications with regards to the publications:
 - a) The publications must be readily accessible by the international research community and indexed in at least two out of three major Science Citation Index (SCI) platforms i.e. Scopus, Web of Science, Google Scholar.
 - b) Invited publications, opinion articles, editorials etc., which are not peer-reviewed are not eligible. Conference proceedings that do not include a full article and are not peer-reviewed as well as extended abstracts are not eligible.
 - c) Both publications must be linked to the topic of the PhD thesis and report original research conducted by the candidates during the period of their studies.
 - d) The PhD candidate must be the main contributor in both publications and is typically expected to be the first author in these publications. If this is not evident by the order in which the authors are listed, it should be clarified in a footnote. The contribution of all co-authors must be mentioned in other appropriate sections of the article or in a memo sent to the Graduate School from the corresponding author unambiguously demonstrating that the candidate is the main contributor. Alphabetical order of authors should be avoided when possible.
 - e) The thesis supervisor(s) may or may not be co-author(s) of the publications. Other members of the Thesis Advisory Committee are typically not co-authors of these publications unless this is justified by their contribution(s).
 - f) A publication shall not be submitted as complementary to the thesis of more than one PhD candidate with the exception of publications where a maximum of two candidates are joint primary authors of the publication as this is made evident either by the order that the candidates feature in the author list and a footnote indicating that the two candidates are joint primary authors or by a specific section describing the contribution of each candidate.

- g) It is the Advisor's responsibility to guide the student through the PhD publication requirements and to make sure that the requirements are met. The Graduate School is responsible to verify that the aforementioned criteria are satisfied before it authorizes the submission of the thesis.
4. We would, firstly, like to thank the EEC for pointing out that the aforementioned matter needs additional clarification. We would also like to inform the EEC that we have already in place the necessary policies and statutes for student complaints, and especially for student complaints towards their supervisors. The policies and procedures are described in detail in the Student Handbook (p. 32-33), which was shared with the EEC before the re-accreditation visit.

Students can address their complaints and issues through several structures. The Graduate School has recently introduced a Student Welfare Officer, whose role is to be available for the students to address any issues, concerns, problems that may arise during their studies at the Institute with the overall goal of making the student experience as rewarding and fruitful as possible.

In addition, students can contact either the faculty members (if the concern is related to a course) or their supervisor for any problems. If a resolution is not achieved at this first level, or if speaking with the faculty member/supervisor presents a conflict of interest for the student, the latter should proceed to speak with the Program Coordinator. The following can be contacted, if the issue persists:

- a) Dissertation Advisory Members
- b) Academic Committee
- c) Associate Provost
- d) Provost

It should be noted that the aforementioned are in order of contact.

For serious grievances, there is in place an established and approved mechanism which includes a formal written complaint and its examination by an ad hoc grievance committee, composed by the Associate Provost. The written complaint should be filed within two months of the event to which it refers to and should include the following, as appropriate:

- a) Statement of the allegation;
- b) Description of the alleged facts;
- c) Summary of steps he/she already has taken in an attempt to resolve the problem;
- d) Name(s) of the person(s) thought to be responsible for the alleged events;
- e) Other facts considered to be pertinent to the case;
- f) Signature of the person initiating the complaint.

The committee meets with both parties and any other people that could shed light on the events. A report written by the committee, after examining all facts, is forwarded to the President who is responsible for the final actions.

5. We would like to inform the External Committee that we are taking the necessary measures in order to make sure that all our processes will continue to be operating smoothly even if our

student community faces a great expansion. We have concluded a market research for a Student Information System and we are close to making an agreement for one. Most of the procedures for admission, progression and certification will be automated and our administrative personnel will therefore, be able to cope with a future expansion. However, we would like to point out that no serious expansion of the student community is foreseen within the next few years as this is beyond the strategic objectives of the Graduate School.

5. Learning resources and student support

(ESG 1.6)

Findings

A short description of the situation in the Higher Education Institution (HEI), based on elements from the application for external evaluation and on findings from the onsite visit.

Adequate teaching and learning resources are available. The laboratories and the technical equipment including the IT infrastructure are outstanding and assure that students receive an up-to-date best practice education. Although the staff and student numbers of the Institute have increased considerably over the last years, the premises seem to be adequate and are constantly expanded. Human support resources are available, both on a formal institutional level as well as on an informal personal level (due to the small size of the institute). Students receive individual support by their supervisors.

Strengths

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

The learning and research resources are outstanding and offer the students the opportunity to undertake original and individual research, making this a very competitive programme on an international level. The integration of students into research projects encourages students in their career as junior researchers. The EEC was also impressed by the strong financial support (tuition fee waiver, fellowships, research placements) that the institute offers to the PhD students.

Areas of improvement and recommendations

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

The evaluation committee got the impression that the library resources could be improved, and that Library itself should be expanded, although it is obvious that Archaeological Sciences and Digital Cultural Heritage research bibliography mostly is available online. If the institution continues to grow, we further recommend that more formal HR processes be implemented (**response 1**).

The Cyprus Institute response:

1. We do agree with the EEC that our physical library should be expanded and we have already enriched it with new books proposed by our faculty members. We do recognize its importance and we will continue to work towards its expansion. As our student community is still relatively small, it does not allow for more formal HR processes to be implemented but we will certainly take into consideration the EEC's advice as we grow. However, it is important to highlight

that we offer our students a number of online library resources. For instance, our collaboration with the University of Illinois, provides full access, to both students and staff, to the electronic library of the university which is one of the richest academic libraries in the world regarding online books, journals and databases. In addition, we have recently become members of the Consortium of Cypriot Libraries, which is an initiative by local HEIs for creating a network and achieve better prices in securing access for our students and faculty to various other online journals and databases. The Graduate School also covers the access to the physical library of the University of Cyprus for our students, which is in very close proximity to our campus. Our students also have access to a number of local libraries such as the library of the Cyprus American Archaeological Research Institute and the library and archives of the Archbishop Makarios III foundation.

6. Additional for doctoral programmes (ALL ESG)

Findings

A short description of the situation in the Higher Education Institution (HEI), based on elements from the application for external evaluation and on findings from the onsite visit.

We are satisfied that student selection criteria, details on the formatting and structure of the dissertations and arrangements for supervision committees all comply with the necessary standards and requirements. See above, section 4, for more detailed observations.

Strengths

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

The programme is highly competitive, with stringent selection criteria. We learned that the acceptance rate is just 20%, and the student completion rate is exceptionally high.

Areas of improvement and recommendations

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

It was apparent that some resources are available to students for travel and other research costs, but this is ad hoc, and based on negotiation with individual supervisors. We would recommend that a set budget be made available for these purposes that is more equally accessible to all PhD's (**response 1**).

In general, current resourcing and staffing levels can support the teaching and learning model of STARC. However, it may not scale well in the face of future growth, and we would advise that the present staff/student ratio should not increase in the future (**response 2**).

The Cyprus Institute response:

1. A new policy has been recently introduced by the Office of Graduate Studies for funding travel expenses for conferences. More precisely, a call for applications is now advertised to all doctoral students twice per year (one in the fall and one in the spring semester). Students

have to submit an application to the Graduate School with all the details related to their participation in the conference and an estimated budget. All applications will be assessed by the School, and based on specific criteria, a limited number of applicants will receive funding.

2. We consider our low student to faculty ratio one of the strongest advantages and the main characteristics of our school and therefore, we intend to remain loyal to it. Our strategy is that the students' numbers can only grow when there is an aligned growth of the teaching and learning resources and staff.

B. Conclusions and final remarks

Please provide constructive conclusions and final remarks which may form the basis upon which improvements of the quality of the programme of study under review may be achieved, with emphasis on the correspondence with the EQF.

The EEC was highly impressed with the rigour, scientific quality, innovation and scope of the programme, and with the quality and interdisciplinarity of the enthusiastic staff. Cyl has enjoyed remarkable success in international grant capture, and overall student satisfaction is extremely high. This gives us a high level of confidence in the application for this programme.

We identified some areas which Cyl may wish to consider to make it even better, and to put it on a more robust footing. We consider these factors to be institutional and technical, rather than intellectual. Overall, the whole edifice functions extremely well at its present scale, but we note that it is unlikely to be able to expand much further in this model (although we are cognizant of the Provost's remarks that this is not the intention) (**see response 5, Section 4 and response 2, Section 6**).

We also noted the overall emphasis on research excellence, and commend the emphasis we saw on integrating students in research practice. However, the fact that while there is a clear pathway for recognizing research excellence for staff (for example through tenure, promotion etc), the pathways for recognizing and rewarding excellent teaching are less clear. We recommend that Cyl should consider making the career structure for staff clearer (**see response 1, Section 3**).

In tandem with this, an academic institution which relies to such an extent on external research income (and applies generous reduction in its fees to students on the back of this) is – however strong its track record – at some risk of events beyond its control. We would urge the Cyl to keep this in mind.

The Cyprus Institute response:

This review has helped us decide to start a process to review our tuition fees. We wish to try to charge at a level appropriate for, and sustainable within, the Cyprus context. We note that few Cyprus higher education institutions charge real full costs in this regard, which limits our room for change. We note the recommendation to be cautious about applying excessive discounts and failing to recoup some substantial part of teaching costs via fees in the absence of any government or other funding to cover these.



Finally, we were very greatly impressed by the apparently very high level of student satisfaction and low drop-out rate; but we had some concerns about the lack of detail with regard to robust systems for dealing with complaints and disputes that arise in any academic organization (**see response 4, Section 4**).

C. Higher Education Institution academic representatives

<i>Name</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>Signature</i>
Dr Chrysanthia Leontiou	Head of the Office of Graduate Studies	
Associate Prof. Nikolas Bakirtzis	Program Coordinator	
Prof. George Christophides	President of The Cyprus Institute and Provost of the Graduate School	

Date: 08/06/2021

