



NEAPOLIS UNIVERSITY PAFOS

**SCHOOL OF ARCHITECTURE, LAND AND
ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES**

**CLARIFICATIONS ON THE EXTERNAL EVALUATION
REPORT**

for the Postgraduate Master in Science (MSc) Program in

**Environmental Impacts Assessment and Sustainability
Management
(in short EIASM)**

May 2017

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION	3
CLARIFICATIONS AND ANSWERS TO THE EXTERNAL EVALUATION COMMITTEE FINDINGS.....	4
CLARIFICATIONS AND ANSWERS ON THE CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS OF THE EXTERNAL EVALUATION COMMITTEE	24
ANNEX I.....	29
ACADEMIC CALENDAR 2017-2019.....	29
ANNEX II.....	32
CURRICULUM VITAE OF PROFESSOR SOLON XENOPOULOS.....	32
PROGRAM DIRECTOR	32
ANNEX III.....	35
CALCULATION WITH COST SALARY ANALYSIS.....	35
ANNEX IV	36
TABLE 2: COURSE DISTRIBUTION PER SEMESTER ACCORDING TO DOCUMENT 200.1	36
ANNEX V	37
ANNEX 1 – LIST OF COMPULSORY COURSES AND ELECTIVE COURSES ACCORDING TO DOCUMENT 200.1.....	37
ANNEX VI.....	38
ANNOUNCEMENT FOR LECTURER	38
ANNEX VII.....	41
BOOKS INVOICES	41

INTRODUCTION

The present document has been prepared within the framework of the External Evaluation of the Postgraduate Master in Science (MSc) Program in Environmental Impacts Assessment and Sustainability Management by the External Evaluation Committee and the report submitted to the Cyprus Agency of Quality Assurance and Accreditation in Higher Education by the latter, 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 2016” [N. 136 (I)/2015]. The evaluation of the aforementioned postgraduate program took place at the 24th of May 2017 at the Premises of Neapolis University.

The present document aims to clarify and or answer and discuss the findings of the External Evaluation Committee.

CLARIFICATIONS AND ANSWERS TO THE EXTERNAL EVALUATION COMMITTEE FINDINGS

II. The internal evaluation procedure (page 5 of the Evaluation Report)

Finding by the External Evaluation Committee

“...Some elements were not covered in the application e.g., research, viability and resourcing...”

University comments

The document prepared by Neapolis University for the approval of the Postgraduate Master in Science (MSc) Program in Environmental Impacts Assessment and Sustainability Management and submitted to DIPAE was according to Document: 200.1 “APPLICATION FOR EVALUATION – ACCREDITATION- PROGRAM OF STUDY”. In Document 200.1 there were no clear requirements for submission of information for research, viability and resourcing. Yet, in the document prepared by Neapolis University and submitted to DIPAE, relevant information is provided, as well as in the site of Neapolis (www.nup.ac.cy) and in documents submitted by the University in the context of gaining Operating License. Furthermore, during the External Evaluation Committee visit at the 24th of May 2017 complementary information was provided and a feasibility study for the Program was submitted to DIPAE on the 25th of May according to the instructions of the External Evaluation Committee.

Regarding research activities, of course there are much potential and they will be exploited as soon as the Program is approved. Program’s teaching staff will formulate research proposals for submission for funding, in cooperation with the Research Office of the University. Some of the teaching personnel have already started working towards the implementation of the aforementioned so as soon as students reach the moment for their thesis there will be potential for students to participate in research activities.

Finding by the External Evaluation Committee

“The internal evaluation report prepared by the University did not raise any specific weaknesses or points of further improvements for the program and this casts a shadow on the institution’s capacity for practicing reflection and continuously improving its educational and research activities and practices.”

University comments

The University implements internal mechanisms and procedures for identifying weaknesses and points of further improvements for all Programs. Certainly if such cases rise when the Program starts, then appropriate measures and alterations will be implemented to face out weaknesses and needs for further improvements. Please see paragraph 9 (pages 112-114) of the Document submitted to DIPAE for the Program’s approval. The same procedures for Quality Assurance apply for all Programs of the University and the same procedures will be applied for the Postgraduate Master in Science (MSc) in Environmental Impacts Assessment and Sustainability Management as well. Furthermore, please see below:

Internal Quality Assurance System - Process of a program evaluation

(Where PODSPROSE: Online Diagnostics System, SAR: Self-Assessment Report)

Every 3 to 5 years program coordinators will organize a self-assessment based on the Basic Program Quality scan of PROSE, and produce an extensive Program Self-

Assessment Report (P-SAR). Administrative units also produce a SAR, but on the basis of a selected list of thematic questionnaires in the PROSE system. In a SAR, descriptive elements are limited. The focus is on evaluation of strong and weak points. Key criteria are:

- ☐ Description of the program and course units
 - % of course units for which all course descriptions according to the Bologna declaration (learning outcomes, teaching methods, assessment criteria) are adequately present in the consulting section of the program, both from the viewpoint of the (potential) student and the educational expert.
- ☐ Validation of the program and course units
 - The extent to which the goals and methods are validated by internal and external experts/peers.
 - The adequacy with which the program has changed in the past 3 to 5 years.
 - The successful implementation of requirements formulated by a previous check-up or audit.
- ☐ Student attraction and student admission
 - Success of the program in relation to similar programs in other institutions
 - Validation of previously acquired competences
- ☐ Curriculum design
 - flexibility of the program
 - coherence of the program
- ☐ Teaching and learning methods
 - adequacy of teaching methods
 - innovative approaches
 - quality of teaching/tutoring practice
- ☐ Assessment
 - adequacy of assessment methods
 - innovative approaches
 - quality of assessment practice
- ☐ Study load and study progress
 - retention rates
 - passing rates
 - performance outcomes (performance of students who pass)
 - adequacy of study load and study duration
- ☐ Quality management
 - adequacy of the quality control in the program
 - quality of diagnostics and the improvement plans
 - performance of the improvement projects
- ☐ Organization
 - adequacy of academic staff in number and competence
 - working conditions and opportunities for academic staff
 - evaluation and support for academic staff
 - adequacy of setting and equipment for teaching and learning

Quality improvement planning

On the basis of the self-assessment and review reports (in which intended improvement goals are identified), and on the basis of results of questionnaires, observations and measurements, the Quality Management unit coordinates and supports the quality improvement planning by making an inventory of plans, creating links between improvement projects, and accentuating progress and outcomes.

For this purpose, use is made of the PRIOR method in setting priorities for improvement plans (and by using the prioritizing suggestions in PODS(PROSE Online Diagnostics System)). PODS is also used for elaborating project plans that contain 5 to 15 actions that have to be coordinated.

PROSE Online Diagnostics (PODS) is implemented in the operational management of Neapolis. The quality manager is the Online Account Manager (OAM) of PODS. Unit managers can have an access as online diagnostics managers, to activate and manage

online consultations/questionnaires. The diagnostics result automatically in reports, ready to be used in consensus meetings or for decision-making.

PROSE Diagnostics are based on the involvement of many participants through the PODS online tool, and the discussion in a consensus group based on the questionnaire results. The system gives the opportunity to involve all teaching and administrative staff online, and then have a consensus meeting on the basis of the results. In this discussion, use is also made of satisfaction questionnaires. The consensus meeting produces the final scores (thus yielding the quality indicators based on self-assessment) and also the priorities for improvement.

Teaching staff can use PODS for organizing anonymous feedback from students. For this purpose, the Quality Management unit delivers a one-page guideline and a temporary access to the system. For certain purposes or units the anonymous survey option can be used, which allows users to generate custom-made questionnaires that can be filled out online by huge numbers of respondents without access limitations.

Indicators

Quality indicators are based in part on self-assessment by staff, which in their turn rely largely on feedback from respondents. Besides the quality indicators based on self-assessment, there are also indicators based on objective measurements. The set of indicators is revised at least every three years.

Neapolis chooses for a set of indicators that are essentially linked to quality issues. For example, the number of typographical errors in brochures may tell something about the printing process, but not about the quality of the content. It is dangerous to pin down the multidimensional quality of things to one element of it.

Finding by the External Evaluation Committee

"It should be noted that in most instances there were no justifications/descriptions in the internal evaluation report. This to some extent reflects the overall approach to quality assurance at the University, which seems to be present at the institution level, in accordance with national laws and guidelines, but less evident at the program level. Any judgment by the committee on quality assurance specific to the program is thus reserved until such procedures are fully defined, in place and/or implemented during the first year of implementation of such a program".

University comments

Please see paragraph 9 (pages 112-114) of the Document submitted to DIPAE for the Program's approval. The same procedures for Quality Assurance apply for all Programs of the University and the same procedures will be applied for the Postgraduate Master in Science (MSc) in Environmental Impacts Assessment and Sustainability Management as well. Furthermore, please see below:

Internal Quality Assurance System - Process of a program evaluation

(Where PODS PROSE: Online Diagnostics System, SAR: Self-Assessment Report)

Every 3 to 5 years program coordinators will organize a self-assessment based on the Basic Program Quality scan of PROSE, and produce an extensive Program Self-Assessment Report (P-SAR). Administrative units also produce a SAR, but on the basis of a selected list of thematic questionnaires in the PROSE system. In a SAR, descriptive elements are limited. The focus is on evaluation of strong and weak points. Key criteria are:

- ☐ Description of the program and course units
 - % of course units for which all course descriptions according to the Bologna declaration (learning outcomes, teaching methods, assessment criteria) are

- adequately present in the consulting section of the program, both from the viewpoint of the (potential) student and the educational expert.
- ☐ Validation of the program and course units
 - The extent to which the goals and methods are validated by internal and external experts/peers.
 - The adequacy with which the program has changed in the past 3 to 5 years.
 - The successful implementation of requirements formulated by a previous check-up or audit.
- ☐ Student attraction and student admission
 - Success of the program in relation to similar programs in other institutions
 - Validation of previously acquired competences
- ☐ Curriculum design
 - flexibility of the program
 - coherence of the program
- ☐ Teaching and learning methods
 - adequacy of teaching methods
 - innovative approaches
 - quality of teaching/tutoring practice
- ☐ Assessment
 - adequacy of assessment methods
 - innovative approaches
 - quality of assessment practice
- ☐ Study load and study progress
 - retention rates
 - passing rates
 - performance outcomes (performance of students who pass)
 - adequacy of study load and study duration
- ☐ Quality management
 - adequacy of the quality control in the program
 - quality of diagnostics and the improvement plans
 - performance of the improvement projects
- ☐ Organization
 - adequacy of academic staff in number and competence
 - working conditions and opportunities for academic staff
 - evaluation and support for academic staff
 - adequacy of setting and equipment for teaching and learning

Quality improvement planning

On the basis of the self-assessment and review reports (in which intended improvement goals are identified), and on the basis of results of questionnaires, observations and measurements, the Quality Management unit coordinates and supports the quality improvement planning by making an inventory of plans, creating links between improvement projects, and accentuating progress and outcomes.

For this purpose, use is made of the PRIOR method in setting priorities for improvement plans (and by using the prioritizing suggestions in PODS(PROSE Online Diagnostics System)). PODS is also used for elaborating project plans that contain 5 to 15 actions that have to be coordinated.

PROSE Online Diagnostics (PODS) is implemented in the operational management of Neapolis. The quality manager is the Online Account Manager (OAM) of PODS. Unit managers can have an access as online diagnostics managers, to activate and manage online consultations/questionnaires. The diagnostics result automatically in reports, ready to be used in consensus meetings or for decision-making.

PROSE Diagnostics are based on the involvement of many participants through the PODS online tool, and the discussion in a consensus group based on the questionnaire results. The system gives the opportunity to involve all teaching and administrative staff online, and then have a consensus meeting on the basis of the results. In this discussion, use is also made of satisfaction questionnaires. The consensus meeting produces the final

scores (thus yielding the quality indicators based on self-assessment) and also the priorities for improvement.

Teaching staff can use PODS for organizing anonymous feedback from students. For this purpose, the Quality Management unit delivers a one-page guideline and a temporary access to the system. For certain purposes or units the anonymous survey option can be used, which allows users to generate custom-made questionnaires that can be filled out online by huge numbers of respondents without access limitations.

Indicators

Quality indicators are based in part on self-assessment by staff, which in their turn rely largely on feedback from respondents. Besides the quality indicators based on self-assessment, there are also indicators based on objective measurements. The set of indicators is revised at least every three years.

Neapolis chooses for a set of indicators that are essentially linked to quality issues. For example, the number of typographical errors in brochures may tell something about the printing process, but not about the quality of the content. It is dangerous to pin down the multidimensional quality of things to one element of it.

1. EFFECTIVENESS OF TEACHING WORK – AVAILABLE RESOURCES

Finding by the External Evaluation Committee

“1.1.3 The implementation is difficult to assess at this stage, as the program has not yet started. Some of the implementation material (teaching supplements, procedures, web pages) is not ready yet. There is some reasonable expectation that part of the expected material/procedures will be ready once the program starts. For coming academic years it would need to be finalized and “spiked” 9 months before the start of the academic year.”

University comments

Criterion 1.1.3.1. *“...The implementation of a specific academic calendar and its timely publication”* was graded with 2 by the External Evaluation Committee. The calendar was not attached to the document submitted to DIPAE for the program due to the absence of relevant requirement. Yet, the academic calendar has already been prepared (it is attached at the end of the present document as Annex I) and it will be published and available to students as soon as the program is approved. The teaching supplements and web pages will also be prepared as soon as the Program will be approved. The teaching material is under initial preparation and it will be fully prepared as soon as the Program is approved. Teaching supplements, web pages and teaching material will definitely be ready before lectures begin and they will all certainly be available to students early enough. For coming academic years they will all be “spiked” 9 months before the begin of the academic year. Regarding the procedures, the relevant information is provided in the document submitted to DIPAE for the approval of the Program.

Finding by the External Evaluation Committee

“1.1.4, 1.1.5, 1.1.6, 1.1.7, 1.1.8, 1.1.9, 1.1.11 Such processes have not been tested yet as the program has not begun. A reasonable expectation of moderate effectiveness is present”.

University comments

The relevant information is provided in the documents submitted to DIPAE for the approval of the Program and further complementary information was provided to the External Evaluation Committee during visit at the 24th of May 2017. Furthermore, regarding facilities, the members of the External Committee had the chance to visit the University's Library, facilities and infrastructure to be used during the Program. Regarding students' support, communication, feedback, mentoring, etc. please see response to 1.1.10 and 1.1.12. Students are allowed to contact any of their tutors through phone calls, emails and face to face any time for follow up, mentoring, feedback, academic support, etc.

Finding by the External Evaluation Committee

“1.1.10 and 1.1.12 During the Site Visit, based on informal discussions held with random undergraduate students it emerged that there is a friendly attitude by the faculty for dispute resolution. However, according to the information provided no specific mechanism is in place for the program at hand. We recommend that formal processes are developed and implemented in the program”.

University comments

The Criterion 1.1.10 (*Academic mentoring processes are transparent and effective for undergraduate and postgraduate programs and are taken into consideration for the calculation of academic work load*) and the Criterion 1.1.12 (*The program of study*

provides satisfactory mechanisms for complaint management and for dispute resolution) was also graded with 2 by the External Evaluation Committee. Regarding this, please see paragraph 9.3.4. (page 114) of the Document submitted to DIPAE for the program to be approved. According to this paragraph, *“Each student is allocated a personal tutor for the duration of the degree. The purpose of the personal tutorial system is to provide each student with a dedicated point of contact among the staff, with whom they can discuss personal issues relating to family, career, studies, social matters etc., in a positive and sympathetic manner”*. Furthermore, the relevant procedures are based on the general provisions of the University’s operation Statute and it is provided that:

- If students experience lack of communication or supervision by their tutors then they initially address to their tutors and the Program Director. If the problem is not solved then a written request shall be submitted to the Dean of the School.
- Within 10 days, the Dean shall consult with the parties involved and suggest ways for the problem to be solved.

Finding by the External Evaluation Committee

Additional Notes (page 6) of the External Evaluation Committee’s report: “International best practices suggest 30 as the maximum planned number of students per class”.

University comments

Every year no more than 30 students will be allowed to enroll in the Program. The University is well aware about this suggestion.

Finding by the External Evaluation Committee

“1.2.1 Slides, supplementary material, assignments and a written examination are suitable but do not constitute alone an excellent solution. This particularly considering that the on-site elements (lectures/tutorials) are limited to 3hr per 2-week period, whereas the expected standard for 7.5 ECTS would be 8hrs per 2-week period. Therefore, a hybrid approach - comprising traditional lecture-room based approaches as well as elements of distance learning - is expected in order to justify the expected effort of 25hrs per 1 ECTS. We would encourage faculty to check such complementary methods to enhance student learning”.

University comments

Students will need to do self studying and get prepared before each of the lecture for presentations, workshops, etc to demonstrate their self studying, knowledge improvement and to facilitate the interactive approach of the courses. Furthermore, students will be required during each lecture to submit an assignment for which they will need to implement self studying and bibliographic research. The subject/ project will be provided to students during the previous lecture. To facilitate this students will be in continuous contact with each tutor via email. Any questions that may arise from self studying and personal contact will be made public through the program’s platform on Moodle. In addition e-books and online sources will be provided. The evaluation and feedback to the students’ performance on the given assignments will be 100% in classroom.

Finding by the External Evaluation Committee

“1.2.3 The implementation is difficult to assess at this stage, as the program has not yet started. Based on intention alone moderate performance is expected”.

University comments

Students will need to do self studying and get prepared before each of the lecture for presentations, workshops, etc to demonstrate their self studying, knowledge improvement and to facilitate the interactive approach of the courses. Their performance will be evaluated by the tutors and feedback will be provided to students on regular basis. Furthermore, students will need to submit assignments for which they will also be evaluated and feedback on their performance will be given.

Finding by the External Evaluation Committee

“1.2.5 Based on information received during the Site Visit, specific activities are planned for enhancing active participation of students in the educational process. Taking into consideration the positive attitude of faculty on such activities, the committee encourages them to further develop their capacity through appropriate training in modern practices in Higher education and learning. For example how about flip classroom activities, to involve the students in the learning process through the concept of “learning by doing” etc”.

University comments

Students will need to get prepared before each of the lecture for presentations, workshops, etc to demonstrate their self studying, knowledge improvement and to facilitate the interactive approach of the courses. Furthermore, assuming this program is successful and well perceived amongst students and professionals, more laboratory based “thesis” may be proposed at a further stage. This is in light of the launching of the new laboratory facilities of the engineering school, which among others will host environmental science laboratories. Therefore, the suggestion of the External Evaluation Committee is already implemented and it will be further developed. Regarding the further development of faculty capacity through training in modern practices in Higher education and learning, the University will take this suggestion into consideration and implement it as part of the mid-term planning.

Finding by the External Evaluation Committee

“1.3.3 No Visiting Professors seem to be supporting the program of study”.

University comments

Selected courses will be delivered by specialized Professor, Associate Professor as well as Lecturers with expertise and experience that are permanent staff of the University. Therefore, there is no need for the time for Visiting Professors.

Finding by the External Evaluation Committee

“1.3.5. According to the application, 4 out of 7 faculty are Special Teaching Personnel and/or Special Scientists which will cover 5 out of 9 of the classes to be taught (excl. dissertation)”.

University comments

Criterion 1.3.5. (In every program of study the Special Teaching Personnel does not exceed 30% of the Teaching Research Personnel) was graded with 2 by the External Evaluation Committee. The University has taken into consideration the relevant suggestion of the External Evaluation Committee and has announced the position of one Lecturer (please see Annex VI). Therefore, the ratio of full-time to part-time/external personnel will

be addressed so as the Special Teaching Personnel will not exceed 30% of the Teaching Research Personnel.

Finding by the External Evaluation Committee

“1.3.7 The teaching team seems to be motivated and in good collaboration with one another which can be perceived positively. However it must be noted that the ratio of full-time to part-time/external personnel (and their associated part in the teaching efforts) raises some concern and should be addressed as part of the short to mid-term planning of the program”.

University comments

The University has taken into consideration the relevant suggestion of the External Evaluation Committee and has announced the position of one Lecturer (please see Annex VI). Therefore, the ratio of full-time to part-time/external personnel will be addressed so as the Special Teaching Personnel will not exceed 30% of the Teaching Research Personnel.

Finding by the External Evaluation Committee

“1.3.9 The teaching and administrative load of some the involved faculty seems very high and does not provide opportunities for pursuing research”.

University comments

The teaching load of the personnel in the duration of a whole academic year does not exceed the 9 hours/week limit, and this limit is exceeded only in occasions when the teaching load is not even among the winter and the spring semester. The existing teaching load of the faculty allow for their productive engagement with research (publications and research projects) and this is confirmed by the publications presented in the teaching personnel CVs (included in the Document to DIPAE for the program to be approved).

Finding by the External Evaluation Committee

“1.3.10 No planning presented”.

University comments

Criterion 1.3.10 (Future redundancies / retirements, expected recruitment and promotions of academic personnel safeguard the unimpeded implementation of the program of study within a five-year span) was graded with 1 by the External Evaluation Committee.

The University has taken into consideration the suggestion of the External Evaluation Committee to increase the number of permanent full-time Teaching Research Personnel by one. Furthermore, safeguarding the unimpeded implementation of the program of study within a five-year span will be addressed as well with the standard hierarchy that is in place at the university. According to the law the university Professors are evaluated based on their performance in research and teaching. Upon retirement of a specific faculty member, one of lower rank will be naturally promoted.

One of the Program's teaching personnel has already been approved for his appointment in the rank of Assistant Professor from the rank of Lecturer.

Finding by the External Evaluation Committee:

“1.3.11 The program coordinator as suggested in the application (Prof. Solon Xenopoulos) is the Dean of School, which suggests that administrative experience is present. However, the committee cannot further comment on whether he will efficiently coordinate the specific

program of study based on the documents available (his CV was not included in the application)”.

University comments

Criterion 1.3.11 (The program’s Coordinator has the qualifications and experience to efficiently coordinate the program of study) was graded with 2 by the External Evaluation Committee. By mistake the CV of Prof. Solon Xenopoulos was not attached. Please find it in Annex II of this document.

2. PROGRAM OF STUDY AND HIGHER EDUCATION QUALIFICATIONS

Finding by the External Evaluation Committee:

“2.1.3 The committee reserves judgment on this aspect as the relevant legislative framework is still under development”.

University comments

The Program has been planned in order to allow graduates to be able to conform to the provisions of relevant legislative framework which has been developed and is under consultation. Furthermore, the Program has been carefully planned in order to allow graduates to become members of and be accredited by the Royal Institute of Chartered Surveyors (RICS) under the Category of “Environmental Specialists”. RICS is a Professional Body that will allow the Program’s Graduates to be active and considered “competent” as the legislative framework provide for those who examine and contact Environmental Impacts Assessment.

Finding by the External Evaluation Committee:

“2.1.4 The teaching material was not available during the Site Visit to be assessed. Whilst the committee does not raise concerns pertaining to the faculty capacity to produce the required teaching material, it must be noted that its preparation will require considerable time. The program content and methods of assessment were found adequate during the Site”.

University comments

The teaching material is under initial preparation and it will be fully prepared as soon as the Program is approved. Teaching material will definitely be ready before lectures begin and it will certainly be available to students early enough. Furthermore books for every course has been ordered. Please see attached Invoices in Annex VII.

Finding by the External Evaluation Committee:

“2.2.3 The program progression is adequate. Depending on the admissions requirements a number of “bridge” elective courses/seminars might be appropriate in order to facilitate incoming students (such as Introduction to GIS, Introduction to Ecology, Introduction to Mathematical Modelling etc.)”.

University comments

Please see Paragraph 5.1. (pages 35-36) of the Document submitted to DIPAE for the Program’s approval. According to this Paragraph, to be admitted to the master's program candidates must possess a Bachelor of Science degree or equivalent. The general admission criteria are based on the type and quality of previous studies, the grade

obtained in previous studies and the suitability of the candidate for the program of study that has been applied for. The University's admission policy is to make admission offers to applicants who are judged to have the background and abilities to have a reasonable expectation of success in the program to which they are made an offer and who are likely to benefit from university study. Applicants should demonstrate a commitment to a career in Environmental Impact Assessment and Sustainability Management, preferably through previous work experience.

Furthermore, courses provide for introductory lectures that will facilitate students and help them become more familiar with terms and concepts that will rise during next lectures of each course.

Even the aforementioned provisions are in place, the University has taken into consideration the suggestion of the External Evaluation Committee and it is provided that before lectures begin, the last weeks of September tutorials will be provided to students on GIS, Ecology, Sustainability and Mathematical Modelling so as to ensure even more the comfort of incoming students.

Finding by the External Evaluation Committee:

“2.2.5 A number of “bridge” elective courses/seminars are suggested to enhance the program, particularly reflecting the current admissions requirements. See response to question 2.2.3”.

University comments

Criterion 2.2.5. *(The program, in addition to the courses focusing on the specific discipline, includes an adequate number of general education courses)* was graded with 2 by the External Evaluation Committee.

Please see Paragraph 5.1. (pages 35-36) of the Document submitted to DIPAE for the Program's approval. According to this Paragraph, to be admitted to the master's program candidates must possess a Bachelor of Science degree or equivalent. The general admission criteria are based on the type and quality of previous studies, the grade obtained in previous studies and the suitability of the candidate for the program of study that has been applied for. The University's admission policy is to make admission offers to applicants who are judged to have the background and abilities to have a reasonable expectation of success in the program to which they are made an offer and who are likely to benefit from university study. Applicants should demonstrate a commitment to a career in Environmental Impact Assessment and Sustainability Management, preferably through previous work experience.

Furthermore, courses provide for introductory lectures that will facilitate students and help them become more familiar with terms and concepts that will rise during next lectures of each course.

Even the aforementioned provisions are in place, the University has taken into consideration the suggestion of the External Evaluation Committee and it is provided that before lectures begin, the last weeks of September tutorials will be provided to students on GIS, Ecology, Sustainability and Mathematical Modelling so as to ensure even more the comfort of incoming students.

Finding by the External Evaluation Committee:

“2.3.1 According to information provided during the Site Visit, the university has an overarching quality assurance structure that seems to follow the national law/guidelines. A quality assurance implementation specific to the program was not presented”.

University comments

Please see paragraph 9 (pages 112-114) of the Document submitted to DIPAE for the Program's approval. The same procedures for Quality Assurance apply for all Programs of the University and the same procedures will be applied for the Postgraduate Master in Science (MSc) in Environmental Impacts Assessment and Sustainability Management as well. Furthermore, please see below:

Internal Quality Assurance System - Process of a program evaluation

(Where PODS PROSE: Online Diagnostics System, SAR: Self-Assessment Report)

Every 3 to 5 years program coordinators will organize a self-assessment based on the Basic Program Quality scan of PROSE, and produce an extensive Program Self-Assessment Report (P-SAR). Administrative units also produce a SAR, but on the basis of a selected list of thematic questionnaires in the PROSE system. In a SAR, descriptive elements are limited. The focus is on evaluation of strong and weak points. Key criteria are:

- ☐ Description of the program and course units
 - % of course units for which all course descriptions according to the Bologna declaration (learning outcomes, teaching methods, assessment criteria) are adequately present in the consulting section of the program, both from the viewpoint of the (potential) student and the educational expert.
- ☐ Validation of the program and course units
 - The extent to which the goals and methods are validated by internal and external experts/peers.
 - The adequacy with which the program has changed in the past 3 to 5 years.
 - The successful implementation of requirements formulated by a previous check-up or audit.
- ☐ Student attraction and student admission
 - Success of the program in relation to similar programs in other institutions
 - Validation of previously acquired competences
- ☐ Curriculum design
 - flexibility of the program
 - coherence of the program
- ☐ Teaching and learning methods
 - adequacy of teaching methods
 - innovative approaches
 - quality of teaching/tutoring practice
- ☐ Assessment
 - adequacy of assessment methods
 - innovative approaches
 - quality of assessment practice
- ☐ Study load and study progress
 - retention rates
 - passing rates
 - performance outcomes (performance of students who pass)
 - adequacy of study load and study duration
- ☐ Quality management
 - adequacy of the quality control in the program
 - quality of diagnostics and the improvement plans
 - performance of the improvement projects
- ☐ Organization
 - adequacy of academic staff in number and competence
 - working conditions and opportunities for academic staff
 - evaluation and support for academic staff

- adequacy of setting and equipment for teaching and learning

Quality improvement planning

On the basis of the self-assessment and review reports (in which intended improvement goals are identified), and on the basis of results of questionnaires, observations and measurements, the Quality Management unit coordinates and supports the quality improvement planning by making an inventory of plans, creating links between improvement projects, and accentuating progress and outcomes.

For this purpose, use is made of the PRIOR method in setting priorities for improvement plans (and by using the prioritizing suggestions in PODS(PROSE Online Diagnostics System)). PODS is also used for elaborating project plans that contain 5 to 15 actions that have to be coordinated.

PROSE Online Diagnostics (PODS) is implemented in the operational management of Neapolis. The quality manager is the Online Account Manager (OAM) of PODS. Unit managers can have an access as online diagnostics managers, to activate and manage online consultations/questionnaires. The diagnostics result automatically in reports, ready to be used in consensus meetings or for decision-making.

PROSE Diagnostics are based on the involvement of many participants through the PODS online tool, and the discussion in a consensus group based on the questionnaire results. The system gives the opportunity to involve all teaching and administrative staff online, and then have a consensus meeting on the basis of the results. In this discussion, use is also made of satisfaction questionnaires. The consensus meeting produces the final scores (thus yielding the quality indicators based on self-assessment) and also the priorities for improvement.

Teaching staff can use PODS for organizing anonymous feedback from students. For this purpose, the Quality Management unit delivers a one-page guideline and a temporary access to the system. For certain purposes or units the anonymous survey option can be used, which allows users to generate custom-made questionnaires that can be filled out online by huge numbers of respondents without access limitations.

Indicators

Quality indicators are based in part on self-assessment by staff, which in their turn rely largely on feedback from respondents. Besides the quality indicators based on self-assessment, there are also indicators based on objective measurements. The set of indicators is revised at least every three years.

Neapolis chooses for a set of indicators that are essentially linked to quality issues. For example, the number of typographical errors in brochures may tell something about the printing process, but not about the quality of the content. It is dangerous to pin down the multidimensional quality of things to one element of it.

Finding by the External Evaluation Committee:

“2.3.2 This is in place for the overarching structure. Nothing detailed was presented for the specific program. We expect that this will be implemented at program level”.

University comments

Please see paragraph 9 (pages 112-114) of the Document submitted to DIPAE for the Program's approval. The same procedures for Quality Assurance apply for all Programs of the University and the same procedures will be applied for the Postgraduate Master in Science (MSc) in Environmental Impacts Assessment and Sustainability Management as well. Furthermore, please see below:

Internal Quality Assurance System - Process of a program evaluation

(Where PODS PROSE: Online Diagnostics System, SAR: Self-Assessment Report)

Every 3 to 5 years program coordinators will organize a self-assessment based on the Basic Program Quality scan of PROSE, and produce an extensive Program Self-Assessment Report (P-SAR). Administrative units also produce a SAR, but on the basis of a selected list of thematic questionnaires in the PROSE system. In a SAR, descriptive elements are limited. The focus is on evaluation of strong and weak points. Key criteria are:

- ☐ Description of the program and course units
 - % of course units for which all course descriptions according to the Bologna declaration (learning outcomes, teaching methods, assessment criteria) are adequately present in the consulting section of the program, both from the viewpoint of the (potential) student and the educational expert.
- ☐ Validation of the program and course units
 - The extent to which the goals and methods are validated by internal and external experts/peers.
 - The adequacy with which the program has changed in the past 3 to 5 years.
 - The successful implementation of requirements formulated by a previous check-up or audit.
- ☐ Student attraction and student admission
 - Success of the program in relation to similar programs in other institutions
 - Validation of previously acquired competences
- ☐ Curriculum design
 - flexibility of the program
 - coherence of the program
- ☐ Teaching and learning methods
 - adequacy of teaching methods
 - innovative approaches
 - quality of teaching/tutoring practice
- ☐ Assessment
 - adequacy of assessment methods
 - innovative approaches
 - quality of assessment practice
- ☐ Study load and study progress
 - retention rates
 - passing rates
 - performance outcomes (performance of students who pass)
 - adequacy of study load and study duration
- ☐ Quality management
 - adequacy of the quality control in the program
 - quality of diagnostics and the improvement plans
 - performance of the improvement projects
- ☐ Organization
 - adequacy of academic staff in number and competence
 - working conditions and opportunities for academic staff
 - evaluation and support for academic staff
 - adequacy of setting and equipment for teaching and learning

Quality improvement planning

On the basis of the self-assessment and review reports (in which intended improvement goals are identified), and on the basis of results of questionnaires, observations and measurements, the Quality Management unit coordinates and supports the quality improvement planning by making an inventory of plans, creating links between improvement projects, and accentuating progress and outcomes.

For this purpose, use is made of the PRIOR method in setting priorities for improvement plans (and by using the prioritizing suggestions in PODS(PROSE Online Diagnostics System)). PODS is also used for elaborating project plans that contain 5 to 15 actions that have to be coordinated.

PROSE Online Diagnostics (PODS) is implemented in the operational management of Neapolis. The quality manager is the Online Account Manager (OAM) of PODS. Unit managers can have an access as online diagnostics managers, to activate and manage online consultations/questionnaires. The diagnostics result automatically in reports, ready to be used in consensus meetings or for decision-making.

PROSE Diagnostics are based on the involvement of many participants through the PODS online tool, and the discussion in a consensus group based on the questionnaire results. The system gives the opportunity to involve all teaching and administrative staff online, and then have a consensus meeting on the basis of the results. In this discussion, use is also made of satisfaction questionnaires. The consensus meeting produces the final scores (thus yielding the quality indicators based on self-assessment) and also the priorities for improvement.

Teaching staff can use PODS for organizing anonymous feedback from students. For this purpose, the Quality Management unit delivers a one-page guideline and a temporary access to the system. For certain purposes or units the anonymous survey option can be used, which allows users to generate custom-made questionnaires that can be filled out online by huge numbers of respondents without access limitations.

Indicators

Quality indicators are based in part on self-assessment by staff, which in their turn rely largely on feedback from respondents. Besides the quality indicators based on self-assessment, there are also indicators based on objective measurements. The set of indicators is revised at least every three years.

Neapolis chooses for a set of indicators that are essentially linked to quality issues. For example, the number of typographical errors in brochures may tell something about the printing process, but not about the quality of the content. It is dangerous to pin down the multidimensional quality of things to one element of it.

Finding by the External Evaluation Committee:

“2.3.3 This may be in place for the overarching structure. Nothing detailed was presented for the specific program. We expect that this will be implemented at program level”.

University comments

Please see paragraph 9 (pages 112-114) of the Document submitted to DIPAE for the Program's approval. The same procedures for Quality Assurance apply for all Programs of the University and the same procedures will be applied for the Postgraduate Master in Science (MSc) in Environmental Impacts Assessment and Sustainability Management as well. The regulations of the internal quality assurance system are being provided through the Quality Management Handbook, which is being developed. This handbook provides all the essential details regarding the internal quality assurance system, the processes and the quality assurance mechanisms. Furthermore please see respond to 2.3.2 above.

Finding by the External Evaluation Committee:

“2.3.4 The quality assurance process seems to follow at university level the national law and European guidelines. Nothing detailed was presented for the specific program. We expect that this will be implemented at program level. It was not possible for the committee to determine if there are restrictions set by non-academic factors”.

University comments

Please see paragraph 9 (pages 112-114) of the Document submitted to DIPAE for the Program's approval. The same procedures for Quality Assurance apply for all Programs of the University and the same procedures will be applied for the Postgraduate Master in

Science (MSc) in Environmental Impacts Assessment and Sustainability Management as well. Furthermore please see respond to 2.3.2 above.

Finding by the External Evaluation Committee:

“2.4.2 A specific process to ensure learning outcomes are achieved was not presented. It is expected that this will be part of the program coordinator’s operative role”.

University comments

The structure of the Program, the Curriculum, the content, the teaching methods, the assignments and teaching personnel were selected carefully in order to ensure that the learning outcomes will be achieved. Furthermore, frequent meetings between the teaching personnel and the program coordinator will be implemented and evaluation of the Program by students will facilitate the superintendence of the achievement of learning outcomes. Please also see respond to 2.3.2 above.

Finding by the External Evaluation Committee

“2.4.8 The committee found this question as non-applicable”.

University comments

Criterion 2.4.8. *(The recognition and transfer of credit units from previous studies is regulated by procedures and regulations which ensure that the majority of credit units is awarded by the institution which awards the higher education qualification)* was graded by the External Evaluation Committee as non-applicable. It is highly unusual for Masters degrees to accept transfer students. In the unlikely case that we are presented with such a case the transcript of the prior institution will be evaluated by the appropriate members of the faculty. It is possible that additional information may be required by the applicant first academic institution such as curricula etc. The relevant procedure was included in the Document submitted to DIPAE for the Program to be approved. Please see paragraph 5.11 (page 38).

Finding by the External Evaluation Committee

“2.5.2 At the moment there are no international visiting professors supporting this program”.

University comments

Criterion 2.5.2. *(The program attracts Visiting professors of recognized academic standing)* was graded with 2 by the External Evaluation Committee. Selected courses will be delivered by specialized Professor, Associate Professor as well as Lecturers with relevant to their courses expertise and experience. These teaching personnel are permanent staff of the University. Therefore, there is no need for the time for Visiting Professors.

Finding by the External Evaluation Committee

“2.5.4 Based on the information provided the academic profile of the program is compatible with corresponding programs of study internationally. However the committee reserves judgment until the follow-up evaluation after the full implementation of the program”.

University comments

Indeed the structure of the Program, the Curriculum, the content, the teaching methods, the assignments, etc are compatible with corresponding programs of study internationally and especially taking into consideration that the Program's target is allow for graduates to become members of RICS. Therefore, the whole Program has been designed according to other Programs in UK that are similar, accredited and under RICS recognition.

3.RESEARCH WORK AND SYNERGIES WITH TEACHING**Finding by the External Evaluation Committee**

"3.1.2 There is no evidence suggesting that new research results could be incorporated in the program of study.

University comments

Criterion 3.1.2. *(New research results are embodied in the content of the program of study)* was graded with 2 by the External Evaluation Committee. The teaching personnel will take the comment of the External Evaluation Committee into consideration and formulate the content and teaching material in order to include new research results. Furthermore, as soon as the Program begins and students enroll, the teaching staff will formulate research proposals for submission for funding, in cooperation with the Research Office of the University. Some of the teaching personnel have already started working towards implementing the aforementioned comment to the Program.

Any new research results that will arise from work performed at the university, which is relevant to the topic of the course will be available to the students, assuming they have already been presented in peer review journals or conferences. Furthermore, the students will be responsible for the up-to-date evaluation of the literature in the relevant topics. New results that may arise from data collected by the students will be evaluated by the appropriate member of the staff. It is very difficult to ensure that the university will have the funds to support research activities by the students, as it is the case in most Masters Programs throughout the world. Members of the staff, however, in collaboration with the University's Department of Research will constantly evaluate the calls in order to find appropriate themes. It is possible to engage students in the grant application process, assuming they have the capabilities.

Finding by the External Evaluation Committee

3.1.5 External non-governmental research funding is limited and cannot be compared positively to the funding of other institutions in Cyprus and abroad.

University comments

Criterion 3.1.5. *(External, non-governmental, funding for the academic personnel's research activities, is compared positively to the funding of other institutions in Cyprus and abroad)* was graded with 2 by the External Evaluation Committee. Neapolis is a new university. For a university that has only been around for 7 years, it has an excellent track record. So far the university has ensured funds for research in the area of one million Euros. Of course this is a small budget compared to other institutions in Cyprus and elsewhere, however it is unfair to claim that this does not compare favorably to other institutions in Cyprus that are of the same age, because it does compare in a very remarkable way.

Finding by the External Evaluation Committee

“3.1.6, 3.1.7 No evidence or clear policy was provided of internal faculty funding being made available for the academic personnel at the University to carry out research specific to the subject-matter of the program”.

University comments

Criterion 3.1.6. *(Internal funding, of the academic personnel’s research activities, is compared positively to the funding of other institutions in Cyprus and abroad)* and Criterion 3.1.7. *(The policy for, indirect or direct, internal funding of the academic personnel’s research activity is satisfactory)* were both graded with 2 by the External Evaluation Committee.

Regarding the policy for internal faculty funding that should be developed to enable academic personnel at the University to develop relevant research activities, the University already provides for financial support for publications, visits and participation to conferences. Furthermore, the University will take into consideration the comment of the External Evaluation Committee and implement it further.

Finding by the External Evaluation Committee

“3.1.8 The participation is limited and cannot be considered satisfactory”.

University comments

Criterion 3.1.8. *(The participation of students, academic, teaching and administrative personnel of the program in research activities and projects are satisfactory)* was graded with 2 by the External Evaluation Committee. Please see response to External Evaluation Committee’s comment for criterion 3.1.5. Furthermore, as referred to 1.2.5. an environmental science laboratory will be launched and therefore we aspire in having more extensive participation of faculty to research activities once the research facilities will be in place. In addition, once research facilities will be in place more laboratory based “thesis” may be proposed at a further stage for students. Members of the staff, in collaboration with the University’s Department of Research will constantly evaluate the research calls in order to find appropriate themes. It is possible to engage students in the grant application process, assuming they have the capabilities. Some of the teaching personnel have already started working towards the implementation of the aforementioned so as soon as students reach the moment for their thesis there will be potentials for their participation in research activities. Teaching personnel has already extensive research activity and experience and this is demonstrated in their CVs that were included in the Documents submitted to DIPAE for the Program. Currently, two of the teaching personnel are participating as researchers as below:

- (a) Dr Natia Anastasi is participating to the project Engine4F (an Erasmus+ on actions to attract more students to STEM careers) and to CSRC (a Horizon 2020 focusing on the formulation of a Science Center of Excellence in Cyprus)
- (b) Dr. Ioannis Pissourios is participating to the project InHerit (an Erasmus+ on actions to promote cultural heritage as a generator of sustainable development in the field of urban planning)

Up to date, research at Neapolis University has produced 40 peer reviewed publications.

Finding by the External Evaluation Committee

“3.1.9 According to the information provided the participation of students in potential research activities (thesis) is very limited and the focus is set on professional skills”.

University comments

Criterion 3.1.9. (*Student training in the research process is sufficient*) was graded with 2 by the External Evaluation Committee. The criterion in the Document: 200.1 “APPLICATION FOR EVALUATION – ACCREDITATION- PROGRAM OF STUDY” is “*Student training in the research process is sufficient*” and NOT “*Participation of students in potential research activities is sufficient*”. Therefore, the University disagrees with the comment and grade of the External Evaluation Committee, especially taking into consideration the response to 3.1.5., 2.1.5. and 3.1.8 regarding students’ participation in research activities. With reference to students’ training in the research process, the course “Dissertation Seminar” will provide students with skills for research, so as the assignments provided for each of the course to be taught in the program. Furthermore, for all courses self studying is provided and this will certainly include bibliographic research to be done by students.

4. ADMINISTRATION SERVICES, STUDENT WELFARE AND SUPPORT OF TEACHING WORK**Finding by the External Evaluation Committee**

“4.1.2, 4.1.3 No specific information was provided to the committee in relation to such mechanisms. This should be reviewed and addressed by university management in view of the expected future increase of the student population”.

University comments

Please see paragraph 9 and especially paragraph 9.3.4. (page 114) of the Document submitted to DIPAE for the program to be approved. According to this paragraph, “*Each student is allocated a personal tutor for the duration of the degree. The purpose of the personal tutorial system is to provide each student with a dedicated point of contact among the staff, with whom they can discuss personal issues relating to family, career, studies, social matters etc., in a positive and sympathetic manner*”. Furthermore, the relevant procedures are based on the general provisions of the University’s operation Statute.

Finding by the External Evaluation Committee

“4.2.7 No training opportunities seem to be provided by the University in accordance with the oral information provided during the Site Visit. The committee strongly encourages the university to develop such opportunities and all faculties to take advantage of these; in particular not limited to the use of specific tools, but on the pedagogy of higher education and learning”.

University comments

Criterion 4.2.7. (*The teaching personnel are provided with training opportunities in teaching method, in adult education, and in new technologies on the basis of a structured learning framework*) was graded with 2 by the External Evaluation Committee. Before the beginning of each semester, faculty members as well as the Library personnel deliver specialized lectures and organize seminars on the use of Moodle (i.e. of the on-line learning platform of the University) and on the use of the electronic learning resources of the library. In addition, such guidance is offered to any individual (student or teaching personnel) throughout the academic year, upon request. Furthermore, the University will take the suggestion of the External Evaluation Committee into consideration and implement it as part of the mid-term planning of the Program.

Finding by the External Evaluation Committee

“4.3.1 According to the financial projections provided after the Site Visit the budgeted teaching resources are reasonably adequate for the running of the program. The committee suggests that the university reviews its policy regarding the development of academic/teaching personnel in accordance with internationally accepted practices”.

University comments

Furthermore, the University already provides for financial support for publications, visits and participation to conferences. Furthermore, the University has announced the position of one Lecturer (please see Annex VI). The suggestion will be taken into consideration and be implemented as part of the mid-term planning of the Program.

Finding by the External Evaluation Committee

“4.3.3 According to the financial information provided after the Site Visit the remuneration of academic personnel appears relatively low (1.42 FTE = 16 427Euro)”.

University comments

Criterion 4.3.3. *(The remuneration of academic and other personnel is analogous to the remuneration of academic and other personnel of the respective institutions in Cyprus)* was graded with 2 by the External Evaluation Committee.

The way the remuneration cost was calculated is :-

Permanent Academic staff = Teaching hours on Msc Env / 156 (FTE equivalent Hours) @ Salary Cost p.a.

Visiting Academic Staff = Teaching Hours Msc Env @ Hourly Rate agreed with NUP

There was an error in the formula and the cost was understated . Therefore the amount is 26.513 euros per annum and not 16.000 euro for the program. Please find attached the calculation with Salary Cost analysis as Annex III.

CLARIFICATIONS AND ANSWERS ON THE CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS OF THE EXTERNAL EVALUATION COMMITTEE

Suggestion by the External Evaluation Committee

“1. In the case that the board approves the program all teaching material must be produced in a timely manner and before the start of the academic year, in order to ensure adequate quality in the teaching process”.

University comments

The teaching material is under initial preparation and it will be fully prepared as soon as the Program is approved. Teaching material will definitely be ready before lectures begin and it will certainly be available to students early enough. Books for every course have been ordered. Please see attached Invoices.

Suggestion by the External Evaluation Committee

“2. The teaching load of some of the personnel should be reconsidered in order to avoid overloading and to provide development opportunities in accordance with international practices in academic institutions. Furthermore, a transparent policy for internal faculty funding should be developed to enable academic personnel at the University to develop relevant research activities”.

University comments

The teaching load of the personnel in the duration of a whole academic year does not exceed the 9 hours/week limit, and this limit is exceeded only in occasions when the teaching load is not even among the winter and the spring semester. The existing teaching load of the faculty allow for their productive engagement with research (publications and research projects) and this is confirmed by the publications presented in the teaching personnel CVs (included in the Document to DIPAE for the program to be approved). Furthermore, the University has announced the positions of one Lecturer for the Program (please see Annex VI).

Regarding the policy for internal faculty funding that should be developed to enable academic personnel at the University to develop relevant research activities, the University already provides for financial support for publications, visits and participation to conferences. Furthermore, the suggestion will be taken into consideration and be further implemented as part of the mid-term planning of the Program.

Suggestion by the External Evaluation Committee

“3. A transparent and efficient procedure for dispute resolution should be developed and implemented at program level”.

University comments

Please see response to 1.1.2.

Suggestion by the External Evaluation Committee

“4. The ratio of full-time to part-time/external personnel (and their associated part in the teaching efforts) raises some concern and should be addressed as part of the short to mid-term planning of the program. The committee finds that if the program is to be

implemented the university should increase the number of permanent full-time Teaching Research Personnel by one”.

University comments

The University has taken into consideration the relevant suggestion of the External Evaluation Committee and has announced the position of one Lecturer for the Program (please see Annex VI).

Suggestion by the External Evaluation Committee

“5. The committee strongly encourages the university leadership to further develop staff capacity through appropriate training in modern practices in Higher education and learning”.

University comments

The University will take this suggestion into consideration and implement it as part of the mid-term planning.

Suggestion by the External Evaluation Committee

“6. A number of “bridge” elective courses/seminars are suggested to enhance the program, particularly reflecting the current admissions requirements i.e., facilitate incoming student integration (such as Introduction to GIS, Introduction to Ecology, Introduction to Mathematical Modelling etc.)”

University comments

Please see Paragraph 5.1. (pages 35-36) of the Document submitted to DIPAE for the Program's approval. According to this Paragraph, to be admitted to the master's program candidates must possess a Bachelor of Science degree or equivalent. The general admission criteria are based on the type and quality of previous studies, the grade obtained in previous studies and the suitability of the candidate for the program of study that has been applied for. The University's admission policy is to make admission offers to applicants who are judged to have the background and abilities to have a reasonable expectation of success in the program to which they are made an offer and who are likely to benefit from university study. Applicants should demonstrate a commitment to a career in Environmental Impact Assessment and Sustainability Management, preferably through previous work experience.

Furthermore, courses provide for introductory lectures that will facilitate students and help them become more familiar with terms and concepts that will rise during next lectures of the courses.

Even the aforementioned provisions are in place, the University has taken into consideration the suggestion of the External Evaluation Committee and it is provided that before lectures begin, the last weeks of September tutorials will be provided to students on GIS, Ecology, Sustainability and Mathematical Modelling so as to ensure even more the comfort of incoming students.

Suggestion by the External Evaluation Committee

“7. The overarching quality assurance process at university level seems to follow the national law and European guidelines. Should the program be approved the committee expects that such a process will also be implemented at program level.

University comments

Please see paragraph 9 (pages 112-114) of the Document submitted to DIPAE for the Program's approval. The same procedures for Quality Assurance apply for all Programs of the University and the same procedures will be applied for the Program as well. Furthermore, please see below:

Internal Quality Assurance System - Process of a program evaluation

(Where PODS PROSE: Online Diagnostics System, SAR: Self-Assessment Report)

Every 3 to 5 years program coordinators will organize a self-assessment based on the Basic Program Quality scan of PROSE, and produce an extensive Program Self-Assessment Report (P-SAR). Administrative units also produce a SAR, but on the basis of a selected list of thematic questionnaires in the PROSE system. In a SAR, descriptive elements are limited. The focus is on evaluation of strong and weak points. Key criteria are:

- ☐ Description of the program and course units
 - % of course units for which all course descriptions according to the Bologna declaration (learning outcomes, teaching methods, assessment criteria) are adequately present in the consulting section of the program, both from the viewpoint of the (potential) student and the educational expert.
- ☐ Validation of the program and course units
 - The extent to which the goals and methods are validated by internal and external experts/peers.
 - The adequacy with which the program has changed in the past 3 to 5 years.
 - The successful implementation of requirements formulated by a previous check-up or audit.
- ☐ Student attraction and student admission
 - Success of the program in relation to similar programs in other institutions
 - Validation of previously acquired competences
- ☐ Curriculum design
 - flexibility of the program
 - coherence of the program
- ☐ Teaching and learning methods
 - adequacy of teaching methods
 - innovative approaches
 - quality of teaching/tutoring practice
- ☐ Assessment
 - adequacy of assessment methods
 - innovative approaches
 - quality of assessment practice
- ☐ Study load and study progress
 - retention rates
 - passing rates
 - performance outcomes (performance of students who pass)
 - adequacy of study load and study duration
- ☐ Quality management
 - adequacy of the quality control in the program
 - quality of diagnostics and the improvement plans
 - performance of the improvement projects
- ☐ Organization
 - adequacy of academic staff in number and competence
 - working conditions and opportunities for academic staff
 - evaluation and support for academic staff
 - adequacy of setting and equipment for teaching and learning

Quality improvement planning

On the basis of the self-assessment and review reports (in which intended improvement goals are identified), and on the basis of results of questionnaires, observations and measurements, the Quality Management unit coordinates and supports the quality improvement planning by making an inventory of plans, creating links between improvement projects, and accentuating progress and outcomes.

For this purpose, use is made of the PRIOR method in setting priorities for improvement plans (and by using the prioritizing suggestions in PODS (PROSE Online Diagnostics System)). PODS is also used for elaborating project plans that contain 5 to 15 actions that have to be coordinated.

PROSE Online Diagnostics (PODS) is implemented in the operational management of Neapolis. The quality manager is the Online Account Manager (OAM) of PODS. Unit managers can have an access as online diagnostics managers, to activate and manage online consultations/questionnaires. The diagnostics result automatically in reports, ready to be used in consensus meetings or for decision-making.

PROSE Diagnostics are based on the involvement of many participants through the PODS online tool, and the discussion in a consensus group based on the questionnaire results. The system gives the opportunity to involve all teaching and administrative staff online, and then have a consensus meeting on the basis of the results. In this discussion, use is also made of satisfaction questionnaires. The consensus meeting produces the final scores (thus yielding the quality indicators based on self-assessment) and also the priorities for improvement.

Teaching staff can use PODS for organizing anonymous feedback from students. For this purpose, the Quality Management unit delivers a one-page guideline and a temporary access to the system. For certain purposes or units the anonymous survey option can be used, which allows users to generate custom-made questionnaires that can be filled out online by huge numbers of respondents without access limitations.

Indicators

Quality indicators are based in part on self-assessment by staff, which in their turn rely largely on feedback from respondents. Besides the quality indicators based on self-assessment, there are also indicators based on objective measurements. The set of indicators is revised at least every three years.

Neapolis chooses for a set of indicators that are essentially linked to quality issues. For example, the number of typographical errors in brochures may tell something about the printing process, but not about the quality of the content. It is dangerous to pin down the multidimensional quality of things to one element of it.

Suggestion by the External Evaluation Committee

Further to the aforementioned suggestions and conclusions included to the written report of the External Evaluation Committee, during the Committee's visit to Neapolis University's premises at the 24th of May for the evaluation of the Program the External Evaluation Committee suggested **orally** *"The course "Research Seminar" to be taught during the 1st or the 2nd semester to facilitate the early preparation of students for the research within the context of their Thesis"*.

University comments

The faculty of the program and the Program Director decided to adopt this suggestion due to the reasons provided above. Therefore we herein attaching as:

- (a) **Annex IV** the "TABLE 2: COURSE DISTRIBUTION PER SEMESTER" according to the Document 200.1.
- (b) and as **Annex V** the ANNEX 1 – LIST OF COMPULSORY COURSES AND ELECTIVE COURSES according to the Document 200.1.

The description and contents of all courses remain the same as presented in document submitted to DIPAE for the Program approval.

ANNEX I
ACADEMIC CALENDAR 2017-2019

Contact class hours during 1st semester

Academic Year 2017-2018	Contact class hours			
	Sustainability and Strategic Environmental Assessment	Environmental Protection Law and Policy	Urban planning and sustainable development	Theory, Procedures and Methods of Environmental Impacts Assessment and reports
22 Sep-24 Sep	3	3	3	3
29 Sep-1 Oct				
6 Oct-8 Oct	3	3	3	3
13 Oct-15 Oct				
20 Oct-22 Oct	3	3	3	3
27 Oct-29 Oct				
3 Nov-5 Nov	6	3	3	3
10 Nov-12 Nov				
17 Nov-19 Nov	3	3	6	3
24 Nov-26 Nov				
1 Dec-3 Dec	3	3	3	3
8 Dec-10 Dec				
15 Dec-17 Dec	3	3	3	3
22 Dec-23 Dec				
12 Gen-14 Gen	3	3	3	3
19 Gen-21 Gen				
Total contact hours	27	24	27	24

Contact class hours during 2nd semester

Academic Year 2017-2018	Contact class hours				
	Sustainability science and management	Economic analysis and environmental economics	GIS and Environmental Modeling	Environmental Impacts assessment of projects	Dissertation seminar
9 Feb-11 Feb	3	3	3	3	3
16 Feb-18 Feb					
23 Feb-25 Feb	3	3	3	3	3
2 Mar-4 Mar					
9 Mar-11 Mar	3	3	3	3	3
16 Mar-18 Mar					
23 Mar-25 Mar	3	3	3	3	3
30 Mar-1 Apr					
20 Apr-22 Apr	3	3	3	3	3
27 Apr-29 Apr					
4 May-6 May	3	3	6	3	
11 May-13 May					
18 May-20 May	3	3	3	6	
25 May-27 May					
1 Jun-3 Jun	3	3	3	3	
8 Jun-10 Jun					
15 Jun-17 Jun					
Total contact hours	24	24	27	27	15

Contact class hours during 3rd semester

Academic Year 2018-2019	
21 Sep-23 Sep	Dissertation
28 Sep-30 Sep	
5 Oct-7 Oct	
12 Oct-14 Oct	
19 Oct-21 Oct	
26 Oct-28 Oct	
2 Nov-4 Nov	
9 Nov-11 Nov	
16 Nov-18 Nov	
23 Nov-25 Nov	
30 Dec-2 Dec	
7 Dec-9 Dec	
14 Dec-16 Dec	
21 Dec-23 Dec	
11 Gen-13 Gen	
18 Gen-20 Gen	
Total contact hours	-

ANNEX II
CURRICULUM VITAE OF PROFESSOR SOLON XENOPOULOS
PROGRAM DIRECTOR

SOLON XENOPOULOS**EDUCATION:**

1986	Postgraduate Studies at the Bartlett School of Architecture and Planning, UCL. Course: Advanced Architectural Studies. Field: The Architecture of Cinematic Space
1966	Diploma in Architecture, School of Architecture, National Technical University of Athens (N.T.U.A.)

ACADEMIC EXPERIENCE:

2009 - today	Professor at the postgraduate programme of the National Technical University of Athens (N.T.U.A.)
2013 - 2014	Professor at the University of Nicosia Department of Architecture
2012 - 2013	Head of the Department of Architecture, University of Nicosia
2011	Emeritus Professor at the National Technical University of Athens (N.T.U.A.). School of Architecture. Department of Architectural Language – Communication & Design
2009 (fall semester)	Visiting Professor at the University of Cyprus, Department of Architecture
2002 - 2004	Head of the Department of Architectural Language – Communication & Design School of Architecture. National Technical University of Athens (N.T.U.A.).
1974 - 2010	Professor at the National Technical University of Athens (N.T.U.A.). School of Architecture. Department of Architectural Language – Communication & Design

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE:

1993-today	Architectural office: "Solon Xenopoulos – Eleni Hadjinicolaou Architects"
1975 – 1992	Own Architectural Practice in Athens
1967 – 1975	Worked in London as Assistant Architect with: Douglas Stephen & Partners, Erno Goldfinger & Associates, Clifford Wearden & Associates, William & Winkley, Architects.

MAIN PUBLICATIONS:

1. **Books:**
 - 2014 June, Xenopoulos Solon, "Should space be blamed for everything? Scattered texts on Architecture". University of Nicosia Editions.
2. **Monographs:**
 - 2000, "Eleni Hadjinicolaou – Solon Xenopoulos A creative Architectural office. A presentation". The World of Buildings, No. 21. pg.176-188
3. **Publications in Referred Journals:**
 - 2010, "Space and Time in Architecture", Highlights Magazine, no.8, pg. 76-77
 - 2005 Sept. – Oct., "The architecture of the transforming image and the studies in architecture", Architects Magazine, SADAS-PEA, Greece, Vol. 53B, pg. 58-59
 - 2004 September, "Conceptual Approach to Design Problems", A+T Architecture and Technology Magazine, no.6, pg.128-132
 - 1997 July, "Clock – Chemistry Lab – Fire Station Buildings", Technological – Cultural Park in Lavrio. Studies and Tasks, (1994 – 1997), N.T.U.A. editions, pg.84 – 91

- 1997 July, "Products Storage – Limekiln", Technological – Cultural Park in Lavrio. Studies and Tasks, (1994 – 1997), N.T.U.A. editions, pg. 106 – 107
 - 1996 Oct, "The Dimitris Pikionis Children's Playground in Filothei." Casabella, No. 638. pg.66-69
 - 1995 May 5th, "Offices for the Ministry of Culture in Athens." TEFHOS 14.15 International Review of Architecture, pg.162-163
 - 2004 Jan.-Feb., "Space and the Architecture of Time", Highlights magazine, No. 24, pg. 76-77
 - 2003 September-October, "The Architecture of the Intermediate Phase". Highlights magazine, No. 22. pg.59-61
- 4. Publications in non-referred academic journals**
- 1987 Summer, Rodrigo Perez de Arce & Solon Xenopoulos, "Gazi Park Competition", AA files, Athens, pg. 42-45
- 5. Chapters in Books:**
- 2006, Skousboll, Karin. "Athens Concert Hall, Green Zone of the Olympic Village, Main Press Centre, Astrolavos Gallery", Greek Architecture Now, Athens, Studio Art Bookshop, pg. 57, 165, 168, 210-211
 - 2006 November, "Heterogeneity, Complexity and Space at the Children's Playground in Filothei by D. Pikionis", Indictos magazine, no.21, pg. 229-249
- 6. Other Publications:**
- 2000, "The redesign of the Lavrio industrial complex". The World of Buildings, No. 22, pg. 48-60
 - 1998, "Astrolavos Art Gallery in Athens". Athens – A guide to recent Architecture, pg. 176-189.
 - 1997 February, "Architecture of the Void", A3 Architecture magazine, no.6, pg. 18-19
- 9. Publication of Architectural Competitions/Awards/Prizes:**
- 2013 September, "New Central Offices for the Cyprus Cooperative Bank", Edition for the results of the International Architectural Competition, pg. 148-152
 - 2006 July, "102 x Metaxourgio. Architectural Competition of G.E.C. S.A. and DOMES", DOMES Magazine, no.48, pg.113
 - 2001, "2nd Prize Competition Entry for Omonia Square", Unification of Archaeological Sights Association edition, pg.19-22.
 - 2001, "2nd Prize Competition Entry for Koumoundourou Square", Unification of Archaeological Sights Association edition, pg.135-138.
 - 2001, "Competition Entry for Syntagma Square", Unification of Archaeological Sights Association edition, pg.85
 - 1997 May-June, "Design of a new square in Patras. Achaia", Union of Architects editions, pg.233-234
 - Urban landscape of the area of the archaeological site of Keramikos. (2nd prize)
 - International Competition for the master plan of the University of Nicosia. (Final Selection)
 - Closed Architectural Competition for the Conservation and Refurbishment of Kazoulis Villa, and its re-use as a European, Educational and Cultural Centre of Social Insurance. (2nd prize)
 - Architectural Competition for the Naval Museum in Kefallinia Island. (3rd prize)
 - Monument to the Greek Resistance in Patras. (3rd prize)
 - City of Paphos Town Hall: (Honorary Mention)
 - Polytechnic School of the University of Cyprus. (Award)
 - Architectural Competition for the Department of Biological Sciences & Common Teaching Facilities 03 of the University of Cyprus. (Honorary Mention)
 - Architectural Competition for an Environmental Education Centre next to salt-lakes in Larnaca, Cyprus.
 - International Architectural Competition for the Olympic Green for the Beijing Olympic Games.
 - Architectural Competition for a monument for the Mari explosion in Cyprus.
 - The New Theatre for the Theatrical Organisation of Cyprus in Nicosia.
- 10. Publications of Architectural work:**
- 2013 June, "Archives Building of the CyBC", Ktirio, monthly magazine, Vol. 5, pg. 36-42
 - 2013, "M.P.C. (Main Press Centre for the Olympic Games 2004)", Union of Architects SADAS in Attiki, Exhibition Catalogue, pg. 134-135
 - 2012, "Student Hostel in Patras", Architecture in Greece 46/2012 (annual review), pg.134-137.
 - 2012, "Primary School and Kindergarten in Paphos", Architecture in Greece 46/2012 (annual review), pg.178-182
 - 2012, "Radio and Television Archives building for the Cyprus Broadcasting Corporation", Architecture in Greece 46/2012 (annual review), pg.183-187
 - 2012, "Private Residence in Karistos", Design + Art in Greece 43/2012, pg.60-63.
 - 2011 March, Modestou Irene, "A house of Memories. CyBC Archives Building", Syntheses, No.178, pg.98-100
-

- 2008, "Primary School and Kindergarten in Paphos, Cyprus", Occupation: Woman Engineer, E.D.E.M. editions
 - 2007, "Vacation Residence in Aegina", Vacation Residence and Garden magazine, no.10
 - 2007 May, "Music Library Lilian Voudouri", Greek Structures Magazine, No 117, pg. 132-137.
 - 2006, "Archives Building of the CyBC" The 5th Pan-Hellenic Architectural Exhibition in Patras, Exhibition catalogue, Papasotiriou edition, Patras, pg.278-281
 - 2005, "Open Air Theatre in Delfi", Architectural Prizes edition by SADAS-PEA, pg.68-69
 - 2005 Oct. – 2006 March, "Apartment building in Aghia Paraskevi Athens", Garden Magazine, vol. 12, pg. 56-63
 - 2005 Oct. – 2006 March, "Holiday Residence in Kithnos", Garden Magazine, vol. 12, pg. 64-69
 - 2004, "Four Holiday residences in Kithnos", Holiday Residence and Garden, annual edition, Vol. 5, pg. 94-99
 - 2004 August, "Main Press Centre (M.P.C.) for the Athens 2004 Olympic Games", monthly edition of the Technical Chamber of Greece (TEE), no.2306, pg.80-81
 - 2003, "Main Press centre (M.P.C.) for the Athens 2004 Olympic Games", monthly edition of the Technical Chamber of Greece (TEE), No.2255, pg.22-24
 - 2000, "Apartment Building in Aghia Paraskevi", Garden Magazine, no.12, pg.56-69
 - 2000, "House in Aghia Maria Kithnos", Garden Magazine, no.12, pg.56-69
 - 2000, "Four vacation residences", Vacation Residence and Garden magazine, no.5, pg.94-99
 - 1998 December, "JAZZ ROCK Record Shop in Athens", Style and Decor, no.9, pg.142-146.
 - 1998 August 6th, "A New Cinema regains life", Style and Space Magazine, pg. 82-87
 - 1998 June, "Chora Theatre", Technika, no.139, pg.142-146
 - 1998 June, "Chora: The transformation of a space and the architecture of the void", TECHNIKA Monthly technical, scientific and economic edition, pg. 42-45
 - 1998 March 27th, "Chora, a multipurpose space in Kipseli", Athinorama magazine
 - 1998 February 28th, "New "Chora" theatre in the old "Attiki" Cinema. A multipurpose space.", Kathimerini newspaper.
 - 1998 January 12th, "The old Attiki Cinema in Athens transformed into a multipurpose centre of cultural activities", Eleftherotipia newspaper
 - 1997 May-June, "Reconstruction and addition of a new wing to the 1st and 4th Primary School in Patras. Achaia", Union of Architects editions, pg.215
 - 1997 May-June, "Multipurpose building for the Technical Education Institution, Patras", Union of Architects editions, pg. 190
 - 1993 Dec – 1994 Jan, "Apartment in Lykabetus", INSIDE magazine, pg. 76-82.
 - 1990 June, "Main Gate to the Greek Refineries in Aspropirgos S.A.", Technika magazine monthly technical scientific and economic edition, vol. 53, pg. 52-53
-

ANNEX III
CALCULATION WITH COST SALARY ANALYSIS

		LECTURES	TOTAL TEACHING HOURS	FTE / Per Hour	Salary Cost p.a.	Cost
EIASM1	Environmental Protection Law and Policy	3 every second teaching week	24	0,153846154	20.000	3.077
EIASM2	Theory, Procedures and Methods of Environmental Impacts Assessment	3 every second teaching week	24	75 euros per hour	PT	1.800
EIASM3	Urban planning and sustainable development	3 to 6 every second teaching week	27	0,153846154	24.000	3.692
EIASM4	Sustainability and Strategic Environmental Assessment	3 to 6 every second teaching week	27	50 Euros per hour	PT	1.200
EIASM5	Sustainability science and management	3 every second teaching week	24	0,153846154	9.600	1.800
EIASM6	Economic analysis and environmental economics	3 every second teaching week	24	0,153846154	75.000	1.800
EIASM7	GIS and Environmental Modeling	3 to 6 every second teaching week	27	75 euros per hour	PT	2.025
EIASM8	Environmental Impacts assessment of projects	3 to 6 every second teaching week	27	50 euros per hour	PT	1.350
EIASM9	Dissertation Seminar	3 every second teaching week	21	0,153846154	63.500	9.769
TOTAL			222	1,4		26.513

ANNEX IV**TABLE 2: COURSE DISTRIBUTION PER SEMESTER ACCORDING TO DOCUMENT 200.1**

A/A	Course Type	Course Name	Course Code	Periods per two weeks	Period duration	Number of weeks/academic semester	Total periods/academic semester	Number of ECTS
1st Semester								
1.	Compulsory	Environmental Protection Law and Policy	EIASM1	3	50 minutes	8	24	7
2.	Compulsory	Theory, Procedures and Methods of Environmental Impacts Assessment	EIASM2	3	50 minutes	8	24	7
3.	Compulsory	Urban planning and sustainable development	EIASM3	3	50 minutes	9	27	7,5
4.	Compulsory	Sustainability and Strategic Environmental Assessment	EIASM4	3	50 minutes	9	27	8,5
2nd Semester								
5.	Compulsory	Sustainability science and management	EIASM5	3	50 minutes	8	24	7
6.	Compulsory	Economic analysis and environmental economics	EIASM6	3	50 minutes	8	24	6
7.	Compulsory	GIS and Environmental Modeling	EIASM7	3	50 minutes	9	27	7
8.	Compulsory	Environmental Impacts assessment of projects	EIASM8	3	50 minutes	9	27	7
9.	Compulsory	Dissertation Seminar	EIASM9	3	50 minutes	5	15	3
3rd Semester								
10.	Compulsory	Dissertation	EIASM10	-	-	-	-	30

ANNEX V**ANNEX 1 – LIST OF COMPULSORY COURSES AND ELECTIVE COURSES ACCORDING TO DOCUMENT 200.1**

	COURSE	ECTS	COMPULSORY /ELECTIVE
1st Semester	Environmental Protection Law and Policy	7	Compulsory
	Theory, Procedures and Methods of Environmental Impacts Assessment	7	Compulsory
	Urban planning and sustainable development	7,5	Compulsory
	Sustainability and Strategic Environmental Assessment	8,5	Compulsory
2nd Semester	Sustainability science and management	7	Compulsory
	Economic analysis and environmental economics	6	Compulsory
	GIS and Environmental Modeling	7	Compulsory
	Environmental Impacts assessment of projects	7	Compulsory
	Dissertation Seminar	3	Compulsory
3rd Semester	Dissertation	30	Compulsory
		90	

ANNEX VI
ANNOUNCEMENT FOR LECTURER



Lecturer in GIS and Environmental Modelling

The Postgraduate Program MSc in Environmental Impacts Assessment and Sustainability Management announces one academic position at the rank of Lecturer in GIS and Environmental Modelling

Candidates should have a PhD in GIS and Environmental Modelling. The candidate's years of academic experience, research record and scientific contributions, involvement in teaching and in the development of high quality undergraduate and graduate curricula will be considered. An internationally competitive remuneration package is offered according to qualifications and experience.

All applications, including a cover letter and a Curriculum Vitae should be sent by email to the Human Resources Department at hrd@nup.ac.cy.

For an application click [here](#), tel: +357 26843300, or email: hrd@nup.ac.cy

CLOSING DATE: 27th August, 2017

JOB DESCRIPTION Lecturer in GIS and Environmental Modelling

Job Title: Lecturer
Department/School: Postgraduate MSc Program in Environmental Impacts Assessment and Sustainability Management
Contacts Internal: Academic colleagues and administrative staff in the Program and University. External: Academic community in GIS and Environmental Modelling and professional bodies
Major Duties <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To teach postgraduate courses offered by the Program. • Participation in PhD supervising Committees • To be actively involved in research, that will result in publication in highly-rated journals. • To participate in R&D projects funded by the EU/local institutions. • To develop the course material as needed. • To undertake administrative duties as assigned by the Head of the Program. • To represent the Program at seminars and conferences. • To promote the image of the Program in the wider academic and business communities. • To supervise and guide research students. • To enhance teaching innovation and contribute to new research ideas.

GIS and Environmental Modelling	Lecturer
Essential/ Desirable	
PhD in GIS and Environmental Modelling, or a related discipline	Essential
Previous university lecturing and teaching experience	Desirable
Ability to teach in both Greek and English	Essential
Ability to communicate in Russian, Chinese or Arabic	Desirable
Ability to supervise doctorate thesis	Desirable
Participation in International Academic Networks and Fora	Essential
Ability to teach across a range of programmes, with evidence of teaching excellence	Essential
Actively involved in research, with publications in journals	Essential
Ability to contribute to the Research strategy of the department	Essential
Be able to work in cooperation with colleagues and undertake appropriate administrative and managerial duties	Essential
Willingness to relocate and associate with the local community	Essential
Ability to contribute towards the department's teaching and research plans	Essential
Organisational and administrative skills	Essential
Willingness for continuous personal and academic development	Essential
Actively demonstrate leadership skills	Desirable
Ability to adapt to change and be prepared to undertake a wide variety of responsibilities	Desirable

ANNEX VII
BOOKS INVOICES