

Doc. 300.1.1

Date: 17.10.2023

External Evaluation Report

(Conventional-face-to-face programme of study)

- **Higher Education Institution:**
Neapolis University
- **Town:** Pafos
 - **School/Faculty (if applicable):** School of Social Sciences, Arts and Humanities
 - **Department/ Sector:** Department, History, Politics and International Studies

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

In Greek:

Διδακτορικό στη Νεότερη και Σύγχρονη Ιστορία (3-8 ακαδημαϊκά έτη, 180 ECTS)

In English:

PhD in Modern and Contemporary History (3-8 academic years, 180 ECTS)

- **Language(s) of instruction:** Greek/ English
- **Programme's status:** Currently Operating
- **Concentrations (if any):**

In Greek: Concentrations

In English: Concentrations



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 2021 [L.136(I)/2015 – L.132(I)/2021].

A. Introduction

This part includes basic information regarding the onsite visit.

The visit of the EEC took place on Monday 16 October 2023 at the premises of Neapolis University of Paphos. Ahead of the onsite visit, an initial briefing session was held online (via Zoom) on 10 October between the four members of the panel and the representative of the CYQAA, during which the EEC were briefed about the programme of the visit; were given access to a wealth of digital information resources provided by the University and the Department about the programme; and discussed the allocation of areas of priority for each member based on their respective expertise and interests.

The onsite visit commenced at 10:00 with a comprehensive briefing on the University's strategic goals and milestones of the past years by Prof. Savvas Chatzichristofis, Vice Rector of Research and Innovation, Member of Internal Evaluation Committee and Head of the University's Research Department; and a presentation of the internal quality assurance mechanisms Dr. Georgia Christou, Head of the Quality Assurance Department. The visit proceeded with a series of thematic sessions with representatives of the Department and members of the NUP's Distance Learning Unit: the first on the strategic planning, activities, achievements, and challenges of the Department of History, Politics and International Studies; second, on the goals, standards, structure, and content of the programme (PhD in Modern and Contemporary History); and third, on the learning and research support (both on-campus and digital) of the programme (learning philosophy, learning materials/activities used, management of the student journey and learning experience, learning support, student profiles and journeys after graduation).

The visit also included dedicated sessions with members of the programme's teaching team and with representatives of the University's student-facing administrative teams (student support, resources, facilities); and onsite tours to the facilities. During these sessions, the members of the EEC were provided with all the necessary information about the operation of the programme and the way it is supported by the University's learning and support infrastructures. A separate session with students of the programme – either currently studying or recent graduates - enabled the members of the panel to hear directly of their experiences as students of the programme and noted the very high levels of student satisfaction with the content, delivery, and administration of the distance-learning programme.

The EEC onsite visit concluded at 6.30 with a final session with Prof Pantelis Silvia's, Rector of the University and many of the University/Department representatives who had participated in earlier panels.



B. External Evaluation Committee (EEC)

<i>Name</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>University</i>
Piers Ludlow	Professor	London School of Economics
Iakovos Michailidis	Professor	Aristotle University of Thessaloniki
Aristotle Kallis	Professor	Keele University
Neta Christoforou	Student	University of Cyprus
Name	Position	University
Name	Position	University

C. Guidelines on content and structure of the report

- *The external evaluation report follows the structure of assessment areas.*
- *At the beginning of each assessment area there is a box presenting:*
 - (a) sub-areas*
 - (b) standards which are relevant to the European Standards and Guidelines (ESG)*
 - (c) some questions that EEC may find useful.*
- *The questions aim at facilitating the understanding of each assessment area and at illustrating the range of topics covered by the standards.*
- *Under each assessment area, it is important to provide information regarding the compliance with the requirements of each sub-area. In particular, the following must be included:*

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.

Strengths

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

Areas of improvement and recommendations

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

- *The EEC should state the compliance for each sub-area (Non-compliant, Partially compliant, Compliant), which must be in agreement with everything stated in the report. It is pointed out that, in the case of standards that cannot be applied due to the status of the HEI and/or of the programme of study, N/A (= Not Applicable) should be noted.*
- *The EEC should state the conclusions and final remarks regarding the programme of study as a whole.*
- **The report may also address other issues which the EEC finds relevant.**

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

Sub-areas

- 1.1 Policy for quality assurance**
- 1.2 Design, approval, on-going monitoring and review**
- 1.3 Public information**
- 1.4 Information management**

1.1 Policy for quality assurance

Standards

- *Policy for quality assurance of the programme of study:*
 - *has a formal status and is publicly available*
 - *supports the organisation of the quality assurance system through appropriate structures, regulations and processes*
 - *supports teaching, administrative staff and students to take on their responsibilities in quality assurance*
 - *ensures academic integrity and freedom and is vigilant against academic fraud*
 - *guards against intolerance of any kind or discrimination against the students or staff*
 - *supports the involvement of external stakeholders*

1.2 Design, approval, on-going monitoring and review

Standards

- *The programme of study:*
 - *is designed with overall programme objectives that are in line with the institutional strategy and have explicit intended learning outcomes*
 - *is designed by involving students and other stakeholders*
 - *benefits from external expertise*
 - *reflects the four purposes of higher education of the Council of Europe (preparation for sustainable employment, personal development, preparation for life as active citizens in democratic societies, the development and maintenance, through teaching, learning and research, of a broad, advanced knowledge base)*
 - *is designed so that it enables smooth student progression*
 - *is designed so that the exams' and assignments' content corresponds to the level of the programme and the number of ECTS*
 - *defines the expected student workload in ECTS*

- *includes well-structured placement opportunities where appropriate*
- *is subject to a formal institutional approval process*
- *results in a qualification that is clearly specified and communicated, and refers to the correct level of the National Qualifications Framework for Higher Education and, consequently, to the Framework for Qualifications of the European Higher Education Area*
- *is regularly monitored in the light of the latest research in the given discipline, thus ensuring that the programme is up-to-date*
- *is periodically reviewed so that it takes into account the changing needs of society, the students' workload, progression and completion, the effectiveness of procedures for assessment of students, student expectations, needs and satisfaction in relation to the programme*
- *is reviewed and revised regularly involving students and other stakeholders*

1.3 Public information

Standards

- *Regarding the programme of study, clear, accurate, up-to date and readily accessible information is published about:*
 - *selection criteria*
 - *intended learning outcomes*
 - *qualification awarded*
 - *teaching, learning and assessment procedures*
 - *pass rates*
 - *learning opportunities available to the students*
 - *graduate employment information*

1.4 Information management

Standards

- *Information for the effective management of the programme of study is collected, monitored and analysed:*
 - *key performance indicators*
 - *profile of the student population*
 - *student progression, success and drop-out rates*
 - *students' satisfaction with their programmes*
 - *learning resources and student support available*
 - *career paths of graduates*
- *Students and staff are involved in providing and analysing information and planning follow-up activities.*

You may also consider the following questions:

- *What is the procedure for quality assurance of the programme and who is involved?*
- *Who is involved in the study programme's design and development (launching, changing, internal evaluation) and what is taken into account (strategies, the needs of society, etc.)?*
- *How/to what extent are students themselves involved in the development of the content of their studies?*
- *Please evaluate a) whether the study programme remains current and consistent with developments in society (labour market, digital technologies, etc.), and b) whether the content and objectives of the study programme are in accordance with each other?*
- *Do the content and the delivery of the programme correspond to the European Qualifications Framework (EQF)?*
- *How is coherence of the study programme ensured, i.e., logical sequence and coherence of courses? How are substantial overlaps between courses avoided? How is it ensured that the teaching staff is aware of the content and outputs of their colleagues' work within the same study programme?*
- *How does the study programme support development of the learners' general competencies (including digital literacy, foreign language skills, entrepreneurship, communication and teamwork skills)?*
- *What are the scope and objectives of the foundation courses in the study programme (where appropriate)? What are the pass rates?*
- *How long does it take a student on average to graduate? Is the graduation rate for the study programme analogous to other European programmes with similar content? What is the pass rate per course/semester?*
- ***How is it ensured that the actual student workload is in accordance with the workload expressed by ECTS?***
- *What are the opportunities for international students to participate in the study programme (courses/modules taught in a foreign language)?*
- *Is information related to the programme of study publicly available?*
- *How is the HEI evaluating the success of its graduates in the labor market? What is the feedback from graduates of the study programme on their employment and/or continuation of studies?*
- *Have the results of student feedback been analysed and taken into account, and how (e.g., when planning in-service training for the teaching staff)?*
- *What are the reasons for dropping out (voluntary withdrawal)? What has been done to reduce the number of such students?*

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 basic design of the PhD programme is well conceived and very much in line with international norms. Students are thus expected to follow a methodological seminar in the course of their first year, to meet regularly with their supervisor(s) throughout, but especially during the early stages, and to provide periodic presentations of their research findings. There is also some flexibility in terms of how long the total project should take. The expectation that the work should be completed in four years is sensible, but it is likewise useful that procedures exist for a further year to be taken where necessary. Similarly there seem to be sensible rules for interrupting the programme of study or for requesting additional time. And arrangements for monitoring students' progress seem to be quite sophisticated and thorough. Inevitably many doctorates will follow a less easily predictable path than undergraduate or Masters degrees. This reflects the nature of the research task, which is much more prone to accident or delay than lower levels of study, but it is compounded at NUP by the demographics of those on the doctoral programme, as several seem to be combining their PhDs with full time careers elsewhere. As a result, it is unrealistic to expect them to conform exactly with the neatly plotted timelines that we were presented with. But this is not really a complaint so much as a recognition of messy reality and a reminder that any doctoral programme will need a fair degree of flexibility built in so as to cope with this messiness. The quality assurance process seems thorough and professional. The fact that this doctoral programme is embedded within a university-wide doctoral school is also a positive development, although care needs to be taken that the specificities of history as a discipline are recognised and catered for within the doctoral school.

Strengths

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

Clear timetable with some flexibility.

Supported by university-wide doctoral school.

Focus on Cypriot history.

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.

Care needs to be taken that the doctoral school recognises the specificities of history as a discipline.

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



Sub-area		<i>Non-compliant/ Partially Compliant/Compliant</i>
1.1	Policy for quality assurance	Compliant
1.2	Design, approval, on-going monitoring and review	Compliant
1.3	Public information	Compliant
1.4	Information management	Compliant

2. Student – centred learning, teaching and assessment (ESG 1.3)

Sub-areas

2.1 Process of teaching and learning and student-centred teaching methodology

2.2 Practical training

2.3 Student assessment

2.1 Process of teaching and learning and student-centred teaching methodology

Standards

- *The process of teaching and learning supports students' individual and social development.*
- *The process of teaching and learning is flexible, considers different modes of delivery, where appropriate, uses a variety of pedagogical methods and facilitates the achievement of planned learning outcomes.*
- *Students are encouraged to take an active role in creating the learning process.*
- *The implementation of student-centered learning and teaching encourages a sense of autonomy in the learner, while ensuring adequate guidance and support from the teacher.*
- *Teaching methods, tools and material used in teaching are modern, effective, support the use of modern educational technologies and are regularly updated.*
- *Mutual respect within the learner-teacher relationship is promoted.*
- *The implementation of student-centred learning and teaching respects and attends to the diversity of students and their needs, enabling flexible learning paths.*
- *Appropriate procedures for dealing with students' complaints regarding the process of teaching and learning are set.*

2.2 Practical training

Standards

- *Practical and theoretical studies are interconnected.*
- *The organisation and the content of practical training, if applicable, support achievement of planned learning outcomes and meet the needs of the stakeholders.*

2.3 Student assessment

Standards

- *Assessment is consistent, fairly applied to all students and carried out in accordance with the stated procedures.*

- *Assessment is appropriate, transparent, objective and supports the development of the learner.*
- *The criteria for the method of assessment, as well as criteria for marking, are published in advance.*
- *Assessment allows students to demonstrate the extent to which the intended learning outcomes have been achieved. Students are given feedback, which, if necessary, is linked to advice on the learning process.*
- *Assessment, where possible, is carried out by more than one examiner.*
- *A formal procedure for student appeals is in place.*
- *Assessors are familiar with existing testing and examination methods and receive support in developing their own skills in this field.*
- *The regulations for assessment take into account mitigating circumstances.*

You may also consider the following questions:

- *How is it monitored that the teaching staff base their teaching and assessment methods on objectives and intended learning outcomes? Provide samples of examination papers (if available).*
- *How are students' different abilities, learning needs and learning opportunities taken into consideration when conducting educational activities?*
- *How is the development of students' general competencies (including digital skills) supported in educational activities?*
- *How is it ensured that innovative teaching methods, learning environments and learning aids that support learning are diverse and used in educational activities?*
- *Is the teaching staff using new technology in order to make the teaching process more effective?*
- *How is it ensured that theory and practice are interconnected in teaching and learning?*
- *How is practical training organised (finding practical training positions, guidelines for practical training, supervision, reporting, feedback, etc.)? What role does practical training have in achieving the objectives of the study programme? What is student feedback on the content and arrangement of practical training?*
- ***Are students actively involved in research? How is student involvement in research set up?***
- *How is supervision of student research papers (seminar papers, projects, theses, etc.) organised?*
- ***Do students' assessments correspond to the European Qualifications Framework (EQF)?***
- *How are the assessment methods chosen and to what extent do students get supportive feedback on their academic progress during their studies?*
- *How is the objectivity and relevance of student assessment ensured (assessment of the degree of achievement of the intended learning outcomes)?*

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.

Current and past PhD students expressed a high level of satisfaction with the quality of the programme and the support they received from their supervisors and the Department. They found the programme to be well-designed and the guidance from supervisors to be valuable. It is clear to the EEC that the ties between supervisor and research student on this Programme are very close and conducive to a productive working relationship that deals effectively with the Programme's learning objectives and provides a supportive framework for the pursuit of student learning. The EEC is confident that the programme and the PhD thesis correspond to the EQF.

One notable aspect of an advanced research degree is that students are expected to take control of their own learning process and become independent learners. The EEC, during their onsite visit and review of documentation, did not find anything that contradicted this expectation.

The programme is designed to provide flexibility to students, which is achieved through close collaboration between students and their supervisors. This was evident from the feedback provided by students during the onsite visit. It is worth mentioning that the student cohort is diverse, with a significant number of students pursuing a PhD out of personal interest rather than with the intention of pursuing an academic career. The Programme encourages and supports this flexibility in learning paths.

Both the University and the Department have established a comprehensive student evaluation procedure to address any concerns raised by students. This ensures that issues are promptly addressed and resolved. Regarding practical training, the Department provides general training for incoming PhD students. However, the EEC noted that the materials provided to students do not clearly outline the content of this training.

The documentation supplied by the University clearly lays out the PhD progress review and examination processes, which adhere to rigorous international standards. Students have access to this information and it is also prominently featured in the student-facing materials. The EEC members were impressed with the detailed procedures for benchmarking student progress throughout the Programme, as evidenced by the Gantt chart provided at the beginning of the studies. However the EEC noted the absence of a clear outline of the bespoke PhD methodological and research training in the supplied materials. Upon request we were sent this information, which indicates that good provision is made, but it would surely be sensible were this information included, for instance, in the student handbook?

Strengths

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

- Rigorous system of monitoring student progress standardised by the University and the Department
- Strong supervisor-student ties that ensure a supportive framework for learning
- High degree of flexibility in teaching and learning (especially important in this case given the on-standard academic backgrounds of many 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.

- More agile practical training specifically tailored to the needs of a PhD degree should be introduced at the beginning of the cycle to put in place strong foundations for the pursuit of research and the PhD thesis writing tasks
- Opportunities for different kinds of practical training, such as providing opportunities to students to acquire teaching experience. Although this may not be so important in the case of students who are pursuing PhD research out of personal interest but may be important for other students who may be interested in the option of an academic career.
- More detail about the research training in the materials provided to the students.

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

Sub-area		<i>Non-compliant/ Partially Compliant/Compliant</i>
2.1	Process of teaching and learning and student-centred teaching methodology	Compliant
2.2	Practical training	Compliant
2.3	Student assessment	Compliant

3. Teaching staff (ESG 1.5)

Sub-areas

- 3.1 Teaching staff recruitment and development**
- 3.2 Teaching staff number and status**
- 3.3 Synergies of teaching and research**

3.1 Teaching staff recruitment and development

Standards

- *Institutions ensure the competence of their teaching staff.*
- *Fair, transparent and clear processes for the recruitment and development of the teaching staff are set up.*
- *Teaching staff qualifications are adequate to achieve the objectives and planned learning outcomes of the study programme, and to ensure quality and sustainability of the teaching and learning.*
- *The teaching staff is regularly engaged in professional and teaching-skills training and development.*
- *Promotion of the teaching staff takes into account the quality of their teaching, their research activity, the development of their teaching skills and their mobility.*
- *Innovation in teaching methods and the use of new technologies is encouraged.*
- *Conditions of employment that recognise the importance of teaching are followed.*
- *Recognised visiting teaching staff participates in teaching the study programme.*

3.2 Teaching staff number and status

Standards

- *The number of the teaching staff is adequate to support the programme of study.*
- *The teaching staff status (rank, full/part time) is appropriate to offer a quality programme of study.*
- *Visiting staff number does not exceed the number of the permanent staff.*

3.3 Synergies of teaching and research

Standards

- *The teaching staff collaborate in the fields of teaching and research within the HEI and with partners outside (practitioners in their fields, employers, and staff members at other HEIs in Cyprus or abroad).*
- *Scholarly activity to strengthen the link between education and research is encouraged.*
- *The teaching staff publications are within the discipline.*

- *Teaching staff studies and publications are closely related to the programme's courses.*
- *The allocation of teaching hours compared to the time for research activity is appropriate.*

You may also consider the following questions:

- *How are the members of the teaching staff supported with regard to the development of their teaching skills? How is feedback given to members of the teaching staff regarding their teaching results and teaching skills?*
- *How is the teaching performance assessed? How does their teaching performance affect their remuneration, evaluation and/or selection?*
- *Is teaching connected with research?*
- *Does the HEI involve visiting teaching staff from other HEIs in Cyprus and abroad?*
- *What is the number, workload, qualifications and status of the teaching staff (rank, full/part timers)?*
- *Is student evaluation conducted on the teaching staff? If yes, have the results of student feedback been analysed and taken into account, and how (e.g., when planning in-service training for the teaching staff)?*

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 recruitment of the teaching staff is in accordance with international standards and the university's general regulations to ensure transparency and the selection of experienced personnel.

The programme includes five members from the Academic Staff of Neapolis University. They are all well-established scholars in the fields of History and International Relations. They have substantial research work and a strong international academic presence and profile. From their CVs, one can discern that they primarily focus on political, diplomatic, and economic history, while one member of the teaching staff specializes in local Cypriot history.

These factors, combined with the relatively small number of doctoral candidates (currently, there are ten active PhD students), and considering that four other candidates are under evaluation, along with the fact that each member of the academic staff can supervise up to five doctoral theses, lead us to the conclusion that the academic staff is sufficient.

It should also be noted that the Program seeks to incorporate certain interdisciplinary elements. Therefore, in recent years, supervisors and co-supervisors from other programs and universities in Cyprus and abroad have been utilized in overseeing and co-supervising doctoral theses.



Strengths

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

Academic Profile of the Teaching Staff.

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 selection of doctoral candidates is based on the research interests of the academic staff. This means it primarily focuses on aspects of Greek and Cypriot political, diplomatic, and economic history. The EEC believes that if the program wishes to expand into new academic fields, it should recruit academic personnel with new areas of expertise, such as early modern history, Ottoman history, Mediterranean history, and history of the Middle East.

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

Sub-area		<i>Non-compliant/ Partially Compliant/Compliant</i>
3.1	Teaching staff recruitment and development	Compliant
3.2	Teaching staff number and status	Compliant
3.3	Synergies of teaching and research	Compliant

4. Student admission, progression, recognition and certification (ESG 1.4)

Sub-areas

- 4.1 Student admission, processes and criteria
- 4.2 Student progression
- 4.3 Student recognition
- 4.4 Student certification

4.1 Student admission, processes and criteria

Standards

- *Pre-defined and published regulations regarding student admission are in place.*
- *Access policies, admission processes and criteria are implemented consistently and in a transparent manner.*

4.2 Student progression

Standards

- *Pre-defined and published regulations regarding student progression are in place.*
- *Processes and tools to collect, monitor and act on information on student progression, are in place.*

4.3 Student recognition

Standards

- *Pre-defined and published regulations regarding student recognition are in place.*
- *Fair recognition of higher education qualifications, periods of study and prior learning, including the recognition of non-formal and informal learning, are essential components for ensuring the students' progress in their studies, while promoting mobility.*
- *Appropriate recognition procedures are in place that rely on:*
 - *institutional practice for recognition being in line with the principles of the Lisbon Recognition Convention*
 - *cooperation with other institutions, quality assurance agencies and the national ENIC/NARIC centre with a view to ensuring coherent recognition across the country*

4.4 Student certification

Standards

- *Pre-defined and published regulations regarding student certification are in place.*
- *Students receive certification explaining the qualification gained, including achieved learning outcomes and the context, level, content and status of the studies that were pursued and successfully completed.*

You may also consider the following questions:

- *Are the admission requirements for the study programme appropriate? How is the students' prior preparation/education assessed (including the level of international students, for example)?*
- *How is the procedure of recognition for prior learning and work experience ensured, including recognition of study results acquired at foreign higher education institutions?*
- *Is the certification of the HEI accompanied by a diploma supplement, which is in line with European and international standards?*

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 process for admitting PhD students appears very thorough. The number of different levels at which the application is scrutinised minimises the risk of students being taken on lightly by academics whose energies would be better deployed elsewhere. Likewise the fairly strict rules about the maximum number of students on the PhD programme at any one time are welcome, since this too lessens the chance of any one supervisor taking on more than they can realistically manage, and consequently struggling to provide adequate supervision and support. This is particularly important given that the number of historians on the staff able to supervise doctorates remains quite small.

As noted above the procedures for progression also seem well thought through, with regular milestones and targets to help ensure that students remain on track, but with enough flexibility built in to cope with the realities of research.

Strengths

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

Thorough admissions procedure

Good procedures for monitoring progression

Some built-in flexibility.

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.

Our only concern is that there is not at present any provision made for PhD students to gain teaching experience while on the programme. This probably does not matter for those currently on the programme, since most are already in employment and are not seeking to begin an academic career. Instead they are doing the doctorate mainly out of interest and enthusiasm for the subject matter. Given that they are often doing the doctorate alongside full time jobs, many would probably not have the time to teach at university level as well. But it does seem strange for a doctoral programme not to provide for a student who did intend to progress to a subsequent academic career and who would need to demonstrate teaching experience to have any chance of securing a university position. It would hence be sensible were this option available to those doing the programme.

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

Sub-area		<i>Non-compliant/ Partially Compliant/Compliant</i>
4.1	Student admission, processes and criteria	Compliant
4.2	Student progression	Compliant
4.3	Student recognition	Compliant
4.4	Student certification	Compliant

5. Learning resources and student support (ESG 1.6)

Sub-areas

5.1 Teaching and Learning resources

5.2 Physical resources

5.3 Human support resources

5.4 Student support

5.1 Teaching and Learning resources

Standards

- *Adequate and readily accessible teaching and learning resources (teaching and learning environments, materials, aids and equipment) are provided to students and support the achievement of objectives in the study programme.*
- *Adequacy of resources is ensured for changing circumstances (change in student numbers, etc.).*
- *All resources are fit for purpose.*
- *Student-centred learning and flexible modes of learning and teaching, are taken into account when allocating, planning and providing the learning resources.*

5.2 Physical resources

Standards

- *Physical resources, i.e. premises, libraries, study facilities, IT infrastructure, are adequate to support the study programme.*
- *Adequacy of resources is ensured for changing circumstances (change in student numbers, etc.).*
- *All resources are fit for purpose and students are informed about the services available to them.*

5.3 Human support resources

Standards

- *Human support resources, i.e. tutors/mentors, counsellors, other advisers, qualified administrative staff, are adequate to support the study programme.*
- *Adequacy of resources is ensured for changing circumstances (change in student numbers, etc.).*

- *All resources are fit for purpose and students are informed about the services available to them.*

5.4 Student support

Standards

- *Student support is provided covering the needs of a diverse student population, such as mature, part-time, employed and international students and students with special needs.*
- *Students are informed about the services available to them.*
- *Student-centred learning and flexible modes of learning and teaching, are taken into account when allocating, planning and providing student support.*
- *Students' mobility within and across higher education systems is encouraged and supported.*

You may also consider the following questions:

- *Evaluate the supply of teaching materials and equipment (including teaching labs, expendable materials, etc.), the condition of classrooms, adequacy of financial resources to conduct the study programme and achieve its objectives. What needs to be supplemented/ improved?*
- *What is the feedback from the teaching staff on the availability of teaching materials, classrooms, etc.?*
- *Are the resources in accordance with actual (changing) needs and contemporary requirements? How is the effectiveness of using resources ensured?*
- *What are the resource-related trends and future risks (risks arising from changing numbers of students, obsolescence of teaching equipment, etc.)? How are these trends taken into account and how are the risks mitigated?*
- *Evaluate student feedback on support services. Based on student feedback, which support services (including information flow, counselling) need further development?*
- *How is student learning within the standard period of study supported (student counselling, flexibility of the study programme, etc.)?*
- *How students' special needs are considered (different capabilities, different levels of academic preparation, special needs due to physical disabilities, etc.)?*
- *How is student mobility being supported?*

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.

Quite a lot of thought seems to have been given to equipping the library with the resources that PhD students in history will need, despite the youth of NAP. Research students in history have unusual needs, compared to those in many other disciplines, because of their need for books and especially for books that were published long before e-books became the norm and are hence unavailable in digital form. This poses an obvious difficulty for a newish library that cannot rely on the lengthy back-catalogue that an older institution might have. But both the presentations we were given by the library staff and the testimonies of the PhD students themselves suggests that interlibrary loans, the network of Greek libraries and to a lesser extent digitisation under the OSDEL scheme go a long way towards addressing this potential difficulty. The preservation and digitisation of primary sources through the Hephaestus repository is also likely to be of value to several of the research projects.

Also encouraging was the way in which NAP has developed its range of online Webinar and digital events so as to give PhD students the best possible opportunity to see other more experienced academics present, to be exposed to up-to-date historiography, and to be able to relate their own detailed research subjects to a wider field of study. This goes a long way to mitigating the potential difficulties of doing a PhD in a small university in a location some way away from the major centres of scholarship. The digital provision is also likely to be particularly well suited to the type of PhD student that NAP has succeeded in attracting, given the challenges of balancing attendance at seminars with professional and family commitments.

Strengths

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

Good library support.

Creative use of electronic repository.

Expanding range of Webinars and digital events.

Thorough student support.

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.

No recommendations.

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

Sub-area	<p><i>Non-compliant/ Partially Compliant/Compliant</i></p>
----------	--



5.1	Teaching and Learning resources	Compliant
5.2	Physical resources	Compliant
5.3	Human support resources	Compliant
5.4	Student support	Compliant

6. Additional for doctoral programmes (ALL ESG)

Sub-areas

- 6.1 Selection criteria and requirements**
- 6.2 Proposal and dissertation**
- 6.3 Supervision and committees**

6.1 Selection criteria and requirements

Standards

- *Specific criteria that the potential students need to meet for admission in the programme, as well as how the selection procedures are made, are defined.*
- *The following requirements of the doctoral degree programme are analysed and published:*
 - *the stages of completion*
 - *the minimum and maximum time of completing the programme*
 - *the examinations*
 - *the procedures for supporting and accepting the student's proposal*
 - *the criteria for obtaining the Ph.D. degree*

6.2 Proposal and dissertation

Standards

- *Specific and clear guidelines for the writing of the proposal and the dissertation are set regarding:*
 - *the chapters that are contained*
 - *the system used for the presentation of each chapter, sub-chapters and bibliography*
 - *the minimum word limit*
 - *the binding, the cover page and the prologue pages, including the pages supporting the authenticity, originality and importance of the dissertation, as well as the reference to the committee for the final evaluation*
- *There is a plagiarism check system. Information is provided on the detection of plagiarism and the consequences in case of such misconduct.*
- *The process of submitting the dissertation to the university library is set.*

6.3 Supervision and committees

Standards

- *The composition, the procedure and the criteria for the formation of the advisory committee (to whom the doctoral student submits the research proposal) are determined.*
- *The composition, the procedure and the criteria for the formation of the examining committee (to whom the doctoral student defends his/her dissertation), are determined.*
- *The duties of the supervisor-chairperson and the other members of the advisory committee towards the student are determined and include:*
 - *regular meetings*

- *reports per semester and feedback from supervisors*
- *support for writing research papers*
- *participation in conferences*
- *The number of doctoral students that each chairperson supervises at the same time are determined.*

You may also consider the following questions:

- *How is the scientific quality of the PhD thesis ensured?*
- *Is there a link between the doctoral programmes of study and the society? What is the value of the obtained degree outside academia and in the labour market?*
- *Can you please provide us with some dissertation samples?*

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 selection and supervision of doctoral theses are based on the University's Doctoral Studies Regulation, which complies with European standards for Higher Education. The minimum duration of enrolment in the Doctoral Programme is three years, while the maximum is five years. During their studies, the doctoral candidate is monitored by a three-member Advisory Committee. At the end of each year, the doctoral candidate submits a progress report. The final examination takes place before a five-member Examination Committee.

There is a clear link between the doctoral programme and local society, actively encouraged by the supervision teams. This pertains to the areas of research (partly driven by the privileged access to local sources), as well as to the way in which research by members of the Department and PhD students feeds into public engagement with the local communities.

The criteria for the formation of both the advisory and the scientific examining committees are clearly laid down in the supplied documentation and appear rigorous.

As noted in earlier sections of this report, the apparent lack of clear opportunities for the PhD candidates to acquire teaching experience prior to graduating may be a limitation in terms of equipping some students to pursue a career in the academic sector.

Strengths

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

The role of the doctoral school.

A clear, if narrow, focus on Cypriot history.

Clear efforts to strengthen and maintain links between the university, the programmes, and society.

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.

Make provision for PhD students who wish to gain teaching experience in the course of their degree, with a view to starting an academic career.

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

Sub-area		<i>Non-compliant/ Partially Compliant/Compliant</i>
6.1	Selection criteria and requirements	Compliant
6.2	Proposal and dissertation	Compliant
6.3	Supervision and committees	Compliant

D. Conclusions and final remarks

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

The programme has a good focus on Cypriot history and clearly fulfils an important need. It has also been well designed to meet the needs of a distinctive cohort of students, many of whom are doing this degree mid-career, often alongside full-time employment. The support that the NUP provides such students seems good and their enthusiasm for the programme was clear. The same can be said about the staff recruitment processes and the overall framework for quality assurance. It would however be desirable to see the same rigour and level of detail evident in the student-facing documents. Furthermore, the EEC felt that were the department to plan to expand the range of students beyond this group, seeking for instance to recruit students hoping to follow an academic career, some rethinking of the programme might be necessary. One aspect of this may be to work on making the PhD track more attractive for those currently doing the NUP Masters programmes. Another aspect might be the recruitment of new staff able to broaden the range of history covered.



E. Signatures of the EEC

<i>Name</i>	<i>Signature</i>
Piers Ludlow	
Iakovos Michailidis	
Aristotle Kallis	
Neta Christoforou	
Click to enter Name	
Click to enter Name	

Date: 17.10.2023