

Doc. 300.1.1/3

Date: Date.

External Evaluation Report

(Joint - conventional -
face-to-face programme of
study)

- **Higher Education Institution:**
Neapolis University Pafos

Collaborative Institution(s):
University of Western Macedonia

- **Town:** Pafos, Cyprus / Kozani, Greece
- **School/Faculty (if applicable):** School/Faculty

SCHOOL OF ARCHITECTURE, ENGINEERING, LAND AND
ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES – NEAPOLIS UNIVERSITY PAFOS

SCHOOL OF ECONOMICS, BUSINESS AND COMPUTER SCIENCE –
NEAPOLIS UNIVERSITY PAFOS

FACULTY OF ENGINEERING – UNIVERSITY OF WESTERN
MACEDONIA

- **Department/ Sector:** Department/Sector

Department of Civil Engineering – Neapolis University Pafos

Department of Computer Science – Neapolis University Pafos

Department of Product and Systems Design Engineering – University
of Western Macedonia

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].

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

In Greek:

Programme Name

In English:

Product Design Engineering (4 years, 240 ECTS, BEng - Joint, or 5 years, 300 ECTS, Integrated Master - Joint)

- **Language(s) of instruction: English**
- **Programme’s status: New**
- **Concentrations (if any):**

In Greek: Concentrations

In English: Concentrations

A. Introduction

This part includes basic information regarding the onsite visit.

The external evaluation committee (EEC) visited Neapolis University Paphos on March 19, 2025. The visit included meetings with key institutional representatives, faculty, students, and external stakeholders to assess the joint program's structure, quality assurance, and compliance with ESG standards. The visit was structured as follows.

Morning Sessions (09:00 – 12:05)

Introduction of the EEC and meetings (physical and via Teams) with Rectors, and Vice Rectors.

Discussions on program structure, quality assurance, strategic planning, and development.

Legal framework, cooperation agreements, and program delivery.

Analysis of curriculum design, student learning outcomes, and assessment methods.

Midday Session (12:05 – 14:05)

Faculty Q&A on course content, teaching methodologies, and assessment criteria.

Afternoon Sessions (14:05 – 17:40)

Meetings with external stakeholders for industry alignment and employability.

Student and graduate feedback on academic experience and resources.

An administrative staff QA session.

Campus tour to assess facilities.

EEC members' internal discussion and final exit meeting for clarifications.

The visit was instrumental in ensuring a thorough evaluation of the program's quality, alignment with ESG standards, and institutional effectiveness.

The evaluation is also based on a set of documents (program application, etc.) provided.

B. External Evaluation Committee (EEC)

<i>Name</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>University</i>
Lars Eriksson	Professor	Jönköping University, Sweden
Kari-Pekka Heikkinen	Professor of Practice	University of Oulu, Finland
Sergei Glavatskih	Professor	KTH Royal Institute of Technology, Sweden
Andreas Lizidis	Member-ETEK	Cyprus Scientific and Technical Chamber
Andria Stavraki	Member (Student)	University of Cyprus
Name	Position	University

C. Guidelines on content and structure of the report

- *The external evaluation report follows the structure of assessment areas.*
- *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* **YES.**
 - *supports the organisation of the quality assurance system through appropriate structures, regulations and processes* **YES.**
 - *supports teaching, administrative staff and students to take on their responsibilities in quality assurance* **YES.**
 - *ensures academic integrity and freedom and is vigilant against academic fraud* **YES.**
 - *guards against intolerance of any kind or discrimination against the students or staff* **YES.**
 - *supports the involvement of external stakeholders* **YES.**

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* **YES.**
 - *is designed by involving students and other stakeholders* **Unclear (see recommendations).**
 - *benefits from external expertise* **YES, if it is involved.**
 - *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)* **YES.**
 - *is designed so that it enables smooth student progression* **Yes and no (see recommendations).**
 - *is designed so that the exams' and assignments' content corresponds to the level of the programme and the number of ECTS* **YES.**
 - *defines the expected student workload in ECTS* **YES.**

- includes well-structured placement opportunities where appropriate **YES.**
- is subject to a formal institutional approval process **YES.**
- 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 **YES.**
- is regularly monitored in the light of the latest research in the given discipline, thus ensuring that the programme is up-to-date **Unclear (see recommendations).**
- 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 **Unclear (see recommendations).**
- is reviewed and revised regularly involving students and other stakeholders **YES.**

1.3 Public information

Standards

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

1.4 Information management

Standards

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

You may also consider the following questions:

- *What is the procedure for quality assurance of the programme and who is involved? The procedure is digital but also includes interviewing students. Vice rector, teachers and students are 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.)? The management groups of the universities are involved. There is a clear need to involve teachers and students. (see recommendations).*
- *How/to what extent are students themselves involved in the development of the content of their studies? To a smaller degree as the number of selectable courses is limited.*
- *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? (see recommendations).*
- *Do the content and the delivery of the programme correspond to the European Qualifications Framework (EQF)? YES.*
- *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? The program seems to be logical but interviewing teachers pointed towards the lack of the joint coordinated work with the program courses and especially in coordination of the work between two universities. (see recommendations).*
- *How does the study programme support development of the learners' general competencies (including digital literacy, foreign language skills, entrepreneurship, communication and teamwork skills)? Unclear. (see recommendations).*
- *What are the scope and objectives of the foundation courses in the study programme (where appropriate)? What are the pass rates? This question is unclear.*

- *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? This information is not available to the evaluation committee.*
- *How is it ensured that the actual student workload is in accordance with the workload expressed by ECTS? There is no information provided to judge this.*
- *What are the opportunities for international students to participate in the study programme (courses/modules taught in a foreign language)? The program is given in English which facilitates participation of international students.*
- *Is information related to the programme of study publicly available? We believe so.*
- *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? No information available.*
- *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)? Yes, as a part of the course evaluation process that includes 5 components.*
- *What are the reasons for dropping out (voluntary withdrawal)? What has been done to reduce the number of such students? This was mentioned that the dropouts are analyzed but no further information was provided.*

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 two partner Universities apply jointly for the program and involves cooperation between the two universities. The face-to-face evaluation, it was clear that the education managers at the different institutions were clear about the structure and content of the new education, and the students seemed to have high expectations of the new education. It was not as clear whether the teachers involved in the different courses had the same holistic overview of the different parts of the program. There is a clear ambition on interdisciplinarity in the program. It has to be clarified how this shall be ensured also among the teachers involved in the program in different courses with different subject areas.

Strengths

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

When visiting the University and meeting the teachers and experts involved, as well as watching the various presentations about what is being done at the various Universities today, many strengths can be identified. The presenter announces many interesting and relevant projects and initiatives that testify to a competent and committed teaching staff. Another identified strength is a clear interest in each other's Universities, and it is a strength that there is already an established collaboration today. The currently relatively small student groups ensure proximity to professors and teachers that benefits the students' influence and their access to knowledge, which is a strength.

Areas of improvement and recommendations

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

It is recommended to facilitate involvement of students and other stakeholders in the program design

It is recommended to design the program so that it enables smooth student progression, especially during the transition phase from Paphos to Western Macedonia.

It is recommended to assure regularly monitoring of the latest research in the given discipline. Teachers must be given time to do this monitoring ensuring that the programme is up-to-date, and ensuring that all subjects are equally updated in recent research.

It is recommended to periodically reviewed not only the current changing needs of society but more importantly the emerging needs as the students will be graduated in 4-to-5-year time. This proactive approach is a key factor in ensuring that the programme remains consistent with developments in society aligning the content and objectives of the study programme accordingly.

It is recommended to involve students and staff in providing and analysing information and planning follow-up activities. This is especially important when running the programme for the first time.

It is recommended to involve teachers and students in the study programme's design and development (launching, changing, internal evaluation).

It is recommended that programme teachers ensure logical sequence and coherence of courses avoiding overlaps between courses.

It is recommended to enhance support in development of the learners' general competencies (including digital literacy, foreign language skills, entrepreneurship, communication and teamwork skills).

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	Partially 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. **YES.**
- 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. **Unclear (see recommendations).**
- Students are encouraged to take an active role in creating the learning process. **Unclear. (see recommendations).**
- 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. **YES.**
- Teaching methods, tools and material used in teaching are modern, effective, support the use of modern educational technologies and are regularly updated. **YES. Improvements are still needed. (see recommendations).**
- Mutual respect within the learner-teacher relationship is promoted. **YES.**
- The implementation of student-centred learning and teaching respects and attends to the diversity of students and their needs, enabling flexible learning paths. **We believe so.**
- Appropriate procedures for dealing with students' complaints regarding the process of teaching and learning are set. **We believe so.**

2.2 Practical training

Standards

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

2.3 Student assessment

Standards

- Assessment is consistent, fairly applied to all students and carried out in accordance with the stated procedures. **YES.**
- Assessment is appropriate, transparent, objective and supports the development of the learner. **YES.**
- The criteria for the method of assessment, as well as criteria for marking, are published in advance. **YES.**
- 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. **YES.**
- Assessment, where possible, is carried out by more than one examiner. **YES.**
- A formal procedure for student appeals is in place. **YES.**
- Assessors are familiar with existing testing and examination methods and receive support in developing their own skills in this field. **UNCLEAR.**
- The regulations for assessment take into account mitigating circumstances. **YES.**

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).* A system of course evaluation is in place to monitor efficiency of teaching, assessment methods and intended learning outcomes.
- *How are students' different abilities, learning needs and learning opportunities taken into consideration when conducting educational activities?* Availability of teachers is very good according to the students we interviewed. Students get quick and efficient help and support with the learning process.
- *How is the development of students' general competencies (including digital skills) supported in educational activities?* This is integrated into curriculum.
- *How is it ensured that innovative teaching methods, learning environments and learning aids that support learning are diverse and used in educational activities?* This was not clearly demonstrated by the program application or during the campus visit. (see recommendations).
- *Is the teaching staff using new technology in order to make the teaching process more effective?* Computer technology is used but many other technologies are yet to be adopted.
- *How is it ensured that theory and practice are interconnected in teaching and learning?* Through laboratory works, practical examples, field trips (e.g. visits to construction sites) and internships in industry.
- *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?* The labs need to be updated to properly support project work. The practical training is instrumental in achieving the objectives of the study programme. Students like the arrangements but would like to have more opportunities for the practical training.
- *Are students actively involved in research? How is student involvement in research set up?* The students are encouraged to produce research papers. The degree of involvement depends on the course and teacher, which a proper approach.

- *How is supervision of student research papers (seminar papers, projects, theses, etc.) organised? Students are supported by teachers and even other students (examples from University of Western Macedonia)*
- *Do students' assessments correspond to the European Qualifications Framework (EQF)? YES.*
- *How are the assessment methods chosen and to what extent do students get supportive feedback on their academic progress during their studies? The procedure behind the selection of the evaluation methods was not properly explained.*
- *How is the objectivity and relevance of student assessment ensured (assessment of the degree of achievement of the intended learning outcomes)? Through interviewing students and course responsible teachers.*

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.

Selected students we have interviewed are satisfied with their studies.

Strengths

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

The interactions and relationship between the students and teaching staff are very good. The academic environment is deemed to be stimulating. Presentations from the participating universities show interesting and relevant projects indicating the strength.

Areas of improvement and recommendations

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

It is recommended to enhance the process of teaching and learning to be more flexible, integrating different modes of delivery, and a variety of pedagogical methods to facilitate the achievement of planned learning outcomes. Also sharing knowledge, practices, methods among teachers.

It is recommended that the students take an active role in creating the learning process. For example, project-based learning.

It is recommended to further and regularly enhance teaching methods, tools and material to assure that they are modern, effective, and support the use of modern educational technologies

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

Sub-area	Non-compliant/ Partially Compliant/Compliant
----------	---

2.1	Process of teaching and learning and student-centred teaching methodology	Compliant
2.2	Practical training	Partially 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. We believe so.*
- *Fair, transparent and clear processes for the recruitment and development of the teaching staff are set up. We believe so.*

- *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. We believe so.*
- *The teaching staff is regularly engaged in professional and teaching-skills training and development. We believe so.*
- *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. We believe so.*
- *Innovation in teaching methods and the use of new technologies is encouraged. We believe so.*
- *Conditions of employment that recognise the importance of teaching are followed. We believe so.*
- *Recognised visiting teaching staff participates in teaching the study programme. We believe so.*

3.2 Teaching staff number and status

Standards

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

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). YES.*
- *Scholarly activity to strengthen the link between education and research is encouraged. YES.*
- *The teaching staff publications are within the discipline. YES.*
- *Teaching staff studies and publications are closely related to the programme's courses. YES.*
- *The allocation of teaching hours compared to the time for research activity is appropriate. No (in Paphos).*

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? By regular training and the feedback system.*
- *How is the teaching performance assessed? How does their teaching performance affect their remuneration, evaluation and/or selection? There is a system in place*

for performance assessment. Yes, teaching performance affect remuneration, evaluation and/or selection.

- Is teaching connected with research? YES.*
- Does the HEI involve visiting teaching staff from other HEIs in Cyprus and abroad? YES.*
- What is the number, workload, qualifications and status of the teaching staff (rank, full/part timers)? Maximum 8 courses per year in Paphos and 4 courses per year in Western Macedonia.*
- 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)? Yes, there is a system for this.*

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 teachers seem to be used to having and owning their courses with no significant collaborative teaching.

The current incentive system of work allocation seems to emphasise research over teaching.

The teaching performance is assessed and teaching is supposed to be well connected with research. NUP also involves visiting teaching staff from other HEIs and organisations in Cyprus and abroad.

Student evaluation is conducted on the teaching staff, the results of student feedback are analysed and taken into account.

Strengths

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

Having a relatively healthy student / staff ratio can be observed by a committed team of teachers with having long and relaxed relationships with the students.

Strength: involvement of different departments in the programme.

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.

Teaching staff should be more supported with regard to the development of their teaching skills towards project-based learning.

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

Sub-area	Non-compliant/ Partially Compliant/Compliant
----------	---



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. YES.*
- *Access policies, admission processes and criteria are implemented consistently and in a transparent manner. YES.*

4.2 Student progression

Standards

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

4.3 Student recognition

Standards

- *Pre-defined and published regulations regarding student recognition are in place. YES.*
- *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. YES.*
- *Appropriate recognition procedures are in place that rely on:*
 - *institutional practice for recognition being in line with the principles of the Lisbon Recognition Convention YES.*
 - *cooperation with other institutions, quality assurance agencies and the national ENIC/NARIC centre with a view to ensuring coherent recognition across the country YES.*

4.4 Student certification

Standards

- *Pre-defined and published regulations regarding student certification are in place. YES.*
- *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. YES.*

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)? YES.*
- *How is the procedure of recognition for prior learning and work experience ensured, including recognition of study results acquired at foreign higher education institutions? It is considered.*
- *Is the certification of the HEI accompanied by a diploma supplement, which is in line with European and international standards? YES.*

Findings

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

We found that the relevant and standard procedures are in place and support the programme.

Strengths

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

Proper administration and dedicated knowledgeable people. Mature institution, ready to support the programme.

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.

Ensure and regular verify that both Universities support the programme in a similar way.

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, *Yes, to a certain degree*
 - materials, *Yes, library support available*
 - aids and equipment, *Yes, laboratories with suitable equipment*
 are provided to students and support the achievement of objectives in the study programme. *Yes*
- Adequacy of resources is ensured for changing circumstances (change in student numbers, etc.). *Yes, as long as the number of students below 30.*
- All resources are fit for purpose. *Yes.*
- Student-centred learning and flexible modes of learning and teaching, are taken into account when allocating, planning and providing the learning resources. *Yes, with all teaching on site, no remote teaching.*

5.2 Physical resources

Standards

- Physical resources, i.e. premises, libraries, study facilities, IT infrastructure, are adequate to support the study programme. *YES.*
- Adequacy of resources is ensured for changing circumstances (change in student numbers, etc.). *YES, if the maximum number of students is limited to 30.*
- All resources are fit for purpose and students are informed about the services available to them. *We believe so.*

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. **YES.**
- Adequacy of resources is ensured for changing circumstances (change in student numbers, etc.). **YES, if the maximum number of students is limited to 30.**
- All resources are fit for purpose and students are informed about the services available to them. **We believe so.**

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. **We believe so.**
- Students are informed about the services available to them. **We believe so.**
- Student-centred learning and flexible modes of learning and teaching, are taken into account when allocating, planning and providing student support. **We believe so.**
- Students' mobility within and across higher education systems is encouraged and supported. **Yes.**

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? **The infrastructure is adequate.**
- What is the feedback from the teaching staff on the availability of teaching materials, classrooms, etc.? **Positive feedback from the staff and students.**
- Are the resources in accordance with actual (changing) needs and contemporary requirements? How is the effectiveness of using resources ensured? **Yes, and the need for group assignments should be addressed.**
- 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? **(see recommendations)**
- Evaluate student feedback on support services. Based on student feedback, which support services (including information flow, counselling) need further development? **Good support according to students.**
- How is student learning within the standard period of study supported (student counselling, flexibility of the study programme, etc.)? **Good support.**
- How students' special needs are considered (different capabilities, different levels of academic preparation, special needs due to physical disabilities, etc.)?

Availability of teachers is very good according to the students we interviewed.
Students get quick and efficient help and support with the learning process.

- *How is student mobility being supported? The program has integrated mobility due to the final 2(3) years of studies in the University of Western Macedonia.*

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.

Supply of teaching materials and equipment (including teaching labs, expendable materials, etc.) is at an acceptable level as well as the condition of classrooms, adequacy of financial resources to conduct the study programme and achieve its objectives.

The resources are in accordance with changing needs and contemporary requirements. The student feedback on support services. Based on student feedback, the support services are at an acceptable level.

The student mobility support at the end of 2nd year studies from Cyprus to Western-Macedonia was not clearly presented in the evaluation.

Strengths

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

Students and teachers support functions are at an acceptable level, processes support the current teaching model well.

Involvement of several departments and two universities in the same programme sets a strong foundation for an interdisciplinary and ambitious programme.

Areas of improvement and recommendations

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

It is recommended to improve support for project-based learning, program planning and operation in two locations and student mobility.

It is recommended to improve the work with assessment of the resource-related trends and future risks to have a clear plan for taking into account these trends and mitigating the associated risks.

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

Sub-area		<i>Non-compliant/ Partially Compliant/Compliant</i>
5.1	Teaching and Learning resources	Compliant
5.2	Physical resources	Partially 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.

Click or tap here to enter text.

Strengths

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

Click or tap here to enter text.

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.

Click or tap here to enter text.

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	Not applicable
6.2	Proposal and dissertation	Not applicable
6.3	Supervision and committees	Not applicable

7. Eligibility (ALL ESG)

Sub-areas

7.1 Legal framework and cooperation agreement

7.2 The joint programme

7.3 Added value of the joint programme

7.1 Legal framework and cooperation agreement

Standards

- The joint programme is offered in accordance with legal frameworks of the relevant national higher education systems. **YES.**
- The terms and conditions of the joint programme are laid down in a cooperation agreement. The agreement in particular covers the following issues:
 - Denomination of the degree(s) awarded in the programme **YES**
 - Coordination and responsibilities of the partners involved regarding management and financial organisation, including funding, sharing of costs and income, resources for mobility of staff and students. **YES.**
 - Admission and selection procedures for students **YES.**
 - Mobility of students and teaching staff **YES.**
 - Examination regulations, student assessment methods, recognition of credits and degree awarding procedures **YES.**
 - Handling of different semester periods, if existent **YES.**

7.2 The joint programme

Standards

- The partner universities apply joint internal quality assurance processes. **YES.**
- The joint programme is offered jointly, involving all cooperating universities in the design, delivery and further development of the programme. **YES.**
- Aims and learning outcomes are clearly stated, including a joint syllabus, language policy, as well as an account of the intended added value of the programme. **YES.**
- Study counselling and mobility plans are efficient and take into account the needs of different kinds of students. **YES and these need to be further improved.**

7.3 Added value of the joint programme

Standards

The joint programme leads to the following added values:

- Increases internationalisation at the institutions. **YES.**
- Stimulates multinational collaboration on teaching at a high level and makes cooperation binding. **YES.**
- Increases transparency between educational systems. **YES.**

- Develops study and research alternatives in accordance with emerging needs. *No information is available to support this claim.*
- Improves educational and research collaboration. *YES.*
- Offers students an expanded and innovative arena for learning. *The arena is certainly expanded but hardly innovative.*
- Increases highly educated candidates' employability and motivation for mobility in a global labour market. *YES.*
- Increases European and non-European students' interest in the educational programme. *YES.*
- Increases competence at partner institutions through cooperation and implementation of a best practice system. *Potentially yes, but information available does not support this claim.*
- Increases the institution's ability to change in step with emerging needs. *No information is available to support this claim.*
- Contributes to tearing down cultural barriers, both personal and institutional. *YES, potentially.*

You may also consider the following questions:

- Does the joint study programme conform to the requirements of a study programme offered at the specific level? *YES.*
- Is there a system that assures the quality of joint provision and guarantees that the aims of the programme are met? *YES.*
- Do the mechanisms for ensuring the quality of the joint study programme take into consideration the European Standards and Guidelines (ESG)? Are they adopted by all the universities involved? *YES.*
- Is the division of responsibilities in ensuring quality clearly defined among the partner universities? *Yes and no. (see recommendations)*
- Is relevant information about the programme, e.g. admission requirements and procedures, course catalogue, examination and assessment procedures, well documented and published by taking into account the specific needs of students? *YES.*
- What is the added value of the programme of study? *The reference point is not provided to judge the added value.*
- Is there a sustainable funding strategy among the partner universities? Explain. *YES.*

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 two partner Universities apply jointly for the program and involves cooperation between the two universities. The face-to-face evaluation, it was clear that the education managers at the different institutions were clear about the structure and content of the new education, and the students seemed to have high expectations of the new education. It was not as clear whether the teachers involved in the different courses had the same holistic overview of the different parts of the program. Here, a joint workshop with all teachers involved would be valuable to ensure quality and progression in the program. To clearly agree on WHAT for WHO, WHERE, WHEN and WHY before HOW.

The intended learning outcomes is clearly stated on program level in the joint syllabus, but could be clearly stated on course level, means progression from one course to another, in the different subjects. There is a clear ambition on interdisciplinarity in the program. It has to be clarified how this shall be ensures also among the teachers involved in the program in different courses with different subject areas.

Strengths

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

When visiting the University and meeting the teachers and experts involved, as well as watching the various presentations about what is being done at the various Universities today, many strengths can be identified. The presenter announces many interesting and relevant projects and initiatives that testify to a competent and committed teaching staff. Another identified strength is a clear interest in each other's Universities, and it is a strength that there is already an established collaboration today. The currently relatively small student groups ensure proximity to professors and teachers that benefits the students' influence and their access to knowledge, which is a strength.

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 progression of the program needs to be made clear to all courses and teachers involved. The progression between the different courses is not so clear declared, means what knowledge does the students bring with them from one course to another. An illustration of the progression of the different subjects from one course to another, over the different study periods might help to clarify this. This will also ensure and clarify the responsibilities for the quality of the program. This might be of specific importance, since the program is given at two different Universities

Our recommendation is to conduct a joint workshop where the courses are reviewed in detail and that each semester's courses correlate with each other under, for example, a theme. The first semester could, for example, be the students' understanding of space, dimensions, the individual's ability to understand. The second semester's theme could be human factors and the integration of the human being with the product, space. The exercises in the different courses can thus be adapted to the theme.

It could be good to assign the program director in each University (not programme coordinators only) for the joint program.

The Vision and USP can be strengthen. For example, if one of the identified USP at Faculty of Engineering of the University of Western Macedonia, is "The holistic design of products and systems, starting with the conception of the idea and ending with the completion of the final product", it could also be agreed part of the USP for the new joint program.

Mobility for students and staff needs to be clarified in more details. Will staff for example be given the opportunity for mobility through visits to the respective universities? In what way will mobility for students be supported?

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

Sub-area	Non-compliant/ Partially Compliant/Compliant
----------	---

7.1	Legal framework and cooperation agreement	Compliant
7.2	The joint programme	Compliant
7.3	Added value of the joint programme	Not applicable

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 (Consider also the added value of the joint programme).

The 'Application for Evaluation –Accreditation Programme of Study' document defines the program 'Bachelor & Integrated Master in Product Design Engineering in Collaboration with the University of Western Macedonia'. The programme *"aims to develop graduates who will be able to creatively use a range of new technologies in the sciences and arts to design solutions in the form of usable, innovative and cutting-edge products at the undergraduate level."* In addition, *"the aim of the programme is to provide the student with a broad theoretical and practical background knowledge and analytical skills, in order to be fully prepared to develop critical thinking for research production in the respective field of studies. The objective of the program is the holistic product design, which starts with the conception of the idea and leading to the completion of the final product and the methodical, multidisciplinary approach to the design, implementation, technical management and operation of a production system."*

The Application mentions the terms 'Interdisciplinary' or 'Multidisciplinary' 18 times and highlights the need for such new graduates by stating *"The new generation involved in the design and manufacture of products and systems cannot be limited, one-dimensionally, to the theory and practice of the industry, but must acquire knowledge related to economic and promotional management, in order to achieve the objectives of their business activity."* Also the employability of the graduates is stated as *"In the private sector, as professional Product and System Design Engineers, establishing Design Studios and providing integrated and innovative design services for tangible and digital products and systems, working autonomously or in collaboration with professionals in other disciplines."* Based on the evaluation visit, discussions and application this is the vision of the programme.

Interdisciplinary, by definition, is a collaboration by cooperative integration of knowledge, methods, and expertise from multiple distinct fields to address complex problems or achieve shared objectives. (Klein, 2008).

Interdisciplinary learning (IL) is a fairly new phenomenon, which can be defined as an educational approach that integrates knowledge, perspectives, and skills from multiple disciplines to foster deeper understanding, critical thinking, and the ability to address complex, real-world problems (Education Scotland, 2025; School of Education, 2023). The usual way of organising IL in HEIs is by the pedagogical frameworks of 'Project based Learning' (Larmer et al., 2015), or 'Problem based Learning' (Savery, 2006). Both pedagogical frameworks emphasise the concept of 'Learning by Doing', which has relation to the 70:20:10-framework (Johnson et al., 2018) positing that effective learning comprises *"70% experiential (on-the-job experiences), 20% social (interactions with others), and 10% formal (structured training) learning"*.

To effectively implement Project-Based Learning (PjBL) and Problem-Based Learning (PBL), a teacher should develop several essential skills and competencies. The transition to such learning philosophies from lecturing based teaching needs, for instance, 'Facilitation and Guidance Skills', 'Re-definition of Assessment and Evaluation', 'Collaborative and Teamwork Skills', 'Inquiry and Critical Thinking Promotion', 'Adaptability and Flexibility', 'Communication and Interpersonal Skills', 'Organization and Time Management' and 'Reflective Practice' (Larmer, et al., 2015; Savery, 2006, Barrows, 1996)

Understanding the above the following notices were made from the Evaluation discussions, visit to campus (NUP), application and other supplied materials.

Curricula / courses

- Learning outcome (PL5) clearly states that students should be capable of developing a comprehensive product design project, evolving their concepts into functional prototypes by thoughtfully integrating technical proficiency, aesthetic quality, and ergonomic considerations. This outcome underlines the importance of a holistic design education that prepares students for real-world professional challenges.
- Currently, however, the program's courses are predominantly structured and delivered as isolated units. This compartmentalization limits students' ability to perceive and engage with the broader educational context, resulting in reduced clarity regarding how different course contents interconnect. As a consequence, there is a noticeable gap in the cultivation of collaborative skills and the implementation of a project-based, learning-by-doing pedagogical approach, which is crucial for effective design education.
- A significant concern is the timing of project-based activities within the curriculum. Design projects, essential for practical learning and skill integration, are introduced relatively late in the educational timeline—specifically, only in the 8th semester (Industrial Design Project) and the 9th semester (Project in Product Design). Introducing such vital projects at an advanced stage may limit students' opportunities to iteratively develop and refine their skills, integrate theoretical learning with practical experience, and acquire sufficient project management competencies through continuous practice.
- Furthermore, the current curriculum lacks clear definitions or structured frameworks for collaborative projects that explicitly foster interdisciplinary learning. Such interdisciplinary projects are essential, as they provide students with valuable experiences in teamwork, diverse perspectives, and holistic problem-solving approaches, thereby better preparing them for complex professional environments. Also working in collaborative projects is the best way to insure interconnection (collaboration) between different courses.
- Lastly, it was observed that there is an absence of a unified and clearly articulated vision for the program among both teaching and support staff. This shared vision is crucial to ensuring cohesive educational experiences, aligned pedagogical strategies, and effective organizational operations. Establishing a collective understanding and agreement upon the program's objectives and educational approach is especially critical when changes are intended to be implemented across multiple levels and organizations. Strengthening communication and strategic alignment between these two different organizational entities will be key to effectively executing meaningful and sustainable improvements within the program. Recommendation is to structure the programme according to different themes per semester.

Pedagogy

- According to discussions conducted with the NUP teachers and the service provider staff, it was evident that no formal training has been provided thus far to support the implementation of the newly required pedagogical approach. Both groups reported a noticeable absence of structured training sessions, workshops, or professional development activities tailored specifically to the new educational requirements.
- Moreover, the discussions revealed a lack of collaborative effort in terms of curriculum planning and joint course development. Neither the NUP teachers nor the service provider staff provided any concrete

examples or evidence of joint initiatives, co-planning sessions, or collaborative curriculum development projects. Each group appeared to function independently, with minimal or no cross-group interaction aimed at aligning educational strategies or course objectives.

- Additionally, interactions and collaboration with UWM staff and teachers appeared to be minimal and were not strongly emphasized during the discussions. Although occasional informal exchanges may have occurred, participants did not describe structured, ongoing collaborative activities or partnerships involving UWM personnel.
- Furthermore, while the participants did indicate having some experience with project design, it became clear that this experience was primarily confined to individual courses rather than systematically integrated into the broader curriculum framework. Thus, project-based learning and design experiences lacked coherence and alignment across multiple courses, limiting their potential impact on student learning and overall program effectiveness.

Support Services

- Based on insights gathered from the student interviews, it is evident that group work is significantly preferred by the students over individual assignments within the program. Students frequently collaborate on projects that require extensive interaction, planning, negotiation, reporting, and sketching activities. But individually conducted projects are also of importance.
- However, according to the interviews conducted with the service support staff and observations made during the facility walk-around at NUP, there seems to be a notable gap in the infrastructure needed to effectively facilitate this emphasis on collaborative student work. Both the physical facilities and the available IT infrastructure appear insufficient in fully supporting students' collaborative requirements.
- Presently, students are expected to manage their group projects within laboratory spaces, which are typically designed for practical experimentation rather than collaborative project management. This means there is an absence of dedicated office-like environments where students can comfortably engage in essential aspects of project planning, such as discussions, brainstorming sessions, detailed negotiations, documentation, and sketching or conceptualization.
- Consequently, this gap in dedicated collaborative spaces might be affecting the effectiveness of group work and potentially hindering students' ability to achieve the intended learning outcomes related to teamwork and collaborative project development. To address this issue, there is a somewhat need for creating supportive and purpose-built collaborative spaces that can foster productive group interactions and ultimately enhance the learning experience.

Companies in connection with NUP

- Inputs were received from the company representatives at various organizational levels. Both hard skills, such as technical competencies, and soft skills, including knowledge, attitude, and recognition of company targets, were highlighted as important.

- Within the Mechanical Engineering field, emphasis was placed specifically on competencies in 3D design and applied technical drawing (SolidWorks), though it was noted that currently, interdisciplinary skills are not effectively utilized.
- Additionally, representatives pointed out the necessity for management renewal to better align with the values and expectations of Generation Z employees.
- Participation in the program was considered highly beneficial and practical, particularly due to the free access it provides to various professional tools. Companies regularly provided inputs, and almost every year, an online event was held where students presented their package designs. Additionally, student CVs were distributed among the member companies.
- Companies actively participated through networking, supplying laboratory testing equipment, and even offering opportunities for tester cooperation in Frankfurt. Furthermore, companies expressed willingness to collaborate in offering postgraduate studies and Master's programs in Germany.
- From the perspective of the companies, interdisciplinary study and collaborative experiences added significant value, especially highlighting the importance of financial knowledge and strong communication skills.

Recommendations

1. A clear role of a dedicated Program Director with appropriate responsibility and authority is needed to effectively organise planning, execution of the program. There is a urgent need for this role in both organising Universities.
2. There is also a necessity for collaborative curricula development and practical planning, structured in two distinct phases, involving active participation from both responsible institutions. Teaching staff as well as support services staff should collaborate closely in this planning process. Furthermore, these collaborative plans should be validated together with relevant stakeholders.
3. Realising the collaborative planning and program execution, the staff mobility principles and rules should be defined more clearly.
4. Pedagogical training, particularly focused on project-based learning methodologies, should be provided to all staff members, not limited to teachers.
5. Additionally, visualization tools or methods should be implemented to clearly demonstrate the curriculum structure in content and student skill development.
6. Also it is of important to further facilitate engagement of industry in the programme is substantial and continuous.
7. Application of IDEx Model: The IDEx (Interdisciplinary Design Engineering) model, successfully implemented at the University of Western Macedonia, should be applied to students at Neapolis University Pafos as well. This model is highly influential as it includes presentations of work from older students, which can inspire and guide newer students in their projects.
8. Program Alignment & Consistency: Professors and organizers need to align their understanding of the program's aims and objectives to ensure consistency in course delivery and learning outcomes.
9. Group Projects & Collaboration: The program should integrate group projects throughout its duration to enhance students' communication, teamwork, and problem-solving skills.
10. Interdisciplinary Projects: Collaboration with other departments, such as Economics and Marketing, should be encouraged to expose students to different perspectives and interdisciplinary teamwork.
11. Workload of Professors: The workload of professors at Neapolis University Pafos should be minimized to enhance productivity, teaching effectiveness, and student engagement.

References:

Klein, J. T. (2008). Evaluation of interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary research: a literature review. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 35(2), S116-S123.

Education Scotland 2025: <https://blogs.glowscotland.org.uk/glowblogs/technologies/interdisciplinary-learning/what-is-interdisciplinary-learning/>

School of Education 2023: <https://soeonline.american.edu/blog/interdisciplinary-education/>

Larmer, J., Mergendoller, J., & Boss, S. (2015). Setting the standard for project based learning. Ascd.

Savery, J. R. (2015). Overview of problem-based learning: Definitions and distinctions. *Essential readings in problem-based learning: Exploring and extending the legacy of Howard S. Barrows*, 9(2), 5-15.

Johnson, S. J., Blackman, D. A., & Buick, F. (2018). The 70: 20: 10 framework and the transfer of learning. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 29(4), 383-402.

Larmer, J., Mergendoller, J. R., & Boss, S. (2015). Gold Standard PBL: Essential Project Design Elements. Buck Institute for Education.

Savery, J. R. (2006). Overview of Problem-based Learning: Definitions and Distinctions. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Problem-Based Learning*.

Barrows, H. S. (1996). Problem-based learning in medicine and beyond: A brief overview. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*.



E. Signatures of the EEC

<i>Name</i>	<i>Signature</i>
Professor Lars Eriksson	
Professor of Practice Kari-Pekka Heikkinen	
Professor Sergei Glavatskih	
Andreas Lizidis	
Andria Stavraki	
Click to enter Name	

Date: 20.03.2025