

Doc. 300.1.1/2

Date: Date.

External Evaluation Report

(E-learning programme of study)

- **Higher Education Institution:**
Neapolis University Pafos
- **Town:** Pafos
- **School/Faculty (if applicable):** Economics, Business and Computer Science
- **Department/ Sector:** Economics and Business
- **Programme of study- Name (Duration, ECTS, Cycle)**

In Greek:

Programme Name

In English:

MSc in Organizational Leadership & Human Resource Management (18 months, 90 credits)

- **Language(s) of instruction:** English
- **Programme's status:** New
- **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 external Evaluation Committee arrived at Neapolis University Pafos at 8.45 on Wednesday 22 October, 2025.

An indicative schedule of meetings for the site visit was provided by Ms. Christiana Maki of the Cyprus Agency of Quality Assurance and Accreditation in Higher Education.

All individuals listed on the meeting agenda were present and interacted productively with the Evaluation Committee.

The following meetings were undertaken:

09:10 – 09:45 – *Meeting with the University Rector, Vice Rector of Academic Affairs, Vice Rector of Research and innovation, Dean of the School of Economics, Business and Computer Science, Head of the Department of Economics, and the Head of the Quality Assurance Office.*

This meeting provided the Evaluation Committee with an excellent overview of the history and general operation of the university.

09:45 10:20 – *Meeting with the Dean of the School of Economics, Business and Computer Science, Head of the Department of Economic, and Business and the Academic Coordinator of the proposed programme.*

The meeting provided the Evaluation Committee with very detailed information on the structure, content, management and teaching methodology proposed for the new programme.

11:45- 12.30 – *Meeting with the head and key staff members of the E-Learning Unit.*

This meeting provided a detailed overview of the university's E-Learning philosophy, the key features and functionality of the E-Learning Platform, and of the supports provided by the pedagogical support team to academic staff and students.

13:30-14:30 – *Meeting with a number of teaching staff on the proposed programme.*

This meeting provided the Evaluation Committee with an insight into the mix of academic staff on the proposed programme, indicative content of the proposed subject mix, and associated assessment strategies. Insight was also provided on academic staff academic qualifications and teaching philosophies/approaches.

14:30-15.15 – *Meeting with external Stakeholders of the university.*

This meeting provided information to the Evaluation Committee into the local business and administrative context, clarified the positive role and input of external stakeholders into the design of the programme and also provided contextual information on the market demand/need for the proposed programme of study.

15:15-16:00 – *Meeting with University administrative staff responsible for supporting the programme.*

This meeting provided the Evaluation Committee with information on the management of student admission, progression and certification. It also provided information on career/alumni and student welfare services.

16:30 – 17:00 – *Meeting (online) with University students and graduates*

This meeting gave the Evaluation Committee insights into the experience of students studying in an online environment.

17:00-17:30 – *Tour of the institutional premises.*

This tour provided the Evaluation Committee with an overview of the main buildings and physical teaching infrastructure of the university.

17:45- 18.15 – *Exit Discussion with the Dean of the School of Economics, Business and Computer Science, Head of Department of Economics and Business and the Academic Coordinator of the Programme.*

In this exit discussion the Evaluation Committee provided some initial feedback on their impressions during the day and sought some minor additional material on the operation of the programme.

The evaluation herein drew on evidence comprised of:

- A electronic package of paperwork which was read by all members of the committee prior to the scheduled visit.
- Information from staff, the leadership team, students and other stakeholders in the scheduled meetings.

Taken together, these form the basis of the report.

Click or tap here to enter text.

B. External Evaluation Committee (EEC)

<i>Name</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>University</i>
Clare Kelliher	Professor	Cranfield University, UK
Kathleen Riach	Professor	University of Glasgow, UK
Thashmee Karunaratne	Professor	KTH Royal Institute of Technology, Sweden
Paul McGrath	Professor	University College Dublin, Ireland
Mr. Alexandros Efgeniou	Student Member	Open University of Cyprus, 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*
 - *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.

1.1 *Policy of Quality of Assurance*

The Evaluation Committee consider that Neapolis University Pafos has a well-developed and tried and tested policy for quality assurance. This system is externally accredited and benchmarked against other relevant academic institutions. It has in place appropriate and robust processes for the design, approval, on-going monitoring and review of programmes. The University Quality Assurance Committee has appropriate expertise and relevant tools to provide excellent and fine-grained oversight of the performance review process. The QA process allows for an appropriate level of academic freedom and integrates well with a range of external stakeholders. The QA process does not make any specific provision for the initial review of new programmes.

1.2 *Design, Approval, on-going Monitoring and Review*

The programme has stated aims and objectives which feed into associated learning outcomes. These programme aims and objectives are in line with the strategy of Neapolis University Pafos and reflect design input from external stakeholders. The design of the programme reflects the four purposes of higher education of the Council of Europe and is designed around the ECTS. The programme will be subject to periodic review to ensure its quality and continuing relevance and appears to offer attractive employment opportunities. The Evaluation Committee noted the spread of subjects on this programme across Departments and Schools. It also noted the absence of peer grading within subjects and the absence of external oversight of subject, departmental or institutional grading processes. They found that the research methods course, as a compulsory and important component of the programme, focuses largely on quantitative methods and has an inadequate focus on qualitative methods and analysis – as one would expect for a Master's course in this area.

1.3 *Public Information*

There is no public information on the proposed programme of study currently available. As such the Evaluation Committee were unable to make any informed judgement on this issue. However, the Evaluation Committee is satisfied that existing information and publicity information dissemination processes and procedures within the university will satisfactorily address all public information needs of prospective students (E.g. selection criteria, assessment procedures, graduate employment information, etc.). The committee did not see any evidence of situations where student pass rates on programmes were made publicly available.

1.4 *Information Management*

High quality arrangements are in place for the effective collection, monitoring and analysis of programme information. The programme has clear key performance indicators (standardized across programmes within the university) and has in place appropriate mechanisms to manage and support student progression. The programme has appropriate student learning resources and supports in place.

Strengths

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

The Evaluation Committee were impressed by the overall quality of the programme design, monitoring and development processes in place within the university. Specific strengths the Evaluation Committee would like to highlight include:

- a) A comprehensive quality assurance system that is externally assessed and benchmarked.
- b) A well-qualified, highly motivated and flexible academic and administrative support team underpinning the operation and effectiveness of the QA process.
- c) The ability to generate and analyse appropriate levels of information to ensure the timely monitoring and review of the programme.
- d) A strong public perception of delivering quality academic programmes.

Areas of improvement and recommendations

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

The Evaluation Committee identified a small number of issues related to the study programme's design and development and feels that addressing these now would further enhance the quality of the proposed programme. These proposed actions would also help with the clarity of communication to academic and support staff, students and external stakeholders. These issues are listed below.

a. Issue 1: Some Ambiguity over Programme Aims and Objectives.

During the various meetings held at the site visit, the Evaluation Committee encountered some differences in the manner in which a variety of internal and external stakeholders articulated the nature and core design objectives of the programme. The Evaluation Committee recommend that further consideration needs to be given to more clearly articulate the essence and uniqueness of the proposed programme and the nature of the graduate it hopes to deliver.

Recommended Action:

To ensure full compliance with 1.2, the Evaluation committee recommend that the Programme Coordinator collaboratively revisits the learning aims and objectives of the programme with a view to simplifying and crystallising its essence and unique selling point. These revised aims and objectives can then be communicated to the teaching team to facilitate some tailoring of academic content and assessment and be reflected in external publicity material planned for the programme. These revised programme aims and objectives could also be used to clarify optimal pathways for students on the programme.

b. Issue 2: Developing Programme identity

The Evaluation Committee were of the view that the shared nature of the delivery all the programme subjects (all shared with other programmes across multiple Departments and Schools) could lead to a dilution of the identity and level of communal bonding of the programme.

Consideration needs to be given to how the identity and communal bonding of the programme will be developed and maintained.

Recommended Action:

The committee recommends that the Programme Coordinator should put in place specific opportunities (face to face and/or virtual) to help build and maintain a distinctive programme

identity among this cohort of students. For example, use could be made of dedicated career talks or skill development session from external stakeholders to achieve this.

c. Issue 3: Initial Programme Grade Monitoring and Review

The Evaluation Committee noted the potentially diverse intake that could manifest itself in this programme. This rich diversity of the student cohort (which the committee saw as a strength of the programme) and open selection prerequisites has the potential to produce unusual grade distributions. The committee also noted that course delivered on this programme would cut across university Departments and Schools. As such the committee considers that the existing standardised institutional grade review and approvals process could negatively impact on the development of the programme.

Recommended Action:

The Evaluation Committee recommends that Department Heads and Programme Coordinator pay special attention to both the standard and consistency of grading across subjects on this programme and that existing institutional grading norms should not unduly influence grading practices on this programme while it develops and beds down.

d. Issue 4: DMBA as Inadequate Preparation for the Dissertation

The Evaluation Committee noted that the preparation for the dissertation via the research methods and data analysis course (DMBA500) is inadequate for a Master's level programme on organizational leadership and HRM. This is due to the course having a heavy skew towards quantitative methods and analysis as the expense of qualitative methods.

Recommended Action:

the compulsory research methods course needs to include adequate consideration and skills of qualitative methods and analysis. This is particularly significant in the context of a degree programme that focuses on organizational leadership and HRM and where students are likely to want to address questions that require a qualitative approach.

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

2.4 Study guides structure, content and interactive activities

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

Standards

- *The e-learning methodology is appropriate for the particular programme of study.*
- *Expected teleconferences for presentations, discussion and question-answer sessions, and guidance are set.*
- *A specific plan is developed to safeguard and assess the interaction:*
 - *among students*
 - *between students and teaching staff*
 - *between students and study guides/material of study*
- *Training, guidance and support are provided to the students focusing on interaction and the specificities of e-learning.*
- *The process of teaching and learning supports students' individual and social development.*
- *The process of teaching and learning is flexible, considers different modes of e-learning 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 e-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.*
- *For distance learning programs, the number of students in both undergraduate and Master's level postgraduate programs does not exceed 30 students per class.*

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

- A complete assessment framework is designed, focusing on e-learning methodology, including clearly defined evaluation criteria for student assignments and the final examination.
- 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 e-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.

2.4 Study guides structure, content and interactive activities

Standards

- A study guide for each course, fully aligned with e-learning philosophy and methodology and the need for student interaction with the material is developed. The study guide should include, for each course week / module, the following:
 - Clearly defined objectives and expected learning outcomes of the programme, of the modules and activities in an organised and coherent manner
 - Presentation of course material, and students' activities on a weekly basis, in a variety of ways and means (e.g. printed material, electronic material, teleconferencing, multimedia)
 - **Weekly schedule of interactive activities and exercises (i.e. simulations, problem solving, scenarios, argumentation)**
 - Clear instructions for creating posts, discussion, and feedback
 - Self-assessment exercises and self-correction guide
 - Bibliographic references and suggestions for further study
 - Number of assignments/papers and their topics, along with instructions and additional study material
 - Synopsis
- Study guides, material and activities are appropriate for the level of the programme according to the EQF.

You may also consider the following questions:

- *Is the nature of the programme compatible with e-learning delivery?*

- *How do the programme, the material, the facilities, and the guidelines safeguard the interaction between students, students and teaching staff, students and the material?*
- *How many students upload their work and discuss it in the platform during the semester?*
- *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.

2.1: Process of Teaching and Learning and Student-centred Teaching Methodology.

The proposed programme would not exceed 30 students, although they would be part of a course cohort that may be significantly larger than this. There was representation of one distance learning student on the Departmental Council organigram and Course Coordinators were the first point of contact for students in case of difficulty. Resources are accessible to students, included through recorded synchronized session. The course learning design encouraged students to collaborate with each other, and courses include 'learning moments' where student can choose how they engage and learn with each other. At the beginning of the course there is also an induction period where students get to know each other to establish a healthy learning community. There is evidence of teaching methods and approaches that are modern and make good use of technology and different platforms and technologies. There is a mix of delivery including synchronous and asynchronous delivery. The user guides (for example, the one for examination proctoring systems) is not user friendly due to small font size and accessibility optimization around colours and font.

On the courses there is evidence of student-centred learning, including flipped classrooms, and students have agency in how they engage with the course material (such as how they use of recordings of online lectures and organized group and/or case studies). It was not clear how often course content was updated (such as on a biannual basis) and there was no evidence provided of student online safeguarding (although there is an office of student care based at a university level). Staff proactively work to foster mutual respect and positive relationships with students to create positive learning environments. While there was no written evidence provided around how teaching and learning activities were organized in the presence of AI, staff did discuss university-wide policies around AI in learning and teaching that were about to be brought in, which may have significant consequences at a course level.

2.2. Practical Training.

There was evidence of students having opportunities to bring together theoretical ideas with practical examples. Exercises, activities and assessment across all the courses encouraged application of concepts and ideas to enhance learning. The programme has benefitted from external practitioner engagement during its design stage and this shows in both the opportunities for students to hear from non[academic experts, for example, through practitioner guest appearances, and in the way the course integrates key ideas from academic reading with applied examples.

2.3 Student Assessment.

The learning methodologies that are used to inform assessment in this programme replicate the University's existing learning management systems in terms of their applicability and functionality.. There are consistent and transparent assessment frameworks, and criteria and frameworks appear in the respective study guides for each course. There is consistency in how the full mark for each course was broken into component parts. However, assessment is not flexible and students cannot choose how they are assessed in ways that would follow student-centred forms of assessment. There are specific e-learning activities such as group assessments. There is a lack of detail about how the dissertation is assessed, even though it represents a significant proportion of the assessment for the degree. There was the use of rubrics for each course, although no rubric was provided for the dissertation. There was disparity across courses in the use of different styles and layout of rubrics across courses with no clear evidence of a pedagogical rationale for the differences. Testimonials from student stakeholders (albeit from other programmes) indicate the potential for improved analytical feedback, which would help to improve self-directed learning and critical thinking. The university-level processes surrounding student appeals and extenuating circumstances is already established and functioning on other programmes

2.4 Study Guides Structure, Content and Interactive Activities.

The draft study guides that were provided follow a standardized template in how they are presented, including the technological support they are provided. References and suggestions for further study are present. Guides also include defined objectives and expected learning outcomes and include a clear plan of course material and activities in a chronological format and clear instructions on creating posts and student engagement. The majority of courses provided a variety of references and suggestions for further study. Even though staff suggested that students are eligible to undertake dissertations using qualitative methods and analysis, DMBA500 could better cover qualitative methods (see section 1 recommendations), and other learning outcomes in other

courses do not mention qualitative methods. This inclusion would be expected in a course exploring people management at a Masters level.

Strengths

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

The Evaluation Committee was highly impressed by the programme's strong focus on student-centred learning, teaching, and assessment. The Evaluation Committee would like to particularly commend the following key strengths:

- a) The committee were confident that the programme will be delivered in an environment with an established track record in delivering high quality online teaching.
- b) The programme will utilise a diversity of teaching approaches and assessment strategies across its various courses.
- c) The programme will have the active support of a robust technological infrastructure.
- d) The staff on the programme are highly engaged and technologically competent.

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.

Issue 1: Interactive Activities are Vulnerable to use of Generative AI

There was consideration of AI in the assessments space, but less attention to how interactive activities are AI resilient. Course interactive activities (provided as examples) can become vulnerable in the presence of generative AI.

Recommended Action:

Course content should be audited under the guidelines of the new generative AI that will be provided by the University in the near future. In particular, the Evaluation Committee recommend to have explicit guidelines for students and staff regarding how to use AI for effective learning and how to create assessments and activities that are not vulnerable to AI.

b. Issue 2: Present and Consistency of Rubrics for all Courses

Recommended Actions:

Study guides should be checked to ensure they have rubrics, including the dissertation. In addition, an area of improvement may be considering the possibility for more consistency around the format and layout of rubrics used across the programme.

c. Issue 3: Availability of Support over Extended Hours

While students noted teaching staff availability outside regular office hours, the availability of IT support was limited (apart from during examination time). Notable, the support service hours are limited at the weekend.

Recommended Actions:

The University may wish consider how support services can align with the working patterns of student study, especially if the cohort from this programme are intending to be based across different timezones.

c. *Issue 4: Lack of Detail around Dissertation Purpose and Marking (see also section 1 recommendations)*

Recommended Action:

The assessment of the dissertation and the role it has on the programme as an integrative device needs to be further articulated and clearly communicated to students within the study guide.

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
2.4	Study guides structure, content and interactive activities	Partially 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.*
- *Training, guidance and support are provided to the teaching staff focusing on interaction and the specificities of e-learning.*
- *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:

- *Is the teaching staff qualified to teach in the e-learning programme of study?*
- *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.

3.1 Teaching staff recruitment and development.

Staff on the programme are well qualified with relevant doctoral level qualifications. Evidence from both documentation and management and teaching staff testimonials suggest adequate time to focus on both their own research agendas and continuous professional development. There were institutional guidelines and processes in place around recruitment and promotion (including expectations around annual research output expectations and 5 year expectations of formal promotion) with teaching staff reporting they were aware of (and comfortable) with progression, with staff having been successfully promoted internally. Teaching takes place over 2 semesters with time in the Summer for research, although this time may also be used for developing new or updating programme design, which may have one-off workload implications for a period.

There were adequate financial resources available to support research and professional development with staff having latitude over how to curate their own development, as well as internal seminars and visiting faculty to help build capacity, and an organically led mentoring practice. In specific regards to their own pedagogical development around teaching practice was also evidence in centrally-resourced seminars held regularly that staff could attend that provided updates and debrief of emerging or important with recordings placed online. In addition, new staff were required to attend a course (c. 25 hours) to provide them with proficiency in blended learning and course design and delivery. Overall, staff were excellent: highly engaged and motivated, and clearly passionate about education, as well as very responsive to students, with students mentioning them replying during evenings and weekends (which may have staff wellbeing implications).

3.2 Teaching staff number and status.

Each course has clear ownership by a permanent member of faculty. There is a workload model in place and staff usually taught 3-4 courses per semester, although this balanced out depending on administrative responsibilities and research outputs. While course sizes are traditionally small, it was unclear who has oversight over the number of students on one course and how different levels of support and resource were proactively initiated and embedded around additional teaching support as numbers of programmes (and subsequently, the number of students) will grow. Course delivery did not suffer from any excessive use of visit staff or adjunct. The rank and status of staff was overall appropriate for a Masters level programme and drew from a variety of different disciplinary expertise and research active staff.

3.3 Synergies of teaching and research.

Staff CVs and testimonials evidenced both relevant synergies and their publications trajectories were relevant to the courses they were teaching, even if not directly related to organizational leadership and HRM. There was evidence of international collaboration, mainly through co-authorship of staff publications. Few of the staff's publications appeared on the course syllabi, even though there were several publications that would have been relevant to include. For most courses, it was very clear to see the connection between staff expertise and the content on the courses, with the exception of DMBA574. The consequence of this was clear in a course that lack content speaking to more contemporary debates in operations (such as managing complex supply chains or ESG concerns in operations), and mainly used two text books as opposed to multiple reading sources and journal articles as seen in other courses that are expected at Masters level. Some staff coordinating courses are from departments and disciplines beyond the focus of the programme but do provide relevant expertise. The advisory board and other mechanisms provided staff with insights into practitioner networks but no members of staff were members of professional accreditation organizations such as CIPD or CMI.

Strengths

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

The Evaluation Committee were impressed that all staff they spoke to (including both teach staff and support services staff) were highly engaged, motivated, showed a comprehensive awareness of distance learning design and delivery, and clearly had a passion for student focussed teaching. The Evaluation Committee particularly wishes to acknowledge the following strengths:

- a) There was a clear senior leaderships commitment to providing a culture where research-informed teaching can thrive was clear and backed up by adequate financial and time resource to undertake research and scholarship activities.
- b) Evidence highlighted an alignment between staff research expertise and the courses they taught.
- c) Staff both contributed to, and were proactive in, fostering a culture of ambition and excellence around teaching and broader activities and research trajectories within the School as a whole.
- d) There was an awareness of staff to engage with the theory-practice nexus and how that translated into their practice.
- e) Career progression and development opportunities.

Areas of improvement and recommendations

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

a) Issue 1: Formalising mentoring arrangements

Staff mentoring was in place and considered organic, as growth in the Department and School continues, this may inadvertently produce inconsistencies and disparities.

Recommended Actions

It is valuable consider a more proactive and tactical approach to mentoring that ensures early and mid-career staff have access to senior researchers relevant to their own areas of expertise. Given the current Faculty make-up, in the short-term one example may be the involvement of external or visiting researchers to help build this capacity or support infrastructure

b) Issue 2: Staff Developmental Opportunities around International Emerging Trends in Industry and Practice

Staff were both exposed to and actively engaged with a variety of external stakeholders, and have close relations with industry in the local area and regional context. However, given the international ambitions of the programme, providing opportunities for broader practitioner and occupations exposure would be valuable.

Recommended Actions:

It may be that key members of faculty associated with the programme are supported through time and financial support to gain an external professional accredited qualification such as an academic practitioner qualification from the CIPD or a CMI qualification. This may also provide reputational benefits for the programme.

c) Issue 3: Numbers of students on courses as potential risk to staff workload and wellbeing

The practice of multiple programmes from across different School's feeding into the same course presents a vulnerability in terms of staff workload. It was noted that on course had high numbers of students on it (although there were resources and support available when requested).

Recommended Action:

Structures and processes should be put in place around resourcing considerations that are mobilized as soon as student numbers of an overall course are confirmed, rather than a more reactive measure that required course leaders to seek help. This could be through the workload mechanism. For example, it may be when certain benchmarks are met (such as 'n' of students or 'n' number of programmes feeding into a course), additional resources are automatically added. To support this, workload demands should be reviewed on an on-going basis to ensure that staff are able to perform effectively in teaching, research and administrative activities.

d) Issue 4: Full teaching teams' awareness of key contemporary debates across organizational leadership and HRM

Given the plurality of the programme (which is a strength in many ways), and that is constituted through courses that are taught across multiple programmes, there are some teaching staff on the programme who may benefit from a refresh or development around the substantive focus on the programme (see also section 1, recommendation a).

Recommended Actions:

Both time and financial resources should be made available to collectively bring together the teaching team as a whole to either engage in peer-learning or a short intensive training/overview of relevant debates germane to organizational leadership and HRM. This will (i) provide them with confidence of having a broad grasp on key debates that students are likely to want to know; and (ii) provide a valuable point of socialization for the teaching staff where there is the development of both knowledge and an equilibrium of what organizational leadership and HRM mean for them as a teaching team in preparation for the incoming cohort on the programme.

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	Partially 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 programme sits within the broader established institutional structure for admissions, progression, progress monitoring, recognition and certification.

Based on the documentation provided there is evidence that the regulations regarding student admission, progression and certification are clearly defined and available in the application for Evaluation – Accreditation Programme of Study document and published university documentation.

Based on the documentation provided to the Evaluation Committee and discussions with appropriate staff during the meetings during our visit, there was good evidence of the below.

4.1 Student admission, processes and criteria

The admissions policies, admission processes and criteria are implemented consistently and in a transparent manner

4.2 Student progression

The following are in place: regulations regarding student admission; regulations regarding student progression; processes and tools to collect, monitor and act on information on student progression; regulations regarding student recognition; student certification

4.3 Student recognition

There is recognition that prior learning contributes to students' progress and promotes mobility.

4.4 Student certification

Students receive certification that meets the defined standards.

Strengths

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

The Evaluation Committee commended the programme's strong emphasis on consistency and governance around student admission, progression, recognition and certification and acknowledge the following areas of particular strengths:

- a. The requirements for admission were considered appropriate for the level of qualification. The committee also noted the wider consideration (beyond formal qualifications) of the candidate's ability to successfully complete the programme of study.

- b. The committee welcomed the university's commitment to equal opportunity for students regardless of physical ability and the processes in place via the university's Special Educational Needs and Disabilities Centre.
- c. The committee also noted how consideration is given to the assessment of students with special educational needs.
- d. There is a new University department (around 6 months old) - SPW (Student progress and wellbeing) that is dedicated to student progress and welfare which is a very welcome structural addition and is noted as a positive.

Areas of improvement and recommendations

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

a) Issue 1: Possible lack of resources for student progression and wellbeing

It was appreciated that the newly formed SPW office was structured to provide support for students in terms of progression and wellbeing needs. However, given this was a university-wide service in a growing institution, it was unclear if the resource available was enough to satisfy student demand.

Recommended Action:

To ensure SPW continues to be a strength it is important to ensure that this is appropriately resourced as student numbers grow across the University

b) Issue 2: Diversity of cohort impacting student experience

As it stands there are no clear prerequisites qualifications or experience requirements for entry to the programme.

Recommended Action:

The diverse make-up of the cohort offers the opportunity to bring together a wide range of applicants and can potentially be a benefits. However, consideration should be given to the implications of having learners in a course with varying degrees of background and experience.

c) Issue 3: Ethical vulnerabilities around on data-driven decision making for students

There is evidence that monitoring of student learning progression based on the student learning data will be implemented at both the course and programme levels. While such monitoring can positively support student motivation and engagement by proactive provision of feedback on performance in interactive activities and engagement with learning, it can also raise potential concerns related to student privacy and ethical implications of using student behaviour data.

Recommended Action:

Careful consideration should be given to the ethical implications of data-driven decision-making, ensuring that learning analytics are used responsibly and do not lead to unintended bias or a demotivating factor for students. In addition, it is recommended to introduce a 'Learning analytics contract' for students at the programme level and/or at the course level for obtaining informed consent from students.

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	Partially 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

- *Weekly interactive activities per each course are set.*
- *The e-learning material and activities take advantage of the capabilities offered by the virtual and audio-visual environment and the following are applied:*
 - *Simulations in virtual environments*
 - *Problem solving scenarios*
 - *Interactive learning and formative assessment games*
 - *Interactive weekly activities with image, sound and unlimited possibilities for reality reconstruction and further processing based on hypotheses*
 - *They have the ability to transfer students to real-life situations, make decisions, and study the consequences of their decisions*
 - *They help in building skills both in experiences and attitudes like in real life and also in experiencing - not just memorizing knowledge*
- *A pedagogical planning unit for e-learning, which is responsible for the support of the e-learning unit and addresses the requirements for study materials, interactive activities and formative assessment in accordance to international standards, is established.*
- *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 e-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.

5.1 Teaching and Learning Resources

The course guides are comprehensive and clearly present the weekly activities, their types of assessment and whether they are formative or summative assessments.

The courses are presented in the LMS and have evidence of thoughtful integration of the technology resources available into the interactive learning activities. There is also evidence that the activities help to have a learning experience, through group and peer review activities.

The courses are developed by a team upon the provision of the ILOs by the Course Coordinator, and the pedagogical unit collaborates with the teacher to design the learning activities. A technology-savvy member in the team is available for support. This teamwork is established as a standard process, according to the feedback from the teachers responsible for the courses and the e-learning and pedagogy development unit.

Student-centredness is shown in the provision of the learning resources and activities, especially with the multimodality of the learning resources and assessment types. "Flexibility" is mainly regarding the possibility of accessing the learning resources, especially the recorded lectures, but not about flexible learning; thus, the learning resources provision is mostly about recorded lectures and library resources, which are possible to redistribute up to 20% of each resource

5.2 Physical Resources

The IT infrastructure allows the facilitation of the online distance learning mode. The library has access to Open Athens access points, via which the readings and learning resources can be accessed. The recommended course literature can be accessed through the library. The library is acting upon such requests in a reactive way.

5.3 Human Support Resources

The teaching and learning team involved in the programme implementation is largely adequate. The teaching staff acknowledge the possibility of acquiring additional support staff upon request. Technology staff shows reactive availability to support teachers and students in troubleshooting needs and using new technology. The resource persons are familiar with service provision for distance programs.

5.4 Student Support

Student support provision pathways are clear from the support providers' perspectives. Both the library and the learning unit are attentive to student needs. The study guides provide clear instructions of what resources are available and how to reach out for help when required. There are instant support services (e.g. IT) for students during online examinations and other interactive activities. Support methods and processes, such as audio books and extra time for students who have Neurodevelopmental disorders, are available.

Strengths

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

The Evaluation Committee were impressed by the level of support and infrastructure to enable a positive student experience and journey throughout their degree. In particular the Evaluation committee wish to note the following strengths:

- a) The Evaluation Committee appreciated the effort the University has taken in regard to consolidating the support processes needed by distance education students.
- b) The alignment of the technology support services with the schedules of graded assessments, including the provision of quick troubleshooting hotlines, is appreciated
- c) The library's attempts to access research and learning resources through global portals such as Open Athens, as well as the agreement service of 20% redistributability of resources, which immensely help online distance education, are appreciated.
- d) The committee also recognises the setup of the Technology, Pedagogy and Content Knowledge –(TPACK) teams around course development and execution.
- e) The team involved in the development of student soft skills is commended, and the Evaluation Committee acknowledge their efforts to carefully integrate cross-cutting upskilling plans for students in all programs.

Areas of improvement and recommendations

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

The evaluation team observed some areas of improvement regarding the sub-area of Learning resources and student support

a) Issue 1: Implications of Generative AI

The impact of Generative AI on the design and development of interactive and assessment activities is unclear.

Recommended Action:

Although a policy for Generative AI and Academic Integrity will be available for teachers and other stakeholders in the near future, the Evaluation Committee have not observed any pre-planning of the implementation of a process from the support point of view on whether they need to be prepared to support the teachers with pedagogically sound methods.

b) Issue 2: Inclusive learning resources to promote accommodation of students with additional needs.

A multimodality of options for learning resources that will help the inclusion of special needs students may be increased. The Evaluation Committee have observed that there is a staff member who has expertise in special needs in the support team that can be further leveraged.

Recommended Actions:

The Evaluation Committee recommend Course Coordinators to work together with the experts in the Learning Technology team to design potential ways to provide other learning resources suitable for special needs groups.

c) Issue 3: Consent for the selection of students for skills training based on data.

Data driven decision-making may be well intentioned around the selection of students for additional skills training. However, there may be implications for using data in ways that students have not clearly consented to.

Recommended Action:

The Evaluation Committee recommends that care is taken around student's privacy and the ethical implications of data-driven decision-making on students' performance when designing the interventions around skills development at a University level. In particular, informed consent for the specified purpose of data should be gained from the student. The Evaluation Committee understands that this may potentially need to be reviewed at a University level.

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	Compliant
5.3	Human support resources	Compliant
5.4	Student support	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 overall impressions of the Evaluation Committee are that the proposed programme has considerable merit and potential to deliver high quality and marketable graduates. The programme will be embedded in an existing and effective institutional quality assurance process within the university and delivered by a team of experienced and motivated academic staff. It will be capably supported in its delivery by an effective technology and support infrastructure.

The recommendations the Evaluation Committee have made in the report above have the potential to further refine and ultimately improve the delivery of a worthwhile programme and make an important contribution to the University's portfolio.

As the size of single programmes grows as well as the number of programmes offered increases, there may be a need to build in processes to assess how student and staff quality of experience may be affected.

It was noted that overall, the University exhibits a progressive and ambitious approach to grow and high engagement with technology. As they continue to grow, there is likely to be consideration of considering how their student-centred approach to learning and teaching may extend into the domain of student-centred assessment and be appropriately operationalized.

Furthermore, the Evaluation Committee recognise that many of the aforementioned recommendations may need to be addressed at a University, rather than exclusively at the level of this programme. For example, recommendation around data management and use may involve the designated Data Protection Officer in the University.

Finally, the Evaluation Committee express our appreciation to all involved in both the visit and the preparation of documentation. There is appreciation for the thoughtful and detailed level of engagement with the process by all stakeholders involved.



E. Signatures of the EEC

Name	Signature
Professor Clare Kelliher	
Professor Kathleen Riach	
Professor Thashmee Karunaratne	
Professor Paul McGrath	
Mr. Alexandros Efgeniou	
Click to enter Name	

Date: 23/10/25