

Doc. 300.1.1

Date: 19/11/2025

External Evaluation Report (Conventional-face-to-face programme of study)

- **Higher Education Institution:**
University of Cyprus
- **Town:** Nicosia
 - **School/Faculty (if applicable):** School of Social Sciences and Sciences of Education
 - **Department/ Sector:** Department of Education
- **Programme of study- Name (Duration, ECTS, Cycle)**

In Greek:

Αναλυτικά Προγράμματα, Διδασκαλία και Συγκριτική Παιδαγωγική [6-16 ακαδημαϊκά εξάμηνα, 240 ECTS, Διδακτορικό]

In English:

Curriculum, Teaching and Comparative Education [6-16 academic semesters, 240 ECTS, PhD]

- **Language(s) of instruction:** Greek
- **Programme's status:** Currently Operating



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

The External Evaluation Committee (EEC) were warmly welcomed to the campus at the University of Cyprus on the 18th November, 2025. The Evaluation Committee arrived at 9.00 am to begin the various meetings over the course of the day. We began with a meeting with the Vice Rector of Academic Affairs, had a presentation by the Dean of the School of Social Sciences and Sciences of Education, presentations by the Chair of the Department for Education and Academic Coordinator (Professor Klerides was ill with Covid; his slides were ably presented by Professor Phillippou), met with academic staff, students and administrators either teaching, learning or supporting the programme, and had a fruitful meeting with stakeholders. We had an opportunity to visit the new library which was stunning and to meet with the librarian able to show us the collections that were held that related to curriculum, teaching and comparative education. The EEC appreciated the thorough preparation of the documents that were provide prior to our site visit and the opportunity over the course of the day to ask questions and clarify points that had emerged in our reading of the paperwork. We valued the openness of the discussions that enabled us to emerge with a more thorough understanding of the programme, its organization, outcomes and areas for future directions. We were reviewing both the Master and PhD in Curriculum, Teaching and Comparative Education, which proved useful to see them together as there is also a learning pathway from one programme to the next.



B. External Evaluation Committee (EEC)

<i>Name</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>University</i>
Susan Lee Robertson	Chair	University of Cambridge
Josefina Sala Roca	Member	Autonomous University of Barcelona
Florian Waldow	Member	Humboldt University
Athena Theodotou	Member (Student)	Open University of Cyprus

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:*
 - *is a part of the strategic management of the program.*
 - *focuses on the achievement of special goals related to the quality assurance of the study program.*
 - *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*
 - *is developed with input from industry leaders and other stakeholders (i.e. industry leaders, professional bodies/associations, social partners, NGO's, governmental agencies) to align with professional standards.*
 - *integrates employer surveys to adapt to evolving workplace demands.*
 - *regularly utilizes alumni feedback for long-term effectiveness assessment.*
 - *is published and implemented by all 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*

- *Aligns course learning outcomes with student assessments using rubrics to ensure objectives are met.*
- *Connects each course's aims and objectives with the programme's overall aims and objectives through mapping, aligning with the institutional strategy.*
- *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*
 - *collaborates with industry experts for curriculum development.*
 - *conducts joint reviews with external academic specialists to maintain academic rigor.*
 - *performs periodic assessments with external stakeholders to ensure continuous alignment with market needs.*
 - *establishes collaboration with international educational institutions or/& other relevant international bodies for a global perspective.*
 - *conducts regular feedback sessions with local community leaders for societal relevance.*

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*

In addition, the program has established mechanisms of transparency & communication to ensure that

- Professional bodies validate program descriptions and outcomes.
- Community leaders actively participate in ensuring that the program's public information is relevant and resonates with the local and societal context.
- External auditors review public information for accuracy & consistency vis-à-vis the actual implementation of the program.
- Industry-specific & societal information is regularly updated with expert inputs.
- Alumni testimonials are included for a realistic portrayal of program outcomes.

1.4 Information management

Standards

- *Information for the effective management of the programme of study is collected, monitored and analysed using specific indicators and data i.e:*
 - *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*
 - *industry trend analysis.*
 - *feedback mechanisms from external partners/stakeholders*
 - *data exchanges with professional networks*
 - *employer insights concerning career readiness*
- *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?
- How and to what extent are external stakeholders involved in the quality assurance process of the program?
- How is external stakeholder feedback gathered, analyzed and implemented,?
- In what ways do external stakeholders assist in making program information publicly available?
- How do external stakeholders contribute to evaluating graduate success in the labor market and obtaining feedback on employment 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.

The doctoral programme in Curriculum, Teaching, and Comparative Education aims to develop and enrich the educational research community in the fields of curriculum studies and comparative education. The programme's aims and learning outcomes align with standard expectations for doctoral studies, focusing on building research capacity in curriculum design, development, comparison, and evaluation. The learning outcomes are behaviourally oriented (e.g., to construct, discuss, locate) and conform to the European Qualifications Framework. While the language of instruction is Greek, prospective students are expected to be proficient in written and spoken English.

The evaluation document outlines the programme requirements in two tables. Table 1 details the total requirement of 240 ECTS credits, distributed as follows: a Comprehensive Exam: 14 ECTS; Research Stages: 120 ECTS; Writing Stages: 46 ECTS; Elective Courses (Group A): 48 ECTS; and Elective Courses (Group B): 12 ECTS.

Table 2 outlines the course distribution across semesters. Each course runs for 3 hours per week over a 13-week period (totalling 39 academic hours) and carries 12 ECTS credits.

Six staff members teach on the programme; courses cover a range of areas, including: Comparative Education, History of Education, Governance, and Development, Curriculum and Teaching, Literacy, Language, Linguistics, and Education, Research Methods and Evaluation (three areas).

The compulsory components consist of a comprehensive examination and four research stages, culminating in the dissertation proposal. Elective courses are divided into two groups: List A: Comparative Education, Curriculum Development and Evaluation, History of Education, Independent Study, Sociology of the Curriculum, Education Governance and Development; and List B: Discourse Analysis, Qualitative Research in Education, Basic and Advanced Statistical Modelling, and Advanced Research Methods.

The annual intake is very small; each year the average is around 1 or 2 doctoral students recruited and who graduate. When we enquired about the small intake, we were assured that teaching loads were full, and that the supervisors are also involved in supervisions in other programmes.

A review of the course objectives, learning outcomes, and teaching methodologies (e.g., lectures, small group work, projects) shows they are aligned with well-regarded international doctoral programmes. The bibliographies are also appropriate. Assessment methods, while not fully standardised, are in line with the courses' orientations.

Details about the PhD programme are available on the University of Cyprus website. This programme represents a development for the university, aligning with broader international trends

in how doctoral programmes are offered and communities are built. The small cohort size makes this model particularly suitable for the University of Cyprus.

The publicly available programme requirements specify the number of semesters, ECTS credits, and the timeline for the comprehensive examination. They also outline the process for the doctoral dissertation proposal and its defence. The guidelines include notes on the comprehensive examination's timing and the nature of the PhD proposal, detailing the necessary preparation and support. The process for constituting the examination committee is clearly defined, including who appoints and approves its members. The thesis can be written in an international language unless otherwise specified, though the abstract must be submitted in Greek. The guidelines also provide information on support mechanisms and the procedure for the public defence, including the open lecture and the subsequent discussion with the committee. Overall, these materials are publicly accessible, clearly written, and highly informative.

The Internal Quality Assurance regulations, along with the composition of the institution's Internal Quality Committee, are specified in the application document. Quality assurance is stated as an integral part of the university's operations, with the overall purpose of assuring the culture and maintaining the excellence of its study programmes. To that end, the university has developed a quality assurance policy and an internal quality assurance system, which is applied to all study programmes across the university, including this doctoral degree. Its operations are based on a particular set of principles, in this case, the PDCA cycle (Plan, Do, Check, Act), and are framed by policies, rules, procedures, and criteria, as well as a number of quality assurance instruments to ensure the proper organisation, operation, and quality of the study programme—in this particular case, the PhD. It is compliant with the national Agency for Quality Assurance and Accreditation of Higher Education standards, as well as the quality assurance guidelines of the Higher Education Area at the European level.

Quality Assurance is overseen by the governance structures of the University of Cyprus, notably the Senate, which is the highest decision-making body and oversees the overall operation of its study programmes. The Department's Council studies proposals submitted by its committee and takes decisions to amend an existing programme or launch a new one, depending on the nature of the issues facing the programme. A range of policies, rules, and regulations make up the quality assurance system. These include: rules of study for postgraduate students; Plagiarism Policy; Student Complaint Policy and Procedures; Code of Conduct at Work and Equality and Anti-discrimination policies. These are important because they specify the overall means through which a programme is not just delivered, but is also held accountable to the rest of the university.

To ensure programme quality, a number of tools are used, including: course evaluation by students at the end of each semester; Instructor evaluation by students at the end of each semester; an exit survey (once a year, largely for undergraduates, but also applied to exiting doctoral students); a student satisfaction survey (once every two years) relating to the services of the University of Cyprus; external evaluation and accreditation once every five years (of which this particular evaluation is one instance); Key performance Indicators (KPIs), including staff-student ratio, number of incoming applicants, duration of studies, average degree grades, dropout rates,

and course success rates; and Internal Quality Departmental Committee, which was established in the Department of Education in the first semester of 2023, making it a newer procedure.

The Department's Council, as the decision-making body within the department, assists with decisions around existing or new proposals. It specifies in detail the potential number of students, the project's feasibility, staff expertise, the minimum number of semesters required, course codes, titles, and so on. The process for this is also outlined in detail, including ECTS credits and the justification for them. There are also details on the professional development of staff, including how quality teaching is rewarded, how teaching is evaluated, and how feedback is given.

The composition of the Internal Quality Committee is detailed. This university-wide committee has representation from: undergraduate and postgraduate students; two experts in quality assurance matters; one representative from each faculty; and the Vice Rector for Academic Affairs. Details on study regulations are provided, covering staff and student obligations, when studies might be suspended, when students might be removed from the register, and disciplinary controls for various offences. These offences might include safety breaches, transgressing photocopying rights, or other disciplinary misdemeanours. Details are also given on the scholarships offered and how they are allocated. There are "Evagora" scholarship schemes operating at the University of Cyprus that have supported 270 PhD students over the last three years (which is approximately 80-90 students per year), along with the total amount funded. These are awarded either on an achievement or merit basis. However an amount of this funding has to be paid back if the programme is not completed within a specified period of time.

A range of administrative services support doctoral studies within the department. The first, which also functions as a quality assurance mechanism, is the establishment of the Graduate School. Its purpose is to promote the further development of postgraduate studies at the University of Cyprus by coordinating the evaluation, development, and promotion of postgraduate programmes offered by academic departments, without interfering in their direct work.

Specifically, the Graduate School is tasked with formulating indicators, encouraging the design of more inter-departmental and university-wide study programmes (including doctoral ones), and seeking departmental cooperation in shaping curricula. This creates possibilities for interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary studies, which is a welcome development. It also aims to explore ways to pursue collaborations with local, state, and international bodies, in line with best practices.

More classically identified within the formal mechanisms is the Academic Development and Quality Sector (ADEQS). This body provides administrative support to departments and the medical school for the continuous improvement of service quality. ADEQS acts as the point of contact between the department and the administration, providing direct responses and supporting the design and development of new curricula, including support for micro-credentials and hybrid or distance learning.

ADEQS comprises the following offices: The Evaluation and Accreditation Office who helps support conventional programmes of study. Its tasks include monitoring, helping to prepare

evaluation reports (of the kind this particular evaluation represents), coordinating internal reports, and managing their submission; the Programme Development and Quality Assurance Office who support departments in the development and revision of new and existing study programmes, as well as in developing short-cycle programmes; and the Distance Learning Support Office.

In our discussion with students, they raised the issue of having a much reduced pool of courses available to them if they have completed the Masters of Curriculum, Teaching and Comparative Education. The doctoral students believed that the small number of papers they had not taken offered them a small pool of choice and that they were very keen to pick up more advanced courses that extended their line of inquiry – e.g. working on International Organisations and Education – by courses in either sociology or politics focused on International Organisations, IR theory and so on. At present, this presents challenges as the ECTS's are not standardized across the Faculty. However we believe that this might be a project to be picked up by the Graduate School – to produce a list of ECTS courses that might be taken in the Faculty that enabled more cross departmental access for PhDs that extended their learning and offered opportunities for interand transdisciplinarity. We also felt that the Graduate School could be charged with exploring a range of internships (the model we are thinking of here are the Doctoral Training Centres in the UK who act as brokers across departments, universities and into industry).

Strengths

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

There are strong quality assurance mechanisms in place. The design of the PhD sits well within the overall structures of the university. The Graduate School is an important innovation for the University of Cyprus and should be nurtured to deliver administrative oversight, efficiencies and community for the graduate community.

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 doctoral students believed that the small number of papers they had not taken offered them a small pool of choice and that they were very keen to pick up more advanced courses that extended their line of inquiry – e.g. working on International Organisations and Education – by courses in either sociology or politics focused on International Organisations, IR theory and so on. At present, this presents challenges as the ECTS's are not standardized across the Faculty. However we believe that this might be a project to be picked up by the Graduate School – to produce a list of ECTS courses that might be taken in the Faculty that enabled more cross departmental access for PhDs that extended their learning and offered opportunities for interand transdisciplinarity. We also felt that the Graduate School could be charged with exploring a range of internships (the model we are thinking of here are the Doctoral Training Centres in the UK who act as brokers across departments, universities and into industry).



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

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

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

Sub-areas

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

2.2 Practical training

2.3 Student assessment

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

Standards

- *The process of teaching and learning supports students' individual and social development.*
- *The process of teaching and learning is flexible, considers different modes of delivery, where appropriate, uses a variety of pedagogical methods and facilitates the achievement of planned learning outcomes.*
- *Students are encouraged to take an active role in creating the learning process.*
- *The implementation of student-centered learning and teaching encourages a sense of autonomy in the learner, while ensuring adequate guidance and support from the teacher.*
- *Teaching methods, tools and material used in teaching are modern, effective, support the use of modern educational technologies and are regularly updated.*
- *Mutual respect within the learner-teacher relationship is promoted.*
- *The implementation of student-centred learning and teaching respects and attends to the diversity of students and their needs, enabling flexible learning paths.*
- *Appropriate procedures for dealing with students' complaints regarding the process of teaching and learning are set.*
- *Detailed schedules in course materials are included, explicitly stating the expected hours for lectures, self-study, and group projects, ensuring transparency in time allocation.*
- *A system is integrated where each learning activity is assigned a weight proportional to its importance and time requirement, aiding in balanced curriculum design.*

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.*

- *The expected hours for different components of practical training, such as lab work, fieldwork, and internships are clearly documented in the training manuals*
- *A weighting system is applied to various practical training elements, reflecting their significance in the overall learning outcomes and student workload.*

2.3 Student assessment

Standards

- *Assessment is consistent, fairly applied to all students and carried out in accordance with the stated procedures.*
- *Assessment is appropriate, transparent, objective and supports the development of the learner.*
- *The criteria for the method of assessment, as well as criteria for marking, are published in advance.*
- *Assessment allows students to demonstrate the extent to which the intended learning outcomes have been achieved. Students are given feedback, which, if necessary, is linked to advice on the learning process.*
- *Assessment, where possible, is carried out by more than one examiner.*
- *A formal procedure for student appeals is in place.*
- *Assessors are familiar with existing testing and examination methods and receive support in developing their own skills in this field.*
- *The regulations for assessment take into account mitigating circumstances.*
 - *The time allocation for each assessment task is explicitly stated in course outlines, ensuring students are aware of the expected workload.*
 - *A balanced assessment weighting strategy is implemented, considering the complexity and learning objectives of each task, to ensure fair evaluation of student performance.*

You may also consider the following questions:

- *How is it monitored that the teaching staff base their teaching and assessment methods on objectives and intended learning outcomes? Provide samples of examination papers (if available).*
- *How are students' different abilities, learning needs and learning opportunities taken into consideration when conducting educational activities?*
- *How is the development of students' general competencies (including digital skills) supported in educational activities?*
- *How is it ensured that innovative teaching methods, learning environments and learning aids that support learning are diverse and used in educational activities?*
- *Is the teaching staff using new technology in order to make the teaching process more effective?*
- *How is it ensured that theory and practice are interconnected in teaching and learning?*

- *How is practical training organised (finding practical training positions, guidelines for practical training, supervision, reporting, feedback, etc.)? What role does practical training have in achieving the objectives of the study programme? What is student feedback on the content and arrangement of practical training?*
- **Are students actively involved in research? How is student involvement in research set up?**
- *How is supervision of student research papers (seminar papers, projects, theses, etc.) organised?*
- **Do students' assessments correspond to the European Qualifications Framework (EQF)?**
- *How are the assessment methods chosen and to what extent do students get supportive feedback on their academic progress during their studies?*
- *How is the objectivity and relevance of student assessment ensured (assessment of the degree of achievement of the intended learning outcomes)?*

Findings

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

The site visit gave a very strong impression of an atmosphere of mutual trust and respect between teachers and students. This came through very strongly in the testimony of teachers, students and alumni alike. There appears to be a well-developed feedback culture, both with regard to teachers giving feedback on students' work and students giving feedback on the teaching. Undoubtedly aided by the fact that the number of students is very low (intake of a maximum of 2 students / year, in practice often considerably fewer), teachers and supervisors monitor students' progress closely and respond well to individual needs of students and support them in the organisation of their studies and their research.

As laid out in section 1, PhD students take the same courses as Masters' students and are subject to the same rules as the MA students concerning their coursework. According to the course descriptions, various teaching approaches are implemented with a mix of lecturing, group work, group discussion and debates, students' own research and student presentations. Group sizes are comparatively small, with a minimum of five and a maximum of 25, the typical size according to the teachers being about 15. Feedback on assignments is provided by both teachers and peers. Course content, intended learning outcomes and methods of assessment are laid out clearly in the course descriptions. Students are encouraged to actively participate in the teaching and learning process. Seminar-type learning formats in some courses allow students to interact and respond to each others' work. Research and teaching are linked quite well in the sense that teachers' own research is used in their teaching. Teachers encourage students to participate in conferences, summer schools etc. and funds are made available for this purpose. At the site visit, the department's involvement in the GLOBED project was highlighted particularly as a welcome input from outside.

The assessment criteria for individual courses are clearly described in varying detail for each course. According to the course descriptions, assessment consists typically of a mix of participation, a final exam and other activities such as a mid-term test, a written assignment or a research activity such as archival research or fieldwork. Most assessments include individual exams and assignments. In some courses, group work (e.g. writing a joint paper) is part of the assessment. As a rule, the teachers who taught the course appear to also be responsible for assessment. Final exams typically account for 40% of the grade. Neither a second assessor nor peer assessment seem to be included, with the Students appear not to be provided with a choice of review items and assessment types. On reviewing the website, we come to the conclusion that assessment corresponds to the EQF.

After completing the five compulsory courses, PhD students take a mid-term examination tailored to their individual learning and research trajectory (typically after three semesters). After successfully passing this examination, students submit their research proposal, which has to be approved of by the Department Council. 2 to 4 semesters after the mid-term examination, students have to defend the first three chapters of their dissertation. The final defence of the thesis is in front of a five-member committee, with two external evaluators added to the supervising committee.

Teaching is on the main campus, which is located at a considerable distance from the department (20-45 minutes by car). Courses and reading lists updated are updated regularly by teachers.

Practical training in research has an important place already in the initial phases of the programme (i.e. during the compulsory coursework). Students are expected to engage in activities such as archival research and fieldwork.

The PhD-programme does not lead to a professional degree in the sense that it prepares for a distinct profession (such as a teaching degree), and does not contain compulsory practical training in the sense of preparing for a distinct profession. However, doing internships is possible and encouraged.

Strengths

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

A major strength of the programme is the dedication and highly professional attitude displayed by teachers, creating an atmosphere of mutual trust. This came through very strongly in the site visit. Teachers were described as approachable and supportive. The well-developed feedback culture, the possibility of creating their own learning path with support from the teachers and the fact that the individual needs of the students are well taken care of was specially highlighted. The fact that support structures are working very well is also evidenced by the extremely low rates of dropout from the programme and the extremely high rates of completion within the stipulated time frame.

Areas of improvement and recommendations

According to our impressions at the site visit, individual supervisors support the individual learning of students very well. However, there are three areas in which we saw the potential for improvement.

The first aspect concerns peer learning, i.e. PhD students learning from each others' work. According to our impressions at the site visit, individual supervisors organise seminar formats where students present their work to each other. However, aspects of peer-learning might be strengthened further and given a more systematic place in the course, establishing formats in which PhD-students from outside an individual supervisor's group (and possibly even from other social sciences) could interact and learn from each other.

The second aspect concerns improving students self-learning through enhancing exchange with other disciplines. Students demanded greater flexibility in their choice of potential courses outside education, e.g. from fields of political science and sociology. At present, organisational obstacles such as different ways of calculating ECTS seem to stand in the way of this. The planned move of the institute to the Aglantzia campus with work spaces for students should also facilitate conversations between PhD-students from different disciplines.

Both for strengthening peer learning and improving exchange between different social science disciplines, the graduate school, which at present seems to fulfil a merely administrative function, could be assigned a bigger role.

The third aspect concerns strengthening practical training and employability by making internships a more integral part of the programme.

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

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

3. Teaching staff (ESG 1.5)

Sub-areas

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

3.1 Teaching staff recruitment and development

Standards

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

3.2 Teaching staff number and status

Standards

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

3.3 Synergies of teaching and research

Standards

- *The teaching staff collaborate in the fields of teaching and research within the HEI and with partners outside (practitioners in their fields, employers, and staff members at other HEIs in Cyprus or abroad).*

- *Scholarly activity to strengthen the link between education and research is encouraged.*
- *The teaching staff publications are within the discipline.*
- *Teaching staff studies and publications are closely related to the programme's courses.*
- *The allocation of teaching hours compared to the time for research activity is appropriate.*

You may also consider the following questions:

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

Findings

3.1 Teaching staff recruitment and development

The doctoral programme is supported by six full-time, permanent academic staff members, all possessing strong research profiles aligned with the programme's fields, including curriculum studies, teaching, comparative education, literacy, research methodology, evaluation and educational policy. Recruitment and promotion follow clearly regulated university procedures that ensure transparency and external academic input.

The teaching staff demonstrate a high level of international academic orientation. Most completed their postgraduate and doctoral studies at prestigious foreign universities, and several maintain active participation in European-funded research projects, international academic organisations and cross-institutional collaborations. This international profile strengthens the programme's academic character and ensures that, although most doctoral dissertations are written in Greek, the Department is fully equipped to supervise international students and support research conducted in English.

Supervision arrangements are clearly structured. Each doctoral student is supported by a three-member supervision committee, with one principal supervisor overseeing the process. Supervisors

typically accept no more than five doctoral students, a policy deliberately designed to safeguard high-quality supervision and allow for adequate academic support. The intake of two students per year reflects not a lack of demand but a deliberate limitation based on staff capacity; indeed, demand significantly exceeds available places, but the Department prioritises academic quality by ensuring supervisors do not exceed manageable supervision limits.

Students expressed high levels of satisfaction with the supervisory support they receive, noting that professors are accessible, supportive and flexible. In several cases, supervision is embedded in ongoing research projects, which allows doctoral candidates to benefit from expanded research resources, including access to project data, networks and additional research funding.

Visiting academics also participate occasionally and purposefully, contributing to specific seminars or doctoral activities, thereby enriching the programme without replacing permanent staff.

3.2 Teaching staff number and status

The number of teaching staff (six permanent full-time academics) is appropriate for the programme's structure and intake, particularly given the small and carefully regulated admission numbers. The controlled intake reflects the Department's intentional commitment to maintaining a sustainable supervisor-to-student ratio and preserving the quality of doctoral supervision. All teaching staff hold suitable academic ranks for doctoral-level teaching and supervision, and no reliance on part-time or short-term teaching staff was observed. Visiting academics contribute on a limited and supplementary basis, never exceeding the number of permanent faculty.

3.3 Synergies of teaching and research

The programme exhibits strong synergies between teaching and research. Academic staff maintain active engagement in international collaborations, European-funded projects, international research networks and cross-university initiatives, which provide a rich intellectual environment for doctoral students. Their publications fall squarely within the disciplinary domains of the programme, and many staff integrate their ongoing research into doctoral supervision and seminar discussions.

Teaching loads are reasonable, ensuring that staff can sustain high levels of research productivity while supporting doctoral candidates effectively. Doctoral supervision often benefits from being embedded within broader funded research initiatives, facilitating access to additional resources, academic networks and opportunities for dissemination.

Strengths

The doctoral programme benefits from a highly qualified and internationally oriented team of six full-time, permanent academic staff, all holding doctoral degrees and demonstrating strong research profiles. Many completed their postgraduate and doctoral studies at prestigious universities abroad and maintain active participation in European-funded research projects, international research networks and collaborations with universities in Cyprus and overseas. This international background enriches the programme's academic environment and ensures that, although dissertations are predominantly written in Greek, the staff are fully capable of supervising international students and supporting doctoral work in English.

Supervision quality is a major strength. Each doctoral student is guided by a three-member supervisory committee, with a clearly defined principal supervisor. The Department applies a policy whereby supervisors typically oversee no more than five doctoral candidates (in some cases we noted some supervisors have more than this, for example one faculty member had ten), ensuring close attention, sustained supervisory engagement and high-quality research guidance. This careful distribution of supervision duties is reflected in students' feedback, which consistently highlights professors' supportiveness, accessibility and flexibility, contributing to a positive and academically nurturing environment.

Another important strength is the intentional regulation of annual intake. Although demand for admission to the PhD programme is high, the Department deliberately admits only as many students as the academic staff can supervise responsibly, ensuring that the supervisor–student ratio remains optimal and that academic quality is not compromised.

The staff's strong research-teaching integration further enhances the quality of the programme. Academic staff actively incorporate their research into doctoral seminars and supervision, providing students with access to ongoing projects, contemporary debates and international scholarly discussions. Research projects funded through European or national sources also create additional opportunities for doctoral students to engage with data, networks and research infrastructures.

Finally, the programme's academic environment is enriched by the targeted involvement of visiting academics and former students, who contribute to selected doctoral activities and seminars. Their participation broadens exposure to international perspectives while maintaining the central role and responsibility of permanent academic staff.

Areas of improvement and recommendations

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

The programme may consider enhancing the visibility of supervisory workload planning in the departmental documents, even though current arrangements appear effective and well regulated.

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

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

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

Sub-areas

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

4.1 Student admission, processes and criteria

Standards

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

4.2 Student progression

Standards

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

4.3 Student recognition

Standards

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

4.4 Student certification

Standards

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

You may also consider the following questions:

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

Findings

The programme has a well-defined admissions policy and the requirements for admission are transparent and well suited for purpose. Students need to possess an appropriate academic background (BA and MA in relevant subjects), a certain level of proficiency in English. As part of the admissions process, they need to provide two letters of reference, a motivation and research interests statement, a CV and a preliminary research proposal. A personal interview is also part of the admissions process. Students' progress is monitored by a three-person committee, with the main supervisor doing the largest share of the work and supervisors keeping close track of students' progress. The progression through the programme is also clearly set out: students have to do their compulsory coursework during the first two semesters of the programme and pass a mid-term examination individually tailored to their progress at the end of the third semester. Students have to defend their thesis proposal and take a mid-term exam after roughly two years. One to two years after the mid-term exam, students have to defend the first three chapters of their thesis. The PhD needs to be completed in a maximum of 16 semesters.

Strengths

The small number of students together with high degree of dedication and professionalism by supervisors and other teaching staff leads students progressing smoothly through the programme. Evidence for this are the exceptionally low dropout rates. Nearly all students complete their degrees and finish within the stipulated time (16 semesters maximum).

Areas of improvement and recommendations

One problem for PhD-students receiving a government scholarship seems to be the lack of alignment between the funding period of government scholarships (which require completion of the PhD within six years) and the temporal structure of the programme (which allows for a maximum time to completion of 8 years and involving considerable amounts of coursework and preparation of midterm examination during the first three semesters)

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

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

5. Learning resources and student support (ESG 1.6)

Sub-areas

5.1 Teaching and Learning resources

5.2 Physical resources

5.3 Human support resources

5.4 Student support

5.1 Teaching and Learning resources

Standards

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

5.2 Physical resources

Standards

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

5.3 Human support resources

Standards

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

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

5.4 Student support

Standards

- *Student support is provided covering the needs of a diverse student population, such as mature, part-time, employed and international students and students with special needs.*
- *Students are informed about the services available to them.*
- *Student-centred learning and flexible modes of learning and teaching, are taken into account when allocating, planning and providing student support.*
- *Students' mobility within and across higher education systems is encouraged and supported.*
- *Students receive support in research-led teaching through engagement in research projects, mentorship from research-active faculty, and access to resources that enhance their research skills and critical engagement with current studies.*

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.

The Department for Education is located in two sites; the old site of the University, and the new site where the teaching and major services, as well as many of the other departments, as now located. The new site and buildings of the University of Cyprus is architecturally stunning. The ongoing issue for the Department is that the offices are located on the old site, while all other activities and services, teaching, library and so on, are located on the new site. This creates real issues not only because of time spent travelling, but also limits the capacity to 'belong' to the Faculty of Social Sciences and Education, and to the rest of the university. This is a major issue for PhD students who have no real home.

A wide array of university offices provide support, ranging from Academic Affairs and Student Welfare to IT Infrastructures; Technical Services; the Centre for Teaching and Learning; Career Centre and Centre for Entrepreneurship. The Student Welfare Association supports financially students in need, regardless of their level of study. Applications for financial support are submitted to the Social Support Office of the Academic Affairs and Student Welfare Services; the total amount of financial aid offered to students is decided annually depending on the financial capacity of the Association's Fund. Some 500 students are aided every year with an annual budget of 150.000 euros. Students can apply for financial assistance in external schemes supported by the State. This includes PhD students, and is based on either need or achievement.

The University provides student support mechanisms at both the departmental level and centrally through the Academic Affairs and Student Welfare Service. A key central service is the University Mental Health Centre, which now operates under the Department of Psychology. It offers free assessment services to students facing difficulties with learning, adjusting to university life, or other personal challenges. The Centre also organises workshops and presentations on topics such as student welfare, mental health, and disability.

Regarding student life, there are numerous clubs focused on specific interests like dance and music. The Career Centre provides advice, hosts an online jobs portal listing part-time and full-time employment, and offers individual support with CV development. Students can also book into career seminars. For healthcare, the university has a Health and Safety Department available to students. While free healthcare is offered, international students (non-European) are required to have private health insurance, whereas European students can use the European Health Insurance Card.

For housing, the university offers 12 residential buildings with a total capacity of 208 single rooms and two common rooms, which are made available to students. Many students in the Master's programme work full-time so it is not clear the extent to which they access these residential living opportunities.

In terms of infrastructure—including classrooms, laboratories, library, and equipment—the new campus houses most of these resources. It is home to lecture theatres, amphitheatres, reading rooms, meeting rooms, student clubs, sports centres, and the administrative offices.

The new Stelios Ioannou Learning Resource Centre, opened in 2018, consolidates the library collection under one roof. We visited the Library and were impressed with its architecture and also the capacity to provide a space for learning. It offers a very large number of study spaces, including 900 individual and group study areas, all with wheelchair access. The library itself serves both internal university users and external users for a contribution. Its extensive collection includes: 400,000 printed books; more than 100,000 printed volumes of scientific journals; 700,000 electronic books; 200 scientific databases; and 30,000 electronic journal titles, providing access to many millions of scientific articles.

As a founding member of the Cyprus Library Consortium, the library operates alongside six other Cypriot public and private academic libraries, participating in agreements that enable inter-library loans and resource sharing. There is a librarian allocated to support the Department for Education staff and students.

The library features multi-media spaces and designated rooms to support different kinds of access, including self-study and group study. A large number of seminars are also held within the library, offering a range of training and information services. In line with modern trends, it is actively involved in European Open Science promotion projects.

We did ask about student mobility (e.g. Erasmus) and it appears that the students are mostly working full time so have limited capacity to be away from their work.

Strengths

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

The new campus is impressive as is the library and the teaching facilities; they really are state of the art.

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.

Move the Department of Education offices to the new campus as soon as is feasible as this has placed limits on the ability of the Department – academics, administrators and doctoral students - to feel part of the university and easily access all of its services



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

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?*
- *Are the criteria reflected in dissertation samples?*

Findings

The programme has a well-defined admissions policy and the requirements for admission are transparent and well suited for purpose. Students need to possess an appropriate academic background (BA and MA in relevant subjects), a certain level of proficiency in English. As part of the admissions process, they need to provide two letters of reference, a motivation and research interests statement, a CV and a preliminary research proposal. A personal interview is also part of the admissions process. Students' progress is monitored by a three-person committee, with the main supervisor doing the largest share of the work and supervisors keeping close track of students' progress. The progression through the programme is also clearly set out: students have to do their compulsory coursework during the first two semesters of the programme and pass a mid-term examination individually tailored to their progress at the end of the third semester.

After completing the five compulsory courses, PhD students take a mid-term examination tailored to their individual learning and research trajectory (typically after three semesters). After successfully passing this examination, students submit their research proposal, which has to be approved of by the Department Council. 2 to 4 semesters after the mid-term examination, students have to defend the first three chapters of their dissertation. The final defence of the thesis is in front of a five-member committee, with two external evaluators added to the supervising committee. In the defence, the student has to present and defend their work. The five members of the committee deliver a joint report. The maximum time for completing the PhD is 16 semesters.

Throughout the process, supervisors are in close contact with students and monitor their progress. There is a system for checking for plagiarism and the procedure of submitting the thesis to the university library is clearly set out.

There is no definite limit, but the recommended maximum number of doctoral students to be supervised by one supervisor is five.

According to the stakeholder consultations, the PhD awarded in the context of this programme enjoys a good reputation amongst potential employers.

Strengths

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

Supervisors are exemplary; opportunities are made available for some students to get involved in research projects but this is dependent on the supervisor. Funds are available for travel and conference presentations.

Areas of improvement and recommendations

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

We feel based on student feedback that efforts to create a community of inquiry, and to enable them to encounter the key debates in social science research, are lacking somewhat and that both location on the main campus and an expanded Graduate School with more than administrative responsibilities would be hugely beneficial.

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

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

D. Conclusions and final remarks

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

1. Commendations and Strengths

The review committee wishes to acknowledge and commend the following strengths of the programme:

We thank the department for its thorough preparation of the documentation and for the exceptional openness demonstrated during the site visit. The constructive conversations enabled a deep understanding of the programme's nature, offerings, and potential for student success.

Feedback from students was overwhelmingly positive. They reported a high level of trust, and described the academic staff as highly professional, motivated, enthusiastic, and caring. This supportive environment was consistently praised as a key factor in their outstanding educational experience.

The programme's model of close monitoring and support delivers excellent results, particularly in completion rates. This is especially commendable given that many students are working full-time while progressing at a pace comparable to full-time students.

The committee was impressed by the strategic use of resources, including:

- Financial support for students to attend conferences and assist with fees.
- The provision of scholarships.

The inclusion of a six-credit compulsory seminar is a significant innovation. Furthermore, the programme's practice of inviting leading international scholars (e.g., Professor Steve Carney, Professor Jurgen Schriewer, Professor Paul Morris) injects cutting-edge knowledge and provides invaluable networking opportunities for students, especially those working on dissertations. The independent study module also opens up space for flexible learning.

2. Areas for Improvement and Development

The committee recommends the following actions to further strengthen the programme:

The most pressing issue is the physical separation of the Department's offices from the main teaching resources and the library on the new campus. We strongly recommend prioritising the relocation of the Department to the main campus to better integrate academic activities and support services for both staff and students.

While the programme continues to attract students, a slight decline in enrolment has been noted. We encourage the department to actively advertise the demonstrable quality of the programme to ensure its long-term sustainability and visibility for future student intakes.

The doctoral students believed that the small number of papers they had not taken offered them a small pool of choice and that they were very keen to pick up more advanced courses that extended their line of inquiry – e.g. working on International Organisations and Education – by courses in either sociology or politics focused on International Organisations, IR theory and so on. At present, this presents challenges as the ECTS's are not standardized across the Faculty. However we believe that this might be a project to be picked up by the Graduate School – to produce a list of ECTS courses that might be taken in the Faculty that enabled more cross departmental access for PhDs that extended their learning and offered opportunities for interand transdisciplinarity.

We also felt that the Graduate School could be charged with exploring a range of internships (the model we are thinking of here are the Graduate Training Centres in the UK who act as brokers across departments, universities and into industry). We recommend further elaboration on how this school can function not just as an administrative unit, but as a vehicle for fostering interdisciplinary work and providing tangible value to all postgraduate students.

In summary, this is an important and high-quality programme. The recommendations above are intended to build upon its significant strengths and ensure its continued success and growth in the future.



E. Signatures of the EEC

F.

<i>Name</i>	<i>Signature</i>
Susan Lee Robertson	
Josefina Sala Roca	
Florian Waldow	
Athena Theodotou	

Date: 19/11/2025