

Doc. 300.1.1/2

Date: Date.

# External Evaluation Report (E-learning programme of study)

- **Higher Education Institution:**  
EUROPEAN UNIVERSITY CYPRUS
- **Town:** NICOSIA
- **School/Faculty (if applicable):** School of Medicine
- **Department/ Sector:** Medicine
- **Programme of study- Name (Duration, ECTS, Cycle)**  
**In Greek:**  
Δημόσια Υγεία (18 μήνες/90 ECTS, Μεταπτυχιακό  
Εξ' Αποστάσεως  
**In English:**  
Public Health (18 Months/90 ECTS, Master of Science)  
E-Learning
- **Language(s) of instruction:** English
- **Programme's status:** Ongoing
- **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.*

<b>Ref. Numbers:</b>	<b>07.14.327.072</b>
<b>Programmes of study: Name (Duration, ECTS, Cycle)</b>	<b>Public Health (18 Months/90 ECTS, Master of Science)” E-Learning:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>· <b>General Track</b></li><li>· <b>Primary Healthcare</b></li><li>· <b>Infection Prevention and Control</b></li></ul>
<b>Institution:</b>	<b>European University Cyprus</b>
<b>Date of on-site visit:</b>	<b>16 June 2022</b>

**Subject: Remote External Evaluation Schedule**

The remote visit will take place according to the following indicative schedule **and it may be changed according to the EEC's suggestions:**

**Zoom Meeting**

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/4666108955?pwd=ejgwWkRNZTN1WFV3a1hJNGZ0disrdz09>

**Meeting ID: 466 610 8955 Passcode: 9JkEMg**

**10:00 – 10:10· A brief introduction of the members of the External Evaluation Committee**

*[10 minutes]*

- **Professor Gunnar Nilsson (Chair of the Committee), Professor of General Medicine, Deputy Head of the Division of Family Medicine and Primary Care, Karolinska Institute**
- **Professor Filippos Filippidis, Professor in Public Health School of Public Health School's Director of Education, Imperial College London**
- **Professor Hilde Bastiaens, Professor of Healthcare, Research Department of Primary and Interdisciplinary Care, University of Antwerp**
- **Professor Teresa Guasch Pascual, Director of the Psychology and Education Sciences Department, E-Learning expert, University of Catalonia**
- **Ms. Ioanna Papaioannou, Student Representative, TEPAK**

10:10 – 10:50	Names of participants:	Emails:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A meeting with the Rector - Head of the Institution and the Vice Rector of Academic Affairs – short presentation of the Institution</li> </ul> <p>Maximum duration of presentation: 15' Discussion: 10'</p> <p>[25 minutes]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A meeting with the members of the Internal Evaluation Committee</li> </ul> <p>[15 minutes]</p>	<p>Prof. Loizos Symeou (Presenter) Vice Rector of Academic Affairs and Chair of the University Committee of Internal Quality Assurance</p>	<p>L.Symeou@euc.ac.cy</p>
	<p>Prof. Marios Vryonides (Presenter) Vice Rector of Research and External Affairs</p>	<p>M.Vryonides@euc.ac.cy</p>
	<p>Dr. Panagiotis Papageorgis Associate Professor, Dean of the School of Sciences</p>	<p>P.Papageorgis@euc.ac.cy</p>
	<p>Prof. Elizabeth Johnson Professor, Dean of the School of Medicine</p>	<p>e.johnson@euc.ac.cy</p>
	<p>Prof. Theodoros Xanthos Professor, Chair of the Department of Medicine, University Committee of Internal Quality Assurance, Faculty Representative of the School of Medicine</p>	<p>T.Xanthos@euc.ac.cy</p>

	<p><b>Dr. Irene Polycarpou</b> Assistant Professor,  Vice Chair of the Department of Health Sciences,  Member of the Departmental Committee of Internal Quality Assurance</p>	<p><b>I.Polycarpou@euc.ac.cy</b></p>
	<p><b>Dr. Vasiliki Gkretsi</b> Associate Professor, University Committee of Internal Quality Assurance, Faculty Representative of the School of Sciences</p>	<p><b>V.Gkretsi@euc.ac.cy</b></p>
	<p><b>Mr. Yiannis Tsiapini</b> Student Representative of the Departmental Committee of Internal Quality Assurance</p>	<p><b>gt181918@students.euc.ac.c y</b></p>
	<p><b>Ms. Ismini Tzanaki</b>  Student member of the Departmental Committee of Internal Quality Assurance  Department of Medicine</p>	<p><b>it161545@students.euc.ac.c y</b></p>

10:50 – 11:20	Names of participants:	Emails:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A meeting with the Head of the relevant department.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Dr. Panagiotis Papageorgis</b> Associate Professor, Dean of the School of Sciences</p>	<p><b>P.Papageorgis@euc.ac.cy</b></p>

<p><b>Short presentation of the School's / Department's structure</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Mission and strategic planning (including SWOT analysis)</li> <li>o Connecting with society</li> <li>o Development processes</li> </ul> <p><b>[30 minutes]</b></p> <p>Maximum duration of presentation: 15' Discussion: 15'</p>	<p><b>Prof. Elizabeth Johnson</b> Professor, Dean of the School of Medicine</p>	<p><b>e.johnson@euc.ac.cy</b></p>
	<p><b>Prof. Theodoros Xanthos</b> Professor, Chair of the Department of Medicine</p>	<p><b>T.Xanthos@euc.ac.cy</b></p>
	<p><b>Dr. Irene Polycarpou</b> Assistant Professor, Vice Chair of the Department of Health Sciences</p>	<p><b>I.Polycarpou@euc.ac.cy</b></p>
	<p><b>Dr. Demetris Lamnisis</b> Associate Professor Co-coordinator of the program</p>	<p><b>D.Lamnisis@euc.ac.cy</b></p>
	<p><b>Dr. Theodoros Lytras</b> Assistant Professor Co-coordinator of the program</p>	<p><b>T.Lytras@euc.ac.cy</b></p>

**11:20 – 11:30**

**Coffee Break**

**[10 minutes]**

11:30 – 12:40	Names of participants:	Emails:
<p><b>Programme : Public Health (18 Months/90 ECTS, Master of Science)", E Learning</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The programme's standards, admission criteria for prospective students, the learning outcomes and ECTS, the content and the persons involved in the programme's design and development</li> <li>Methodology and equipment used in teaching and learning (i.e. software, hardware, materials, online platforms, teaching material, evaluation methods, projects, samples of written examinations / thesis)</li> </ul> <p>[70 minutes]</p> <p><b>Maximum duration of presentation: 30'</b> <b>Discussion: 40'</b></p>	<p><b>Dr. Demetris Lamnisis (Presenter)</b> Associate Professor Co-coordinator of the program</p>	<p><b>D.Lamnisis@euc.ac.cy</b></p>
	<p><b>Dr. Theodoros Lytras (Presenter)</b> Assistant Professor Co-coordinator of the program</p>	<p><b>T.Lytras@euc.ac.cy</b></p>
	<p><b>Dr. Alexandros Heraclides</b> Associate Professor</p>	<p><b>A.Heraclides@euc.ac.cy</b></p>
	<p><b>Dr. Constantinos Tsioutis</b> Assistant Professor</p>	<p><b>K.Tsioutis@euc.ac.cy</b></p>
	<p><b>Dr. Giannakou Konstantinos</b> Lecturer</p>	<p><b>K.Giannakou@euc.ac.cy</b></p>
	<p><b>Dr. Maria Leonidou</b> Lecturer</p>	<p><b>M.Leonidou@euc.ac.cy</b></p>
	<p><b>Dr. Joseph Papaparaskevas</b> Scientific Collaborator</p>	<p><b>Papaparaskevas@external.euc.ac.cy</b></p>
	<p><b>Dr. Demetrios Paraskevis</b> Scientific Collaborator</p>	<p><b>Paraskevis@external.euc.ac.cy</b></p>



	<b>Dr. Stavros Antoniou</b> Scientific Collaborator	.Antoniou@external.euc.a c.cy
	<b>Dr. Giagkos Lavranos</b> Scientific Collaborator	.Lavranos@external.euc.a c.cy
	<b>Dr. Panayiotis Petrou</b> Scientific Collaborator	.petrou@external.euc.ac.c y
	<b>Dr. Marianna Charalambous</b> Scientific Collaborator	.Charalambous@external. euc.ac.cy

12:40 – 13:10	Names of participants:	Emails:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A meeting with the coordinator and members responsible for the distance learning unit (QA session)</li> <li>○ Distance learning philosophy and methodology</li> <li>○ Distance learning material at the appropriate level according to EQF</li> <li>○ Interaction plan and Interactive weekly activities</li> </ul>	<b>Dr. Paraskevi Chatzipanagiotou</b> Assistant Professor, Director of Distance Education Unit and Chair of the Pedagogical Planning of E-Learning Programs of Study Standing Committee	<b>P.Chatzipanagiotou@euc.ac.cy</b>

<p>o <b>Study guides</b></p> <p><b>[30 minutes]</b></p>	<p><b>Dr. Loucas Louca</b> Associate Professor, Chair of Digitally Enhanced Learning (D.e.L.) Ad-Hoc Committee Ex Officio Member of the Pedagogical Planning of E-Learning Programs of Study Standing Committee</p>	<p><b>L.Louca@euc.ac.cy</b></p>
	<p><b>Dr. Eleni Theodorou</b> Associate Professor, Chair of Faculty Professional Development Standing Committee Ex Officio Member of the Pedagogical Planning of E-Learning Programs of Study Standing Committee</p>	<p><b>E.Theodorou@euc.ac.cy</b></p>
	<p><b>Dr. James Mackay</b> Assistant Professor, Member of the Pedagogical Planning of E-Learning Programs of Study Standing Committee</p>	<p><b>J.Mackay@euc.ac.cy</b></p>

	<p><b>Dr. Maria Papazachariou</b>  <b>Lecturer,</b>  <b>Member of the</b>  <b>Pedagogical Planning of</b>  <b>E-Learning Programs of</b>  <b>Study Standing</b>  <b>Committee</b></p>	<p><b>M.Papazachariou@euc.a</b>  <b>c.cy</b></p>
	<p><b>Dr. Yianna Danidou</b>  <b>Lecturer,</b>  <b>Member of the</b>  <b>Pedagogical Planning of</b>  <b>E-Learning Programs of</b>  <b>Study Standing</b>  <b>Committee</b></p>	<p><b>Y.Danidou@euc.ac.cy</b></p>
	<p><b>Dr. Konstantinos</b>  <b>Giannakou</b>  <b>Lecturer,</b>  <b>Member of the</b>  <b>Pedagogical Planning of</b>  <b>E-Learning Programs of</b>  <b>Study Standing</b>  <b>Committee</b></p>	<p><b>K.Giannakou@euc.ac.cy</b></p>

	<p><b>Dr. Costantinos Nikiforou</b> Assistant Professor, Member of the Pedagogical Planning of E-Learning Programs of Study Standing Committee</p>	<p><b>C.Nikiforou@euc.ac.cy</b></p>
	<p><b>Dr. Theodoros Lytras</b> Assistant Professor, Member of the Pedagogical Planning of E-Learning Programs of Study Standing Committee</p>	<p><b>T.Lytras@euc.ac.cy</b></p>
	<p><b>Dr. Kostas Giannakopoulos</b> Assistant Professor, Member of the Pedagogical Planning of E-Learning Programs of Study Standing Committee</p>	<p><b>K.Giannakopoulos@euc.ac.cy</b></p>
	<p><b>Dr. George Chloupis</b> Lecturer, Member of the Pedagogical Planning of E-Learning Programs of Study Standing Committee</p>	<p><b>G.Chloupis@euc.ac.cy</b></p>

**13:10 – 14:10 Lunch Break**  
**[60 minutes]**

14:10-15:10	Names of participants:	Emails:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· A meeting with members of the teaching staff on each course for all the years of study (QA session).</li> <li>○ Discussion on the CVs (i.e. academic qualifications, publications, research interests, research activity, compliance with Staff ESG), on any other duties in the institution and teaching obligations in other programmes.</li> <li>○ Discussion on the content of each course and its implementation (i.e., methodologies, selected bibliography, students' workload,</li> </ul>	<p><b>Dr. Demetris Lamnisos</b> <b>(Presenter)</b> <b>Associate Professor</b> <b>Co-coordinator of the program</b></p>	<p><b>D.Lamnisos@euc.ac.cy</b></p>
	<p><b>Dr. Theodoros Lytras</b> <b>(Presenter)</b> <b>Assistant Professor</b> <b>Co-coordinator of the program</b></p>	<p><b>T.Lytras@euc.ac.cy</b></p>
	<p><b>Dr. Alexandros Heraclides</b> <b>Associate Professor</b></p>	<p><b>A.Heraclides@euc.ac.cy</b></p>
	<p><b>Dr. Constantinos Tsioutis</b> <b>Assistant Professor</b></p>	<p><b>K.Tsioutis@euc.ac.cy</b></p>
	<p><b>Dr. Giannakou Konstantinos</b> <b>Lecturer</b></p>	<p><b>K.Giannakou@euc.ac.cy</b></p>
	<p><b>Dr. Maria Leonidou</b> <b>Lecturer</b></p>	<p><b>M.Leonidou@euc.ac.cy</b></p>

<p>compliance with Teaching ESG).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Discussion on the learning outcomes, the content and the assessment of each course and their compliance with the level of the programme according to the EQF.</li> <li>Discussion on assessment criteria, samples of final exams or other teaching material and resources.</li> </ul> <p>[60 minutes]</p>	<p><b>Dr. Joseph Papaparaskevas</b> Scientific Collaborator</p>	<p><b>Papaparaskevas@external.euc.ac.cy</b></p>
	<p><b>Dr. Demetrios Paraskevis</b> Scientific Collaborator</p>	<p><b>.Paraskevis@external.euc.ac.cy</b></p>
	<p><b>Dr. Stavros Antoniou</b> Scientific Collaborator</p>	<p><b>S.Antoniou@external.euc.ac.cy</b></p>
	<p><b>Dr. Giagkos Lavranos</b> Scientific Collaborator</p>	<p><b>G.Lavranos@external.euc.ac.cy</b></p>
	<p><b>Dr. Panayiotis Petrou</b> Scientific Collaborator</p>	<p><b>p.petrou@external.euc.ac.cy</b></p>
	<p><b>Dr. Marianna Charalambous</b> Scientific Collaborator</p>	<p><b>I.Charalambous@external.euc.ac.cy</b></p>

**15:10 - 15:20 Coffee Break [10 minutes]**

15:20 – 16:00	Names of participants:	Emails:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A meeting ONLY with students and graduates only</li> </ul>	<p><b>Stamatina Damianakou</b> (Current student)</p>	<p><b>giannos_toumbis@yahoo.com</b></p>
	<p><b>Anna Mitsi</b> (Current Student)</p>	<p><b>ma185304@students.euc.ac.cy</b></p>

<p>(5 – 15 participants).</p> <p>[40 minutes]</p>	Ioanna-Irini Pouliasi (Current student)	sd215055@students.euc.ac.cy
	George Shiamakkides (Current student)	am205713@students.euc.ac.cy
	Christina Merakou (Current Student)	Basileioskats@hotmail.com
	Maria-Zoe Theodoridou (Current Student)	ip205606@students.euc.ac.cy
	Giannos Toumbis (Graduate)	G.Shiamakkides@euc.ac.cy
	Maria Andreou (Graduate)	cm205172@students.euc.ac.cy
	Vasilios Katsilas (Graduate)	mt205616@students.euc.ac.cy
	Eleni Georgiadou (Graduate)	georgiadou.e@gmail.com
	Stavroula Koiliakou (Graduate)	skoilak@yahoo.gr
	Konstantina Hadjidimitriou (Graduate)	constantiahatz@yahoo.com
	Ekaterini Frantzana (Graduate)	af191430@students.euc.ac.cy
	Georgia Fakonti (Graduate)	georgiafakonti@gmail.com
Irene Theodoridou (Graduate)	irinithes@hotmail.com	
Kyriaki Chrysochou (Graduate)	kolettaki9@yahoo.com	

16:00 – 16:20	Names of participants:	Emails:
---------------	------------------------	---------

<p>· A meeting <b>ONLY</b> with members of the administrative staff.</p> <p><i>[20 minutes]</i></p>	<p><b>Ms. Andri Stylianou,</b> Career Advisor, Office of Students Affairs</p>	<p><b>a.stylianou@euc.ac.cy</b></p>
	<p><b>Ms. Elena Stavridi,</b> Advisor, Admissions</p>	<p><b>E.Stavridi@euc.ac.cy</b></p>
	<p><b>Ms. Christina Kolatsi,</b> International Student Advisor</p>	<p><b>C.Kolatsi@euc.ac.cy</b></p>
	<p><b>Mr. Michalis Georgiou,</b> Network Operations Manager, MIS Department</p>	<p><b>M.Georgiou@euc.ac.cy</b></p>
	<p><b>Mr. Theodoros Tzitzimbourounis,</b> Head Librarian</p>	<p><b>t.tzitzimbourounis@euc.ac.cy</b></p>

16:20 – 16:50	Names of participants:	Emails:
<p>· Virtual tour to the premises of the institution (i.e. library, labs, research facilities). Discussion</p> <p><i>[30 minutes]</i></p>	<p><b>Prof. Loizos Symeou</b> Vice Rector of Academic Affairs</p>	<p><b>L.Symeou@euc.ac.cy</b></p>
	<p><b>Dr. Panagiotis Papageorgis</b> Associate Professor, Dean of the School of Sciences</p>	<p><b>P.Papageorgis@euc.ac.cy</b></p>
	<p><b>Prof. Elizabeth Johnson</b> Professor, Dean of the School of Medicine</p>	<p><b>e.johnson@euc.ac.cy</b></p>
	<p><b>Prof. Theodoros Xanthos</b> Professor, Chair of the Department of Medicine</p>	<p><b>T.Xanthos@euc.ac.cy</b></p>



	<b>Dr. Irene Polycarpou</b> <b>Assistant Professor,</b> <b>Vice Chair of the</b> <b>Department of Health</b> <b>Sciences</b>	<b>I.Polycarpou@euc.ac.cy</b>
	<b>Dr. Demetris Lamnisis</b> <b>Associate Professor</b> <b>Co-coordinator of the</b> <b>program</b>	<b>D.Lamnisis@euc.ac.cy</b>
	<b>Dr. Theodoros Lytras</b> <b>Assistant Professor</b> <b>Co-coordinator of the</b> <b>program</b>	<b>T.Lytras@euc.ac.cy</b>

**16:50- 17:20**

<b>Live Streaming of courses</b> <b>(30 minutes)</b>	<b>Course Recording</b> <b>(Please see attached Appendix I)</b>
---	--

**17:20 - 17:30**

**Coffee Break**      *[10 minutes]*

17:30 – 17:40	Names of participants:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A meeting only for the members of the EEC (to sum up and discuss for any additional clarifications needed)</li> </ul>	<p><b>Professor Gunnar Nilsson (Chair of the Committee), Professor of General Medicine, Deputy Head of the Division of Family Medicine and Primary Care, Karolinska Institute</b></p> <p><b>Professor Filippos Filippidis, Professor in Public Health School of Public Health School's Director of Education, Imperial College London</b></p> <p><b>Professor Hilde Bastiaens, professor of healthcare researcher and department of Primary and Interdisciplinary care, University of Antwerp</b></p> <p><b>Professor Teresa Guasch Pascual, Dean of the Faculty of Psychology and Education Sciences, E-Learning expert, Open University of Catalonia</b></p> <p><b>Ms. Ioanna Papaioannou, Student Representative, TEPAK</b></p>

17:40 – 18:00	Names of participants:	Emails:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A meeting with the Head of the relevant department and the programme's Coordinator - exit discussion (questions, clarifications and first</li> </ul>	<p><b>Prof. Loizos Symeou</b> Vice Rector of Academic Affairs</p>	<p><b>L.Symeou@euc.ac.cy</b></p>
	<p><b>Dr. Panagiotis Papageorgis</b> Associate Professor, Dean of the School of Sciences</p>	<p><b>P.Papageorgis@euc.ac.cy</b></p>
	<p><b>Prof. Elizabeth Johnson</b> Professor, Dean of the School of Medicine</p>	<p><b>e.johnson@euc.ac.cy</b></p>

<b>comments from the EEC).</b>  <b>[20 minutes]</b>	<b>Prof. Theodoros Xanthos</b> <b>Professor, Chair of the</b> <b>Department of Medicine</b>	<b>T.Xanthos@euc.ac.cy</b>
	<b>Dr. Irene Polycarpou</b>  <b>Assistant Professor,</b>  <b>Vice-Chair of the</b> <b>Department of Health</b> <b>Sciences</b>	<b>I.Polycarpou@euc.ac.cy</b>
	<b>Dr. Demetris Lamnisos</b> <b>Associate Professor</b> <b>Co-coordinator of the</b> <b>program</b>	<b>D.Lamnisos@euc.ac.cy</b>
	<b>Dr. Theodoros Lytras</b> <b>Assistant Professor</b> <b>Co-coordinator of the</b> <b>program</b>	<b>T.Lytras@euc.ac.cy</b>

**Meeting Notes:**

- All staff must be available during the whole day of the online site visit for queries that may occur.
- The institution should provide very short presentations in the sessions needed, so that adequate time remains for questions by the EEC members and productive discussion.
- The EEC may determine the minimum number of students for the interviews.



## B. External Evaluation Committee (EEC)

<i>Name</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>University</i>
Name Gunnar Nilsson	Professor	Karolinska Institutet
Filippos Filippidis	Senior Lecturer	Imperial College London
Teresa Guasch	Professor	Universitat Oberta de Catalunya
Hilde Bastiaens	Professor	University of Antwerp
Ioanna Papaioannou	Student Representative	TEPAK
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:*
  - sub-areas*
  - standards which are relevant to the European Standards and Guidelines (ESG)*
  - 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 for quality assurance

The program at hand recently started, but its policy for quality assurance seems well anchored to the organization and standards at the European University Cyprus (EUC) and at the Medical School. This includes an available policy, an internal organization of its formal system that supports teachers, administrators and students to take an appropriate part. The Medical School seems to have an established and organized approach towards equality, diversity and the involvement of external stakeholders that are suitable for, and applied in, the program.

#### 1.2 Design, approval, on-going monitoring and review

The design of the program contains appropriate general objectives and learning outcomes. The programme seems to have been developed with proper respect to and inclusion of the perspectives of students as well as external stakeholders. A broad range of learning outcomes are organized into three tracks, and they are suitably complementing to an earlier established and more general Master of Public Health. The programme at hand that has its concentrations in primary health care, and infection prevention and control, is offered also in English, and has been formally approved. Therefore, it seems to well reflect the purposes and standards of higher education in Europe, from students as well as labour market and regulatory perspectives. Concerning the formal content, the programme seems to meet standards for progression of learning outcomes, student workload, and number of ECTS. It does, however, not include structured placement opportunities. The scientific content seems up-to-date, and is merely secured by the fact that most teachers are active in research. A regular revision of the content seems not yet necessary. Subsequent monitoring and periodic reviews are done or planned throughout the programme involving students, whereas the inclusion of other stakeholders is unclear.

#### 1.3 Public information

Public information concerning the programme is publically available at the EUC homepage (<https://euc.ac.cy/en/programs/master-public-health-online/>). The information is within standards at the School of Medicine and EUC, and seems clear and accurate. Content wise, the information fulfills the standards. The overall pass rates for the program are not presented, as they are mainly not available at the moment.

#### 1.4 Information management

Information from the program activities and its management is mainly in place, and in concordance with the standards of the university. Data are including the student population, their performance, success and satisfaction. Also student support and their career are collected. However, the analytic approach to these data seems unclear.

### Strengths

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

#### 1.1 Policy for quality assurance

The program appears to be well anchored within the School of Medicine and is complementary to the other programmes. There seems to be clear processes with the EUC at different levels on how to establish, develop and sustain higher education programmes. The programme benefits from being part of the established quality assessment organization at the School of Medicine, as well as from the competences, infrastructure and organization around distance learning at the EUC.

#### 1.2 Design, approval, on-going monitoring and review

The programme profile towards the perspectives of prospective students already working within the health sector is a strength, as well as the focus on needs from future employers. Student's experiences of the program design seem to be very good. Also, the connection between and focus on the tracks of public health and primary health care seems to be innovative and useful for the public health activities in the society. The administration of approval and future review of the program seems to be well established.

#### 1.3 Public information

The information is of high standard overall , but has no specific strength.

#### 1.4 Information management

In general, the information management has a high standard at the university. No specific strength.

### Areas of improvement and recommendations

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

#### 1.1 Policy for quality assurance

None specific.

#### 1.2 Design, approval, on-going monitoring and review

Future development of this fairly new programme, is mainly still to be done. This should include fine-tuned alignment between learning outcomes, teaching and assessment based on a comprehensive approach using feedback from students, teachers as well as external stakeholders.

The program would content wise benefit from more emphasis on skill competences and real life experiences within the regular courses or within projects/coursework. For example efforts to somehow include placement opportunities or site visits near students' homes. This could also provide insight into local challenges and opportunities in public health, as well as contact with stakeholders and employers in the sector.

### 1.3 Public information

Including pass rates from the public information of the program when available.

### 1.4 Information management

As data from the programme increase over time a more analytic approach could be beneficial. For example, a deeper understanding of opportunities and challenges concerning the distant learning method, could be analyzed among different types of students.

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

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

- 2.2 Process of teaching and learning and student-centred teaching methodology
- 2.3 Practical training
- 2.4 Student assessment
- 2.5 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.*

### 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-centered teaching methodology

The methodology used in the program is appropriate to achieve the aims presented. Students' feedback is provided individually with rubrics, and video conferences are a specific space to talk about the feedback (50% of participation). Students are encouraged to ask for specific feedback. Course coordinators and program coordinators try to guarantee the overlap of assignment deadlines and videoconferences. There is also a student advisor that guides the students about the course to get enrolled in, the number of courses, etc.

### 2.2 Practical training

Concerning practical training, students asked for more authentic tasks, and applied assignments, that let them go to the field. And they also suggest more teamwork.

### 2.3 Student assessment

Concerning student assessment, the program has a strong evaluation system. Evaluation of a course is distributed into 50% assignments, and 50% final examination. Students need to do the assignments and the exam to pass the course. The final exams are online, and they use a specific platform to do them (LockDown browser). There are clear actions to prevent plagiarism, but there are many issues that are dependent on each instructor.

### 2.4 Study guides structure, content and interactive activities

Study guides are aligned with distant learning.

## Strengths

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

- Students monitoring during the whole course (through assignments, synchronous videoconferences...)
- The use of Turnitin in the assignments with a formative purpose. Students are asked to use the tool before submitting the assignment and check the results.
- There is a large variety of formative activities within the courses.
- Students describe professors as very approachable and supportive.

## Areas of improvement and recommendations

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

- It is recommended to implement a more authentic assessment (especially in the final exam).
- It is recommended to have a shared procedure about plagiarism in the whole master's.
- To integrate learning resources in the study guides with different formats: infographics, and videos.
- The high value of the final exam focuses the student to memorize the information for the exam. If a robust continuous assessment is designed to guide the student to solve complex problems during the course (i.e. project based), with significant weighting, the EEC strongly recommends decreasing the weight of the final exam, to orient the student to the learning process.

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

Sub-area		<i>Non-compliant/ Partially Compliant/Compliant</i>
2	Process of teaching and learning and student-centred teaching methodology	Compliant
2.2	Practical training	Partially compliant
2.3	Student assessment	Compliant
2.4	Study guides structure, content and interactive activities	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

The teaching staff involved in the program are of appropriate rank, experience, and area of expertise. The University ensures that they receive adequate training on teaching and learning approaches when they are recruited. More specifically, all new members of staff undertake a 30-35h training programme when they start. This is complemented by regular activities for professional development which are conducted across the University or within the department on an ad-hoc basis (~10h per semester). These are often short activities including seminars and workshops. There is also an informal mentoring scheme which encourages interaction between members of staff with the aim to share good practice. However, it appears that the onboarding program is the most substantial element of the staff's educational development. No members of staff hold qualification on higher education teaching and learning.

The University prioritizes teaching and there is a clear expectation that all members of staff do 12 hours of teaching per week. This can be reduced depending on other activities (e.g. research and publications). The University provides awards for Teaching to recognise and encourage excellence.

Students provide regular feedback on the quality of teaching and teaching staff are informed about these evaluations. There is an iterative process with regard to responding to this feedback, although it may not be fully formalized.

### 3.2. Teaching staff number and status

The number of staff teaching in the program seems adequate. One member of staff is leading each course; however, depending on area of expertise and teaching requirements/commitments, multiple members of staff may be involved in each course.

### 3.3. Synergies of teaching and research

The majority of teaching staff are also engaged in research and are publishing in their area of expertise. This activity informs their teaching. Some work done by students has been published in peer-reviewed journals, which enhances this link between research and teaching. Some members of staff seem to be more active than others in this regard.

## Strengths

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

There is a strong and clear commitment to teaching by the University. All members of staff are expected to be heavily involved in teaching and they are supported to do so, especially with the onboarding program. The areas of expertise and the number of staff seem adequate to run the program and cover all the essential fields taught in the program. Feedback on teaching is collected and shared with the teaching staff to inform future decisions on teaching and learning. Teaching staff are research active and that fosters a meaningful interaction between research and teaching.

## 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.*

Although there is support at the department and institutional level for professional development with regard to teaching, it is not clear whether teaching innovation is indeed applied. No member of staff holds or is aiming to obtain a formal qualification on teaching. This may not be readily available in Cyprus, but having a couple of members of staff with expertise in education would help the program develop and remain up-to-date with educational literature and practice. This could be done informally through the program coordinators or a member of staff with special interest in education.

The number of staff seems sufficient, but this may not be the case in the future. As the institution matures, an increasing number of members of staff is involved in research and other activities which leads to a reduction of teaching hours. If the number of students increases and multiple groups of Greek- and English-speaking students are taught in parallel, this might become a challenge. Having multiple staff teaching in each course may be positive to some extent, but there is always the risk of inconsistency in teaching approaches. It would be good to anticipate these developments and recruit an adequate number of new staff, if required. Another suggestion is to involve GPs in the teaching staff (core staff) for the future primary health care track. And also paramedic professions might be a good idea.

Feedback from students is collected, but there doesn't seem to be a systematic approach in reviewing the feedback and suggesting changes. Formalizing the process may help ensure that this is done effectively across the program. Communicating these changes to students in a "you said - we did" format may also encourage further constructive feedback.

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

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

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

### Sub-areas

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

### 4.1 Student admission, processes and criteria

#### Standards

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

### 4.2 Student progression

#### Standards

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

### 4.3 Student recognition

#### Standards

- *Pre-defined and published regulations regarding student recognition are in place.*
- *Fair recognition of higher education qualifications, periods of study and prior learning, including the recognition of non-formal and informal learning, are essential components for ensuring the students' progress in their studies, while promoting mobility.*
- *Appropriate recognition procedures are in place that rely on:*
  - *institutional practice for recognition being in line with the principles of the Lisbon Recognition Convention*

- *cooperation with other institutions, quality assurance agencies and the national ENIC/NARIC centre with a view to ensuring coherent recognition across the country*

#### 4.4 Student certification

##### Standards

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

*You may also consider the following questions:*

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

##### Findings

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

#### 4.1 Student admission, process and criteria

Student admission requirements and criteria are clearly described both at the level of the prior degree and proficiency of English. There are different options indicated to assess the proficiency in English.

A recognized Bachelor's degree from an officially recognized university in a sciences related field or its equivalent and proficiency in English are required. These seem fair criteria.

The tuition fee is clearly mentioned and is 9,450 euro.

There is not much information on the admission process.

#### 4.2 Student progression

There is clear pre-defined and published information on the student evaluation and progression. There is, in general, information on the evaluation being based for 50% on assignments/ongoing evaluation and 50% on a formal exam. This is also taken up in the different course descriptions. For the master thesis this is also indicated (70% on the work, 30% on the presentation). Specifically for the master thesis there is a formal student progress report used. During the remote review meeting, participants (students) indicated that it was indeed clear to them. The exam is normative, no feedback is foreseen. Feedback and individual discussion is in place for the assignments during the teleconferences. In addition, the project coordinator will follow up individually with students who have less than 70% of their credits covered after the first semester. The admin staff indicated that the progression of the majority of the students is good, few students have problems.

There is also a structured system of Student Advisors that follow up the progress of students (each student has a dedicated advisor). A first contact already takes place before registration.

Finally, policies for students with special needs and counseling services (Center of Applied Psychology and Personal Development) are in place. Contact persons, time they can reach them, are available.

#### 4.3 Student recognition

There is detailed information available on the transfer credit evaluation policy of which the maximum number cannot exceed 9 for the Master's degree. The 'Transfer Credit Evaluation Form' needs to be submitted at the Office of Administration together with a non-refundable fee'. The details on the fee are not stated. The criteria seem fair. During the remote review meeting, it was indicated that this evaluation is done case by case and that usually a credit can be transferred if the content of the course already taken covers 70% of the learning outcomes of the new course.

#### 4.4 Student certification

A master degree diploma is issued, a supplement which follows the model developed by the European Commission, Council of Europe and UNESCO/CEPES. During the review meeting it was indicated that the certificate will be provided to the student within 6 weeks of taking the last exam.

### Strengths

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

Clear information on who can register (criteria) are available as is information on transfer of credits.

Several follow up systems for students' progression are in place and are clearly communicated. Information on evaluation is shared and clear for students.

A master diploma with a supplement following the EU model is used. Students receive the diploma within 6 weeks of taking the last exam.

### Areas of improvement and recommendations

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

It could be beneficial for students to get structured feedback after the formative exam.

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

- *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

Interactive activities are well established, but meetings and discussion opportunities with teachers can still be improved. From a student perspective, the e-learning material seems well organized, up to date and available on a working platform with adequate administrative functionality. Also, the programme seems to have a highly demanding workload, with a reasonable balance between theoretical and practical assignments. Interaction between students is good but somewhat missing between semesters. The e-learning activities seem to support both experiences and attitudes, but more community building activities are asked for from students. The programme seems to have an ability to transfer well into real-life situations, but still a closer collaboration with health care and public health workplaces would be beneficial, such as site visits or placements. There is a distance learning unit in place with several activities around design, study material, learning activities, assessment as well as training for teachers with a student-centered approach.

#### 5.2 Physical resources

In general, the physical resources are adequate, given the type of programme. The physical resources seem to be fit for purpose, well known and available from a student perspective.

#### 5.3 Human support resources

Human support seems well established and adequate at the EUC and at the Medical School. The students are informed about the services, and they seem to be ensured for changes in the number of students and other circumstances.

#### 5.4 Student support

Student support appears available for diverse needs. Student mobility is limited and could be more substantial even given the distant learning methodology.

**Strengths**

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

5.1 Teaching and Learning resources

- Well organized learning material and activities, with a fairly clear alignment between learning outcomes, activities and assessments.
- The distance learning unit.
- The library with extensive e-learning resources.

5.2 Physical resources

A well working platform for e-learning.

5.3 Human support resources

Well established and adequate resources for e-learning

5.4 Student support

A well-established system for diverse needs.

**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.*

5.1 Teaching and learning resources

- The opportunities for meetings and discussions with teachers.
- Support for interaction between students between semesters.
- Community building activities for students.
- Closer collaboration with health care and public health workplaces, to support real-life understanding as well as the integration between the areas.

5.2 Physical resources

None.

5.3 Human support resources

None.

5.4 Student support

Student mobility opportunities and activities adapted to distant learning.

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

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



5	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.*

1. Future review, monitoring and development is considered important, given that the programme is fairly new. This should aim for a fine-tuned alignment of learning outcomes, teaching and assessment based on feedback from students, teachers as well as external stakeholders. The program can benefit from more emphasis on skill competences and real-life experiences, to gain insight in real-life challenges and opportunities in public health, as well as contact with stakeholders and employers in the sector. Also, pass rates from the program should be published when available. As data from the program increase over time a more analytic approach could be beneficial.
2. The EEC felt that the new stream on primary health care may be quite clinical in its approach, and that involving primary care health providers in the core teaching team would be beneficial. While the explanation given by the program leads (i.e. in relation to recent changes in the Healthcare System of Cyprus) makes sense, the EEC would suggest close monitoring of the stream in its first year of implementation and collection of detailed feedback from students. This should allow a thorough review of the stream at the end of the year and implementation of necessary adjustments.
3. Students' feedback included requests for more contact time with teaching staff, more teamwork (which is needed in future professional lives) and more interaction with health authorities to achieve hands-on experience. The EEC also suggests reviewing assessments to consider how they might be more authentic. These changes can enhance the program and improve the experience for both students and teaching staff.
4. The EEC feels that student assessment too heavily relies on final exams. The EEC recommends a stronger focus on formative assessment, with more authentic tasks and practical assignments, and less emphasis on the final exams.
5. Teaching and learning resources may benefit from more opportunities for students to meet and discuss with teachers. Between students a better general support for community building activities can be recommended, and in specific the interaction between students between semesters are asked for. On learning resources, a closer collaboration with healthcare and public health workplaces can be recommended, to support real-life understanding, the integration between the areas, and possibly also student mobility.

