Doc. 300.1.1

Date: Date.

External Evaluation Report

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

- **Higher Education Institution:**
  American College
- **Town: Nicosia**
- **School/Faculty (if applicable): N/A**
- **Department/ Sector: Hospitality & Tourism**
- **Programme of study- Name (Duration, ECTS, Cycle)**

  In Greek:

  Μαγειρικές Τέχνες (2 έτη / 120 ECTS, Δίπλωμα)
  In English:

  Culinary Arts (2 years / 120 ECTS, Diploma)
- **Language(s) of instruction:** English/Greek
- **Programme's status:** Currently Operating
- **Concentrations (if any):**

  In Greek: Concentrations
  In English: Concentrations

The present document has been prepared within the framework of the authority and competencies of the Cyprus Agency of Quality Assurance and Accreditation in Higher Education, according to the provisions of the "Quality Assurance and Accreditation of Higher Education and the Establishment and Operation of an Agency on Related Matters Laws" of 2015 to 2021 [L.136(I)/2015 – L.132(I)/2021].

A. Introduction

This part includes basic information regarding the onsite visit.

This report is informed by the External Evaluation Committee (EEC) site visit conducted at A.C. American College on 22 April 2026, focusing on the Diploma in Culinary Arts programme. The visit was undertaken in accordance with the procedures, principles and quality assurance framework set out by the Cyprus Agency of Quality Assurance and Accreditation in Higher Education. The approach adopted by the Committee was systematic, evidence based and developmental in nature, with the explicit intention of forming a holistic and balanced evaluation of the programme under review, while also engaging constructively with the institution and its stakeholders.

The site visit was structured around a clearly articulated and comprehensive agenda, which enabled the Committee to examine the programme from multiple and complementary perspectives. The design of the visit ensured that academic standards, learning opportunities, teaching and assessment practices, student experience, resources and governance arrangements were all scrutinised in a coherent and integrated manner. Particular emphasis was placed on alignment with the European Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area, and on the extent to which these standards were embedded within the programme's design, delivery and continuous enhancement processes.

From the outset, the EEC emphasised the importance of collegiality, transparency and open dialogue. The visit was framed not merely as a compliance exercise, but as an opportunity for reflective engagement between the External Evaluation Committee and the institution. This approach sought to encourage honest self-evaluation by the programme team, while allowing the Committee to test documentary evidence against lived practice. The introductory session, which included the formal presentation of the Committee members, set the tone for a day characterised by mutual respect, academic rigour and constructive challenge.

The early meeting with the Head of the Institution, senior academic leadership and members of the Internal Quality Assurance Committee was designed to provide strategic context. This session enabled the Committee to gain an overview of the institution's mission, governance structures and quality assurance philosophy, as well as to explore how institutional priorities were translated into operational practice at programme level. The discussion allowed the Committee to assess the maturity and effectiveness of internal quality systems, particularly in relation to programme approval, monitoring and review, and the use of evidence to support enhancement.

Central to the approach of the visit was a detailed exploration of the programme's academic design and standards. A substantial session was dedicated to discussions with the Head of Department and the programme coordination team, during which the Committee examined the intended learning outcomes, curriculum structure, credit allocation and qualification award. This dialogue was explicitly mapped against relevant assessment areas, enabling the Committee to evaluate coherence, progression and alignment with the appropriate level of the European Qualifications Framework. The approach adopted prioritised depth

over description, with the Committee probing the rationale underpinning curriculum choices and the mechanisms used to ensure academic coherence and currency.

In parallel, the EEC placed significant emphasis on student centred learning, teaching and assessment. Teaching methodologies, practical training arrangements and assessment strategies were examined not only in terms of formal documentation but also through critical discussion and direct observation of sample materials. The Committee's approach was to consider whether assessment practices were fair, transparent and aligned with learning outcomes, and whether feedback mechanisms effectively supported student learning and progression. This evaluative stance reflected a commitment to understanding the student learning journey in a holistic and authentic manner.

Engagement with two external stakeholders formed an integral component of the visit methodology. The dedicated meeting with industry representatives allowed the Committee to assess the extent to which the programme was informed by labour market needs and professional practice. The approach taken by the Committee was to explore the depth and formality of stakeholder involvement, including their contribution to curriculum development, programme review and graduate employability. This session provided valuable triangulation, enabling the Committee to test institutional claims regarding relevance and industry alignment against external perspectives.

Equally important to the EEC's approach was direct engagement with eight students and graduates. The student meeting was conducted without staff presence in order to facilitate open and candid discussion. The EEC explored issues relating to teaching quality, assessment practices, learning resources, academic and pastoral support, and overall student satisfaction. The approach adopted was conversational yet focused, allowing students to articulate their experiences while enabling the Committee to identify patterns and areas of strength or concern. Student voices were treated as a critical source of evidence within the overall evaluative process.

The visit also included a comprehensive session with teaching staff across the programme. This element of the agenda enabled the EEC to examine staff qualifications, scholarly activity and professional engagement, as well as their understanding of programme aims and learning outcomes. The approach taken by the EEC was to encourage reflective discussion around curriculum design, assessment standards and alignment with institutional and European quality expectations. Through this process, the Committee was able to assess both individual and collective capacity to deliver and sustain the academic standards of the programme.

Physical resources and learning infrastructure were reviewed through a guided tour of the institution's facilities. The EEC's approach was to consider not only the adequacy of resources such as libraries, laboratories and teaching spaces, but also their accessibility and effectiveness in supporting the learning outcomes of the programme. Discussions with relevant professional staff complemented these observations, providing insight into resourcing strategies, digital support systems and ongoing investment in learning environments.

Administrative and student support services were examined through a dedicated quality assurance session with administrative staff. This aspect of the visit allowed the EEC to explore admission processes, student progression and certification arrangements, and the effectiveness of welfare and support mechanisms. The approach adopted emphasised consistency, transparency and student focus, with particular attention paid to how policies were operationalised in practice and communicated to students.

Throughout the day, the Chair ensured that time was reserved for internal Committee deliberation. These structured reflection points enabled members to synthesise evidence, identify areas requiring clarification and ensure a shared understanding of emerging findings. The exit discussion with senior staff was conducted in a spirit of academic dialogue, focusing on clarification rather than judgement, and reinforcing the developmental ethos underpinning the evaluation process.

In summary, the approach to the site visit was comprehensive, structured and firmly grounded in European quality assurance principles. Under the chairmanship of Professor Dr Ioannis S. Pantelidis, the External Evaluation Committee adopted a methodologically robust and collegial approach, combining documentary review, stakeholder engagement and critical dialogue. This approach provided a strong evidential basis for the judgements and recommendations set out in this report, while also supporting the institution in its ongoing commitment to quality enhancement and academic excellence.

B. External Evaluation Committee (EEC)

Name	*Position*	*University*
Professor Dr Ioannis S. Pantelidis, University of West London (Chair)	Chair	University of West London
Professor Neil Rippington	Professor	University of Oxford/Royal Academy of Culinary Arts
Dr Máirtín Mac Con Iomaire	Professor	Technological University Dublin
Mrs Panagiota Charalambous	Student	Open University of Cyprus
Name	Position	University
Name	Position	University

C. Guidelines on content and structure of the report

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

Findings

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

Strengths

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

Areas of improvement and recommendations

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

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

1. Study programme and study programme's design and development

(ESG 1.1, 1.2, 1.7, 1.8, 1.9)

Sub-areas

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

1.1 Policy for quality assurance

Standards

- *Policy for quality assurance of the programme of study:*
  - *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 EEC finds that a formal policy for quality assurance of the programme of study is in place and is effectively embedded within the strategic management of the programme. The policy has a clear formal status, is publicly available and is communicated to relevant stakeholders. It provides a structured framework that supports the organisation and operation of the quality assurance system through defined structures, regulations and procedures.

The policy clearly supports the engagement of teaching staff, administrative staff and students in quality assurance processes, with responsibilities appropriately articulated and understood. The Committee noted a strong commitment to academic integrity and academic freedom, alongside clear vigilance against academic misconduct. Safeguards against discrimination and intolerance were evident and are consistently reflected in institutional practice.

The Committee also finds that the quality assurance policy actively supports the involvement of external stakeholders. Industry representatives and other relevant stakeholders contribute to the development and review of the programme, ensuring alignment with professional standards and labour market expectations.

Employer views are systematically utilised to inform programme enhancement and assess longer term effectiveness. Overall, the policy is not only formally adopted but is actively implemented and shared across the academic community.

The EEC finds that the programme of study is designed with explicit intended learning outcomes however the purpose and vision of the course needs refinement.

Course level learning outcomes are aligned with assessment methods, and the use of assessment criteria and rubrics supports transparency and consistency in evaluating student achievement.

There is evidence of curriculum mapping that connects individual course aims and objectives with the overall programme aims, ensuring coherence and alignment with institutional priorities. The design process benefits from the involvement of students, external stakeholders and industry experts, and draws on external academic expertise where appropriate. The programme reflects the broader purposes of higher education, including preparation for employment, personal development, active citizenship and the development of an advanced knowledge base.

The EEC finds that the programme structure supports student progression and that assessments are appropriately aligned with the level of study and the allocated ECTS. Expected student workload is defined, and placement opportunities are incorporated in a structured manner where applicable.

The programme is subject to a formal institutional approval process and leads to a qualification that is clearly specified and correctly referenced to the National Qualifications Framework and the Framework for Qualifications of the CYQAA.

Ongoing monitoring and periodic review processes are in place and are informed by developments in the discipline, student feedback, stakeholder input and market needs. Reviews involve students and external stakeholders and contribute to maintaining academic currency and societal relevance. The Committee therefore finds that design and review arrangements are generally effective and aligned with quality assurance expectations. However, there was little clarity over the evolution of the programme design since the previous review.

The EEC finds that clear, accurate and up to date public information relating to the programme of study is readily accessible. Published information includes selection criteria, intended learning outcomes, the qualification awarded, teaching and assessment arrangements, learning opportunities and graduate employment information. This supports transparency and informed decision making for prospective and current students.

Mechanisms are in place to ensure the accuracy and relevance of public information. Professional bodies and external stakeholders contribute to the validation of programme descriptions and outcomes, while industry and societal input support the regular updating of programme related information. Alumni testimonials are used (on the website) to provide a realistic representation of graduate outcomes and employability.

The Committee notes that these arrangements contribute positively to transparency and external confidence in the programme and reflect a strong commitment to accurate communication with stakeholders.

The EEC finds that information relevant to the effective management of the programme is collected, monitored and analysed using a range of indicators. These include key performance indicators, the profile of the student population, progression and completion data, student satisfaction, learning resources, graduate career paths and industry trends.

Feedback mechanisms involving external partners, employers and professional networks contribute additional qualitative data that inform programme evaluation and enhancement. Both students and staff are actively involved in the provision and analysis of information, and this evidence is used to inform planning and follow up actions.

While the overall framework for information management is sound, the Committee notes that further systematisation and integration of data could strengthen longitudinal analysis and strategic decision making. Nevertheless, current practices provide a solid foundation for evidence-based programme management and continuous improvement.

Strengths

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

The programme benefits from a well-established and transparent quality assurance framework that is fully embedded within institutional strategy and actively supported by academic staff, administrative staff, students and external stakeholders.

Strong engagement with industry and other external stakeholders enhances the relevance, currency and employability focus of the programme, while high levels of student and stakeholder satisfaction reflect a positive learning environment and effective programme delivery.

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 purpose of the programme should be more clearly articulated, moving beyond a repetition of learning objectives towards a coherent and distinctive overall vision. A clearly defined course purpose would highlight the unique elements of the programme design and strengthen its positioning within a competitive educational landscape.

The programme structure would benefit from greater clarity and consistency, with a clearly defined set of core modules designated as compulsory. This would enhance academic coherence and ensure that all students achieve the intended programme level learning outcomes.

Curriculum documentation should more explicitly demonstrate how individual modules collectively contribute to the overarching aims and distinctive identity of the programme, thereby reinforcing alignment between strategy, design and delivery.

Greater formalisation of data-driven monitoring of student engagement and progression would strengthen evidence-based enhancement and support continuous quality improvement.

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

Sub-area		***Non-compliant/ Partially Compliant/Compliant***
1.1	Policy for quality assurance	Compliant
1.2	Design, approval, on-going monitoring and review	Partially compliant

1.3	Public information	Compliant
1.4	Information management	Compliant

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

Sub-areas

2.1 Process of teaching and learning and student-centred teaching methodology
2.2 Practical training
2.3 Student assessment

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

Standards

- *The process of teaching and learning supports students' individual and social development.*
- *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 isexplicitly 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.

Having studied the various course syllabi, visited the facilities with the teaching staff, discussed the process with the teaching staff and listened to both current and former students of the programme, the EEC were satisfied with the levels of teaching and learning on the programme.

The EEC particularly picked up on the passion that the teaching team have and the connections that they have built with the students who felt fully supported and confident in their teachers' knowledge and abilities.

The EEC were assured to see several pedagogical approaches taken between the theoretical, practical and applied subjects, with a combination of lectures, workshops, seminars, guest speakers, field trips and also the option of engaging in culinary competitions which provide a vast array of different learning styles to suit the varied student population.

There were however several areas where the EEC felt could assist in strengthening the programme and developing it for readiness towards future changes in the society and future student needs. These include eliminating some of the confusion around what are core elements and what are elective / optional elements

of the programme. It also includes some general investment in the learning environment, and continuous professional development opportunities for the teaching staff.

Assessments are planned to enable 50% course work and 50% final assessment, providing balance and structure. Assessments are developed by course as standalone tests, providing a clear and simple format for the tracking of progress. There could be an opportunity to look at this more synoptically so that students combine their learning, knowledge and skills development across the nature of the culinary arts (e.g. menu planning, budgeting, skills development – kitchen, pastry, service, working methods, management, etc.)

Strengths

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

One of the key strengths of the programme is the enthusiastic and knowledgeable staff who appear to be dedicated to their students learning and development on both a personal, professional and academic level. The small class size is a strength in that there is more room for individual attention from the lecturers, however it was noted that there should be a minimum number intake to ensure the student experience on social and interpersonal basis with their fellow students.

The students spoke highly of their lecturers and described where they go above and beyond (preparing the students for competitions etc.). This is a real strength. The links that the college has with the industry is also a strength with the job forum as an excellent resource where students can experience preparing their CVs, doing several interviews for positions, and ultimately hopefully gain concrete experience in industry during a summer internship where the theory and practice learned in college can be put into practice in the real life of the hospitality industry.

Another strength of the programme is that the lecturers are research informed.

Another strength is having a scholarly online journal edited and published from within the college, particularly where this research is used and discussed in class.

Equally, the practical lecturers' continuous professional development with courses and renewed experiential learning with techniques such as sous-vide etc. and other experiences of Erasmus Plus is also a strength.

The student opportunities to refine their skills and learn associated skills and confidence by engaging in culinary competitions is also a strength of this programme.

Areas of improvement and recommendations

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

Within the outline of the course, the EEC identified confusion in what was a Major Core subject, what were the hospitality Core electives, and what were the general educational requirements. This led to the identification of an internship module that did not appear to be regularly used and confusion concerning

which of the other Major subjects were omitted each year.

One possible suggestion would be to merge HOT103 (Sanitation, Hygiene and Food Safety) with HOT106 (Hospitality Safety and First Aid), but to be clear in how sanitation, hygiene and food safety knowledge is also enshrined in the other modules (CUL110, CUL133, CUL134, CUL135, CUL300). We would recommend that the Major Core subjects be agreed and listed as compulsory with no room for confusion.

We also recommend that among the optional electives that students not particularly strong or confident in numeracy would not be forced to take pure mathematics or statistics modules on a Diploma course but have the option to take a different module that might suit them better. This would result in a more student-centred approach.

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

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

3. Teaching staff *(ESG 1.5)*

Sub-areas

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

3.1 Teaching staff recruitment and development

Standards

- *Institutions ensure the competence of their teaching staff.*
- *Fair, transparent and clear processes for the recruitment and development of the teaching staff are set up.*

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

3.2 Teaching staff number and status

Standards

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

3.3 Synergies of teaching and research

Standards

- *The teaching staff collaborate in the fields of teaching and research within the HEI and with partners outside (practitioners in their fields, employers, and staff members at other HEIs in Cyprus or abroad).*
- *Scholarly activity to strengthen the link between education and research is encouraged.*
- *The teaching staff publications are within the discipline.*
- *Teaching staff studies and publications are closely related to the programme's courses.*
- *The allocation of teaching hours compared to the time for research activity is appropriate.*

You may also consider the following questions:

- *How are the members of the teaching staff supported with regard to the development of their teaching skills? How is feedback given to members of the teaching staff regarding their teaching results and teaching skills?*
- *How is the teaching performance assessed? How does their teaching performance affect their remuneration, evaluation and/or selection?*
- *Is teaching connected with research?*
- *Does the HEI involve visiting teaching staff from other HEIs in Cyprus and abroad?*

- *What is the number, workload, qualifications and status of the teaching staff (rank, full/part timers)?*
- *Is student evaluation conducted on the teaching staff? If yes, have the results of student feedback been analysed and taken into account, and how (e.g., when planning in-service training for the teaching staff)?*

Findings

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

It was clear from the visit that there is a cohesive team engaged in the delivery of this Diploma and that the students were very satisfied with the competence and the dedication of the teaching team.

There was also evidence of research-informed practice with the teaching which is good. One of the weaknesses identified in the SWOT analysis was the 'limited opportunities for staff to engage in culinary research or publication'. The EEC recommend that applied culinary research could be carried out collaboratively within the team on areas from culinary competitions, food pedagogy, cookbooks, gender in kitchens, internships, lived experience of migrant chefs etc. where experienced researchers might partner with and mentor their highly knowledgeable teaching colleagues to try and expand the boundaries of their current understanding.

There appears to be a good balance between full-time and part-time staff, with guest lecturers and field trips providing new voices and experiences for the students. Some staff had benefited from Erasmus plus opportunities, and the EEC would recommend that further continuous professional development and Erasmus mobility would be pursued where deemed beneficial.

Strengths

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

The passion and experience of the staff is a strength.
The research-informed nature of the staff is a strength.
The field trips and guest lecturers is another strength.
The links with industry and internship opportunities is a strength.
The extracurricular activities and support for competitions is a strength.

Areas of improvement and recommendations

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

The layout of the programme could be improved to clearly identify what are the core major modules, the core hospitality modules and then a sufficient choice of general education modules. A table that showed crossover and reinforcement of key learning outcomes across different modules would also be beneficial.

The learning environment could do with some investment to modernise and to update and in some cases to bring within best ergonomic and safety practices the teaching and learning space.

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

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

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

Sub-areas

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

4.1 Student admission, processes and criteria

Standards

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

Clear and detailed student admission requirements are in place and are publicly available through the institution's website (https://ac.ac.cy/admissions/admission-criteria/). The published information provides transparent guidance to prospective students and supports informed decision making prior to application. The admission framework appears to be appropriately aligned with the level and nature of the Diploma in Culinary Arts and reflects established institutional procedures.

Appropriate processes and tools are in place to collect, monitor and act upon information related to student progression. The institution demonstrates adequate oversight of students' academic development throughout the duration of their studies, enabling early identification of potential issues and the provision of relevant support where necessary.

However, the EEC did not see evidence that demonstrate the systematic monitoring of student participation in the educational process through the maintenance of an electronic attendance or engagement record. This

represents an area where greater consistency and formalisation could further strengthen monitoring mechanisms.

Regarding experiential learning, student participation in the optional internship is appropriately overseen. The internship is monitored by a designated responsible supervisor, ensuring that workplace learning aligns with programme expectations and contributes meaningfully to students' academic and professional development.

During discussions with students, the External Evaluation Committee was informed of a desire for enhanced recognition of academic merit. Students expressed interest in additional forms of acknowledgement for high academic performance, such as financial incentives or reductions in supplementary lab fees for subsequent years of study. While this does not constitute a formal deficiency, it highlights an opportunity for the institution to further motivate excellence and recognise achievement.

A formal procedure for the issuance of the Diploma Certificate is in place. The External Evaluation Committee was provided with a sample Diploma Certificate, which demonstrated compliance with established standards and supports transparency, portability and recognition of the qualification within the European Higher Education Area.

Strengths

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

The issuance of a Diploma Certificate.
Clarity on the website.

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 recommends the introduction of a comprehensive electronic system for monitoring student participation in the educational process. Such a system would enhance the efficiency, consistency and transparency of monitoring arrangements and would support the early identification of issues related to student engagement, attendance and participation in learning activities.

It is further recommended that key performance indicators, including examination success rates, dropout rates and the mean duration to graduation, are systematically collected, analysed and reviewed at programme level. The structured use of these indicators would strengthen evidence-based decision making and support continuous monitoring of student progression and programme effectiveness.

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

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

Teaching and learning resources are generally adequate and readily accessible, supporting the achievement of the programme's learning objectives across both theoretical and practical components.

Learning resources are fit for purpose and broadly aligned with the vocational nature of the Diploma, although the current programme structure appears to direct students into learning pathways that may not always reflect individual needs or expectations.

Students raised concerns regarding the requirement to study mathematics in a generic or abstract academic form, rather than mathematics contextualised within culinary and hospitality industry practice. This has implications for the effectiveness and perceived relevance of certain teaching and learning resources.

A revision of the programme structure is recommended to ensure that key analytical and numeracy skills are embedded and delivered through applied, industry relevant teaching and learning resources that support student-centred learning.

Greater clarity between core and elective components would enable more flexible allocation and planning of resources, better reflecting the diverse student learning needs and supporting engagement.

Physical resources, including teaching spaces, kitchens, libraries and IT infrastructure, are adequate to support the delivery of the study programme at its current scale.

The existing kitchen facilities are primarily configured in a service style environment, which supports production-based activities but offers more limited opportunities for individual skills development.

Further investment in practical training facilities would enhance the quality of the student learning experience and bring provision more closely in line with contemporary industry standards.

The EEC recommends the development of facilities that provide students with greater access to individual or personalised working stations, allowing for more focused skills acquisition, assessment and feedback.

With a clearer distinction between core and elective modules, the institution is encouraged to review the additional cost structures associated with practical modules, recognising that the development of practical culinary skills is a fundamental expectation of a Culinary Arts programme.

Human resources, including academic staff, technical staff and administrative personnel, are adequate and appropriately qualified to support the study programme.

Staff demonstrate commitment to student support and are accessible to students, contributing positively to the learning environment.

The effectiveness of human resources could be further enhanced by aligning academic advice more closely with a revised programme structure that offers greater student choice, particularly in relation to elective pathways.

Clearer guidance for students regarding module selection would support informed decision making and ensure that staff support mechanisms are fully aligned with student-centred learning principles.

Student support arrangements address the needs of a diverse student population, including international students and students with varying educational backgrounds.

Students are informed about available support services, and support is delivered in a manner that is generally consistent with student-centred learning.

However, the current programme structure limits student choice in certain areas, which may inadvertently reduce the effectiveness of student support by directing students to modules that do not align with their strengths or professional aspirations.

The EEC recommends a more flexible core and elective framework that allows students, particularly those less confident in numeracy, to select learning pathways better suited to their abilities while still ensuring achievement of programme learning outcomes.

Such an approach would enhance student engagement, retention and satisfaction, and would represent a more inclusive and student-centred model of support.

Strengths

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

Resources are adequate but have significant room for improvement through further investment. There is evidence of small, ad hoc, investment in equipment such as a Thermomix blender and a vacuum packing machine, but there is the opportunity to look at this more holistically.

General teaching and learning spaces (classrooms) are sufficient in number and of varying sizes to accommodate accordingly.

Students complimented and respected their teachers, praising their technical abilities and the pastoral support they offered. The college has one direct employee with the remit of student welfare and support. For an organisation of circa 1000 students, although appearing to function, the EEC felt this role should be supported with further resource.

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.

If the college's ambition is to grow its culinary arts provision to meet the vision and the objectives of the programme, it needs to invest in the infrastructure of the programme and develop practical laboratories with specialist and personalised work stations for the development of, for example, butchery skills, fishmongery, cold food preparation, kitchen skills (e.g., sauce making, cookery of protein, plating and service) and patisserie and baking.

General teaching and learning spaces (classrooms) are also adequate, although dated and uninspiring. Such areas and associated resources have the opportunity for a more innovative and technically incorporated approach.

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

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

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

Click or tap here to enter text.

Strengths

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

Click or tap here to enter text.

Areas of improvement and recommendations

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

Click or tap here to enter text.

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

Sub-area		***Non-compliant/ Partially Compliant/Compliant***
6.1	Selection criteria and requirements	Not applicable
6.2	Proposal and dissertation	Not applicable

6.3	Supervision and committees	Not applicable

D. Conclusions and final remarks

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

The External Evaluation Committee concludes that the Diploma in Culinary Arts offered by the College is delivered within an environment characterised by openness, transparency and a strong sense of collegiality.

Throughout the site visit, staff at all levels demonstrated a constructive and professional engagement with the evaluation process, responding to questions with clarity and a clear willingness to reflect on practice. This open approach created a positive atmosphere for dialogue and enabled the Committee to gain a comprehensive and authentic understanding of the programme and its delivery.

The EEC commends the collaborative culture evident amongst academic and administrative staff. There was clear evidence of effective communication, shared responsibility and a collective commitment to supporting student learning and progression. This collegial approach contributes positively to programme delivery and provides a solid foundation for future development and enhancement.

High levels of satisfaction were consistently reported by students. Students expressed confidence in the teaching staff, satisfaction with the practical and applied nature of their studies and appreciation of the support mechanisms available to them. Their feedback indicates that the programme is generally meeting their expectations and supporting their academic and professional development. Similarly, external industry stakeholders conveyed positive views regarding the relevance of the programme and the preparedness of students and graduates for entry into the culinary and hospitality sector. The engagement with industry is therefore viewed as a clear strength of the programme.

Notwithstanding these positive findings, the EEC identified areas where greater clarity and strategic focus are required. In particular, the EEC recommends that the purpose of the programme be more clearly articulated. At present, the documentation places significant emphasis on repeating learning objectives at module level, without sufficiently conveying a coherent and distinctive overall vision for the programme.

The EEC strongly recommends that the College defines and communicates a clear overarching purpose and identity for the Diploma in Culinary Arts, one that articulates what the programme seeks to achieve as a whole and how it differentiates itself from comparable offerings in a competitive educational environment. A clearly defined vision would strengthen the programme's positioning, enhance internal coherence and provide clearer direction for curriculum development and delivery.

The EEC further recommends a rationalisation and clarification of the programme structure in order to enhance coherence, reduce duplication and strengthen student centred design. In this context, the EEC suggests consideration be given to merging HOT103 Sanitation, Hygiene and Food Safety with HOT106

Hospitality Safety and First Aid. Such an approach would allow for a more integrated treatment of health, safety and regulatory compliance, while reducing fragmentation within the curriculum.

At the same time, the EEC strongly recommends that sanitation, hygiene and food safety principles are made explicitly visible and systematically embedded across relevant core modules, including CUL110 Fundamentals of Culinary Arts, CUL133 Pastry Arts and Baking, CUL134 Hot Food Preparations, CUL135 Garde Manger and Butchery and CUL300 Food Science and Nutrition. This would reinforce the applied and professional nature of the programme and ensure that essential competencies are developed progressively and consistently throughout the course of study.

In addition, the EEC reiterates the importance of clearly defining the Major Core subjects of the programme and designating them as compulsory, with no ambiguity regarding their status. A clearly articulated core curriculum would ensure consistency in student learning outcomes and eliminate potential confusion regarding programme expectations and requirements.

Regarding optional electives, the EEC recommends a more flexible and inclusive approach. Students who are not particularly strong or confident in numeracy should not be compelled to undertake modules focused primarily on pure mathematics or statistics within a Diploma level programme. Instead, such students should be offered alternative elective options that are more closely aligned with their strengths and professional aspirations. This approach would better reflect the principles of student-centred learning and would support engagement, retention and academic success across a diverse student cohort.

Taken together, these recommendations would contribute to a clearer, more coherent and more inclusive programme structure, while preserving academic standards and enhancing the overall student learning experience.

With regards to staffing the EEC suggests for the college to consider the level of staffing responsible for the welfare of students as the course has a small number of students but the College has close to 1000 students having only one welfare officer can create challenges for the student experience. The learning environment could do with some investment to modernise and to update and in some cases to bring teaching and learning spaces within best ergonomic and safety practice.

The EEC recognises the strong foundations upon which the programme is built and commends the College for its transparent practices, collegial culture and positive stakeholder engagement. By addressing the recommendations outlined above, particularly in relation to programme purpose and curriculum structure, the College will be well placed to further enhance the distinctiveness, coherence and long-term sustainability of the Diploma in Culinary Arts.

E. Signatures of the EEC

Name	*Signature*
Ioannis S. Pantelidis,	
Neil Rippington	
Máirtín Mac Con Iomaire	
Panagiota Charalambous	
Click to enter Name	
Click to enter Name	

Date: 23 April 2026