



ΦΟΡΕΑΣ ΔΙΑΣΦΑΛΙΣΗΣ ΚΑΙ ΠΙΣΤΟΠΟΙΗΣΗΣ ΤΗΣ ΠΟΙΟΤΗΤΑΣ ΤΗΣ ΑΝΩΤΕΡΗΣ ΕΚΠΑΙΔΕΥΣΗΣ
CYPRUS AGENCY OF QUALITY ASSURANCE AND ACCREDITATION IN HIGHER EDUCATION



eqar /// enqa.

Doc. 300.3.1

Date: Date

External Evaluation Report (Departmental)

- **Higher Education Institution:**
Frederick University
- **Town:** Nicosia
- **School/Faculty:** School of Health Sciences
- **Department:** Nursing
- **Department's Status:** Currently Operating
- **Programme(s) of study under evaluation:**
Name (Duration, ECTS, Cycle)

Programme 1

In Greek:

Πτυχίο Νοσηλευτικής [4 ακαδημαϊκά έτη, 240 ECTS, 1ος Κύκλος]

In English:

Bachelor of Science in Nursing [4 academic years, 240 ECTS, 1st Cycle] Programme Name

Programme 2

In Greek:

Μεταπτυχιακό Δίπλωμα Μάστερ στην Προηγμένη Φροντίδα Υγείας (Κατεύθυνσεις Α: Κοινωνική Φροντίδα Υγείας, Β: Επείγουσα Φροντίδα Υγείας)

In English:

Master(MSc) in Advanced Health Care (3 academic semesters, 90 ECTS (Specializations A: Community Health Care, B: Emergency Health Care)

Programme 3

In Greek:

Διδακτορικό Δίπλωμα στις Επιστήμες Υγείας

In English:

Doctoral of Philosophy in Health Sciences



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].



Department's programmes (to be filled by the CYQAA officer and verified by the EEC):

DEPARTMENT	PROGRAMMES OF STUDY

A. Introduction

This part includes basic information regarding the onsite visit.

The onsite visit took place from 04/07/2022 to 05/07/2022 in the premises of Frederick University at Nicosia-Cyprus and at the Apollonion Private Hospital. The onsite visit was performed by all 5 members of the EEC with the support of Mrs Emily Mouskou, from the CYQAA. During the visit, the EEC members had the opportunity to meet the Vice President of the Council, the Rector of the Institution, the Vice Rector of Quality Assurance, the Vice Rector of Research and International Relations, the School of Health Sciences Representative in the Internal Quality Committee, the Dean and Vice Dean of the School of Health Sciences, the Chair and Vice Chair of the Department, the PhD and the Clinical Practice Coordinators, the Head of Nursing Labs and Simulation, most of the faculty tutors/academic staff, (including some of the visiting faculty) representatives of administrative staff and a group of undergraduate nursing students as well as some MSc/PhD candidates and graduates. Most participants joined the meeting in person with a small number online. No major communication difficulties were encountered. More specifically, on 04/07/2022 the agenda included a variety of power point presentations, and interactive conversations with all aforementioned people, as well as, a visit to the premises of the university (library, labs, teaching rooms, etc). The Frederick University buildings include several spaces and classrooms/labs which are large and adequate for educational purposes. The lab facilities are up-to-date, well equipped with a variety mannequins (parts and whole body), including high fidelity models. Nursing students, by using these facilities, have the opportunity to be well prepared for the modern health care environment. In general, it seems that the University is well organized, the environment is hospitable, the staff are open to questions. There was a good range of students, and all were informative and open about their experiences. Moreover, in the discussions with the senior staff, they seemed receptive and open to advice. On 05/07/2022 the EEC members visit the Apollonion Hospital and met with the Head of Nursing services (Mrs Kotsiftopoulou Despina) as well as with the clinical practice coordinator (Dr Evanthia Asimakopoulou). We also met clinical mentors and undergraduate students with whom we had the opportunity to observe in a practice setting and to discuss their programme openly. According to information provided to EEC, up to 5 students per mentor can be assigned which we consider to be a strength of the BSc programme. In general, the clinical environment was very hospitable for experiential education and training and all students seemed enthusiastic. Based on the aforementioned observations, we concluded that the clinical placement component of the BSc Nursing program under evaluation is well planned as well as being organized and delivered effectively.

B. External Evaluation Committee (EEC)

<i>Name</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>University</i>
Sanna Salanterä	Professor of Clinical Nursing Science, Vice Dean, Faculty of Medicine	University of Turku, Finland
Margarita Giannakopoulou	Professor of Fundamentals of Nursing	National Kapodistrian University of Athens, Greece
Daniel Kelly	Royal College of Nursing, Professor of Nursing Research	Cardiff University, UK
Ioanna Papaioannou	MSc, Midwifery student	Cyprus University of Technology
Andreas Andreou	Representative	Cyprus Council of Nurses and Midwives
Name	Position	University

C. Guidelines on content and structure of the report

- *The external evaluation report refers to the Department as a whole (programmes offered, teaching staff, administrative staff, infrastructure, resources, etc.).*
- *The external evaluation report follows the structure of assessment areas and sub-areas.*
- *Under each assessment area there are quality indicators (criteria) to be scored by the EEC on a scale from one (1) to five (5), based on the degree of compliance for the above mentioned quality indicators (criteria). The scale used is explained below:*

1 or 2:	Non-compliant
3:	Partially compliant
4 or 5:	Compliant

- *The EEC must justify the numerical scores provided for the quality indicators (criteria) by specifying (if any) the deficiencies.*
- *It is pointed out that, in the case of indicators (criteria) that cannot be applied due to the status of the Department, N/A (= Not Applicable) should be noted and a detailed explanation should be provided on the Department's corresponding policy regarding the specific quality indicator.*
- *In addition, for each assessment area, it is important to provide information regarding the compliance with the requirements. In particular, the following must be included:*

Findings

A short description of the situation in the Department based on evidence from the Department's application and the site - 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 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.***
- *The report may also address other issues which the EEC finds relevant.*

1. Department's academic profile and orientation
(ESG 1.1, 1.2, 1.4, 1.5, 1.6, 1.7, 1.8, 1.9)

Sub-areas

- 1.1 Mission and strategic planning (including SWOT analysis)**
- 1.2 Connecting with society**
- 1.3 Development processes**

Mark from 1 to 5 the degree of compliance for each quality indicator/criterion

- 1 or 2: Non-compliant*
- 3: Partially compliant*
- 4 or 5: Compliant*

Quality indicators/criteria		
1. Department's academic profile and orientation		
1.1 Mission and strategic planning (including SWOT analysis)		1 - 5
1.1.1	The Department has formally adopted a mission statement, which is available to the public and easily accessible.	4
1.1.2	The Department has developed its strategic planning aiming at fulfilling its mission.	4
1.1.3	The Department's strategic planning includes short, medium-term and long-term goals and objectives, which are periodically revised and adapted.	4
1.1.4	The programmes of study offered by the Department reflect its academic profile and are aligned with the European and international practice.	4
1.1.5	The academic community is involved in shaping and monitoring the implementation of the Department's development strategies.	4
1.1.6	Stakeholders such as academics, students, graduates and other professional and scientific associations participate in the Department's development strategy.	4
1.1.7	The mechanism for collecting and analysing data and indicators needed to effectively design the Department's academic development is adequate and effective.	4
Justify the numerical scores provided for the quality indicators (criteria) by specifying (if any) the deficiencies.		

[Click to enter text.](#)

Additionally, provide information on the following:

1. Coherence and compatibility among programmes of study offered by the Department.
2. Coherence and compatibility among Departments within the School/Faculty (to which the Department under evaluation belongs).

[Click to enter text.](#)

Provide suggestions for changes in case of incompatibility.

[Click to enter text.](#)

1. Department's academic profile and orientation

1.2 Connecting with society		1 – 5
1.2.1	The Department has effective mechanisms to assess the needs and demands of society and takes them into account in its various activities.	4
1.2.2	The Department provides sufficient information to the public about its activities and offered programmes of study.	4
1.2.3	The Department ensures that its operation and activities have a positive impact on society.	4
1.2.4	The Department has an effective communication mechanism with its graduates.	5

Justify the numerical scores provided for the quality indicators (criteria) by specifying (if any) the deficiencies.

[Click to enter text.](#)

1. Department's academic profile and orientation

1.3 Development processes		1 – 5
1.3.1	Effective procedures and measures are in place to attract and select teaching staff to ensure that they possess the formal and substantive skills to teach, carry out research and effectively carry out their work.	5
1.3.2	Planning teaching staff recruitment and their professional development is in line with the Department's academic development plan.	4
1.3.3	The Department applies an effective strategy of attracting high-level students from Cyprus and abroad.	4

1.3.4	The funding processes for the operation of the Department and the continuous improvement of the quality of its programmes of study are adequate and transparent.	4
<p>Justify the numerical scores provided for the quality indicators (criteria) by specifying (if any) the deficiencies.</p> <p>Click to enter text.</p> <p>Additionally, write:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Expected number of Cypriot and international students - Countries of origin of international students and number from each country <p>We were informed that numbers of students are shaped by available supervision at Masters & Doctoral levels. At Masters this was set at 5 students per supervisor. Undergraduate numbers are predicted to rise from current levels. International students were in the minority with 70% currently from Cyprus with the remainder from Greece and a small number from other countries. The intention is to grow the number of international students.</p>		

Findings

A short description of the situation in the Department based on evidence from the Department's application and the site - visit.

The department provided a range of information in advance, and we were able to ask questions about different aspects of their work. The staff to student ratio was positive and there was a willingness to invest further. The staff were positive in their attitude and the students were highly complimentary about the department. Areas for growth and improvement were discussed openly.

Strengths

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

Highly motivated faculty, good resources and string links with clinical partners. A satisfied student body who are keen to see the university succeed. It was pleasing to see the Sustainability Report 2021.

Areas of improvement and recommendations

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

Review and submission guidelines for the PhD was the area that attracted most concern. This needs to be addressed so that the quality of theses can be improved and comparable with the standard of other institutions.

EEC encourages the University also to consider the use of small plastic water bottles and instead explore alternatives.

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

Sub-area	<i>Non-compliant / Partially Compliant / Compliant</i>
1.1 Mission and strategic planning	Compliant
1.2 Connecting with society	Compliant
1.3 Development processes	Compliant

2. Quality Assurance

(ESG 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.6, 1.7, 1.8)

Sub-areas

- 2.1 System and quality assurance strategy
- 2.2 Quality assurance for the programmes of study

Mark from 1 to 5 the degree of compliance for each quality indicator/criterion

- 1 or 2: *Non-compliant*
- 3: *Partially compliant*
- 4 or 5: *Compliant*

Quality indicators/criteria		
2. Quality Assurance		
2.1 System and quality assurance strategy		1 - 5
2.1.1	The Department has a policy for quality assurance that is made public and forms part of the Institution's strategic management.	5
2.1.2	Internal stakeholders develop and implement a policy for quality assurance through appropriate structures and processes, while involving external stakeholders.	4
2.1.3	The Department's policy for quality assurance supports guarding against intolerance of any kind or discrimination against students or staff.	5
2.1.4	The quality assurance system adequately covers all the functions and sectors of the Department's activities:	
2.1.4.1	Teaching and learning	4
2.1.4.2	Research	4
2.1.4.3	The connection with society	4
2.1.4.4	Management and support services	5
2.1.5	The quality assurance system promotes a culture of quality.	4
2.1.6	Students' evaluation and feedback	4

Justify the numerical scores provided for the quality indicators (criteria) by specifying (if any) the deficiencies.

Based on discussions with the students, critical reflecting of the programme could be enhanced at all levels of education.

2. Quality Assurance		
2.2 Quality assurance for the programmes of study		1 – 5
2.2.1	The responsibility for decision-making and monitoring the implementation of the programmes of study offered by the Department lies with the teaching staff.	4
2.2.2	The system and criteria for assessing students' performance in the subjects of the programmes of studies offered by the Department are clear, sufficient and known to the students.	5
2.2.3	The quality control system refers to specific indicators and is effective, which have been presented and discussed.	4
2.2.4	The results from student assessments are used to improve the programmes of study.	4
2.2.5	The policy dealing with plagiarism committed by students as well as mechanisms for identifying and preventing it are effective.	5
2.2.6	The established procedures for examining students' objections/ disagreements on issues of student evaluation or academic ethics are effective.	4
2.2.7	The Department publishes information related to the programmes of study, credit units, learning outcomes, methodology, student admission criteria, completion of studies, facilities, number of teaching staff and the expertise of teaching staff.	5
2.2.8	Names and position of the teaching staff of each programme are published and easily accessible.	4
2.2.9	The Department has a clear and consistent policy on the admission criteria for students in the various programmes of studies offered.	5
2.2.10	The Department flexibly uses a variety of teaching methods.	5
2.2.11	The Department systematically collects data in relation to the academic performance of students, implements procedures for evaluating such data and has a relevant policy in place.	5
2.2.12	The Department analyses and publishes graduate employment information.	5

2.2.13	The Department ensures adequate and appropriate learning resources in line with European and international standards and/or international practices, particularly:	
2.2.12.1	Building facilities	5
2.2.12.2	Library	4
2.2.12.3	Rooms for theoretical, practical and laboratory lessons	5
2.2.12.4	Technological infrastructure	5
2.2.12.5	Academic support	5
2.2.14	There is a student welfare service that supports students in regard to academic, personal problems and difficulties.	5
2.2.15	The Department's mechanisms, processes and infrastructure consider the needs of a diverse student population such as mature, part-time, employed and international students as well as students with disabilities.	5
2.2.16	Mentoring of each student is provided and the number of students per each permanent teaching member is adequate.	5
2.2.17	The provision of quality doctoral studies is ensured through doctoral studies regulations, which are publicly available.	3
2.2.18	The number of doctoral students, under the supervision of a member of the teaching staff, enables continuous and effective feedback to the students and it complies with the European and international standards.	4
2.2.19	The Department has mechanisms and funds to support writing and attending conferences of doctoral candidates.	5
2.2.20	There is a clear policy on authorship and intellectual property.	5

Justify the numerical scores provided for the quality indicators (criteria) by specifying (if any) the deficiencies.

Enhance the expectations and guidance given to doctoral candidates. The quality of the thesis needs to be subjected to closer scrutiny and examiners should be informed about what is expected.

Findings

A short description of the situation in the Department based on evidence from the Department's application and the site - visit.

The department of nursing seemed to be very aware of the importance of quality indicators to improve its reputation and to attract more students.

Strengths

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

Collection of adequate information allows quality indicators to be monitored. There are a number of positive practices and resources that help make this Department high performing (including technology, physical space, staff motivation and student satisfaction).

Areas of improvement and recommendations

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

Enhance the expectations and guidance given to doctoral candidates. The quality of the thesis needs to be subjected to closer scrutiny and examiners should be informed about what is expected.

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

Sub-area	<i>Non-compliant / Partially Compliant / Compliant</i>
2.1 System and quality assurance strategy	Compliant
2.2 Quality assurance for the programmes of study	Partially Compliant

3. Administration (ESG 1.1, 1.3, 1.6)

Mark from 1 to 5 the degree of compliance for each quality indicator/criterion

- 1 or 2: *Non-compliant*
3: *Partially compliant*
4 or 5: *Compliant*

Quality indicators/criteria		
3. Administration		1 - 5
3.1	The administrative structure is in line with the legislation and the Department's mission.	5
3.2	The members of the teaching and administrative staff and the students participate, at a satisfactory degree and on the basis of specified procedures, in the management of the Department.	5
3.3	The administrative staff adequately supports the operation of the Department.	5
3.4	Adequate allocation of competences and responsibilities is ensured so that in academic matters, decisions are made by academics and the Department's council competently exercises legal control over such decisions.	4
3.5	The Department applies effective procedures to ensure transparency in the decision-making process.	4
3.6	Statutory sessions of the Department are held and minutes are kept.	5
3.7	The Department's council operates systematically and autonomously and exercise the full powers provided for by the law and / or the constitution of the Department without the intervention or involvement of a body or person outside the law provisions.	4
3.8	The manner in which the Department's council operates and the procedures for disseminating and implementing their decisions are clearly formulated and implemented precisely and effectively.	4
3.9	The Department applies procedures for the prevention and disciplinary control of academic misconduct of students, teaching and administrative staff, including plagiarism.	5
3.10	The Department has appropriate procedures for dealing with students' complaints.	4

3.11 Internationalization of the Department and external collaborations.

4

Justify the numerical scores provided for the quality indicators (criteria) by specifying (if any) the deficiencies.

Click to enter text.

Findings

A short description of the situation in the Department based on evidence from the Department's application and the site - visit.

Evidence of opportunities for student involvement and quality were evident. However, students were unable to provide many examples of being involved in official quality assessment. It is not always possible to judge how decisions are made but we were told about valuing collaboration.

Strengths

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

Good administrative support with mechanisms for quality control. Open to suggestions for improvement and able to see future possibilities.

Areas of improvement and recommendations

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

No areas of concern

Please select what is appropriate for the following assessment area:

Assessment area	<i>Non-compliant / Partially Compliant / Compliant</i>
3. Administration	Compliant



4. Learning and Teaching (ESG 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.9)

Sub-areas

- 4.1 Planning the programmes of study
- 4.2 Organisation of teaching

Mark from 1 to 5 the degree of compliance for each quality indicator/criterion

- 1 or 2: *Non-compliant*
- 3: *Partially compliant*
- 4 or 5: *Compliant*

Quality indicators/criteria		
4. Learning and Teaching		
4.1 Planning the programmes of study		1 - 5
4.1.1	The Department provides an effective system for designing, approving, monitoring and periodically reviewing the programmes of study.	4
4.1.2	Students and other stakeholders, including employers, are actively involved on the programmes' review and development.	4
4.1.3	Intended learning outcomes, the content of the programmes of study, the assignments and the final exams correspond to the appropriate level as indicated by the European Qualifications Framework (EQF).	5
4.1.4	The programmes of study are in compliance with the existing legislation and meet the professional qualifications requirements in the professional courses, where applicable.	5
4.1.5	The Department ensures that its programmes of study integrate effectively theory and practice.	3
Justify the numerical scores provided for the quality indicators (criteria) by specifying (if any) the deficiencies.		
The deficiency in the section refers to the need for better integration of theory and practice at Master's level and the need for better quality products at Doctoral level. These are explored in more depth in other sections.		
4. Learning and Teaching		
4.2 Organisation of teaching		1 – 5

4.2.1	The Department establishes student admission criteria for each programme, which are adhered to consistently.	5
4.2.2	Recognition of prior studies and credit transfer is regulated by procedures and regulations that are in line with European standards and/or international practices.	5
4.2.3	The number of students in the teaching rooms is suitable for theoretical, practical and laboratory lessons.	5
4.2.4	The teaching staff of the Department has regular and effective communication with their students, promoting mutual respect within the learner-teacher relationship.	5
4.2.5	Student-centred learning and teaching plays an important role in stimulating students' motivation, self-reflection and engagement in the learning process.	5
4.2.6	The teaching staff of the Department provides timely and effective feedback to their students.	4
4.2.7	The criteria and the method of assessment as well as the criteria for marking are published in advance.	5
4.2.8	The assessment allows students to demonstrate the extent to which the intended learning outcomes have been achieved.	5
<p>Justify the numerical scores provided for the quality indicators (criteria) by specifying (if any) the deficiencies.</p> <p>Click to enter text.</p>		

Findings

A short description of the situation in the Department based on evidence from the Department's application and the site - visit.

Feedback of students seemed to be of acceptable standard. However, we noted that the students did not adopt a critical perspective when reflecting their educational experiences.

Strengths

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

Student-centered approaches were emphasized.

Areas of improvement and recommendations

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

[Click to enter text.](#)



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

Sub-area	<i>Non-compliant / Partially Compliant / Compliant</i>
4.1 Planning the programmes of study	Compliant
4.2 Organisation of teaching	Compliant

5. Teaching Staff (ESG 1.5)

Mark from 1 to 5 the degree of compliance for each quality indicator/criterion

- 1 or 2: *Non-compliant*
 3: *Partially compliant*
 4 or 5: *Compliant*

Quality indicators/criteria		
5. Teaching Staff		1 - 5
5.1	The number of teaching staff - full-time and exclusive work - and the subject area of the staff sufficiently support the programmes of study.	5
5.2	The teaching staff of the Department has the relevant formal and substantive qualifications for teaching the individual subjects as described in the relevant legislation.	5
5.3	The visiting Professors' subject areas adequately support the Department's programmes of study.	5
5.4	The special teaching staff and special scientists have the required qualifications, sufficient professional experience and expertise to teach a limited number of programmes of study.	5
5.5	The ratio of special teaching staff to the total number of teaching staff is satisfactory.	5
5.6	The ratio of the number of subjects of the programme of study taught by teaching staff working fulltime and exclusively to the number of subjects taught by part-time teaching staff ensures the quality of the programme of study.	5
5.7	The ratio of the number of students to the total number of teaching staff is sufficient to support and ensure the quality of the programme of study.	5
5.8	Feedback processes for teaching staff in regard to the evaluation of their teaching work, by the students, are satisfactory.	4

Justify the numerical scores provided for the quality indicators (criteria) by specifying (if any) the deficiencies.

No deficiencies noted. Number of permanent teaching staff 13, 11 were nurses. 10 visiting faculty of which 5 are nurses. These numbers include visiting professors of other disciplines.

Also, write the following:

- Number of teaching staff working full-time and having exclusive work
- Number of special teaching staff working full-time and having exclusive work
- Number of visiting Professors

- Number of special scientists on lease services

Click to enter text.

Findings

A short description of the situation in the Department based on evidence from the Department's application and the site - visit.

Staff resources are adequate

Strengths

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

Good range of expertise

Areas of improvement and recommendations

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

Enhance numbers of social scientists and qualitative teachers.

Please ✓ what is appropriate for the following assessment area:

Assessment area	<i>Non-compliant / Partially Compliant / Compliant</i>
Teaching staff number, adequacy and suitability	Compliant
Teaching staff recruitment and development	Compliant
Synergies of teaching and research	Compliant

6. Research

(ESG 1.1, 1.3, 1.5, 1.6)

Mark from 1 to 5 the degree of compliance for each quality indicator/criterion

1 or 2: *Non-compliant*
3: *Partially compliant*
4 or 5: *Compliant*

Quality indicators/criteria		
6. Research		1 - 5
6.1	The Department has a research policy formulated in line with its mission.	3
6.2	The Department consistently applies internal regulations and procedures of research activity, which promote the set out research policy and ensure compliance with the regulations of research projects financing programmes.	4
6.3	The Department provides adequate facilities and equipment to cover the staff and students' research activities.	4
6.4	The Department has the appropriate mechanisms for the development of students' research skills.	4
6.5	The results of the teaching staff research activity are published to a satisfactory extent in international journals which work with critics, international conferences, conference proceedings, publications, etc. The Department also uses an open access policy for publications, which is consistent with the corresponding national and European policy.	4
6.6	The Department ensures that research results are integrated into teaching and, to the extent applicable, promotes and implements a policy of transferring know-how to society and the production sector.	3
6.7	The Department provides mechanisms which ensure compliance with international rules of research ethics, both in relation to research activity and the rights of researchers.	3
6.8	The external, non-governmental, funding of research activities of teaching staff is similar to other Departments in Cyprus and abroad.	4
6.9	The policy, indirect or direct of internal funding of the research activities of the teaching staff is satisfactory, based on European and international practices.	4

Justify the numerical scores provided for the quality indicators (criteria) by specifying (if any) the deficiencies.

Some research strategy is needed to enhance this aspect of the department's work.
More evidence of research ethics is needed in their PhD student dissertations.

Findings

A short description of the situation in the Department based on evidence from the Department's application and the site - visit.

Strong potential for increasing the research profile in the department. Themes would assist in this regard.

Strengths

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

Expertise is strong, with some further development.

Areas of improvement and recommendations

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

Research strategy and focused themes would be a valuable addition, better evidence of ethics in the PhD studies would be useful.

Please ✓ what is appropriate for the following assessment area:

Assessment area	<i>Non-compliant / Partially Compliant / Compliant</i>
Research mechanisms and regulations	Compliant
External and internal funding	Compliant
Motives for research	Compliant
Publications	Compliant

7. Resources (ESG 1.6)

Mark from 1 to 5 the degree of compliance for each quality indicator/criterion

- 1 or 2: *Non-compliant*
3: *Partially compliant*
4 or 5: *Compliant*

Quality indicators/criteria		
7. Resources		1 - 5
7.1	The Department has sufficient financial resources to support its functions, managed by the Institutional and Departmental bodies.	4
7.2	The Department follows sound and efficient management of the available financial resources in order to develop academically and research wise.	4
7.3	The Department's profits and donations are used for its development and for the benefit of the university community.	4
7.4	The Department's budget is appropriate for its mission and adequate for the implementation of strategic planning.	4
7.5	The Department carries out an assessment of the risks and sustainability of the programmes of study and adequately provides feedback on their operation.	4
7.6	The Department's external audit and the transparent management of its finances are ensured.	4
7.7	The fitness-for-purpose of support facilities and services is periodically reviewed.	4
Justify the numerical scores provided for the quality indicators (criteria) by specifying (if any) the deficiencies. Click to enter text.		

Findings

A short description of the situation in the Department based on evidence from the Department's application and the site - visit.

As far as was possible to judge the Department was benefitting from financial investment and will need to grow further to justify and extend their areas of strength.

Strengths

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

Willingness to invest and support a growing Department.

Areas of improvement and recommendations

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

No major problems but investment must be balanced by the risks of market pressures and the need for more international students.

Please ✓ what is appropriate for the following assessment area:

Assessment area	<i>Non-compliant / Partially Compliant / Compliant</i>
7. Resources	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 Department under review may be achieved.

Frederick University, School of Health Sciences, Department of Nursing is responsible for bachelor's, master's and doctoral education. The university has good quality assessment methods, a clear mission and vision, and the unit under assessment is in line with the university's strategy. The unit's educational programmes are generally up-to-date and the learning environment is excellent. A particular strength of the unit is the scientific orientation of the teachers (all have PhDs), the good team spirit and the highly student-centred teaching. Students have excellent support systems and very personalised support at all levels of education. Practical training is based on theory and science. Students are satisfied with the education they receive and many go on to study for masters and doctorates in the same unit after their undergraduate degree. Teaching resources are excellent and it was welcome that they had considered sustainable development goals to protect the environment. It would be good to see more of this across the different programmes in Health Sciences. It is important to maintain a good ratio of permanent and visiting teachers. Practical training and theoretical teaching are mutually supportive. A clear area for improvement is the PhD dissertation requirements, the implementation of which needs to be monitored more closely. In addition, the EEC recommends that the unit could have a research programme under specific research themes based on the expertise of the faculty where students at different levels of education could also participate in relevant research projects. In this way, the unit will strengthen its own level of expertise and knowledge and its reputation would be enhanced. Staff are motivated and enthusiastic about their work and were very welcoming and open to suggestions. The unit was well prepared for the evaluation and the necessary information was at hand. The unit has excellent opportunities to develop and become more competitive.



E. Signatures of the EEC

<i>Name</i>	<i>Signature</i>
Sanna Salanterä	
Margarita Giannakopoulou	
Daniel Kelly	
Ioanna Papaioannou	
Andreas Andreou	
FullName	

Date: Click to enter date

