

Doc. 300.3.1

Date: Date

# External Evaluation Report (Departmental)

- **Higher Education Institution:**  
European University Cyprus
- **Town: Nicosia**
- **School/Faculty:** School of Sciences
- **Department:** Health Sciences
- **Programme(s) of study under evaluation**  
**Name (Duration, ECTS, Cycle)**

## Programme 1

### **In Greek:**

Φυσικοθεραπεία (4 Έτη / 240 ECTS, Π τ  
υ χ ί ο)

### **In English:**

Physiotherapy (4 Years / 240 ECTS, Bachelor of  
Science)

## Programme 2

### **In Greek:**

Programme Name

### **In English:**

Sports Physiotherapy and Exercise (18 months, 90 ECTS, M.Sc.)

## Programme 3

### **In Greek:**

Programme Name

### **In English:**

Physiotherapy (3 years, 180 ECTS, Ph.D.)

- **Department's Status: Currently Operating**

**The present document has been prepared within the framework of the authority and competencies of the Cyprus Agency of Quality Assurance and Accreditation in Higher Education, according to the provisions of the “Quality Assurance and Accreditation of Higher Education and the Establishment and Operation of an Agency on Related Matters Laws of 2015 to 2019” [N. 136 (I)/2015 to N. 35(I)/2019].**

## A. Introduction

*This part includes basic information regarding the onsite visit.*

Department of Health Sciences: Dr. Chryssoula Thodi, Chair at the University 7000 students Department of Health Sciences: 2000 students 62 fulltime faculty members Labs for teaching and research (mainly for teaching) The undergraduate programs: Nursing, Occupational Therapy, Physiotherapy, Radio diagnostics and Radiotherapy and Speech and Language Therapy The postgraduate programs: Master in Public Health, Sports Physiotherapy, Language Pathology, Midwifery, Nursing The Doctoral programs: Public Health, Nursing and Physiotherapy Student service with administrative staff seemed to be is well organized and executed There are several different size lecture rooms and computer labs that are common to all program of studies of the University. The Department of Health Sciences have several laboratories for mainly to teaching, including following labs: three nursing, radio diagnostics, electrotherapy, two physiotherapy, speech and language clinic, occupational therapy, assistive technology, biology/microbiology, laboratory of exercise science and human performance, Anatomy, structure, and function. All these are well equipped, but rather old fashioned in comparison to other department we visited (i.e., medicine, dentistry) The library offers its services and extensive collection of books and access to electronic journals; however, we did not visit the library. Student workplaces on the premises were not seen or shown.

## B. External Evaluation Committee (EEC)

<i>Name</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>University</i>
<b>Lee Ingle</b>	Professor	University of Hull, GB
<b>Ari Heinonen</b>	Professor	University of Jyväskylä, FIN
<b>Eling de Bruin</b>	Professor	Karolinska Institute, SE
<b>Chrystalla Leonidou</b>	Physiotherapist, Cyprus Sports Physiotherapy Association	na
<b>Ioanna Papaioannou</b>	Student representative	na
<b>Name</b>	Position	University

## C. Guidelines on content and structure of the report

- *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:	<i>Non-compliant</i>
3:	<i>Partially compliant</i>
4 or 5:	<i>Compliant</i>

- *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 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
- 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		
<b>1. Department's academic profile and orientation</b>		
<b>1.1 Mission and strategic planning</b>		<b>1 - 5</b>
1.1.1	The Department has formally adopted a mission statement, which is available to the public and easily accessible.	3
1.1.2	The Department has developed its strategic planning aiming at fulfilling its mission.	3
1.1.3	The Department's strategic planning includes short, medium-term and long-term goals and objectives, which are periodically revised and adapted.	3
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.	3
1.1.6	Stakeholders such as academics, students, graduates and other professional and scientific associations participate in the Department's development strategy.	3
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.	3
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).

**Collaborations between different programs seemed to be apparent**

Provide suggestions for changes in case of incompatibility.

**Further increase collaborations between different programs by formalizing and creating structures/processes to enhance interdepartmental collaboration. As a way of example, specific regular meetings open for BSc, MSc, PhD, and higher staff in which progress in various projects is mutually discussed. This might create a sense of community and helps undergraduate students in planning their future work.**

## 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.	3
1.2.2	The Department provides sufficient information to the public about its activities and offered programmes of study.	3
1.2.3	The Department ensures that its operation and activities have a positive impact on society.	3
1.2.4	The Department has an effective communication mechanism with its graduates.	3

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

**We did not receive sufficient information about these items. It is our feeling that, based on our discussions, that there is room to improve these items by formulating more specific aims of how to reach society at large, inform the public, and show the potential value of the programs for society. Keep in contact with former students though creation of a kind of alumni association. Most of the discussion concentrated on the PT programs and, therefore, there was less focus put on these aspects.**

## 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.	N/A
-------	--	-----

1.3.2	Planning teaching staff recruitment and their professional development is in line with the Department's academic development plan.	N/A
1.3.3	The Department applies an effective strategy of attracting high-level students from Cyprus and abroad.	N/A
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.	N/A

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

This is another item of which it is difficult to say something. There was not really enough information given.....

Additionally, write:

- Expected number of Cypriot and international students
- Countries of origin of international students and number from each country

Most international students stem from Greece. Some faculties have student-refugees from Syria.

### Findings

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

We found basic structures in the department, however, perceived a lack of focus regarding common goals and strategy. There could be much more efficient cooperation and communication within the department and regarding outside communication with the society.

### Strengths

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

The structure of the programs appropriately prepares students for their work, and they are taught by a dedicated group of young and enthusiastic professionals.

### Areas of improvement and recommendations

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

There seems room for improvement by adding and integrating more senior staff to provide mentorship and leadership.

**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	Partially Compliant
1.2 Connecting with society	Partially Compliant

1.3 Development processes	Partially 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		
<b>2. Quality Assurance</b>		
<b>2.1 System and quality assurance strategy</b>		<b>1 - 5</b>
2.1.1	The Department has a policy for quality assurance that is made public and forms part of the Institution's strategic management.	N/A
2.1.2	Internal stakeholders develop and implement a policy for quality assurance through appropriate structures and processes, while involving external stakeholders.	N/A
2.1.3	The Department's policy for quality assurance supports guarding against intolerance of any kind or discrimination against students or staff.	N/A
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	1
2.1.4.2	Research	1
2.1.4.3	The connection with society	1
2.1.4.4	Management and support services	4
2.1.5	The quality assurance system promotes a culture of quality.	1

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

**Click to enter text.** The above things were described nicely in the documents, but we did not discuss them during the site visit. It is difficult for us to assess how the measures work.

We did not see any quality assurance policies for the department for teaching or research. These need to be developed with the team, for example, in teaching there is no moderation process, staff have little time to mark assignments, and there is no independent external examination of programs which can lead to innovation. Similarly, quality assurance processes for research also need development.

## 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.	N/A
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.	N/A
2.2.3	The quality control system refers to specific indicators and is effective.	N/A
2.2.4	The results from student assessments are used to improve the programmes of study.	N/A
2.2.5	The policy dealing with plagiarism committed by students as well as mechanisms for identifying and preventing it are effective.	N/A
2.2.6	The established procedures for examining students' objections/ disagreements on issues of student evaluation or academic ethics are effective.	N/A
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.	N/A
2.2.8	The Department has a clear and consistent policy on the admission criteria for students in the various programmes of studies offered.	N/A
2.2.9	The Department flexibly uses a variety of pedagogical methods.	N/A
2.2.10	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.	N/A
2.2.11	The Department analyses and publishes graduate employment information.	N/A
2.2.12	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	4

	2.2.12.2	Library	N/A
	2.2.12.3	Rooms for theoretical, practical and laboratory lessons	3
	2.2.12.4	Technological infrastructure	4
	2.2.12.5	Academic support	4
2.2.13	There is a student welfare service that supports students in regard to academic, personal problems and difficulties.		5
2.2.14	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.		N/A
2.2.15	Mentoring of each student is provided and the number of students per each permanent teaching member is adequate.		5
2.2.16	The provision of quality doctoral studies is ensured through doctoral studies regulations, which are publicly available.		5
2.2.17	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.		5
2.2.18	The Department has mechanisms and funds to support writing and attending conferences of doctoral candidates.		4
2.2.19	There is a clear policy on authorship and intellectual property.		N/A

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

Rooms for practical sessions were cramped. Compared to for example the facilities in Medicine the infrastructure for Physiotherapy seemed a little bit dated. Teaching and laboratory support seemed to be lacking, teaching staff made a dedicated and committed impression. We recommend management consider the appointment of laboratory support, administrative support (departmental secretary) and teaching assistance who may be able to support laboratory practical sessions. This will free-up academic staff to become more research active. Ad 2.2.18: There was a contradiction between the student's perception and what the rector told was available at the university for support. Students and staff seemed not aware about some of the funding possibilities.

## Findings

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

We are not confident enough to give a clear judgement. This because we lack enough information.

### Strengths

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

Those areas we allocated a five relate to items for which we could get an impression during our onsite visits.

### Areas of improvement and recommendations

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

Quality assurance should be explicitly broadcasted by, for example, publishing of a quality assurance policy.

**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	Partially 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		
<b>3. Administration</b>		<b>1 - 5</b>
3.1	The administrative structure is in line with the legislation and the Department's mission.	4
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.	3
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.	N/A
3.6	Statutory sessions of the Department are held and minutes are kept.	N/A
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.	N/A
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.	N/A
3.9	The Department applies procedures for the prevention and disciplinary control of academic misconduct of students, teaching and administrative staff, including plagiarism.	4
3.10	The Department has appropriate procedures for dealing with students' complaints.	4

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

It is not clear in which way the members of the teaching staff and the students (especially PhD-students) are actively involved in participation and management of the Department at a satisfactory degree. Specified procedures remain somewhat blurred and unclear. In academic matters, we feel decisions are made by academics and the Department's council competently exercises legal control over such decisions, however, there seems to be a lack of senior academic staff. There were some senior staff in other disciplines. Procedures for the prevention and disciplinary control of academic misconduct of students, teaching and administrative staff, including plagiarism are well described. It is unclear, however, whether this information is actively transported towards the students.

### Findings

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

PhD students are currently not actively involved in management of the department. In academic institutions it is expected that a doctoral student, besides undertaking his/her research studies, they will also be expected to teach undergraduates and/or take on administrative duties. This seems to be not the case at EUC.

### Strengths

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

It seems that the administrative staff is dedicated and adequately supports the department.

### Areas of improvement and recommendations

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

Consider ways of how to integrate PhD students in teaching obligations and administrative work.

**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		
<b>4. Learning and Teaching</b>		
<b>4.1 Planning the programmes of study</b>		<b>1 - 5</b>
4.1.1	The Department provides an effective system for designing, approving, monitoring and periodically reviewing the programmes of study.	3
4.1.2	Students and other stakeholders, including employers, are actively involved on the programmes' review and development.	3
4.1.3	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).	N/A
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.	4
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 PER program has been described; however, it is not clear what it involves. We could not derive enough information to give a credible assessment for item 4.1.3. Regarding point 4.1.5: based on what we have seen the therapies seemed rather old-fashioned.		
<b>4. Learning and Teaching</b>		
<b>4.2 Organisation of teaching</b>		<b>1 - 5</b>

4.2.1	The Department establishes student admission criteria for each programme, which are adhered to consistently.	1
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.	N/A
4.2.3	The number of students in the teaching rooms is suitable for theoretical, practical and laboratory lessons.	3
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.	3
4.2.6	The teaching staff of the Department provides timely and effective feedback to their students.	5
4.2.7	The criteria and the method of assessment as well as the criteria for marking are published in advance.	N/A
4.2.8	The assessment allows students to demonstrate the extent to which the intended learning outcomes have been achieved.	N/A

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

Ad 4.1.2: In most EU countries there are entry level requirements to fulfill before access to the study is allowed. Such criteria are missing for EUC. In the practical lecture there were too many students in the room. It was very crowded. The teaching seems to be focused on frontal teaching whereas it would be desirable to also implement alternative teaching strategies such as problem-based learning, small group “students-teach-students” exercises, etc. Endorse more variety of teaching methods and assessment methods. An open question relates to the quality of the feedback given to students when we consider that teachers only have two days’ time given for their assessments. This seems a possible point of concern that should be addressed.

### Findings

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

The items graded with a 5 related to effective communication between staff and students. There seemed to be a lot of mutual trust.

### Strengths

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

The teachers that we saw made a very competent impression and they all seemed very dedicated. Content wise, however, topics taught not always seemed very up to date or considered the latest evidence-based information. Some topics were a bit outdated and largely disappeared in most PT programs at other institutions. As a way of example, parafine treatment has largely disappeared from PT treatments.

Areas of improvement and recommendations

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

It is perhaps an idea to compare and contrast the program with guidelines given by WCPT for bachelor education: <https://world.physio/sites/default/files/2020-04/PS-2019-Education.pdf> This is a possible way to further evolve the current program and brings it to current international standards.

**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	Partially Compliant
4.2 Organisation of teaching	Partially 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		1 - 5
<b>5. Teaching Staff</b>		<b>1 - 5</b>
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.	2
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.	N/A
5.3	The visiting Professors' subject areas adequately support the Department's programmes of study.	1
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.	N/A
5.5	The ratio of special teaching staff to the total number of teaching staff is satisfactory.	N/A
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.	2
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.	1
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.

Ad 5.1 & 5.7: The ratio of faculty:students is rather high. An ideal ratio would be 1 faculty:20 students. This is a target to aim for. Ad 5.2: It remained unclear whether formal pedagogical qualifications were required for the teaching staff. Ad 3: There was no mentioning of visiting professors. Bringing in fresh ideas from outside seems to be, however, important. Ad 5.4: Hiring special teaching staff is highly recommended, however, it should be defined what "special teaching staff" is? Ad 5.5: not possible to judge. Ad 5.6: Most staff appeared to be part-time. Ad 5.8: Feedback is taken from the

students. Unclear is what happens with this feedback. Is it used to improve the programs?

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

There are 26 academic teaching-staff. Most of these are part-time employed. What are “special teaching staff”? We do not know what the current level of visiting professors are in the department. Four special scientists are available (part-time).

### Findings

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

Currently the ratio teaching staff:students is not ideal, teaching staff should be encouraged in achieving formal pedagogic qualifications, try and set up a program for regular visits from external professors (block courses?), consider hiring/appointing more full-time staff, formalize feedback rounds with the specific aim to improve and adjust teaching where needed.

### Strengths

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

There is a lot of potential and competence at the university. There should be an effort to develop a vision and common idea that brings all the resources to working on a common target.

### Areas of improvement and recommendations

*A list of problem areas followed by or linked to the recommendations of how to improve the situation. Also invite visiting specialist clinical physical therapists.*

We recommend that visiting professors are appointed. See above.

Please ✓ what is appropriate for the following assessment area:

Assessment area	<i>Non-compliant / Partially Compliant / Compliant</i>
5. Teaching Staff	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		
<b>6. Research</b>		<b>1 - 5</b>
6.1	The Department has a research policy formulated in line with its mission.	1
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.	1
6.3	The Department provides adequate facilities and equipment to cover the staff and students' research activities.	1
6.4	The Department has the appropriate mechanisms for the development of students' research skills.	1
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.	1
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.	4
6.8	The external, non-governmental, funding of research activities of teaching staff is similar to other Departments in Cyprus and abroad.	N/A
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.	1
Justify the numerical scores provided for the quality indicators (criteria) by specifying (if any) the deficiencies.		

Researchers follow their own research agenda and do not integrate their work in the context of a common cause e.g., research strategy. Research seminars are not in place which limits exchange between researchers. No research policy could be identified. Formal integration of students into research is lacking. The independent research staff is able to publish their work in indexed peer-reviewed journals.

### Findings

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

There is a lot of potential and staff-related resources that are not efficiently used.

### Strengths

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

Research publications are of reasonable quality and are reflective of the potential available for further improvements.

### Areas of improvement and recommendations

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

Develop a research strategy and common vision with the team. Bundle spare resources towards a common goal. Team-up with professional organizations to strengthen ties with society at large.

**Please ✓ what is appropriate for the following assessment area:**

Assessment area	<i>Non-compliant / Partially Compliant / Compliant</i>
6. Research	Partially 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		
<b>7. Resources</b>		<b>1 - 5</b>
7.1	The Department has sufficient financial resources to support its functions, managed by the Institutional and Departmental bodies.	5
7.2	The Department follows sound and efficient management of the available financial resources in order to develop academically and research wise.	2
7.3	The Department's profits and donations are used for its development and for the benefit of the university community.	N/A
7.4	The Department's budget is appropriate for its mission and adequate for the implementation of strategic planning.	N/A
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.	3
7.6	The Department's external audit and the transparent management of its finances are ensured.	N/A
7.7	The fitness-for-purpose of support facilities and services is periodically reviewed.	N/A

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

Ad 7.1: 11500 EUR × 330 students = 15'180'000 EUR tuition fees for one cohort of PT students. There seems room to invest in research. Ad 7.2: Research wise there seems to be underfinancing. Ad 7.3 & 7.4: Because of a lack of transparent information these items cannot be answered. Ad 7.5: There is a description of risks in the paper documents, however, this is not really detailed or substantiated. Ad 7.6 & 7.7: Not enough information is available to give a adequate assessment of this item.

### Findings

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

There seems to be a positive financial situation that is based on a steady inflow of tuition fees. At the same time, it is observable that the research infrastructure is not according to the latest standard equipment. There is an obvious need for investments in laboratories and equipment. This also would include dedicated laboratory personnel in form of engineers.

### Strengths

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

The teaching resources are good, the potential for research is good on the level of people capable of performing research. Currently lacking are the means to perform credible research based on state-of-the-art research equipment.

### Areas of improvement and recommendations

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

Invest in research laboratory equipment, technicians, and facilities.

Please ✓ what is appropriate for the following assessment area:

Assessment area	<i>Non-compliant / Partially Compliant / Compliant</i>
7. Resources	Non 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.*

The department runs several programs successful. One of the departments strongest elements is its commitment to support students and personnel. Students seem highly motivated and made a good impression. Staff was very dedicated and enthusiastic. What is lacking are means given to both students and staff to fully develop and express their potential regarding state-of-the-art professional fulfillment and further development. A research vision and strategy need to be developed. Outreach towards the local community should be developed within the strategic vision to be developed. Outreaching may take several forms: communicating research to patient organizations, keeping contact with alumni, organizing congresses, etc.

## E. Signatures of the EEC

<i>Name</i>	<i>Signature</i>
Lee Ingle	Professor
Ari Heinonen	Professor
Eling de Bruin	Professor
Chrystalla Leonidou	Physiotherapist, Cyprus Sports Physiotherapy Association
Ioanna Papaioannou	Student representative
FullName	

**Date:** [Click to enter date](#)

