

Doc. 300.2.1

External Evaluation Report (Institutional)

Date: *Date*

- **Higher Education Institution:**

Name

- **Public School of Higher Vocational Education and Training – MIEEK**
- **Town: LIMASSOL**
- **Institution Status: Existing Institution**

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.

The review panel had significant opportunity to question representatives of MIEEK and the Cyprus Agency of Quality Assurance and Accreditation and participated in a thorough inspection of all facilities. It is important to note that this campus is still under construction, albeit this project is almost complete. There were a number of formal presentations with much time available for questions. Questions were also asked and addressed during the onsite visit. What was most important about the onsite visit is that the panel was able to clarify any issues and identify problem areas. The site visit was very well done.

B. External Evaluation Committee (EEC)

Name	Position	University
Morris Altman	Professor and Dean	University of Dundee
Sotiris Karastergiou	Professor	University of Thessaly
Constantinos David	Professor	International Hellenic University
Amalia Tsiami	Professor	University of West London
Georgios Nicolaou	Student	Cyprus University of Technology
Alexis Valiantis	Civil Engineer	A.F Modinos & S.A. Vrahamis Chartered Architects & Engineers
Ioustini Pilidi	Head of the Career Office, UCY Career Centre	University of Cyprus

C. Building Facilities - Student Welfare Services - Infrastructure

- *Under plans and licenses, choose Yes or No depending on the existence of the given documents.*
- *Note whether the statements given under the other facilities, the student welfare services and the infrastructure are considered satisfactory/poor/unsatisfactory for the operation of the Institution.*
- *The EEC must justify the answers provided for the building facilities, the student welfare services and the infrastructure by specifying (if any) the deficiencies.*

SEE ATTACHED DOCUMENT

1. Building facilities

1.1 Plans and licenses

Choose Yes or No depending on the existence of the following documents.

1. Building facilities			
1.1 Plans and licenses		Yes / No	
1.1.1	The following should be copies from the original building permit. On the copies, there should be a visible official stamp of approval from the respective authorities.		
	1.1.1.1	A topographical plan, which displays in a clear manner the extent of the development.	Choose answer
	1.1.1.2	A general site plan, which marks the building facilities, allocated parking spaces (for students, academic and teaching personnel, visitors and disabled individuals), sports premises and outdoor areas.	Choose answer
1.1.2	An operating license issued by the Local Authorities	Choose answer	
1.1.3	The following operating license certificates, duly completed:		
	1.1.3.1	Visual Inspection Form E.O.E. 102	Choose answer
	1.1.3.2	Visual Inspection for the Building's Seismic Sufficiency Form E.O.E.Σ.E.K 103	Choose answer
	1.1.3.3	Inspection Certificate Form 104	Choose answer
	1.1.3.4	Fire Safety Certificate, issued by the Fire Department	Choose answer
1.1.3.5	Certificate for Adequate Electrical and Mechanical Installations, issued by the Electromechanical Department	Choose answer	

Justify the answers provided for the building facilities by specifying (if any) the deficiencies.

[Click to add text](#)

1.2 Other Facilities

Choose Satisfactory or Poor or Unsatisfactory depending on the level of compliance of each statement.

1. Building Facilities		
1.2 Other Facilities		Satisfactory - Poor - Unsatisfactory
1.2.1	Number of teaching rooms and their respective areas, capacity and the percentage of daily occupancy for all units	Choose answer
1.2.2	Number of offices for teaching staff and their respective areas and capacity	Choose answer
1.2.3	Number of laboratories and their respective areas and capacity	Choose answer
1.2.4	Number of rooms/offices for directors/administrators and their respective areas and capacity	Choose answer
1.2.5	Number of rooms/offices for administrative services and their respective areas and capacity	Choose answer
1.2.6	Number of parking spaces designated for students	Choose answer
1.2.7	Number of parking spaces designated for teaching staff	Choose answer
1.2.8	Number of parking spaces designated for people with disabilities	Choose answer
Justify the answers provided for the building facilities by specifying (if any) the deficiencies.		
Click to add text		

SEE ATTACHED DOCUMENT

2. Student Welfare Services

Choose Satisfactory or Poor or Unsatisfactory depending on the level of compliance of each statement.

2. Student Welfare Services		Satisfactory - Poor - Unsatisfactory
2.1	Special access for students with disabilities (PWD)	Choose answer
2.2	Recreation areas	Choose answer
2.3	Policy and statutes for academic student support	Choose answer
2.4	Policy and statutes for financial student support	Choose answer
2.5	Counselling services	Choose answer
2.6	Career office	Choose answer
2.7	Service linking the institution with business	Choose answer
2.8	Mobility office	Choose answer
2.9	Student clubs/organisations/associations	Choose answer
2.10	Other services	Choose answer

Justify the answers provided for the student welfare services by specifying (if any) the deficiencies.

[Click to add text](#)

3. Infrastructure

Choose Satisfactory or Poor or Unsatisfactory depending on the level of compliance of each statement.

3. Infrastructure		Satisfactory - Poor - Unsatisfactory
3.1	Library	Poor
3.2	Computers available for use by the students	Satisfactory
3.3	Technological support	Satisfactory
3.4	Technical support	Satisfactory

Justify the answers provided for the infrastructure services by specifying (if any) the deficiencies.

For all the above, the written documentation and the site visit supports the view that the infrastructure is adequate given the current student population. The library is small, but its space is supplemented by additional study space on campus. Also, it is not clear that the library will have all the required teaching and ‘research’ resources either in hard copy or electronic. The space for books is also very limited. This is a concern especially given that this institution is expected to expand in terms of student numbers.

D. Guidelines on content and structure of the report

- *The external evaluation report follows the structure of assessment areas and sub-areas.*
- *For 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, 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 Institution based on evidence from the Institution'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. Institution'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		
1. Institution's academic profile and orientation		
1.1 Mission and strategic planning		1 - 5
1.1.1	The Institution has formally adopted a mission statement, which is available to the public and easily accessible.	4
1.1.2	The Institution has developed its strategic planning aiming at fulfilling its mission.	4
1.1.3	The Institution's strategic planning includes short, medium-term and long-term goals and objectives, which are periodically revised and adapted.	4
1.1.4	The offered programmes of study align with the aims and objectives of the Institution's development.	5
1.1.5	The academic community is involved in shaping and monitoring the implementation of the Institution's development strategies.	3
1.1.6	In the Institution's development strategy, interested parties such as academics, students, graduates and other professional and scientific associations participate in the Institution's development strategy.	4
1.1.7	The mechanism for collecting and analysing data and indicators needed to effectively design the Institution's academic development is adequate and effective.	3

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

The mission is clearly stated, but more effort needs to be invested publicizing this mission to the stakeholders, could be through web, social media. The academic community is involved in shaping and monitoring the implementation of the Institution's development strategy. But there are gaps. The programmes leads should have a more direct say or voice in this process. The mechanism for collecting and analysing data and indicators needed to effectively design the Institution's academic development requires

more work. It appears to be quite informal and not statistical or methodologically robust. A start has been made. But it is important the institution introduces robust set of indicators, which can be borrowed form of similar institutions or universities. For the other areas this institution has done an excellent job.

1.2 Connecting with society

1 - 5

1.2.1	The Institution 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 Institution provides sufficient information to the public about its activities and offered programmes of study.	4
1.2.3	The Institution ensures that its operation and activities have a positive impact on society.	5
1.2.4	The Institution 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.

Overall, MIEEK Limassol has developed strong links with industry and other stakeholders with whom there is systematic communication and this translates into programs/modules that related to its mission of producing graduate who are job ready (positive impact of Society). The weakest link is in communicating with the public (1.2.2) and with graduates (1.2.4). But there is engagement high school students and other such efforts. But more needs to be done here. Communication with graduates needs to be developed. Having an Alumni office and association would be helpful. So would a newsletter (electronic) for the Alumini, as well as Alumni events.

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 research and effectively carry out their work.	5
1.3.2	The Institution has a two-year growth budget that is consistent with its strategic planning.	5
1.3.3	Planning academic staff recruitment and their professional development is in line with the Institution's academic development plan.	4
1.3.4	The Institution applies an effective strategy of attracting students/ high-level students from Cyprus.	3

1.3.5	The Institution applies an effective strategy to attract high-level students from abroad.	N/A
1.3.6	The funding processes for the operation of the Institution and the continuous improvement of the quality of its programmes of study are adequate and transparent.	5

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

There is a transparent and appropriate process to attract permanent and part-time staff. The budget and its sources are clear (85% EU, 15% Cyprus government). Planned academic staff recruitment process are appropriate as are funding processes for the operation of the Institution and the continuous improvement of the quality of its programmes of study. But an effective strategy of attracting students/ high-level students from Cyprus is weak. The main focus of MIEEK is vocational training/education. Hence this institution needs to develop a strategy of reaching out to the best student where this track is the most appropriate one. Students and their parents need more and clear information of the advantages of a vocational education over a university education, including the expected rate of return.

Additionally, write:

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

The total number of students are expected to be 200. These are domestic. Given the vocational focus of this campus there is no focus on international students.

Findings

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

This is a new facility still under construction, but now almost complete. Overall, this a strong institution in terms of 1.1, 1.2, and 1.3. There are some gaps, discussed above that can be easily addressed.

Strengths

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

MIEEK has a well thought out mission directed to the vocational requirements of Cypriot society and mission clearly informs the processes within the new campus of MIEEK in Limassol. The manner in which academics are hired and positioned is well thought out, i.e. the division of labour between the permanent staff and the part time staff who are industry specialists. This is also flexible and low risk approach to the employment of academic staff given current student numbers. Also, there are strong links with industry and a process in place to link industry advice to the development and refinement of modules and programs. There is also the innovative introduction of

flipped classroom and hybrid classroom for dual mode teaching delivery which increases the flexibility of delivery which particularly important for students who are also working.

Areas of improvement and recommendations

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

More effort needs to be invested publicizing this mission to the stakeholders, could be through web, social media. The programmes leads should have a more direct say or voice in this process. The mechanism for collecting and analysing data and indicators needed to effectively design the Institution's academic development requires more work. It appears to be quite informal and not statistical or methodologically robust. A start has been made. But it is important the institution introduces robust set of indicators, which can be borrowed form of similar institutions or universities. More effort needs to be devoted to communicate with prospective students and their parents. This can be through social media and guidance counsellors, for example. Communication with graduates needs to be developed. Having an Alumni office and association would be helpful. So would a newsletter (electronic) for the Alumini, as well as Alumni events. The current strategy for attracting high-level students from Cyprus is weak. The main focus of MIEEK is vocation training/education. Hence this institution needs to develop a strategy of reaching out to the best student where this track is the most appropriate one. Students and their parents need more and clear information of the advantages of a vocational education over a university education, including the expected rate of return.

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	Partially 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 Ensuring quality 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 Institution has a policy for quality assurance that is made public and forms part of its strategic management.	4
2.1.2	Internal stakeholders develop and implement a policy for quality assurance through appropriate structures and processes, while involving external stakeholders.	5
2.1.3	The Institution'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 Institution's activities:	
2.1.4.1	The teaching and learning	5
2.1.4.2	Research	N/A
2.1.4.3	The connection with society	5
2.1.4.4	Management and support services	4
2.1.5	The quality assurance system promotes a culture of quality.	5
2.1.6	The Institution consistently applies pre-defined and published regulations covering all phases of student 'life cycle', e.g. student admission, progression, recognition and certification.	5

2.1.7	Institutional practice for recognition being in line with the principles of the Lisbon Recognition Convention, cooperation with other institutions and quality assurance agencies and the national ENIC/NARIC centre.	5
2.1.8	Graduates receive documentation explaining the qualification gained.	3

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

The quality assurance structure and processes are transparent and provide the means to assure and improve the quality of the institutions and programs provided by the MIEEK Limassol. Research is not core to this vocational institution, hence N/A. On 2.1.1, this is strong, but we have an issue with how or whether the different measures are weighted. This needs to be clarified for transparency and for ease in decision-making. Also, it appears that the policy is made available on the WEB. But it is not clear how this information/web link to communicated to stakeholders. It is also not clear what documentation and type of documentation is provided on the qualification gained. But information is on the WEB.

2. Quality assurance

2.2 Ensuring quality 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 Institution lies with the teaching staff.	5
2.2.2	The system and criteria for assessing students' performance in the subjects of the programmes of studies offered by the Institution are clear, sufficient and known to the students.	5
2.2.3	The quality control system refers to specific indicators and is effective.	4
2.2.4	The results from student assessments are used to improve the programmes of study.	5
2.2.5	The policy dealing with plagiarism committed by students as well as mechanisms for identifying and preventing it are effective.	3
2.2.6	The institutionalised procedures for examining students' objections/disagreements on issues of student evaluation or academic ethics are effective.	4
2.2.7	The Institution provides information about its activities, including the programmes of study it offers and the selection criteria for them, the intended learning outcomes of these programmes, the qualifications awarded, the teaching, learning and assessment procedures used, the pass rates and the learning opportunities available to the students as well as graduate employment information.	4

2.2.8	The Institution ensures that effective methodology is applied in the learning process.	4
2.2.9	The Institution systematically collects data in relation to the academic performance of students, implements procedures for evaluating such data and has a relevant policy in place.	4
2.2.10	The Institution ensures adequate and appropriate learning resources in line with European and international standards and / or international practices, particularly:	
2.2.10.1	Building facilities	4
2.2.10.2	Library	4
2.2.10.3	Rooms for theoretical, practical and laboratory lessons	4
2.2.10.4	Technological infrastructure	5
2.2.10.5	Support structures for students with special needs and learning difficulties	5
2.2.10.6	Academic Support	5
2.2.10.7	Student Welfare Services	5

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

On 2.2, there is compliance to very high standards, with some exceptions. The QA standards are well articulated and fit with the mission of this institution. There's some gaps in 2.2.3, 2.2.5, 2.2.9, and 2.2.10. On 2.2.3, specific indicators are referred to but no indication on weights assigned to the different indicators are provided. On 2.2.5, on plagiarism reference is made to turn-it-in. But the common practice modern cheat is to purchase project essays. One way to control this to have random students present or be interviewed by instructors. 2.2.9 same as 2.2.3. On 2.2.10. The library is rather small. It appears that seating will be available else in the facility. But it is important that such study space is made available. Workshop and related space is excellent, but there are issues with the cafeteria and Kitchen. It is small given the demand for related programs and also given the equipment in this space. It would be best if adjustments can be made where possible. This is of particular importance given the significance of this program for the hospitality sector in Cyprus..

Findings

Overall, QA standards and procedures are at a very high level. There are some gaps which should not be difficult to address

Click to add text

Strengths

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

The workshop areas are well designed (apart from issues with the Kitchen discussed above) and configured for intradisciplinary learning. Innovative teaching practices are being introduced such as Flipped classrooms-learning project-based learning and work-based learning. Also, IT use is being optimized to enhance the student learning experience. This fits into the international move, in the best higher education institutions, to blended learning. Also, teaching is split into morning and afternoon sessions to accommodate the needs of students who work whilst pursuing their education.

Areas of improvement and recommendations

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

On 2.1.1, this is strong, but we have an issue with how or whether the different measures are weighted. This needs to be clarified for transparency and for ease in decision-making. Also, it appears that the policy is made available on the WEB. But it is not clear how this information/web link to communicated to stakeholders. It is also not clear what documentation and type of documentation is provided on the qualification gained. But information is on the WEB. There's some gaps in 2.2.3, 2.2.5, 2.2.9, and 2.2.10. On 2.2.3, specific indicators are referred to but no indication on weights assigned to the different indicators are provided. On 2.2.5, on plagiarism reference is made to turn-it-in. But the common practice modern cheat is to purchase project essays. One way to control this to have random students present or be interviewed by instructors. 2.2.9 same as 2.2.3. On 2.2.10. The library is rather small. It appears that seating will be available else in the facility. But it is important that such study space is made available. Workshop and related space are excellent, but there are issues with the cafeteria and Kitchen. It is small given the demand for related programs and also given the equipment in this space. It would be best if adjustments can be made where possible. This is of particular importance given the significance of this program for the hospitality sector in Cyprus. Also, for student evaluation, it would be useful to have this done electronically for reasons of efficiency and accuracy.

Please select 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 Ensuring quality for the programmes of study	Compliant

3. Administration (ESG 1.1)

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 in force and the Institution's declared 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 based on specified procedures, in the management of the Institution.	4
3.3	Adequate allocation of competences and responsibilities is ensured so that in academic matters, decisions are made by academics and the Institution's Council competently exercises legal control over such decisions.	4
3.4	The Institution applies effective procedures to ensure transparency in the decision-making process.	4
3.5	The Boards of Departments and Schools, as well as the institutionalised committees of the Institution, operate systematically and exercise fully the responsibilities provided by legislation and / or the constitution and / or the internal regulations of the Institution.	5
3.6	The Council, the Senate as well as the administrative and academic committees, operate systematically and autonomously and exercise the full powers provided for by the statute and / or the constitution of the Institution without the intervention or involvement of a body or person outside the law provisions.	5
3.6	The manner in which the Council, the Senate and/or and the administrative and academic committees operate and the procedures for disseminating and implementing their decisions are clearly formulated and implemented precisely and effectively.	5
3.7	The Institution applies procedures for the prevention and disciplinary control of academic misconduct of students, academic and administrative staff, including plagiarism.	5
3.8	The administrative structure is in line with the legislation in force and the Institution's declared mission.	5

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

There is compliance that meet regulatory standards

Findings

Our site visit discussions confirm that that there is compliance with respect to Administrative Services.

Strengths

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

MIEEK Limassol has created an administrative structure that is all inclusive and will facilitate meeting mission, high quality delivery of education, and an excellent student experience.

Areas of improvement and recommendations

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

Very high level of compliance. Nothing to add.

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 Institution provides an effective system for designing, approving, monitoring and periodically reviewing programmes of study.	5
4.1.2	Students and other stakeholders, including employers, are actively involved on the programmes' review and development.	5
4.1.3	The programmes of study are in compliance with the ESG and the existing legislation and meet the professional qualifications requirements in the professional courses, where applicable.	5
4.1.4	The Institution ensures that its programmes of study integrate effectively theory and practice.	5
4.1.5	The assessment and evaluation procedures and content are in compliance with the level of the programme of study (in reference to EQF).	5
Justify the numerical scores provided for the quality indicators (criteria) by specifying (if any) the deficiencies.		
MIEEK Limassol assures that its teaching, modules, and programs are well informed by all pertinent stakeholders and integrates theory and practice. Also, modules/programs, in this way meet industry standards. Also, MEEIK offer a 2-year degree and a 5B EFQ level diploma all compliant with European professional qualifications and regulated professions standards.		
4.2 Organisation of teaching		1 - 5

4.2.1	The Institution 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 Institution have regular and effective communication with their students.	3
4.2.5	The teaching staff of the Institution provides timely and effective feedback to their students.	4

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

Procedures have been developed to meet the organization of teaching standards at a high level. We have concerns with 4.2.4 and 4.2.5 might also be problematic.

Findings

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

Overall, high standards are met and confirmed by the site visit. However, the gaps that we identified in the site visit were also confirmed in our Q&A session.

Strengths

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

Programs and modules developed in consultation with industry and labour representation as well professional associations, which are critically important to the education students with job-ready skills.

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 not clear what processes are in place for the effective communication between academics and students. We are told students can meet staff after class in the workshop or teaching spaces. But this does not conform with education industry standards. There should be office hours and students should be able to meet academic in office/quiet rooms. There can also be meetings using Cloud capabilities (Teams or Zoom, for example). This institution is just being launched so we can't comment on timely feedback. However, acting on the above should facilitate timely feedback. Also, quiet spaces should be provided to the part-time staff so that they can correct assessments and projects in a timely manner.

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 Institution have 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 Institution'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	The number of teaching staff - full-time and exclusive work - and the subject area of the staff sufficiently support the programmes of study.	5
5.9	The visiting Professors' subject areas adequately support the Institution's programmes of study.	5

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

The information provided and our onsite visit Q&A demonstrate high standards of qualification for full time and part-time academics. Also, class size appears to be small. But we need more data to provide a more detailed commentary. What we do know is that there are approximately 8 full time academic, but four have heavy administrative responsibilities. There are also part-time staff. We are not clear on the support staff available for workshops (required for health and safety as well as for training purposes). The current expectation is that there will be 200 students and 50 staff full time and part time inclusive.

Also, write the following:

- Number of teaching staff working full-time and having exclusive work: 8
- Number of special teaching staff working full-time and having exclusive work
- Number of visiting Professors: There 42 part time specialist academics
- Number of special scientists on lease services

We don't have precise data on this as per our comments above.

Findings

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

The evidence supports the conclusion the teaching staff category are at high standards. For example, 70% of the teaching staff a recognized academic qualification that is higher than level at which staff teach at. The ratio of full to part time of 2:3 is also sufficient to guarantee quality, especially given the high level of expertise of the part-time academics.

Strengths

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

Hiring at high standards. Staff also have publications to support quality teaching.

Areas of improvement and recommendations

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

It would be important to develop a clear procedure to attract visiting academic. But there is a strong program to attract part-timers who in the vocational training space are 'visiting academics' with core areas of specialization. It is not clear from the information provided that there are adequate assistants for the workshops. These areas of concern can be easily addressed.

Please select 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, 1.5, 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 Institution has a research policy formulated in line with its mission.	N/A
6.2	The Institution 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.	N/A
6.3	The Institution provides adequate facilities and equipment to cover the staff and students' research activities.	N/A
6.4	Through its policy and practices, the Institution encourages research collaboration within and outside the Institution, as well as participation in collaborative research funding programmes.	N/A
6.5	The Institution uses a policy for the protection and exploitation of intellectual property, which is applied consistently.	N/A
6.6	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 Institution also uses an open access policy for publications, which is consistent with the corresponding national and European policy.	N/A
6.7	The Institution 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.	N/A
6.8	The Institution provides mechanisms which ensure compliance with international rules of research ethics, both in relation to research activity and the rights of researchers.	N/A
6.9	The external, non-governmental, funding of research activities of academic staff is similar to other Institutions in Cyprus and abroad.	N/A
6.10	The policy, indirect or direct of internal funding of the research activities of the academic staff is satisfactory, based on European and international practices.	N/A

6.11	The programmes of study implement the Institution's recorded research policy.	N/A
------	---	-----

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

This is a vocational institution where doing research per se is not core.

Findings

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

Click to add text

Strengths

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

One should note that some quality research does take place and that there are plans for future research. This is to enhance the quality of vocational education.

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 add text

Please select what is appropriate for the following assessment area:

Assessment Area	<i>Non-Compliant/ Partially Compliant/Compliant</i>
6. Research	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 institution has sufficient financial resources to support its functions, managed by the Council/Senate.	5
7.2	The Institution follows sound and efficient management of the available financial resources in order to develop academically and research wise.	5
7.3	The Institution's profits and donations are used for its development and for the benefit of the university community.	N/A
7.4	The Institution's budget is appropriate for its mission and adequate for the implementation of strategic planning.	5
7.5	The Institution 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 Institution's external audit and the transparent management of its finances are ensured.	5
7.7	The fitness-for-purpose of support facilities and services is periodically reviewed.	5

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

The institutional requirements are easily met at high standards. The budget to meet high standards of education appear to be guaranteed, being 85% provided by the EU. Even though education is free to students the financial support for the institution is solid, especially given government's strong support for the growth of vocational training to meet the needs of the Cypriot labour market.

Findings

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

The evidence provided in documents and through Q&A during the site visit confirm the resources underling the new campus of MIEEK in Limassol is robust.

Strengths

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

Resources appeared to be guaranteed. Of particular importance is the EU support for MIEEK at 85%. Also, of importance is that each of the MIEEK campuses have a local budget. This allows for the new campus to have its budgetary requirements provisioned.

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 not clear how and the extent to which MIEEK “carries out an assessment of the risks and sustainability of the programmes of study and adequately provides feedback on their operation.” We note that there is a robust procedure for consultation of all pertinent stakeholders. What is not clear is under what conditions an existing module is deemed to be unsustainable. Moreover, it is not clear what criteria are used to determine if new module or program should be launched. This is Important given that the budget appears to be quite flexible and supportive. Criteria for sustainability should be specified.

Please select what is appropriate for the following assessment area:

Assessment Area	<i>Non-Compliant/ Partially Compliant/Compliant</i>
7. Resources	Compliant

E. Conclusions and Final Remarks

Please provide constructive conclusions and final remarks which may form the basis upon which improvements of the quality of the Institution under review may be achieved.

Overall, we find that the new campus of MIEEK, in Limassol, is an excellent facility. The modules and programs are stakeholder informed and the technology is state of the art. Also, the modes of educational delivery such flipped classes/delivery is state of the art. Staff are highly qualified and QA is at a very high level. This is an impressive facility and should have help deliver job-ready graduates to fill the gaps in the Cyprus labour market.

But there is room for improvement as listed below:

1. Efforts should be made to improve the gender balance amongst staff and students.
2. There should be a career counsellor available to students.
3. There should be emergency phones linked to security through the campus. This safety feature should help attract more females to programmes.
4. The Kitchen area should be improved with regards to space given student numbers and the equipment in place. To the extent that the space can't be increased or reconfigured the number of students using this space needs to be reduced—to no more than 4 at time, for **health and safety reasons**. Indeed, given the narrowness of the 'corridors' within the Kitchen there is a possibility of some being injured given the use of hot ovens, sharp utensils, and hot plates, for example. Depending on what is being done in the kitchen, the number of students be reduced even further.
5. The library space is small. Students will want to spend time working in the library (student representative input) there should be study space adjacent to the library.
6. The cafeteria is quite small. Adjacent indoor space should be made available for eating and study.
7. Given the Culinary Arts and Catering programs, it would make sense from a financial, sustainability, and educational perspective to have the cafeteria operated by students in this program.
8. The offices for permanent academic staff have no windows (even though there are outward looking walls). This not a conducive space for work and reduce the productivity and efficiency of staff (see attached photo).
9. There is **no office** for the permanent staff and the Culinary Arts and Catering area. It is critical that such an office be constructed adjacent to this area.
10. It is important that part-time staff have the space conducive to prepare lectures, interact with permanent staff and students. **Shared offices would be useful**. This optimizes the learning environment. It is not clear that this is being planned for. Currently, it appears that the view that part time staff are expected to leave after teaching. This will not make for a vibrant and dynamic learning environment. Spatial configuration is important here.
11. Communication with graduates needs to be developed. Having an Alumni office and association would be helpful. So would a newsletter (electronic) for the Alumini, as well as Alumni events.
12. More effort needs to be invested publicizing this mission to the stakeholders, could be through web, social media. The programmes lead should have a more direct say or voice in this process.
13. The mechanism for collecting and analysing data and indicators needed to effectively design the Institution's academic development requires more work.
14. It is important that the institution introduces robust set of indicators, which can be borrowed form of similar institutions or universities.
15. More effort needs to be devoted to communicating with prospective students and their parents. This can be through social media and guidance counsellors, for example. Communication with graduates needs to be developed. Having an Alumni office and association would be helpful. So would a newsletter (electronic) for the Alumini, as well as Alumni events.
16. An effective strategy for attracting students/ high-level students from Cyprus is weak. The focus of MIEEK is vocation training/education. Hence this institution needs to develop a strategy of reaching out to the best student where this track is the most appropriate one. Students and their parents need more and clear information of the advantages of a vocational education over a university education, including the expected rate of return.

17. With regards to indicators re QA, the indicators should be assigned weights for reasons of transparency to facilitate more efficient and effective decision-making.
18. It is not clear what processes are in place for the effective communication between academics and students. We are told students can meet staff after class in the workshop or teaching spaces. But this does not conform with education industry standards. There should be office hours and students should be able to meet academic in office/quiet rooms. There can also be meetings using Cloud capabilities (Teams or Zoom, for example). This institution is just being launched so we can't comment on timely feedback. However, acting on the above should facilitate timely feedback. Also, quiet spaces should be provided to the part-time staff so that they can correct assessments and projects in a timely manner.
19. It is not clear how and the extent to which MIEEK "carries out an assessment of the risks and sustainability of the programmes of study and adequately provides feedback on their operation." We note that there is a robust procedure for consultation of all pertinent stakeholders. What is not clear is under what conditions an existing module is deemed to be unsustainable. Moreover, it is not clear what criteria are used to determine if new module or program should be launched. This is important given that the budget appears to be quite flexible and supportive. Criteria for sustainability should be specified.
20. During our discussion with teaching staff, concern was expressed that there might not be adequate part-time staff and lab, or workshop assistants given the state of the labour market and the distance that qualified staff might have to travel to Limassol (time and transportation costs). This labour shortage could significantly and negatively affect the quality of students' education. It was recommended that efforts be made to attract and retain such staff. Providing office space might be one such measure as would subsidizing travel expenses and relaxing some of the hiring standards.

Most of what we recommend is relatively easy to implement. We believe that what we suggest would improve the quality education provision and the social impact of this new MIEEK campus in Limassol. We would like to express our thanks to all those involved in preparing the documentation for this accreditation.

F. Signatures of the EEC

<i>Name</i>	<i>Signature</i>
Morris Altman	
Constantinos David	
Sotiris Karastergiou	
Amalia Tsiami	
Alexis Valiantis	

Ioustini Pilidi		
Georgios Nicolaou		

Date: SEPT 11, 2022

