

Doc. 300.1.2

Date: 04.07.2019

Higher Education Institution's response

- **Higher education institution:**

NEAPOLIS UNIVERSITY

- **Town:** PAFOS

- **Programme of study (Name, ECTS, duration, cycle)**

In Greek: ΜΕΤΑΠΤΥΧΙΑΚΟ ΝΟΜΙΚΗΣ ΣΤΟ

ΟΙΚΟΝΟΜΙΚΟ ΕΓΚΛΗΜΑ ΚΑΙ ΤΗΝ ΠΟΙΝΙΚΗ ΔΙΚΑΙΟΣΥΝΗ,
90 ECTS, 12/18 ΜΗΝΕΣ

In English: LL.M IN FINANCIAL CRIME AND
CRIMINAL JUSTICE, 90 ECTS, 12/18 MONTHS

- **Language of instruction:** GREEK/ENGLISH

- **Programme's status** New Program

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 and 2016” [N. 136 (I)/2015 and N. 47(I)/2016].

A. Guidelines on content and structure of the report

- *The Higher Education Institution (HEI) based on the External Evaluation Committee’s (EEC’s) evaluation report (Doc.300.1.1) must justify whether actions have been taken in improving the quality of the programme of study in each assessment area.*
- *In particular, under each assessment area, the HEI must respond on, without changing the format of the report:*
 - *the findings, strengths, areas of improvement and recommendations of the EEC*
 - *the deficiencies noted under the quality indicators (criteria)*
 - *the conclusions and final remarks noted by the EEC*
- *The HEI’s response must follow below the EEC’s comments, which must be copied from the external evaluation report (Doc. 300.1.1).*
- *In case of annexes, those should be attached and sent on a separate document.*

We first of all express our gratitude to the EEC which has marked the said program with an average of **9.65**. Nevertheless we always believe that there is room for improvement, so we have proceeded with responding accordingly in order to FULLY comply with the EEC suggestions and recommendations.

1. Study programme and study programme's design and development (ESG 1.1, 1.2, 1.8, 1.9)

Areas of improvement and recommendations

The paperwork provided for this application has at times confused the name of this programme. We recommend that consistency be adopted to avoid potential student confusion, by ensuring that the title of the programme is confirmed as Financial Crime and Criminal Justice.

Done. The title of the programme is confirmed as Financial Crime and Criminal Justice and there is consistency through syllabus, the curriculum and all other relevant documents.

The programme would be improved by and we therefore recommend:

A part-time route for taking this degree (in addition to the full time route proposed) would be of benefit to those students in full time work who struggle with 8 modules in one year and then have to interrupt studies having started. It would provide them with more flexibility from the start and ease pressures on them.

Done. A more flexible part-time route is offered. Students have the opportunity to complete their postgraduate studies in maximum three (3) years. Students will have to complete minimum 15 ECTS per semester. See **Annex 1: Revised Program Study Guide, part 4.**

For those non-law graduates accepted for this degree who have not had any exposure or experience in handling legal sources and working with legal texts and lack basic knowledge of legal institutions and principles we suggest the inclusion of a non-mandatory preliminary optional summer school type short course BEFORE the main taught programme starts in order that they can benefit straightaway from the content of the modules. Such a course should include an opportunity to do formative legal writing tasks and embed adequate referencing skills. We understand that help with legal writing and legal research skills comes in Semester 2 prior to the dissertation but in our view this is too late to be of assistance to students taking substantive semester 1 modules who will be engaging in summative assessments through written assignments in Semester 1.

Done. A non-mandatory summer course will be offered before the main taught programme for those non-law graduates accepted for this degree who have not had any exposure or experience in handling legal sources and working with legal texts and lack basic knowledge of legal institutions and principles. (see Annex 1, part 4 of the Curriculum (2nd paragraph). A syllabus of the short course, Legal research and Methodology, is provided under the section of Syllabus **Annex 1**: Revised Program Study Guide, Curriculum.

With respect to safeguards against plagiarism we fail to see any value in using TURNITIN in such a way to allow students the chance to re-submit work three times via TURNITIN before the submission becomes a final one. We believe that allowing students such a facility does not incentivise academic integrity on the part of students and responsible behaviour on their part. There are better ways to teach students unfamiliar with referencing standards and academic honesty the importance of these standards. We therefore recommend students taking this programme have the opportunity to submit work once and do not see their TURNITIN report.

Done. The students will have the opportunity to submit work only once and will not see their TURNITIN report. See **Annex 1**, part 9 of the revised Curriculum (last paragraph)

.....

1.1 was scored 8 because of lack of moderation (second marking) and external examiner involvement in the programme.

Done. The dissertation has a second internal examiner and a third external examiner has been envisaged to dissertation assessment. A second internal marking examiner has been envisaged for the assessment of written assignments. (See **Annex 1**, part 8 of the revised Curriculum (2nd paragraph)

1.34 was scored 7 because of the use of TURNITIN – see previous comments above

Done. The students will have the opportunity to submit work once and will not see their TURNITIN report. (See **Annex 1** part 9 of the revised Curriculum (last paragraph).

1.5.7 was scored 8 because of our concerns as to the capacity of teaching staff for research given heavy teaching loads and lack of formal institutional commitment to a sustained regular period of study leave over a four to five year cycle.

Done. An announcement for the position of a lecturer or an assistant professor for Criminal law has already been uploaded in order to limit the teaching load of teaching staff. See **Annex 2**: Call for an Assistant Professor in Criminal Law. <https://www.nup.ac.cy/the-university/vacancies-at-nup/>

1.8 and
1.9 were scored at 9 for the same reasons as aforementioned – there is a risk of research time being squeezed out as the programme grows and becomes more successful and it is important for workload management policies to recognize the value of research informed teaching at Masters level.

Done. An announcement for the position of a lecturer or an assistant professor for Criminal law has already been uploaded in order to limit the teaching load of teaching staff. See **Annex 2**.

2. Teaching, learning and student assessment (ESG 1.3)

Areas of improvement and recommendations

We recommend the adoption of tighter assessment processes insofar as internal moderation be adopted as well as external examiner oversight of assessment processes on an annual basis.

Done. The dissertation has a second internal examiner and a third external examiner has been envisaged to dissertation assessment. A second internal marking examiner has been envisaged for the assessment of written assignments. (See **Annex 1** part 8 of the revised Curriculum (2nd paragraph)

We also recommend a bank of previous examination papers set be made available to all students with the caveat of course that each examination will differ from year to year and past papers are not necessarily a guide to their own assessment but nonetheless they may find them to be a useful medium for practicing their writing and revision base.

Done. A bank of previous examination papers has already been established by the Law School.

We recommend that the processes for the conduct of the dissertation be made clear and standard for all students so all students receive the same baseline level of supervision and how exactly the dissertation marks are awarded be clearer to all.

Done. See **Annex 1**, part 17 of the revised Curriculum and **Annex 3: Dissertation Handbook**

2.3 and 2.5 were scored at 8 since we see room for improvement in standardization of feedback proffered to students and enhancing its value to their learning – see comments above. There is no room currently planned into module design and assessment design for specifically formative written assessment prior to the summative mid-term assessment although we understand that some modules may use quizzes etc but there might be scope for practice of essay writing skills in

and marking for example to show students how marking criteria be employed. Students ought to understand how these criteria will be used when their work is marked summatively.

We also believe that past papers ought to be available as stated above.

Done. See **Annex 4:** Assessment Guidelines for Written Assignments. From Week 1 to Week 6 of lectures, students will have to participate in a formative and peer-to-peer review procedure. More precisely students will have to respond to specific forms of formative activities including quizzes, electronic activities and other written activities and these will be assessed and the results clearly explained by the professor. - A bank of previous examination papers has already been established by the Law School.

2.6 – scored at 7 due to comment above – we have not seen marking criteria and this point was not addressed with the LLB students we met. We also did not see examples of student work on LLM programmes to date.

Done. The assessment guidelines for written assignment will be provided to LMM Students -See **Annex 4** : Assessment Guidelines for Written Assignments.

–

2.10 scored at 8 due to our concerns set out in Section 1 above in relation to Staff Capacity going forward for research informed teaching is time is too squeezed..

Done. An announcement for the position of a lecturer or an assistant professor for Criminal Law has already been uploaded in order to limit the teaching load of teaching staff. **Annex 2.**

2.11 and 2.12 scored at 8 due to our concerns that students may not be pushed enough during the taught element of the Masters course to do their own independent reading and research beyond reading lists proffered. While we recognize not all students on this programme will be receptive to such an approach to M level learning it may be to their intellectual benefit to move beyond and outside their intellectual comfort zone to develop a more inquiring outlook and capacity by reading more widely.

Done. From Week 1 to Week 6 of lectures, students will have to participate in a formative and peer-to-peer review procedure. More precisely students will have to respond to specific forms of formative activities including quizzes, electronic activities and other written activities and these will be assessed and the results clearly explained by the professor. Furthermore there will be a non-mandatory summer course focusing on legal research and methodology that could be very useful for students that want to proceed with further research than the one necessary for the LLM course.

Teaching Staff (ESG 1.5)

Areas of improvement and recommendations

Greater engagement of staff in career development through use of internal promotion mechanisms as and when appropriate. Expansion of staff resource in order to ease workload of existing staff (thereby maintaining research capacity) if the programme develops successfully. See comments above in relation to new hires and importance of diversity and equality of opportunity.

Transparent and consistent workload allocation model so that all staff have equal opportunity so all staff have a chance at career progression.

Done. An announcement for the position of a lecturer or an assistant professor for Criminal Law has already been uploaded in order to limit the teaching load of teaching staff (**Annex 2**). Furthermore the University supports and has already accepted during the current semester with full funding the participation of 2 academics teaching at this LLM at conferences and symposiums on relevant subjects, taking place abroad.

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

3.8 was scored at 8 due to the EEC's concerns the risk of overload on teaching staff if the programme succeeds and expands without both new hires and a formal system of study leave to enable staff to maintain intellectual and research capital.

Done. An announcement for the position of a lecturer or an assistant professor for Criminal Law has already been uploaded in order to limit the teaching load of teaching staff. Furthermore, the University has a specific research policy where fully remunerated research leave is envisaged (**Annex 5: NUP Staff Research Policy**).

Students (ESG 1.4, 1.6, 1.7)

Areas of improvements and recommendations

As NUP's postgraduate student numbers increase, the staff may wish to consider introducing a specific postgraduate representative to its Advisory Board and evaluation processes. We would support the School's vision of developing a PhD programme in the future, which may be attractive to potential students taking the proposed programme (LLM in Financial Crime and Criminal Justice) or who have taken it in the past and wish now to contribute to the research community

Done. A postgraduate representative has been introduced to the Advisory Board and evaluation processes. It is in the Law School's future plans to develop a relative PHD programme.

Resources (ESG 1.6)

Areas of improvement and recommendations

Given current size of student cohort we saw no areas of real concern here but would comment that if expansion continues completion of the new site for NUP will be important to maintain quality of learning environment.

N/A

3. Additional for distance learning programmes (ALL ESG)

4. Additional for doctoral programmes (ALL ESG)

5. Additional for joint programmes (ALL ESG)

B. Conclusions and final remarks

C. Higher Education Institution academic representatives

<i>Name</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>Signature</i>
Pantelis Sklias	Rector	
Georgia Christou	Head of Quality Assurance Department	

Date: 04.07.2019