



Doc. 300.1.2

Date:

## Higher Education Institution's Response

- **Higher Education Institution:**  
Frederick University
- **Town:** Nicosia, Limassol (E-learning)
- **Programme** of **study**  
**Name (Duration, ECTS, Cycle)**

### In Greek:

Εκπαίδευση Ενηλίκων (3 ακαδημαϊκά εξάμηνα, 90 ECTS, Μάστερ (MEd), Εξ αποστάσεως)

### In English:

Adult Education (3 academic semesters, 90 ECTS, Master (MEd), E-learning)

- **Language(s) of instruction:** English and Greek
- **Programme's status:** Currently Operating
- **Concentrations (if any):**

**In Greek:** Concentrations

**In English:** Concentrations



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

## A. 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 or 300.1.1/1 or 300.1.1/2 or 300.1.1/3 or 300.1.1/4) must justify whether actions have been taken in improving the quality of the programme of study in each assessment area. The answers' documentation should be brief and accurate and supported by the relevant documentation. Referral to annexes should be made only when necessary.*
- *In particular, under each assessment area and by using the 2<sup>nd</sup> column of each table, the HEI must respond on the following:*
  - *the areas of improvement and recommendations of the EEC*
  - *the conclusions and final remarks noted by the EEC*
- *The institution should respond to the EEC comments, in the designated area next each comment. The comments of the EEC should be copied from the EEC report without any interference in the content.*
- *In case of annexes, those should be attached and sent on separate document(s). Each document should be in \*.pdf format and named as annex1, annex2, etc.*

## 1. Study programme and study programme's design and development (ESG 1.1, 1.2, 1.7, 1.8, 1.9)

Areas of improvement and recommendations <b>by EEC</b>	Actions Taken by the Institution	For Official Use ONLY
<p>These are made for fine tuning.</p> <p>The QAA processes were not publicly available and transparent. There were reviewers who searched the web and engaged with chat a priori and their concerns remained unanswered. It is not clear what data can be accessed, some important ones being barred from viewing outside its immediate close quarters. In this regard, and for future reference, it is recommended that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. QAA reviewers be provided with access to QAA policy and procedures and institutional strategy in this regard.</li> </ol>	<p>We apologize if the EEC had problems accessing the website. As shown during the onsite visit, the information about our policies and procedures are publicly available in our website <a href="#">here</a> and <a href="#">here</a>.</p>	<p>Choose level of compliance:</p>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Information on the external stakeholder involvement is provided in advance of the site visit.</li> </ol>	<p>Although the program was designed and submitted before the policy requiring the involvement of external stakeholders in program design was implemented, we agree with the EEC comments. We acknowledge the need for greater external stakeholder involvement in our QA processes. We have prepared a list of stakeholders and collaborators active in the programme, to be available for reviewers for upcoming site visits. The list of Stakeholders is shown below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Human Resource Development Authority of Cyprus (HRDA)</li> <li>2. Pancyprian Organisation of Greek Teachers (POED), Organization of Greek Secondary Education Officers of Cyprus (OELMEK), Cyprus Technical Education Officers Organisation (OLTEK)</li> </ol>	<p>Choose level of compliance:</p>

	<p>3. Pancyprian Volunteerism Coordinative Council (ΠΣΣΕ – Volunteerism)</p> <p>4. Nicosia Evening Gymnasium - Lyceum (housed in the Lyceum of Archbishop Makarios III - Dasoupoli, founded in 1970) (Second Chance School)</p> <p>5. Nicosia Evening School of Technical and Vocational Education (ESTEE)</p> <p>6. Cyprus Employers &amp; Industrialists Federation (OEB)</p>	
<p>3. Reviewers get the chance to listen to and interview stakeholders not only within the university itself but also from a selection of those likely to benefit long term from the programme such as industry, social movements, NGOs, community agencies.</p>	<p>We greatly appreciate the committee's recommendation to expand the range of stakeholders involved in the review process. Engaging with a diverse group of stakeholders is crucial for the continuous improvement and relevance of our program. In response to this recommendation, we have already developed a comprehensive stakeholder engagement plan that includes representatives from industry, social movements, NGOs, and community agencies. This plan outlines strategies for regular and meaningful engagement with these groups. This ensure that their insights and needs are adequately represented and addressed. Please refer to Response <b>2.1.</b> for the list of stakeholders.</p>	<p>Choose level of compliance:</p>
<p>4. Provision of data regarding 1.4 be supplied to reviewers in advance of the site visit. These can include: key performance indicators; student population profile; student progress and degree of attrition; student programme satisfaction; learning resources and student support; career paths of graduates and involvement in adult education activities at community, municipal, regional, social</p>	<p>As published on the website and shown during the onsite visit, the programme implements the Quality Assurance procedures that the University follows. As a rule, after the end of each academic year, the Coordinator of the Program completes the Program Self Evaluation (IQC104) report which includes quality indicators related to the program (structure, content, etc.), the students (assessment, progress, etc.), and the graduates</p>	<p>Choose level of compliance:</p>

<p>action, national and international levels</p>	<p>(employability, degree grades, duration of studies, etc.). This report also utilizes data and information obtained through the Student Course Evaluation (IQC100) questionnaires, the Faculty Course Evaluation report (IQC101), as well as comments and suggestions made by the focus groups (students, graduates and employers). The Program Self Evaluation also reports on the action taken, related to the Program, with respect to the implementation of the Departments Action Plan agreed between the Department and the Internal Quality Committee.</p> <p>The Program Self Evaluation report is submitted to the Council of the Department and is part of the Department's Self Evaluation Report (IQC107), which is submitted to the Internal Quality Committee of the University.</p> <p>Furthermore, included in the Annual Quality Report is the establishment of the new Student Progress Report (IQC108) which includes quality indicators related to student's progression (Course Assessment Results (Average failure rate, drop-outs, etc.), CGPA Results).</p> <p>The suggestions of the Department and the Internal Quality Committee are reported in the Action Plan of the Department, which also includes agreed actions and measures that aim towards the upgrade and improvement of the Program. The implementation of this action plan is reported in the relevant reports (quality reports of the following academic year) and is monitored by the Departmental Quality Committee, while it is also checked by the Internal Quality Committee of the University.</p>	
--	---	--

<p>5. Evidence of being a courant with most recent critical literature in various fields tackled by study units, especially the key policy concept of Lifelong Learning. This literature ought to be internationalized and extend beyond the equally valuable Anglo-North American framework.</p>	<p>We recognize the value of a broad and inclusive academic perspective. In response, we are taking certain actions. Particularly, from time to time the course coordinators of the programme discuss the updating of the course literature and encourage the lecturers to suggest new titles. We regularly conduct literature reviews to ensure that our course content reflects the latest developments and critical perspectives in the field of Lifelong Learning and other relevant areas. This also includes a focus on recent publications and emerging research trends. We also encourage students to engage with international literature in their assignments and research projects. This broadens their understanding but also fosters critical thinking and a more comprehensive view of the field. Please refer to Annex 01 – Study Guides for the updated bibliography.</p>	<p>Choose level of compliance:</p>
<p>6. Evidence of this programme reflecting the immediate and larger contextual location of its provider: Hellenic, small island state, Mediterranean and European. There is an emerging literature and body of research in these areas which can inform part of the course focuses which renders this programme distinct from that of others provided in other countries.</p>	<p>We appreciate the committee's observation regarding the need to reflect the unique contextual location of our program, including the Hellenic, small island state, Mediterranean, and European contexts. Recognizing the importance of these perspectives in making our program distinct and relevant, we have decided taking the following steps: Ensure that our curriculum explicitly incorporates themes and issues pertinent to the Hellenic, Mediterranean, small island state, and broader European contexts. This includes case studies, examples, and literature that highlight the unique characteristics and challenges of these regions. The Study Guides have been updated with the relevant bibliography. Please see Annex 1 – Study Guides.</p>	<p>Choose level of compliance:</p>

	Additional Bibliography can be found in Annex 2 which will be used throughout the relevant program courses. We also encourage and support students and faculty to undertake research projects that explore educational issues within these contexts and perspectives. Please refer to Annex 3 for the relevant students' research projects.	
7. Evidence as to how course participants are initiated into the important skill of developing and 'packaging' out of the ordinary project proposals at the national, regional and especially international (e.g. EU) levels to secure much needed funding for projects that, as adult educators, they intend to carry out.	<p>We appreciate the Committee's observation. In order to foster a research environment that leads to publications we have a compulsory Research Methods course for all students. Via their coursework students practice in small scale projects leading to the final thesis. We provide comprehensive support for thesis and dissertation work, ensuring that these research efforts are of publishable quality. Students receive guidance on framing their research questions, methodology, data analysis, and manuscript preparation. Each graduate student is assigned a dedicated research mentor who is responsible for guiding them through the thesis research process. These mentors provide one-on-one support and ensure that students are making progress toward their publication goals. Regular progress meetings between students and their research mentors are scheduled to review research advancements, address challenges, and set milestones for manuscript preparation and submission.</p> <p>Additionally, Frederick University offers seminars / workshops focused on the publication process, covering topics such as selecting appropriate journals, writing and structuring manuscripts, responding to reviewers, and understanding the editorial process. We encourage</p>	Choose level of compliance:



	<p>team-based research projects where graduate students can collaborate with faculty and peers. These collaborative efforts often lead to co-authored publications, with clear pathways for students to take the lead and earn first authorship. To promote students' publications, the University has in place a funding scheme for the conference participation and journal publication fees. These schemes also include the case of students.</p>	
--	--	--

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

Areas of improvement and recommendations <b>by EEC</b>	Actions Taken by the Institution	For Official Use ONLY
1. More evidence can be provided as to how the students attain co-ownership of the programme and how their specific cultures, social locations and views of the world are engaged. In short, without undermining the course lecturer's authority, not to be confused with authoritarianism, how are the course participants educators and educatees at the same time? This would be in keeping with the best critical traditions in adult education.	We appreciate the Committee's insight into the importance of student co-ownership and the engagement of diverse perspectives within our program. We recognize that fostering an environment where students are both educators and educatees aligns with the best critical traditions in adult education. We already address this recommendation and intend to further develop our curriculum to incorporate culturally responsive teaching practices. This includes integrating content that reflects the diverse cultures, social locations, and worldviews of our students. Through relevant research projects students are enabled to explore and address issues relevant to their cultural and social contexts. These projects enable students to apply their learning in meaningful ways that reflect their personal and community identities. Please refer to Annex 3 - Indicative students' research projects.	Choose level of compliance:
2. The panel would recommend that a programme of adult education provides greater opportunities for students to engage with the future review, evaluation and design of the programme and courses. The student cohort the panel met are very capable, willing but did not appear to have such opportunity.	We recognize the value of incorporating student input to ensure the program meets their needs and aspirations. In response, students participate in all academic bodies of the University: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Department / School Councils</li> <li>• Senate</li> <li>• Internal Quality Committee</li> <li>• Departmental Quality Committee</li> </ul>	Choose level of compliance:

Areas of improvement and recommendations <b>by EEC</b>	Actions Taken by the Institution	For Official Use ONLY
	<p>Through those bodies, students get involved in the development / revision and evaluation process of the content of their courses. Furthermore, student feedback is provided through course questionnaires and through student focus groups, and it is a significant part of the programme evaluation process.</p> <p>The programme of study, offered by the Department, is reviewed following the process specified in the “Regulations for Review of a Programme of Study” of the University. Changes in the program of study are decided by the Council of the Department following the suggestions of an ad-hoc committee set by the Council of the Department for this purpose. This committee is chaired by the Programme Coordinator, while the students are represented with one of the Programme’s student, appointed by the Students’ Council. For the revision of the Programme the committee considers (a) the findings and suggestions from the Programme Self-Evaluation Report, including suggestions of the students, the academics and the focus groups (students, graduates and employers), (b) the current developments in the fields related to the Programme, (c) suggestions from the Internal Quality Committee, the external evaluation teams, domestic and international professional bodies.</p>	

### 3. Teaching staff (ESG 1.5)

Areas of improvement and recommendations <b>by EEC</b>	Actions Taken by the Institution	For Official Use ONLY
1. Funding and opportunities be provided for graduates and even promising students from the programme to be mentored to publish any pieces deemed outstanding, with something new to say, internationally. As an example, this was done by students in and graduates from the Erasmus Mundus International Master in Adult Education for Social Change. Tutors and lecturing staff served as mentors in this project.	<p>We agree with the Committee's recommendation. The Mobility Office which runs under the Research &amp; Interconnection Service of the University provides funding opportunities for students and personnel through all the Departments of the University. Each department assigns an academic staff member as the department's Mobility/Erasmus Coordinator who is the department's contact point on issues related to mobility programs, mobility agreements and student and personnel mobility. The office is working with two different ERASMUS+ programs, KA103 and KA107 that are both related to student and academic exchanges in Europe and the third countries respectively. Funding from both programs is obtained on an annual basis as per the program rules and the availability of funding through the Erasmus+ national agency.</p> <p>Furthermore, Frederick University is a member of the EU-CONEXUS European University for Smart Urban Coastal Sustainability. Students of the programme will participate in mobilities within the alliance and possibly attend any joint EU-CONEXUS Bachelor / Master / PhD programs in areas related to Adult Education.</p>	Choose level of compliance:
2. The panel would recommend the teaching team use the QA processes to drive investment and consider what additional resources would improve the programme and student experience. The panel would like to have seen more evidence of evaluation translating into action and outcomes.	<p>We appreciate the panel's recommendation to leverage our Quality Assurance (QA) processes to drive investment and enhance the program and student experience. We recognize the importance of translating evaluation into actionable improvements and demonstrating the outcomes of these efforts. All programmes of study at the University are monitored and evaluated systematically and periodically. The evaluation process of the programmes of study involves the university's faculty members, graduates and students, Administrative Services, and when</p>	Choose level of compliance:

Areas of improvement and recommendations <b>by EEC</b>	Actions Taken by the Institution	For Official Use ONLY
	<p>necessary, external experts such as Research and Teaching Staff of other universities, researchers, experts in developing programmes, members of professional bodies or scientific bodies, government agencies and services. The Departmental Quality Committee and the Internal Quality Committee of the University have a significant role in the internal evaluation and the monitoring of programmes of study. The internal evaluation of the programme is based on criteria and quality indicators, as defined by the University's Quality Assurance Policy.</p> <p>It is noted that the students are represented in all bodies involved in the programmes evaluation process since they are represented in the Departmental Quality Committee, in the Council of the Department, as well as in the Internal Quality Committee of the University. Furthermore, student feedback is provided through course questionnaires and through student focus groups, and it is a significant part of the programme evaluation process.</p> <p>At the end of each semester all faculty members must complete the 'Course Evaluation Questionnaire' by the Instructor which refers to the content of the course, method of teaching, students' results and possible weaknesses identified and recommendations for improvements. A questionnaire is also completed by students, for all courses of the programme, as well as other courses they attended during the semester. The Programme Coordinator together with the Head of the Department, analyse the data collected by means of questionnaires. These findings are presented to the Council of the Department or School, accordingly, for providing information and taking the corrective measures. The programme coordinator and the Department report on the implementation of the action</p>	

Areas of improvement and recommendations <b>by EEC</b>	Actions Taken by the Institution	For Official Use ONLY
	<p>plan in the relevant reports of the next year's internal quality process.</p> <p>According to the University's Quality Assurance Policy, the programmes of study are also evaluated every year through the Programmes Self Evaluation report. For this purpose, the programme Coordinator prepares the Programme's Self Evaluation Report which is incorporated in the Department's Presentation Report and submitted, through the relevant Department and School, to the Internal Quality Committee. The Internal Quality Committee report to the Senate together with its own findings and recommendations, while an action plan is decided between the Internal Quality Committee and the department that refers also to the programmes of the Department. To this end, the programme Coordinator takes the necessary steps to implement the relevant recommendations for the improvement of the quality of the programme.</p>	
<p>3. Training of new teachers starting to teach a few days before the course starts should be reimagined to have a better performance in online teaching</p>	<p>We recognize the importance of comprehensive and timely training to ensure high-quality instruction. The University Distance Learning Committee and the Center for Innovation and Excellence in Teaching (CIET) offers a self-paced training course throughout the year for online courses and training, but besides this some of the initiatives we are considering implementing is to pair new teachers with experienced mentors who can provide ongoing guidance and support. Additionally, we have already established a peer support network (via CIET) where new and current instructors can share best practices and troubleshoot challenges together. We systematically offer professional development opportunities throughout the academic year. These include workshops, webinars, and discussion forums focused on emerging trends and best practices in online education.</p>	<p>Choose level of compliance:</p>

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

Areas of improvement and recommendations <b>by EEC</b>	Actions Taken by the Institution	For Official Use ONLY
1. The panel would recommend making a deeper reflection on the reasons why students could dropout to look for the appropriate actions to fix it, beyond the ones regarding the final Dissertation. Maybe a more flexible structure to avoid dropout could be coming from the difficulty to manage their time and dedication.	We appreciate the panel's observation and recommendation regarding the need for deeper reflection on the reasons for dropout among distance learning Master's students. We have gathered the program's students' withdrawal forms to reflect on the reasons they cite for discontinuing the studies. Among the most widely cited reasons are financial difficulties and challenges with balancing academic – work – personal life. Following the Committee's comments during their visit it was obvious that more comprehensive data collection and analysis is needed. We are in the process of adding in the existing, generic DL Student Satisfaction Survey a section with specific program of study items to gather students' perceptions regarding degree requirements. It should be noted that this survey is implemented in addition to the Course and Teaching Evaluation Questionnaire that is mandatory to be submitted by students for each of their course at the end of each semester. At the Studies and Student Welfare Service we will continue implementing online workshops for Distance Learning Students on time management and study-work-life balance (see example <a href="#">here</a> ), as well as workshops on writing and using library resources by the Center of Innovation and Excellence in Teaching (CIET), which is especially useful for Master level students who undertake dissertation. We are	Choose level of compliance:

Areas of improvement and recommendations <b>by EEC</b>	Actions Taken by the Institution	For Official Use ONLY
	committed to systematically assessing the effectiveness of these measures through student feedback and dropout rate analysis.	
2. Data on student progression and attrition needs to be made available.	<p>We acknowledge the Committee's comment on the data concerning students' progression and attrition. The Annual Quality Reporting of the IQC104 (programme Self Evaluation) provides plans, as well as data and quality indicators related to the students' retention and performance, the graduates' degree grades and duration of studies, the destination of graduates, etc. This report is completed by the program coordinator at the end of each academic year, and is submitted to the Departmental Quality Committee for analysis and evaluation. It is also used as a data source for the Department Self Evaluation Report (IQC107).</p> <p>Furthermore, included in the Annual Quality Report is the establishment of the new Student Progress Report (IQC108) which includes quality indicators related to student's progression (Course Assessment Results (Average failure rate, drop-outs, etc.), CGPA Results).</p> <p>During the programme's presentation of the onsite visit the EEC was provided with the relevant data on students' profiles; students' evolution; number of graduates and dropout rate for the last three years of operation of the program. The presentation of the programme was upload in the supported materials of CYQAA's google drive folder.</p> <p>Due to University policies, the content and data collected concerning internal quality reports</p>	Choose level of compliance:



Areas of improvement and recommendations <b>by EEC</b>	Actions Taken by the Institution	For Official Use ONLY
	are strictly confidential and cannot be made publicly available. These materials are intended solely for internal use to support institutional review and decision-making processes.	
3. Also, there is the need for more involvement of the students to committees and focus groups.	Please refer to Response 2.2	Choose level of compliance:

## 5. Learning resources and student support (ESG 1.6)

Areas of improvement and recommendations <b>by EEC</b>	Actions Taken by the Institution	For Official Use ONLY
1. Latest resources in adult education such as book series must be accessed to ensure that the Consortium has the latest e-book digital versions.	Students have access to our consortium's library where we constantly update with the most current e-book digital versions and relevant book series	Choose level of compliance:
2. The panel would recommend that the teaching team more carefully considers evaluation data to ensure resources for changing circumstances, future risks and trends.	Through the internal quality assurance processes employed by the University, the Departments must submit to the internal evaluation committee a self-evaluation report for each programme, on an annual basis. These reports include KPIS such as: profile of the student population, success and dropout rates, student progression etc. The internal quality committee evaluates these indicators and agrees with Department on the action plan to remedee possible weaknesses. The effectiveness of the decided measures, are examined on the next years programme's self-evaluation report. Following the EECs suggestions on further monitoring these KPIs the procedure adopted examines KPIs for the past 3 years instead of only 1 year.	Choose level of compliance:



## 6. Additional for doctoral programmes (ALL ESG)

Areas of improvement and recommendations <b>by EEC</b>	Actions Taken by the Institution	For Official Use ONLY
N/A	N/A	Choose level of compliance:



## 7. Eligibility (Joint programme)

(ALL ESG)

Areas of improvement and recommendations <b>by EEC</b>	Actions Taken by the Institution	For Official Use ONLY
N/A	N/A	Choose level of compliance:

## B. Conclusions and final remarks

Conclusions and final remarks by EEC	Actions Taken by the Institution	For Official Use ONLY
<p><b>All told, this is a positive evaluation.</b> The bulk of recommendations made throughout but especially in the first section are there to fine tune the programme. <b>It is a very worthwhile programme</b> which can have a distinctive flavour reflecting the particular situation of Cyprus as a European, Hellenic, near Middle Eastern, Mediterranean and small island state. Therein lies its strength. This of course not to the exclusion of other larger contextual factors that render this programme full of potential for being a truly international one in the field of adult continuing education.</p>	<p>We would like to sincerely thank the External Evaluation Committee for their dedicated work and invaluable comments, proved both within their evaluation report and during the frank discussions held through the visit. All suggestions made by the EEC have been adopted and implemented as seen by the answers throughout sessions 1-5.</p> <p>We are particularly pleased that the External Evaluation Committee is supportive of the accreditation of the new programme with the improvements suggested implemented, and we are committed in providing an innovative programme with a top quality of education to all prospective students.</p>	<p>Choose level of compliance:</p>



### C. Higher Education Institution academic representatives

<i>Name</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>Signature</i>
<b>Prof. George Demosthenous</b>	Rector	
Click to enter Name	Click to enter Position	
Click to enter Name	Click to enter Position	
Click to enter Name	Click to enter Position	
Click to enter Name	Click to enter Position	
Click to enter Name	Click to enter Position	

**Date:** 07/01/2025

