Cyprus Agency of Quality Assurance and Accreditation in Higher Education

Republic of Cyprus

External Evaluation Report
Program of Study

Institution: …… The Cyprus Institute
………………………………………..…………….........

District: ……… Nicosia
…………………………………………………………………

Name of the Program of Study in Greek:

…… Μάστερ _στην _Ψηφιακή _Πολιτιστική _Κληρονομιά _

………………………………………………………………………………

Name of the Program of Study in English:

……… Master's in Digital Cultural Heritage

……...…………………………………………………………………………

Department: … The Cyprus Institute Graduate School
……………………………………………………………………

Language/s of instruction: … English
……………………………………………………….

Faculty: … The Cyprus Institute Graduate School
……………………………………………………………………….

Program Status (check √ where applicable):

- ➢ New Program of Study: … √ ……
- ➢ Currently operation Program of Study: ………
  - Registered but not evaluated ………
  - Evaluated and accredited by SEKAP ………
  - Evaluated by the Cy.Q.A.A. and did not get accreditation ………

Program Category (check √ where applicable):

➢ Conventional …√……

➢ Distance Learning ………

➢ Inter-university (Name of collaborating university/ies) ………

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INSTRUCTIONS:

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 2016" [N. 136 (I)/2015].

The document is duly completed by the External Evaluation Committee for each program of study. The ANNEX (Doc. Number 300.1) constitutes an integral part of the external evaluation report for the external evaluation accreditation of a program of study.

EXTERNAL EVALUATION COMMITTEE:

NAME	TITLE AND RANK	UNIVERSITY / INSTITUTION
Charles van den Heuvel (chair)	Prof. dr	Huygens Institute for the History of the Netherlands/University of Amsterdam, Netherlands
Graeme Earl	Prof. dr	Kings College London, UK
Robin Skeates	Prof. dr	Durham University, UK
Ms. Tsiapou Sotiroula	Student	University of Cyprus, Cyprus

INTRODUCTION:

I. The External Evaluation procedure

- Short description of the documents that have been studied, of the on site visit meetings, and of the on site visit to the infrastructures.

Documents

Prior to the visit the EEC was provided with:

- Document 200.1, the application for evaluation submitted by the program of studies, including links to the CVs of the involved personnel and the internal evaluation committee report.
- Master's DCH Diploma Supplement Sample
- Master's DCH Diploma Sample
- Master's DCH Transcript Sample
- Access to previous examples of review documents

During the site visit the EEC additionally received:

- Education Quality Management System (EQMS) guide
- Program Handbook 2019-2020
- Student Handbook
- Course Handbook (including Assignments and Exams Samples)
- Biographies of attendees at site visit
- Cyprus Institute Graduate School Prospectus Academic Year 2018-2019
- USB containing presentations given during the site visit

At the end of the visit the EEC received:

- Brochures for Cyprus Institute

On Site Visit Meetings

We chose to follow the indicative schedule provided in advance:

9:00 – 13:00 (indicative time)

- A meeting with the Head of the Institution and the Head or/and members of the Internal Evaluation Committee. *[40 minutes]*
- Examination of the School's structure, including the programs in the proper position, i.e. by indicating the School and the Department under which the programs will operate. *[20 minutes]*
- A meeting with the Head of the relevant department and the programs Coordinators. Presentation of the curriculums (allocation of courses per semester, weekly content of each course, teaching methodology, teaching material, evaluation, samples of papers, samples of

written examinations, admission criteria for prospective students etc.). *[70 minutes]*

- Presentation of programs feasibility study. *[10 minutes]*
- Discussion of the programs as a whole and information relevant to its response to the Criteria. *[60 minutes]*
- Presentation of the equipment used in teaching and learning (software, hardware, materials, online platforms etc.). *[40 minutes]*

13:00 – 14:00

Lunch of EEC **only** with the educational officers of the Agency accompanying them.

On the day the actual structure and timetable varied from this but the content was consistent.

On Site Visit to Infrastructure

We chose to follow the indicative schedule provided in advance:

14:00 – 17:00 (indicative time)

- Presentation of the academic/teaching staff teaching each course for all the years of study. *[20 minutes]*
- Examination of the curriculum vitae of the academic/teaching staff (academic qualifications, publications, research interests, research activity etc.) and their relationship with the institution as teachers in connection with any other duties they may have in the institution or/and other programs. *[20 minutes]*
- A meeting only with members of the teaching staff. *[40 minutes]*
- A meeting only with students or/and their representatives. *[30 minutes]*
- A meeting with members of the administrative staff. *[30 minutes]*
- On site visit to the premises of the institution (library, computer labs, research facilities etc.). *[40 minutes]*

On the day the actual structure and timetable varied from this but the content was consistent.

II. The Internal Evaluation procedure
- Comments concerning the quality and the completeness of the application submitted by the institution of higher education (Doc. Number 200.1), as well as concerning the overall acceptance of and participation in the quality assurance procedures, by the institution in general and by the program of study under evaluation in particular.

We were provided with significant additional detail during the visit (as indicated above and referenced throughout in our comments below). This additional information had a very significant impact on our understanding of the Programme, the Institute and the surrounding context, and in turn on our assessment. We would have appreciated these documents digitally at the same time as the other pre-visit documents listed above.

In particular the site visit and additional documents clarified:

- The relationship between the vision of the Institute and the Programme
- The primary, secondary and tertiary goals of the Programme
- The nature of the learning environment provided by the Institute.

We took note of the scores and comments provided by the internal evaluation committee and indicated this in our comments. In a small number of cases we used the score/ comment directly. Again, this is indicated. During the site visit we were able to go through the internal evaluation and to have queries and lacunae addressed.

All members of the Institution embraced warmly the site visit and the evaluation process.

FINDINGS:

1. EFFECTIVENESS OF TEACHING WORK – AVAILABLE RESOURCES

The majority of the program of study and higher education qualifications described in the documents and detailed during the site visit were deemed to be "Excellent".

- **Organization of Teaching Work**

Those areas scoring in categories other than "Excellent" relate to clarity in the documentation of admissions, assignments and course feedback. We are convinced that the education resulting from the organization of the teaching work will be exemplary, but frequently the unique nature of the learning environment is implicit rather than explicit. The way in which student learning will be curated, effectively at an individual level, could be better communicated.

See specific comments below – section 1.1

- **Teaching**

We are clear that this programme will provide an exemplar in high quality, small group, research-led, individually curated teaching and learning at masters level. The area scoring in a category other than "Excellent" related to clarity of assessment criteria, and potentially also to the number and type of assessments.

See specific comments below – section 1.2

- **Teaching personnel**

The teaching personnel identified for the Programme are excellent, and perfectly qualified to deliver the Programme as planned.

See specific comments below – section 1.3

2. PROGRAM OF STUDY AND HIGHER EDUCATION QUALIFICATIONS

The majority of the program of study and higher education qualifications described in the documents and detailed during the site visit were deemed to be "Excellent".

- **Purpose and Objectives and learning outcomes of the Program of Study**

Those areas scoring in categories other than "Excellent" relate to clarity of the purpose and objectives of the Programme focus and design (2.1.1, 2.1.2 and 2.1.6). During the

site visit it was very clear that these elements were frequently implicit in the documents, and could have been made more explicit.

We have no doubt that the enthusiasm and expertise of the teaching staff will guarantee a high quality learning experience, both in a professional and a research context.

See specific comments below – section 2.1

- **Structure and Content of the Program of studies**

Those areas scoring in categories other than "Excellent" relate to clarity of the curricula and their delivery, and the structure, particularly in terms catering for and developing a broad range of skills and topics. We all felt that the content was excellent.

See specific comments below – section 2.2

- **Quality Assurance of the Program of studies**

See specific comments below – section 2.3

- **Management of the Program of Study**

See specific comments below – section 2.4

- **International Dimension of the Program of Study**

The only area scoring in categories other than "Excellent" was that relating to international exchange programmes, which scored a 4 ("Best practice"). We wanted to draw greater attention to the enormous potential in this area given the connections of the academic team, the many related funded research programmes and the track record of all those involved in the Programme.

See specific comments below – section 2.5

- **Connection with the labor market and the society**

See specific comments below – section 2.6

3. RESEARCH WORK AND SYNERGIES WITH TEACHING

All research work and synergies with teaching administrative services described in the documents and detailed during the site visit were deemed to be "Excellent", with the exception of 3.1.7 ("To A Satisfactory Degree") which concerns the policy for internal funding of academics' personal research.

- **Research Teaching Synergies**

See specific comments below – section 3.1

4. ADMINISTRATION SERVICES, STUDENT WELFARE AND SUPPORT OF TEACHING WORK

All administrative services, student welfare and support of teaching work described in the documents and detailed during the site visit were deemed to be "Excellent", with the exception of 4.2.7 ("To A Satisfactory Degree") where there is an opportunity for improvement in the provision of teacher training.

- **Administrative Mechanisms**

See specific comments below – section 4.3.1

- **Infrastructures / Support**

See specific comments below – section 4.3.2

- **Financial Resources**

See specific comments below – section 4.3.3

5. DISTANCE LEARNING PROGRAMS

N/A

6. DOCTORAL PROGRAMS OF STUDY

N/A

CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS OF THE EXTERNAL EVALUATION COMMITTEE[1]

- The present situation of the program, good practices, weaknesses that have been detected during the external evaluation procedure by the external evaluation committee, suggestions for improvement.

Having reviewed the content of this programme we discussed a number of elements of the curriculum during the site visit. These included the balance between research preparation and professional preparation skills and attributes, local vs. international case studies and emphasis, training of cultural heritage leaders as well as practitioners, extra-curricular opportunities, and the application of the Institute's own research directly to their teaching, including data awareness, digital (open) scholarship, innovation, and educational technologies.

The external evaluation committee is convinced of the potential of this programme to become "Excellent" due to the enthusiasm of the staff, the excellent international network connections, support by government and external funding, staff research and teaching expertise, library, support, sustainability of infrastructure and other aspects, administration and systems, the available equipment and facilities, technical support, and the high employability potential for the students. We believe that this Programme stands out as an exemplar for highly-selective, small-scale, research-led masters teaching. The Programme will add significantly to the discipline of digital cultural heritage at an international level, both from the perspective of new research and of applied research in a professional context. Furthermore, the impressive vision of the Institute also permeates the Programme.

Our recommendations include the following. Note that the current maximum size (e.g. 20) and shape (e.g. the balance between students studying full-time and those potentially dipping in) is of key importance to our evaluation.

1. The breadth and depth of the Programme's content mean that the students will require significant support and guidance. The site visit and supplementary documentation made clear that this is in place. However, communication of these details to prospective and current students will be essential. Management of the learning community will hence also be vital.
2. Clarity of the relationship between this masters, other masters programmes at the Institute and beyond, and the Institute's PhD programmes.

---

[1] It is highlighted, at this point, that the External Evaluation Committee is expected to justify its findings and its suggestions on the basis of the Document num.: 300.1. The External Evaluation Committee is not expected to submit a suggestion for the approval or the rejection of the program of study under evaluation. This decision falls under the competencies of the Council of the Agency of Quality Assurance and Accreditation of higher education.

3. The Programme will need very robust QA and student support, to allow for the proposed flexibility, interdisciplinarity and incoming skills of the students.
4. Ensure that there is a very transparent, robust and equitable selection process
5. Consider indicating two student pathways, taking into account factors such as student background and aspirations, more focused on a professional preparation or a research trajectory. This might include future consideration by the Institute of a research masters separate to this MSc programme.
6. Ensure that digital cultural heritage is the leitmotif of the Programme. The Programme should problematize data driven research and digital cultural heritage methods
7. The scaffolding provided by mandatory modules could be made even clearer, in the progression of the Programme.
8. Possibilities of internships and placements should be more explicit both within the Institute and beyond.

We conclude that the masters programme as designed and documented here is without doubt suitable to be accredited by the CAQA.

Doc. Number: 300.1

Quality Standards and Indicators

External Evaluation of a Program of Study

Institution: …… The Cyprus Institute ………

Program of Study: …… Master's in Digital Cultural Heritage ……………………

Duration of the Program of Study: …………12 months……………….

Evaluation Date: ………12 January 2019…………………

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 2016".

The document describes the quality standards and indicators, which will be applied for the external evaluation of programs of study of institutions of higher education, by the External Evaluation Committee.

DIRECTIONS: Note what is applicable **for each quality standard/indicator**.

1. Poor
2. To an unsatisfactory degree
3. To a satisfactory degree
4. Best practice
5. Excellent

It is pointed out that, in the case of standards and indicators that cannot be applied due to the status of the institution and/or of the program of study, N/A (= Not Applicable) should be noted and a detailed explanation should be provided on the institution's corresponding policy regarding the specific quality standard or indicator.

Members of the External Evaluation Committee

NAME	TITLE AND RANK	UNIVERSITY / INSTITUTION
Charles van den Heuvel (chair)	Prof. dr	Huygens Institute for the History of the Netherlands/University of Amsterdam, Netherlands
Graeme Earl	Prof. dr	Kings College London, UK
Robin Skeates	Prof. dr	Durham University, UK
Ms. Tsiapou Sotiroula	Student	University of Cyprus, Cyprus

Date and Time of the On-Site Visit: ……10 January 2019 9am…………………

Duration of the On-Site Visit: …8 hours………………

1. EFFECTIVENESS OF TEACHING WORK – AVAILABLE RESOURCES							
1.1	**Organization of teaching work**		**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
1.1.1	The student admission requirements to the program of study, are based on specific regulations which are adhered to in a consistent manner.				3		
1.1.2	The number of students in each class allows for constructive teaching and communication, and it compares positively to the current international standards and/or practices.						5
1.1.3	The organization of the educational process safeguards the quality implementation of the program's purpose and objectives and the achievement of the learning outcomes. Particularly, the following are taken into consideration:						
	1.1.3.1	The implementation of a specific academic calendar and its timely publication.					5
	1.1.3.2	The disclosure of the program's curricula to the students, and their implementation by the teaching personnel					5
	1.1.3.3	The course web-pages, updated with the relevant supplementary material					5
	1.1.3.4	The procedures for the fulfillment of undergraduate and postgraduate assignments / practical training			3		
	1.1.3.5	The procedures for the conduct and the format of the examinations and for student assessment			3		
	1.1.3.6	The effective provision of information to the students and the enhancement of their participation in the procedures for the improvement of the educational process.			3		
1.1.4	Adequate and modern learning resources, are available to the students, including the following:						
	1.1.4.1	facilities					5
	1.1.4.2	library					5

	1.1.4.3	infrastructure				5
	1.1.4.4	student welfare				5
	1.1.4.5	academic mentoring				5
1.1.5	A policy for regular and effective communication, between the teaching personnel and the students, is applied.			4	
1.1.6	The teaching personnel, for each course, provide timely and effective feedback to the students.			4	
1.1.7	Statutory mechanisms, for the support of students and the communication with the teaching personnel, are effective.			4	
1.1.8	Control mechanisms for student performance are effective.		3		
1.1.9	Support mechanisms for students with problematic academic performance are effective.				5
1.1.10	Academic mentoring processes are transparent and effective for undergraduate and postgraduate programs and are taken into consideration for the calculation of academic work load.			4	
1.1.11	The program of study applies an effective policy for the prevention and detection of plagiarism.				5
1.1.12	The program of study provides satisfactory mechanisms for complaint management and for dispute resolution.				5

Justify the answer you have provided and note the additional comments you may have on each standard / indicator.

1.1.1. The Programme is explicitly very broad in scope and hence in intake (background of candidates). However, the requirement for very high achievement at the level of whatever qualification was explicit in the meetings is not clearly indicated in the documents. This is also important for clarity of rejection. Is high achievement in a science degree equally valuable to high achievement in an arts degree?

1.1.3.4 Although the **Course Handbook** provides examples of assignments they are missing details such as word count. Some types of assignment are not included in the examples e.g. a placement. Examples of and links between learning objectives, assignment criteria and generic grading criteria are not provided.

1.1.3.5 Example learning objectives are given at some points in the **Course Handbook** but these are not constructively aligned to criteria. The **EQMS** gives

some further detail on assessment but does not link to generic grading criteria or a list of assessment criteria. Programme level learning objectives (e.g. on Page 13 of **Program Handbook**) are not linked to these either.

1.1.3.6 Building on the previous two comments, the students could be provided with a clearer 'map' of their assessment journey from the micro level of grading of one assessment through to the overall award of a classification for the degree. The **Course Handbook** indicates methods for students to provide feedback. This could be enhanced.

1.1.4 The site visit and documentation demonstrated that the learning resources available to students are exemplary.

1.1.4.4 Our only suggestion here. would be that, given the extraordinary learning resources available include a small, closely-integrated teaching and learning community, it would be useful to indicate how issues could be dealt with anonymously outside of that community. Page 9 in the **Student Handbook** provides some indications. Pages 26-27 talk about grievances and these could be highlighted in the context of welfare too.

1.1.5 This could be more explicit. Sections such as Page 25 in the **Program Handbook** are helpful.

1.1.6 Given the nature of the environment we expect formative feedback will be excellent and continuous. Summative feedback policies could be more explicit e.g. in terms of amount, type and timeliness of feedback on assessments.

1.1.7 See 1.1.5

1.1.8 See 1.1.3.5 in terms of grading criteria as these provide control mechanisms for performance.

1.1.10 There could be more clarity in academic mentoring, including pedagogic training. Workload is mentioned in the internal quality assessment notes.

Note, additionally:

α) the expected number of Cypriot and International Students in the program of study.

The program caters to international students, however, we expect the majority to be from the MENA region and Europe.

β) the countries of origin of the majority of students.

Cyprus

γ) the maximum planned number of students per class-section.

15

1.2	Teaching	1	2	3	4	5

1.2.1	The methodology utilized in each course is suitable for achieving the course's purpose and objectives and those of the individual modules.					5
1.2.2	The methodology of each course is suitable for adults.					5
1.2.3	Continuous-formative assessment and feedback are provided to the students regularly.					5
1.2.4	The assessment system and criteria regarding student course performance, are clear, adequate, and known to the students.			3		
1.2.5	Educational activities which encourage students' active participation in the learning process, are implemented.					5
1.2.6	Teaching incorporates the use of modern educational technologies that are consistent with international standards, including a platform for the electronic support of learning.					5
1.2.7	Teaching materials (books, manuals, journals, databases, and teaching notes) meet the requirements set by the methodology of the program's individual courses, and are updated regularly.					5

Justify the answer you have provided and note the additional comments you may have on each standard / indicator.

1.2.4 As per notes for section 1.1.3 above, reducing the number of learning objectives throughout could help here, in terms of the students' understanding, minimising work for staff and enabling flexibility. In addition, we believe that there are too many assessments and too much emphasis on exams. Assessments might also be more diverse e.g. capitalising on the opportunities of the digital. We understand that there is limited scope for changing this but if possible we propose summative assessment is reduced relative to formative.

Overall, we note that the teaching methods, activities and resources on the Programme are excellent.

1.3	**Teaching Personnel**	1	2	3	4	5
1.3.1	The number of full-time academic personnel, occupied exclusively at the institution, and their fields of expertise, adequately support the program of study.					5
1.3.2	The members of teaching personnel for each course have the relevant formal and fundamental qualifications					

		for teaching the course, as described by the legislation, including the following:				
	1.3.2.1	Subject specialization, preferably with a doctorate, in the discipline.				5
	1.3.2.2	Publications within the discipline.				5
1.3.3		The specializations of Visiting Professors adequately support the program of study.				5
1.3.4		Special Teaching Personnel and Special Scientists have the necessary qualifications, adequate work experience and specialization to teach a limited number of courses in the program of study.				n/a
1.3.5		In every program of study the Special Teaching Personnel does not exceed 30% of the Teaching Research Personnel.				n/a
1.3.6		The teaching personnel of each private institution of tertiary education, to a percentage of at least 70%, has recognized academic qualification, by one level higher than that of the program of study in which he/she teaches.				5
1.3.7		In the program of study, the ratio of the number of courses taught by full-time personnel, occupied exclusively at the institution, to the number of courses taught by part-time personnel, ensures the quality of the program of study.				5
1.3.8		The ratio of the number of students to the total number of teaching personnel is adequate for the support and safeguarding of the program's quality.				5
1.3.9		The academic personnel's teaching load does not limit the conduct of research, writing, and contribution to the society.				5
1.3.10		Future redundancies / retirements, expected recruitment and promotions of academic personnel safeguard the unimpeded implementation of the program of study within a five-year span.				5
1.3.11		The program's Coordinator has the qualifications and experience to efficiently coordinate the program of study.				5

Justify the answer you have provided and note the additional comments you may have on each standard / indicator.

1.3.1 The experience and quality of the full-time academic personnel will create an extraordinary environment.

1.3.3 The Visiting staff will be an exemplary addition to the student experience.

1.3.8. Based on the documentation and visit we anticipate that the ratio and hence the level of interaction between staff and students will be outstanding.

2. PROGRAM OF STUDY AND HIGHER EDUCATION QUALIFICATIONS							
2.1	**Purpose and Objectives and learning outcomes of the Program of Study**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	
2.1.1	The purpose and objectives of the program of study are formulated in terms of expected learning outcomes and are consistent with the mission and the strategy of the institution.				4		
2.1.2	The purpose and objectives of the program and the learning outcomes are utilized as a guide for the design of the program of study.			3			
2.1.3	The higher education qualification and the program of study, conform to the provisions of their corresponding Professional and Vocational Bodies for the purpose of registration to these bodies.					n/a	
2.1.4	The program's content, the methods of assessment, the teaching materials and the equipment, lead to the achievement of the program's purpose and objectives and ensure the expected learning outcomes.					5	
2.1.5	The expected learning outcomes of the program are known to the students and to the members of the academic and teaching personnel.					5	
2.1.6	The learning process is properly designed to achieve the expected learning outcomes.			3			
2.1.7	The higher education qualification awarded to the students, corresponds to the purpose and objectives and the learning outcomes of the program.					5	

Justify the answer you have provided and note the additional comments you may have on each standard / indicator.

2.1.1 The relationship between the research preparation and professional preparation aspects of the Programme are not always clear. The mission of the institution could be more clearly linked to the Programme. It is implicit throughout (e.g. in the context of module descriptions, programme description, details of international partnerships, links across the Institution etc.) but not explicitly tied to learning outcomes. The site visit was valuable in clarifying these points and there is no concern that both aims could not be realized by the staff, facilities and teaching.

2.1.2 As noted in 1.1.3 and 1.2.4 this could be more systematic, particularly in terms of alignment between design, purpose, objectives and learning outcomes.

2.1.6 The learning design could be more explicit. The site visit made clear that the learning design (and hence implicit pathways through the Programme) was dependent upon the unique learning environment (including the individual

curation). However, this needs to be made clear to prospective applicants. Addressing the point raised in 2.1.2 would remove any further concerns with respect to the student experience.

2.1.7 The Programme is consistent with an MSc as set out in the application. However, given that the content and outcomes of the Programme and its learning environment are examples of research-led teaching, it may be appropriate to consider a masters by research (MRes/ MPhil). This might take the form of an adjustment to the existing specification or something new, potentially of longer duration. The Institute, facilities and staff are ideally placed to provide such a research training experience.

2.2	Structure and Content of the Program of Study	1	2	3	4	5
2.2.1	The course curricula clearly define the expected learning outcomes, the content, the teaching and learning approaches and the method of assessing student performance.			3		
2.2.2	The European Credit Transfer System (ECTS) is applied and there is true correspondence between credits and workload per course and per semester for the student either he / she studies in a specific program or he/she is registered and studies simultaneously in additional programs of studies according to the European practice in higher education institutions.					5
2.2.3	The program of study is structured in a consistent manner and in sequence, so that concepts operating as preconditions precede the teaching of other, more complex and cognitively more demanding, concepts.				4	
2.2.4	The higher education qualification awarded, the learning outcomes and the content of the program are consistent.					5
2.2.5	The program, in addition to the courses focusing on the specific discipline, includes an adequate number of general education courses.					5
2.2.6	The content of courses and modules, and the corresponding educational activities are suitable for achieving the desired learning outcomes with regards to the knowledge, skills, and abilities which should be acquired by students.					5
2.2.7	The number and the content of the program's courses are sufficient for the achievement of learning outcomes.					5

| 2.2.8 | The content of the program's courses reflects the latest achievements / developments in science, arts, research and technology. | | | | 5 |
| 2.2.9 | Flexible options / adaptable to the personal needs or to the needs of students with special needs, are provided. | | | | 5 |

Justify the answer you have provided and note the additional comments you may have on each standard / indicator.

2.2.1 See related notes above regarding learning design and assessment. For example, the placement learning approach was more clearly demonstrated during the site visit and is less explicit in the documentation of the curricula. Similarly, the outcomes of the thesis are not clearly defined. In addition, the ways in which the teaching methods will deal with the diversity of skills in the context of the learning outcomes etc. are not detailed. For example, the **Course Handbooks** indicate specific software, methods, approaches and so on (e.g. spatial humanities approaches and tools) but we suggest that it could be clearer, and also what the impact will be for students of their differing levels of prior knowledge on the learning experience and assessment. See comment on 2.2.3.

2.2.3 There is evidence of structure and hence progression. Some elements could be revisited e.g. the point at which data management is taught. The relationship between generic concepts and critiques, and specific applications and debates could also be revisited. This might have an impact on the content of the mandatory and elective courses. Improved signposting between courses could provide many of the necessary linkages. Explicitly articulating and critiquing the place of the digital in each of the courses might be helpful in achieving this. This also relates to core digital skills. For example, if a student does not arrive knowing a particular piece of software how will this be dealt with given the lack of explicit prerequisites? The DCH418 gives an indication but this could be clearer throughout the Programme. Perhaps more (unassessed, peer and/ or informal?) opportunities could be provided for bringing core digital and academic literacy up to sufficient levels to enable the learning outcomes to be realised.

2.2.4 But see note on 2.1.7 re: research preparation.

2.2.6 The content will certainly achieve the desired learning outcomes. However, we would note that balancing depth vs breadth of coverage of the content will be key. Our initial assessment was that the content was too broad but the site visit and example documentation reassured us that the learning environment would enable this balance.

Note the expected number of students who will be studying simultaneously at another academic institution, based on your experience so far, regarding students who study simultaneously in the programs of your institution.

The mode of study is full-time, thus they do not expect to have students studying simultaneously in other programs.

2.3	Quality Assurance of the Program of Study	1	2	3	4	5
2.3.1	The arrangements regarding the program's quality assurance define clear competencies and procedures.					5
2.3.2	Participation in the processes of the system of quality assurance of the program, is ensured for					
	2.3.2.1	the members of the academic personnel					5
	2.3.2.2	the members of the administrative personnel					5
	2.3.2.3	the students.					5
2.3.3	The guide and / or the regulations for quality assurance, provide detailed information and data for the support and management of the program of study.					5
2.3.4	The quality assurance process constitutes an academic process and it is not restricted by non-academic factors.					5

Justify the answer you have provided and note the additional comments you may have on each standard / indicator.

As we have noted above, the learning environment of this programme will allow significant individual curation of student experiences. Quality assurance is hence vital. Perhaps the **EQMS** document might be even better linked to the other programme documentation.

2.4	Management of the Program of Study	1	2	3	4	5
2.4.1	Effective management of the program of study with regard to its design, its approval, its monitoring and its review, is in place.					5
2.4.2	It is ensured that learning outcomes may be achieved within the specified timeframe.					5
2.4.3	It is ensured that the program's management and development process is an academic process which operates without any non-academic interventions.					5
2.4.4	The academic hierarchy of the institution, (Rector, Vice-Rectors, Deans, Chairs and Programs' Coordinators, academic personnel) have the sole responsibility for					5

	academic excellence and the development of the programs of study.						
2.4.5	Information relating to the program of study are posted publicly and include:						
	2.4.5.1	The provisions regarding unit credits					5
	2.4.5.2	The expected learning outcomes					5
	2.4.5.3	The methodology					5
	2.4.5.4	Course descriptions					5
	2.4.5.5	The program's structure					5
	2.4.5.6	The admission requirements					5
	2.4.5.7	The format and the procedures for student assessment					5
2.4.6	The award of the higher education qualification is accompanied by the Diploma Supplement which is in line with the European and international standards.						5
2.4.7	The effectiveness of the program's evaluation mechanism, by the students, is ensured.						5
2.4.8	The recognition and transfer of credit units from previous studies is regulated by procedures and regulations which ensure that the majority of credit units is awarded by the institution which awards the higher education qualification.						5

Justify the answer you have provided and note the additional comments you may have on each standard / indicator.

In the case of practical training, note:
- The number of credit units for courses and the number of credits for practical training
- In which semester does practical training takes place?
- Note if practical training is taking place in a country other than the homecountry of the institution which awards the higher education qualification

The ANNEX completed by the Internal Quality Committee did not list any elements in this section. We are therefore not clear whether any details from us are required. Students will learn practical skills throughout the Programme.

2.5	International Dimension of the Program of Study	1	2	3	4	5

2.5.1	The program's collaborations with other institutions are compared positively with corresponding collaborations of other departments / programs of study in Europe and internationally.					5
2.5.2	The program attracts Visiting professors of recognized academic standing.					5
2.5.3	Students participate in exchange programs.				4	
2.5.4	The academic profile of the program of study is compatible with corresponding programs of study in Cyprus and internationally.					5

Justify the answer you have provided and note the additional comments you may have on each standard / indicator.

The Institution has excellent international partnerships. These will help create a wonderful learning environment.

2.5.3 We were provided with examples during the site visit that indicate opportunities would be available for students to benefit from exchange programs, ranging from enrichment of their learning by visiting PhD students through to the potential to visit international partners. It is not clear to what extent this would be possible or how it would function in terms of credit, nature and duration of study. For example, the best opportunity to see such an exchange in practice might be as a component of the thesis, with a student perhaps visiting a partner for some of their research period.

Also, comment on the degree the program compares positively with corresponding programs operating in Cyprus and abroad in higher education institutions of the same rank.

We agree with the statement made by the internal evaluation committee:

"There is no similar program offered in Cyprus. Similar programs are scarce in the MENA region. For this reason, students typically choose European institutions offering such programs. The suggested program's academic profile is fully compatible with the aforementioned programs and therefore, its competitiveness is ensured."

We are very positive that it will provide an original and high-quality masters programme.

2.6	Connection with the labor market and the society	1	2	3	4	5

						5
2.6.1	The procedures applied, so that the program conforms to the scientific and professional activities of the graduates, are adequate and effective.					5
2.6.2	According to the feasibility study, indicators for the employability of graduates are satisfactory.					5
2.6.3	Benefits, for the society, deriving from the program are significant.					5

Justify the answer you have provided and note the additional comments you may have on each standard / indicator.

2.6 As a general point we see very many opportunities for blending the labour market, society, their needs and perspectives, and the Programme.

3. RESEARCH WORK AND SYNERGIES WITH TEACHING						
3.1	**Research - Teaching Synergies**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
3.1.1	It is ensured that teaching and learning have been adequately enlightened by research.					5
3.1.2	New research results are embodied in the content of the program of study.					5
3.1.3	Adequate and sufficient facilities and equipment are provided to support the research component of the program of study, which are available and accessible to the personnel and the students.					5
3.1.4	The results of the academic personnel's research activity are published in international journals with the peer-reviewing system, in international conferences, conference minutes, publications etc.					5
3.1.5	External, non-governmental, funding for the academic personnel's research activities, is compared positively to the funding of other institutions in Cyprus and abroad.					5
3.1.6	Internal funding, of the academic personnel's research activities, is compared positively to the funding of other institutions in Cyprus and abroad.					5

		1	2	3	4	5
3.1.7	The policy for, indirect or direct, internal funding of the academic personnel's research activity is satisfactory.			3		
3.1.8	The participation of students, academic, teaching and administrative personnel of the program in research activities and projects is satisfactory.					5
3.1.9	Student training in the research process is sufficient.					5

Justify the answer you have provided and note the additional comments you may have on each standard / indicator.

3.1.7 The internal evaluation scored this lower. As far as the documentation presented to us we see no issues, although there is limited information.

This programme falls within an excellent research context and there is no doubt that the teaching will be research-led in all respects. This is one of the Programme's key strengths and distinctive features.

4. ADMINISTRATION SERVICES, STUDENT WELFARE AND SUPPORT OF TEACHING WORK

4.1	**Administrative Mechanisms**	1	2	3	4	5
4.1.1	There is a Student Welfare Service that supports students with regards to academic and personal problems and difficulties.					5
4.1.2	Statutory administrative mechanisms for monitoring and supporting students are sufficient.					5
4.1.3	The efficiency of these mechanisms is assessed on the basis of specific criteria.					5

Justify the answer you have provided and note the additional comments you may have on each standard / indicator.

The administrative mechanisms identified in the documentation, application and during the site visit are consistent with our expectations. For example, **EQMS** Page 19 describes external quality assurance, accreditation and so on. In terms of [4.1.2] we would suggest that induction arrangements for new students are made explicit e.g. introduction to staff, use of equipment, etc.

4.2	Infrastructure / Support	1	2	3	4	5
4.2.1	There are suitable books and reputable journals supporting the program.					5
4.2.2	There is a supportive internal communication platform.					5
4.2.3	The facilities are adequate in number and size.					5
4.2.4	The equipment used in teaching and learning (laboratory and electronic equipment, consumables etc) are quantitatively and qualitatively adequate.					5
4.2.5	Teaching materials (books, manuals, scientific journals, databases) are adequate and accessible to students.					5
4.2.6	Teaching materials (books, manuals, scientific journals, databases) are updated regularly with the most recent publications.					5
4.2.7	The teaching personnel are provided with training opportunities in teaching method, in adult education, and in new technologies on the basis of a structured learning framework.			3		

Justify the answer you have provided and note the additional comments you may have on each standard / indicator.

4.2.7 The visit demonstrated that the Institute is exploring means for enhanced provision of training.

4.3	Financial Resources	1	2	3	4	5
4.3.1	The management and allocation of the financial resources of the program of study, allow for the development of the program and of the academic / teaching personnel.					5
4.3.2	The allocation of financial resources as regards to academic matters, is the responsibility of the relevant academic departments.					n/a
4.3.3	The remuneration of academic and other personnel is analogous to the remuneration of academic and other personnel of the respective institutions in Cyprus.					5

| 4.3.4 | Student tuition and fees are consistent to the tuition and fees of other respective institutions. | | | | | 5 |

Justify the answer you have provided and note the additional comments you may have on each standard / indicator.

4.3.3 We have no information regarding the remuneration of personnel in the Institute or elsewhere. We have therefore scored using the internal evaluation.

4.3.4 Our understanding from the visit and documents that the fees are consistent locally. We feel that the Programme would easily merit premium fees in other international contexts. It may be appropriate for the team to consider premium fees in order to enlarge the scholarship funding.

In general, it is clear that the Programme is well resourced financially.

The following criterion applies additionally for distance learning programs of study.

5.	DISTANCE LEARNING PROGRAMS	1	2	3	4	5
5.1	Feedback processes for teaching personnel with regards to the evaluation of their teaching work, by the students, are satisfactory.					
5.2	The process and the conditions for the recruitment of academic / teaching personnel, ensure that candidates have the necessary skills and experience for long distance education.					
5.3	Through established procedures, appropriate training, guidance and support, are provided to teaching personnel, to enable it to efficiently support the educational process.					
5.4	Student performance monitoring mechanisms are satisfactory.					
5.5	Adequate mentoring by the teaching personnel, is provided to students, through established procedures.					
5.6	The unimpeded long distance communication between the teaching personnel and the students, is ensured to a satisfactory degree.					

5.7	Assessment consistency, its equivalent application to all students, and the compliance with predefined procedures, are ensured.					
5.8	Teaching materials (books, manuals, scientific journals, databases) comply with the requirements provided by the long distance education methodology and are updated regularly.					
5.9	The program of study has the appropriate and adequate infrastructure for the support of learning.					
5.10	The supporting infrastructures are easily accessible.					
5.11	Students are informed and trained with regards to the available educational infrastructure.					
5.12	The procedures for systematic control and improvement of the supportive services are regular and effective.					
5.13	Infrastructure for distance education is comparable to university infrastructure in the European Union and internationally.					
5.14	Electronic library services are provided according to international practice in order to support the needs of the students and of the teaching personnel.					
5.15	The students and the teaching personnel have access to the necessary electronic sources of information, relevant to the program, the level, and the method of teaching.					
5.16	The percentage of teaching personnel who holds a doctorate, in a program of study which is offered long distance, is not less than 75%.					

Justify the answer you have provided and note the additional comments you may have on each standard / indicator.

If the following apply, note "√"in the appropriate space next to each statement. In case the following statements do not apply, note what is applicable:

The maximum number of students per class-section, should not exceed 30 students.	
The conduct of written examinations with the physical presence of the students, under the supervision of the institution or under the supervision of reliable agencies which operate in the countries of the students, is compulsory.	

The number of long distance classes taught by the academic personnel does not exceed the number of courses taught by the teaching personnel in conventional programs of study.	

The following criterion applies additionally for doctoral programs of study.

6.	DOCTORAL PROGRAMS OF STUDY	1	2	3	4	5
6.1	The provision of quality doctoral studies is ensured through Doctoral Studies Regulations.					
6.2	The structure and the content of a doctoral program of study are satisfactory and they ensure the quality provision of doctoral studies.					
6.3	The number of academic personnel, which is going to support the doctoral program of study, is adequate.					
6.4	The doctoral studies' supervisors have the necessary academic qualifications and experience for the supervision of the specific dissertations.					
6.5	The degree of accessibility of all interested parties to the Doctoral Studies Regulations is satisfactory.					
6.6	The number of doctoral students, under the supervision of a member of the academic personnel, is apt for the continuous and effective feedback provided to the students and it complies with the European and international standards.					
6.7	The research interests of academic advisors and supervisors are satisfactory and they adequately cover the thematic areas of research conducted by the doctoral students of the program.					
Justify the answer you have provided and note the additional comments you may have on each standard / indicator.						
Note the number of doctoral students under the supervision of each member of the academic personnel of the program and the academic rank of the supervisor.						

FINAL REMARKS – SUGGESTIONS

Please note your final remarks and suggestions for the program of study and/or regarding particular aspects of the program.

As we noted above, we conclude that this masters programme is without doubt suitable to be accredited by the CAQA. It is grounded in an excellent teaching and research environment, and a community of outstanding staff and students. It will provide an exemplar in research-led masters, and in the field of digital cultural heritage.

Names and Signatures of the Chair and the Members of the External Evaluation Committee:

Name:	Signature:
Charles van den Heuvel (chair)	
Graeme Earl	
Robin Skeates	
Ms. Tsiapou Sotiroula	

Date: …11/1/2019……….

300_1_1_ external_evaluation_report_en.docx/EpI