**Doc. 300.1.1**

**Date: 30/3/2023**

# External Evaluation Report
# (Conventional-face-to-face programme of study)

- **Higher Education Institution:**
  **Cyprus University of Technology**

- **Town: Limassol**

  - **School/Faculty (if applicable):  Fine and Applied Arts**

- **Department/ Sector: Fine Arts**

- **Programme of study- Name (Duration, ECTS, Cycle)**

  **In Greek:**

  Καλές Τέχνες (4 ακαδημαϊκά έτη, 242-246 ECTS, Πτυχίο)

  **In English:**

   Fine Arts (4 academic years, 242-246 ECTS, Bachelor)

- **Language(s) of instruction: Greek**

- **Programme's status:** Currently Operating

- **Concentrations (if any):**

**In Greek:** Concentrations
**In English:** Concentrations

ΔΙΠΑΕ CYQAA
ΦΟΡΕΑΣ ΔΙΑΣΦΑΛΙΣΗΣ ΚΑΙ ΠΙΣΤΟΠΟΙΗΣΗΣ ΤΗΣ ΠΟΙΟΤΗΤΑΣ ΤΗΣ ΑΝΩΤΕΡΗΣ ΕΚΠΑΙΔΕΥΣΗΣ
CYPRUS AGENCY OF QUALITY ASSURANCE AND ACCREDITATION IN HIGHER EDUCATION

eqar// enqa.

## A. Introduction

The EEC visited CUT on 30 March 2023 and met the Dean, the Head of Department, eight members of staff, five current students and one alumnus. The days was well organised and there was sufficient time provided for discussion and visit of the premises. We attended teaching sessions, spoke to students in their studios and saw a good range of examples of course work. We were well hosted, and the students were forthcoming with constructive feedback and commentary. We received all documents and supplementary materials in good time for review. During our evaluation the staff were quick and forthcoming with information and details.

Click or tap here to enter text.

## B. External Evaluation Committee (EEC)

| Name | Position | University |
|---|---|---|
| **Professor Neil Mulholland** | Professor, Chair of Contemporary Art Practice & Theory (Chair of EEC) | University of Edinburgh, Scotland |
| **Professor Susanne Clausen** | Professor of Fine Art | University of Reading, England |
| **Professor Jan von Bonsdorff** | Professor of Art History | Uppsala University, Sweden |
| **Marios Tsangaris** | Student | University of Cyprus, Cyprus |

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

- *The external evaluation report follows the structure of assessment areas.*

- *At the beginning of each assessment area there is a box presenting:*
    - (a) *sub-areas*
    - (b) *standards which are relevant to the European Standards and Guidelines (ESG)*
    - (c) *some questions that EEC may find useful.*

- *The questions aim at facilitating the understanding of each assessment area and at illustrating the range of topics covered by the standards.*

- *Under each assessment area, it is important to provide information regarding the compliance with the requirements of each sub-area. In particular, the following must be included:*

### *Findings*

*A short description of the situation in the Higher Education Institution (HEI), based on elements from the application for external evaluation and on findings from the onsite visit.*

### *Strengths*

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

### *Areas of improvement and recommendations*

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

- *The EEC should state the compliance for each sub-area (Non-compliant, Partially compliant, Compliant), which must be in agreement with everything stated in the report. It is pointed out that, in the case of standards that cannot be applied due to the status of the HEI and/or of the programme of study, N/A (= Not Applicable) should be noted.*

- *The EEC should state the conclusions and final remarks regarding the programme of study as a whole.*

- ***The report may also address other issues which the EEC finds relevant.***

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

---

**Sub-areas**

**1.1 Policy for quality assurance**
**1.2 Design, approval, on-going monitoring and review**
**1.3 Public information**
**1.4 Information management**

---

**1.1 Policy for quality assurance**

*Standards*

- *Policy for quality assurance of the programme of study:*
    - *has a formal status and is publicly available* **YES**
    - *supports the organisation of the quality assurance system through appropriate structures, regulations and processes* **YES structure (University level Committee, one member from each Department), NO in terms of supporting processes with up-to-date regulations. The regulations need to be updated with reference to ESG 2015.**
    - *supports teaching, administrative staff and students to take on their responsibilities in quality assurance* **YES and NO. Responsibility lies with the departmental representative has a good insight, but (based on module descriptors and interviews with staff), it doesn't trickle down to other staff and, (based on interviews), not to students.**
    - *ensures academic integrity and freedom and is vigilant against academic fraud* **YES**
    - *guards against intolerance of any kind or discrimination against the students or staff* **YES**
    - *supports the involvement of external stakeholders* **YES**

**1.2 Design, approval, on-going monitoring and review**

*Standards*

- *The programme of study:*
    - *is designed with overall programme objectives that are in line with the institutional strategy and have explicit intended learning outcomes*

**YES, the Programme ILOs are clearly presented in the application and in the slide presentation. They would benefit from being explicitly named 'Programme Level Learning Outcomes' - in line with ESG 2015 - and presented to the students as such.**

The Programme Level ILOs would benefit from being re-written to make them a little clearer and less cumbersome. Some of the ILOs are not ILOs (they are things that can't be learned, or where learning cannot be demonstrated. For example: 'Understand the importance of a deadline.' A student could <u>understand</u> the importance of a deadline and choose to never meet deadlines. Such a student would pass. The ILO should be 'learn and demonstrate effective time management' or something to that effect. (EEC recognise that this could simply be something lost in translation!)

The ILOs are written <u>for students</u> (not staff). The ESG 2015 gives examples of how to write Programme Level outcomes that are worded in this way.

- o *is designed by involving students and other stakeholders benefits from external expertise*

The Programme ILOs have clearly been written involving all staff on the programme. There are examples of ILOs that directly relate to staff/their modules. This is laudable on the one hand since it shows that stakeholders have input. On the other hand, the Programme ILOs can contradict each other, and present objectives to that might not be appropriate to all students if taking disability and/or specific types of practice into consideration. The Programme ILOs do not appear to have been written *with* students since they address staff, not the student body.

- o *reflects the four purposes of higher education of the Council of Europe (preparation for sustainable employment, personal development, preparation for life as active citizens in democratic societies, the development and maintenance, through teaching, learning and research, of a broad, advanced knowledge base)*

The documentation seen by the EEC seems to suggest that this standard has been met – However there is room for improvement vis a vis the breadth of the knowledge base, the relationships between the programme and employment in the sector and support for Professional Development Planning (PDP). e.g. In terms of employability, the programme is a professional degree that trains students to become professional artists. It'd therefore be better to present the professional opportunities available to artists first and foremost. As it stands, the main area of employability listed by the programme is teaching art in schools – that's not what the programme is explicitly designed to do (it's not a Bachelor Ed.) and sets the wrong expectations for applicants and students alike.

- o *is designed so that it enables smooth student progression*

YES

- o *is designed so that the exams' and assignments' content corresponds to the level of the programme and the number of ECTS*

ΔΙΠΑΕ
CYQAA
ΦΟΡΕΑΣ ΔΙΑΣΦΑΛΙΣΗΣ ΚΑΙ ΠΙΣΤΟΠΟΙΗΣΗΣ ΤΗΣ ΠΟΙΟΤΗΤΑΣ ΤΗΣ ΑΝΩΤΕΡΗΣ ΕΚΠΑΙΔΕΥΣΗΣ
CYPRUS AGENCY OF QUALITY ASSURANCE AND ACCREDITATION IN HIGHER EDUCATION

eqar//// enqa.

**The programme has edited its modules so that they are larger in ECTS terms. This should provide the right amount of time for students to complete their assessed projects. The assessments correspond with Level 6.**

> o *defines the expected student workload in ECTS*

**YES. In line with the CUT regulations, the Fine Art programme should described as 240 ECTS <u>min</u>. (not 240-44) Removes ambiguity.**

> o *includes well-structured placement opportunities where appropriate*

**YES. The new version of the programme has excellent placement opportunities set within a validated accredited module. The programme has already taken advantage of the professional placements available via Erasmus+**

> o *is subject to a formal institutional approval process*

**YES**

> o *results in a qualification that is clearly specified and communicated, and refers to the correct level of the National Qualifications Framework for Higher Education and, consequently, to the Framework for Qualifications of the European Higher Education Area*

**YES**

> o *is regularly monitored in the light of the latest research in the given discipline, thus ensuring that the programme is up-to-date*

**YES**

> o *is periodically reviewed so that it takes into account the changing needs of society, the students' workload, progression and completion, the effectiveness of procedures for assessment of students, student expectations, needs and satisfaction in relation to the programme*

**YES**

> o *is reviewed and revised regularly involving students and other stakeholders*

**YES (survey data shown to EEC)**

**1.3 Public information**

*Standards*

- *Regarding the programme of study, clear, accurate, up-to date and readily accessible information is published about:*
  - o *selection criteria*

**The selection criteria are clear and set out by the pan-Cypriot examination.**
**The examination itself is not fit for purpose. There are a few issues major here:**

ΔΙΠΑΕ
CYQAA
ΦΟΡΕΑΣ ΔΙΑΣΦΑΛΙΣΗΣ ΚΑΙ ΠΙΣΤΟΠΟΙΗΣΗΣ ΤΗΣ ΠΟΙΟΤΗΤΑΣ ΤΗΣ ΑΝΩΤΕΡΗΣ ΕΚΠΑΙΔΕΥΣΗΣ
CYPRUS AGENCY OF QUALITY ASSURANCE AND ACCREDITATION IN HIGHER EDUCATION

eqar//// enqa.

- **There are no assessment criteria and no learning outcomes for the examination of the work produced during the 5-day examination. This is not acceptable vis a vis the ECTS.**
- **The examination is not anonymised; it'd therefore be very easy to select students based on knowledge of who they are.**
- **The examination only tests students on observational drawing and sculpture. There's not examination of writing, art history, aesthetics, social practice, collaborative skills, project management, etc. This means that most of the programmes ILOs are not accommodated at all by the entrance exam. Thus, the means of assessment are archaic and do not relate to the contemporary content of the programme.**
- **The examination discriminates against persons with disabilities (e.g., vision impairment). An entrance examination cannot discriminate in such a manner.**
- **The narrow focus of the examination as it stands is biased towards / favours applicants that can afford private preparatory art education.**
- **There seems to be no obvious logic to having a timed examination. The work the students produce over 5 days could be produced in the form of a portfolio; the portfolio could then be examined. The Greek examination is only two days – so there's disparity here that needs to be addressed.**
- **Charing €50 for the examination is unfair and acts as a barrier to entry (Widening Participation issue). The Greek entrance examination, in contrast, does not charge a fee.**

**Since the CUT programme is the only public Fine Art BA in Cyprus and since CUT design the pan-Cypriot entrance examination, there's no reason for the examination to be anything other than fit for CUT's purposes.**

**CUT could work with schools in Cyprus to ensure that art education there aligns more with what happens in their programme.**

> o *intended learning outcomes*

**YES, they are published**.

> o *qualification awarded*

**YES, published**.

> o *teaching, learning and assessment procedures*

**YES, published**.
**Needs some work; more detail on assessment procedures (especially summative feedback, alignment of assessments and ILOs)**

o *pass rates*

**YES**

o *learning opportunities available to the students*

**YES**

o *graduate employment information*

**The first graduates were in 2022, so there's no information here yet**.

**1.4 Information management**

*Standards*

- *Information for the effective management of the programme of study is collected, monitored and analysed:*
  o *key performance indicators*
  o *profile of the student population*
  o *student progression, success and drop-out rates*
  o *students' satisfaction with their programmes*
  o *learning resources and student support available*
  o *career paths of graduates*

**YES**

- *Students and staff are involved in providing and analysing information and planning follow-up activities.*

**YES**

ΔΙΠΑΕ
CYQAA

ΦΟΡΕΑΣ ΔΙΑΣΦΑΛΙΣΗΣ ΚΑΙ ΠΙΣΤΟΠΟΙΗΣΗΣ ΤΗΣ ΠΟΙΟΤΗΤΑΣ ΤΗΣ ΑΝΩΤΕΡΗΣ ΕΚΠΑΙΔΕΥΣΗΣ
CYPRUS AGENCY OF QUALITY ASSURANCE AND ACCREDITATION IN HIGHER EDUCATION

eqar//// enqa.

*Findings*
*A short description of the situation in the Higher Education Institution (HEI), based on elements from the application for external evaluation and on findings from the onsite visit.*

The programme meets most of the standards in terms of program design, approval, on-going monitoring, review, and public information.

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

The programme of study is designed with clear overall objectives that are in line with the institutional strategy, involve students and other stakeholders, and reflect the four purposes of higher education of the Council of Europe. The programme also enables smooth student progression, includes well-structured placement opportunities, and results in a qualification that is clearly specified and communicated.

The overall vision and mission for the programme is well considered and up to date. It has been carefully reviewed and revised with reference to staff and student experiences over the first four years of the BA.

The cohort are lively and actively engaged; there's very clear camaraderie between staff and students. Issues that all HEIs have faced (COVID, lockdown) have been handled very effectively. Considering the programme was brand new during the initial lockdown phase, it has proven to be remarkably resilient.

*Areas of improvement and recommendations*
*A list of problem areas to be dealt with, followed by or linked to the recommendations of how to improve the situation.*

**1. The EEC recommends that CUT Quality Assurance update its assessment and feedback regulations.**

To align with ECTS / ESG 2015 CUT need to put in place clear guidelines on:

Writing clear ILOs for students
Creating assignments that are constructively aligned with ILOs
Reviewing the common marking scheme to ensure that marks are contextualised
Ensure that written/formally recorded summative feedback is given to contextualise all credit-bearing marks
(This might mean ensuring that students get written summative feedback is given on all credit-bearing ILOs)

**2. The EEC recommends that the programme remove OR update the pan-Cypriot entrance examination.**

It seems advisable to remove the entrance examination and replace it with a portfolio and school leavers qualifications approach if that's acceptable to the Cypriot Government. If not, then the EEC recommend that following points are attended to:

Creation of learning outcomes as assessment criteria for the examination of the work produced, in alignment with EQF Level 5 (or EQF Level 6 = entry to First Cycle). The entry examination or its replacement must have clearly stated assessment criteria and learning outcomes, to set the right expectations for applicants and students.

The entrance examination or its replacement should be anonymised.

The entrance examination or its replacement should test applicants on the full range of the CUT BA Fine Art programme level ILOs i.e., drawing, sculpture, writing, art history, aesthetics, social practice, collaborative skills, project management, etc.

The entrance examination or its replacement cannot discriminate against persons with disabilities. (For e.g., a vision impairment should not prevent an applicant from being accommodated).

In alignment with the rest of the EHEA, there should be no application fee.

3. **The EEC recommends that the programme update its narrative regarding 'employability'.**

The program may need to improve how it *primarily* prepares graduates for (self)employment as artists. It can do this by foregrounding the fact that this is a professional degree (much as Architecture or Law are professional degrees). Artists are particularly adept at supporting their practice through creative (entrepreneurial) means. This is far more important than affiliated forms of employment, such as becoming an art teacher.

4. **The EEC recommends that the programme should be described as 240 ECTS <u>min</u>.**

5. **The EEC recommends that all programme staff take part in Professional Development Planning (PDP) on an annual basis to ensure they are kept up to date with current learning and teaching practices in Higher Education and ADM (Art Design Media).**

**Please select what is appropriate for each of the following sub-areas:**

| Sub-area | | Non-compliant/ Partially Compliant/Compliant |
|---|---|---|
| **1.1** | Policy for quality assurance | Partially compliant |
| **1.2** | Design, approval, on-going monitoring and review | Compliant |
| **1.3** | Public information | Compliant |
| **1.4** | Information management | Compliant |

ΔΙΠΑΕ
CYQAA

ΦΟΡΕΑΣ ΔΙΑΣΦΑΛΙΣΗΣ ΚΑΙ ΠΙΣΤΟΠΟΙΗΣΗΣ ΤΗΣ ΠΟΙΟΤΗΤΑΣ ΤΗΣ ΑΝΩΤΕΡΗΣ ΕΚΠΑΙΔΕΥΣΗΣ
CYPRUS AGENCY OF QUALITY ASSURANCE AND ACCREDITATION IN HIGHER EDUCATION

eqar//// enqa.

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

---

**Sub-areas**

**2.1 Process of teaching and learning and student-centred teaching methodology**
**2.2 Practical training**
**2.3 Student assessment**

---

**2.1 Process of teaching and learning and student-centred teaching methodology**

*Standards*

- *The process of teaching and learning supports students' individual and social development.*

**YES. There's a good mix of practice and theory modules; good input from a wide range of staff who have different perspectives to offer students.**

- *The process of teaching and learning is flexible, considers different modes of delivery, where appropriate, uses a variety of pedagogical methods and facilitates the achievement of planned learning outcomes.*

**YES, the process of teaching and learning is flexible and includes different modes of delivery, using a variety of methods. The processes of teaching and learning support the ILOs for each module.**

- *Students are encouraged to take an active role in creating the learning process.*

**YES, beyond the first two years especially so. Students move from directed to self-directed learning. The overall programme design is very clear on how this is explicitly scaffolded.**

- *The implementation of student-centred learning and teaching encourages a sense of autonomy in the learner, while ensuring adequate guidance and support from the teacher.*

**YES, the core approach is student centred both in the Department and at CUT generally. Students have a lot of tutorial contact but are coached more than 'taught', so they learn to become autonomous learners relatively early in their studies.**

- *Teaching methods, tools and material used in teaching are modern, effective, support the use of modern educational technologies and are regularly updated.*

**YES, the EEC sat in on a class; it presented a good use of edutech. Students have good IT access.**

There's some use of Moodle (which was used very well in the example we were shown) but it really should be used universally, across all modules in the programme. As is, Moodle is used voluntarily by staff who decide whether to invest their time in it. This is inconsistent and impacts upon the quality of the student experience. Moodle should be used for all module documents (so that they are readily available to be viewed in advance of the modules running). Moodle is also crucially important to give students written summative feedback and for running student submissions through Turnitin.

The Department only has very limited technical fabrication facilities and no permanent technicians (print and photography with one kiln for ceramics). This is not in alignment with Fine Art technological provision elsewhere in the EHEA. A local point of comparison, the BA Fine Art in Nicosia, has a maker space that contains (limited) provision for wood and metal work. The School in CUT (Art & Design) should invest in a Maker Space that can be used by students across the School and potentially hired out over the summer period to generate income for CUT. A Maker Space would include wood, metal, 3D printing, printing, photography and A/V facilities. A full A/V studio will be in the new building; this will be a much valued technical resource that'd form part of a larger suite/Maker Space.

- *Mutual respect within the learner-teacher relationship is promoted.*

**YES**

- *The implementation of student-centred learning and teaching respects and attends to the diversity of students and their needs, enabling flexible learning paths.*

YES. The option of taking module electives is a good addition to the degree programme in this respect. There are a good range of electives available, and they have direct relevance to Fine Art. The new, larger, ECTS modules also allow more flexibility to students because they don't constrict the students to work in pre-determined media. This is another good change to the programme.

- *Appropriate procedures for dealing with students' complaints regarding the process of teaching and learning are set.*

YES, procedures are in place. It's not clear how students would lodge a complaint about their assessment or feedback. For example, if they ask for feedback, but don't get it, there's no obvious way of resolving the impasse this would create for the student since any possible resolution is always at the whim of individual members of academic faculty.

### 2.2 Practical training

*Standards*

- *Practical and theoretical studies are interconnected.*

ΔΙΠΑΕ CYQAA
ΦΟΡΕΑΣ ΔΙΑΣΦΑΛΙΣΗΣ ΚΑΙ ΠΙΣΤΟΠΟΙΗΣΗΣ ΤΗΣ ΠΟΙΟΤΗΤΑΣ ΤΗΣ ΑΝΩΤΕΡΗΣ ΕΚΠΑΙΔΕΥΣΗΣ
CYPRUS AGENCY OF QUALITY ASSURANCE AND ACCREDITATION IN HIGHER EDUCATION

eqar//// enqa.

**YES, there's clear evidence of this at the module level. Some modules are more theoretical than practical, and vice-versa – this is perfectly acceptable in a Fine Art programme. There are modules post-Year 2 that enable students to integrate theory and practice.**

- *The organisation and the content of practical training, if applicable, support the achievement of planned learning outcomes and meet the needs of the stakeholders.*

**YES**

### 2.3 Student assessment

*Standards*
- *Assessment is consistent, fairly applied to all students and carried out in accordance with the stated procedures.*

**Assessment is carried out in accordance with CUT's stated procedures. However, CUT's stated procedures do not align with the CYQAA or ESG 2015 with respect to consistency and fairness.**

**The main issue is that CUT does not require all assessments to be carried out by more than one examiner. In the Fine Art programme at CUT, there's no reason why each module cannot be assessed by more than one examiner. Larger ECTS modules can be double marked (two examiners agreeing feedback and grades), smaller modules could be monitors (with a second marker reviewing feedback and grades). Having more than one marker is essential in Fine Art since students cannot easily be anonymised; thus, assessors cannot eliminate unconscious bias. This is even more important in the CUT context where there are only c15 students on each module, all readily identifiable by the sole marker, who is also the module tutor. There's too much scope here for bias and no means of mitigating this.**

**The CUT grades used by assessors have no attached criteria. There's no way of understanding why any particular ILO would merit a grade of 5.5 over, say, an 8.5. This is because the marking scheme is entirely decontextualised. Context – marking criteria - needs to be added by the Department for every ILO in every module. This is achieved by creating a 'rubric' – a scoring tool that lists 'what counts'.**

**ILOs and assignments are not constructively aligned (à la the John Biggs' model of constructive alignment recommended by ESG) 2015. In some cases, ILOs are written in ways that are not achievable. In other cases, there's no discernable assessment task ('assignment').**

**While students receive grades at the end of each module, they do not receive written summative feedback. This, again, means that the grade is decontextualied and, as such, has no meaning. Students do not understand if or how they have met the ILOs set out at the beginning of each module, or if they have completed assignments that enable them to achieve the ILOs in the first place.**

- *Assessment is appropriate, transparent, objective and supports the development of the learner.*

**Formative feedback is appropriate and supports the development of the learner. However, due to the issues just mentioned, the summative assessment process set out by CUT cannot be objective and is not transparent (it is not recorded, there are no written statements of assessment nor is there any written feedback. The CUT Quality Assurance Committee needs to work on ensuring this is changed.**

- *The criteria for the method of assessment, as well as criteria for marking, are published in advance.*

**Each module has ILOs, but no modules have assessment criteria. This needs to be rectified at the CUT level. Once solution would be to have ILOs can 'double' as assessment criteria. The marking scale exists (1-10) but there are no marking <u>criteria</u> in CUT. See: <u>https://www.cut.ac.cy/students/practical-information/Educational+Model/Marking+System/</u> Marking criteria really need to be determined at for each Year in the programme and then situated clearly in each module. Again, the simplest way to do this is to create rubrics for grading each ILO in each module.**

- *Assessment allows students to demonstrate the extent to which the intended learning outcomes have been achieved. Students are given feedback, which, if necessary, is linked to advice on the learning process.*

**Please see the EEC's comments above. To reiterate, there's no alignment between ILOs and assessment and there are no assessment criteria used in CUT or in this programme. Students are not given written summative feedback that explains how they did in relation to each of the ILOs. This means they have no way of reflecting on their learning or of knowing how to improve.**

- *Assessment, where possible, is carried out by more than one examiner.*

**Please see EEC's comments above, re: CUT does not require all assessments to be carried out by more than one examiner. It's essential that a small programme (15 students per year) use more than one examiner across all modules to mitigate against unconscious bias.**

- *A formal procedure for student appeals is in place.*

**There is a formal procedure in place in CUT.**

**However, students who want written summative feedback on their module work do not seem to have any recourse to receiving this. They should be given written summative feedback on their work as a matter of course – however, they must request this. Their**

ΔΙΠΑΕ CYQAA

ΦΟΡΕΑΣ ΔΙΑΣΦΑΛΙΣΗΣ ΚΑΙ ΠΙΣΤΟΠΟΙΗΣΗΣ ΤΗΣ ΠΟΙΟΤΗΤΑΣ ΤΗΣ ΑΝΩΤΕΡΗΣ ΕΚΠΑΙΔΕΥΣΗΣ
CYPRUS AGENCY OF QUALITY ASSURANCE AND ACCREDITATION IN HIGHER EDUCATION

eqar//// enqa.

**requests for written summative feedback can be ignored (often the case where tutors are temporarily employed as special teachers) or denied. Since they can't ascertain why they are given a particular grade, it's not clear how they could ever make an appeal.**

- *Assessors are familiar with existing testing and examination methods and receive support in developing their own skills in this field.*

**Assessors create their own testing and examination methods. From this, however, it doesn't follow that they are familiar with the normative EHEA testing and examination methods used in Fine Art. There are no obvious ways in which staff are given support to develop skills in this field (PDP). Based on the diverse ways in which testing, and examination methods are carried out, it strongly suggests that staff are not supported here. There's a lack of consistent good practice in the Department when it comes to testing and examination methods and no sense of there being any leadership from an institutional Director of Quality/Academic Directorate in such matters.**

- *The regulations for assessment take into account mitigating circumstances.*

**YES**

---

*Findings*
*A short description of the situation in the Higher Education Institution (HEI), based on elements from the application for external evaluation and on findings from the onsite visit.*

The programme meets the standards in terms of student-centred teaching methods and practical training.

Student and staff development are well supported. The first two years are foundational and introduce students to a wide range of practical skills in fine art as well theoretical skills and methods in art history and theory. Years 3 and 4 then offer students flexibility in choosing pathways in practice to develop their individual interests. This is mirrored in the theory module, where students focus on developing contextual knowledge in support of their practice-based projects.

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

The EEC recognizes a good mix of practice and theory modules, flexible and diverse teaching and a variety of pedagogical methods as well as updated edutech in the programme.

During their studies, students move seamlessly from directed to self-directed learning.

*Areas of improvement and recommendations*
*A list of problem areas to be dealt with, followed by or linked to the recommendations of how to improve the situation.*

**1. The EEC recommends that the programme use Moodle for all modules**

Moodle is not used by all module leaders; this should be encouraged.

**2. The EEC recommends that CUT Quality Assurance update its assessment and feedback regulations.**

Writing clear ILOs for students
Creating assignments that are constructively aligned with ILOs
Reviewing the common marking scheme to ensure that marks are contextualised
Ensure that written/formally recorded summative feedback is given to contextualise all credit-bearing marks
(This might mean ensuring that students get written summative feedback is given on all credit-bearing ILOs)

The BA Fine Art could make these changes now in advance of CUT updating its regulations. This would mean that the BA Fine Art could act as an invaluable test-case for improved assessment and feedback. Working in close consultation with the students (and some graduates) on this would be very useful.

**Please select what is appropriate for each of the following sub-areas:**

| Sub-area | | *Non-compliant/*<br>*Partially Compliant/Compliant* |
|---|---|---|
| **2.1** | Process of teaching and learning and student-centred teaching methodology | Compliant |
| **2.2** | Practical training | Compliant |
| **2.3** | Student assessment | Compliant |

ΔΙΠΑΕ CYQAA ΦΟΡΕΑΣ ΔΙΑΣΦΑΛΙΣΗΣ ΚΑΙ ΠΙΣΤΟΠΟΙΗΣΗΣ ΤΗΣ ΠΟΙΟΤΗΤΑΣ ΤΗΣ ΑΝΩΤΕΡΗΣ ΕΚΠΑΙΔΕΥΣΗΣ
CYPRUS AGENCY OF QUALITY ASSURANCE AND ACCREDITATION IN HIGHER EDUCATION

eqar//// enqa.

### 3. Teaching staff *(ESG 1.5)*

---

**Sub-areas**

> **3.1 Teaching staff recruitment and development**
> **3.2 Teaching staff number and status**
> **3.3 Synergies of teaching and research**

---

**3.1 Teaching staff recruitment and development**

*Standards*

- *Institutions ensure the competence of their teaching staff.*

**The teaching staff are very clearly competent and well qualified.**

**However, as stated above, as assessors they need to be engaged annually in teaching and assessment skills and methods training. In most EHEA institutions, 5% of staff time is dedicated to such PDP (non-research related staff training). It seems this is left to the discretion of each member of staff. Since such PDP is essential to all staff, it can't be discretionary.**

- *Fair, transparent and clear processes for the recruitment and development of the teaching staff are set up.*

**YES**

- *Teaching staff qualifications are adequate to achieve the objectives and planned learning outcomes of the study programme, and to ensure quality and sustainability of the teaching and learning.*

**YES**

- *The teaching staff is regularly engaged in professional and teaching-skills training and development.*

**See EEC's comments above**.

- *Promotion of the teaching staff takes into account the quality of their teaching, their research activity, the development of their teaching skills and their mobility.*

**YES**

- *Innovation in teaching methods and the use of new technologies is encouraged.*

**There are good examples of innovative teaching methods being used. There are also good examples of moodle and related edutech in the programme. This, however, is inconsistent. Since, again, it's at the discretion of each member of**

ΔΙΠΑΕ
CYQAA
ΦΟΡΕΑΣ ΔΙΑΣΦΑΛΙΣΗΣ ΚΑΙ ΠΙΣΤΟΠΟΙΗΣΗΣ ΤΗΣ ΠΟΙΟΤΗΤΑΣ ΤΗΣ ΑΝΩΤΕΡΗΣ ΕΚΠΑΙΔΕΥΣΗΣ
CYPRUS AGENCY OF QUALITY ASSURANCE AND ACCREDITATION IN HIGHER EDUCATION

eqar/// enqa.

**academic staff, the use of edutech is patchy: some staff use it, many do not. It'd be good to have a champion in the Department for edutech (e.g., a moodle champion) who could introduce and train colleagues in the use of, say, moodle. This would help get all staff up to speed with the technology so that they can all use it. It's also important to do this to collectively agree and set threshold standards in the department for what should be a 100% take-up of moodle. The student experience would then be more consistent that it is currently. The same can be said of teaching innovation – a lead on teaching innovation and a forum for sharing best practice is important.**

- *Conditions of employment that recognise the importance of teaching are followed.*
**YES**

- *Recognised visiting teaching staff participate in teaching the study programme.*
**YES**

## 3.2 Teaching staff number and status

*Standards*

- *The number of the teaching staff is adequate to support the programme of study.*
**YES**
- *The teaching staff status (rank, full/part time) is appropriate to offer a quality programme of study.*
**YES**
- *Visiting staff number does not exceed the number of the permanent staff.*
**YES, compliant**.

## 3.3 Synergies of teaching and research

*Standards*

- *The teaching staff collaborate in the fields of teaching and research within the HEI and with partners outside (practitioners in their fields, employers, and staff members at other HEIs in Cyprus or abroad).*

**YES, all staff have 'Labs' attached to and supportive of their research; the Labs are generously funded for two years after which staff find external funding to run them. The Labs can operate as hubs for research and, as such tend to include external partners as a default. This seems like a very good system.**

- *Scholarly activity to strengthen the link between education and research is encouraged.*

ΔΙΠΑΕ
CYQAA
ΦΟΡΕΑΣ ΔΙΑΣΦΑΛΙΣΗΣ ΚΑΙ ΠΙΣΤΟΠΟΙΗΣΗΣ ΤΗΣ ΠΟΙΟΤΗΤΑΣ ΤΗΣ ΑΝΩΤΕΡΗΣ ΕΚΠΑΙΔΕΥΣΗΣ
CYPRUS AGENCY OF QUALITY ASSURANCE AND ACCREDITATION IN HIGHER EDUCATION

eqar//// enqa.

**YES, one or two staff work on educational research. It'd be good to see them take a lead on this in the Department in terms of the QAA issues mentioned above (feedback and assessment) and, perhaps also, in establishing a Lab around this.**

- *The teaching staff publications are within the discipline.*

**YES**

- *Teaching staff studies and publications are closely related to the programme's courses.*

**YES**

- *The allocation of teaching hours compared to the time for research activity is appropriate.*

**YES**

*Findings*

*A short description of the situation in the Higher Education Institution (HEI), based on elements from the application for external evaluation and on findings from the onsite visit.*

The programme meets the standards in terms of competence of the teaching staff, the number and status of the teachers, and synergies of teaching and research.

*Strengths*

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

The teaching staff are clearly very competent and innovative teaching methods are used.

The teaching staff go beyond expectations in supporting students; especially so during COVID.

There were some great examples of innovative teaching methods being used, particularly in the use moodle and related edutech.

Some staff are clearly very knowledgeable of current educational research; this is a real asset to the Department.

The EEC thought that the seed-funded Labs approach was very good for staff. The involvement of students in the Labs is something that could be very beneficial.

*Areas of improvement and recommendations*

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

**1. The EEC recommends that all programme staff are upskilled in ESG 2015 compliant assessment skills and processes**

**2. The EEC recommends that all programme staff learn and use Moodle**

Moodle is not used by all module leaders; this should be encouraged.

**3. The EEC recommends that programme staff have PDP / non-research related staff training as a formal part of their contract.**

This would be particularly beneficial also for induction of temporary / new staff, ensuring that time is set aside to induct them with the Department and CUT. This will also help with ensuring that there is a more consistent approach to assessment and summative feedback.

**Please select what is appropriate for each of the following sub-areas:**

| Sub-area | | *Non-compliant/* *Partially Compliant/Compliant* |
|---|---|---|
| **3.1** | Teaching staff recruitment and development | Compliant |
| **3.2** | Teaching staff number and status | Compliant |
| **3.3** | Synergies of teaching and research | Compliant |

ΔΙΠΑΕ CYQAA
ΦΟΡΕΑΣ ΔΙΑΣΦΑΛΙΣΗΣ ΚΑΙ ΠΙΣΤΟΠΟΙΗΣΗΣ ΤΗΣ ΠΟΙΟΤΗΤΑΣ ΤΗΣ ΑΝΩΤΕΡΗΣ ΕΚΠΑΙΔΕΥΣΗΣ
CYPRUS AGENCY OF QUALITY ASSURANCE AND ACCREDITATION IN HIGHER EDUCATION

eqar/// enqa.

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

> **Sub-areas**
>
> **4.1 Student admission, processes and criteria**
> **4.2 Student progression**
> **4.3 Student recognition**
> **4.4 Student certification**

---

### 4.1 Student admission, processes and criteria

*Standards*

- *Pre-defined and published regulations regarding student admission are in place.*

**YES**

- *Access policies, admission processes and criteria are implemented consistently and in a transparent manner.*

**YES**

### 4.2 Student progression

*Standards*

- *Pre-defined and published regulations regarding student progression are in place.*

**YES**

- *Processes and tools to collect, monitor and act on information on student progression, are in place.*

**YES**

### 4.3 Student recognition

*Standards*

- *Pre-defined and published regulations regarding student recognition are in place.*

**YES**

- *Fair recognition of higher education qualifications, periods of study and prior learning, including the recognition of non-formal and informal learning, are essential components for ensuring the students' progress in their studies, while promoting mobility.*

**YES**

- *Appropriate recognition procedures are in place that rely on:*
  - *institutional practice for recognition being in line with the principles of the Lisbon Recognition Convention*

> o *cooperation with other institutions, quality assurance agencies and the national ENIC/NARIC centre with a view to ensuring coherent recognition across the country*
>
> **YES**
>
> ### 4.4 Student certification
>
> *Standards*
>
> - *Pre-defined and published regulations regarding student certification are in place.*
>
> **YES**
> - *Students receive certification explaining the qualification gained, including achieved learning outcomes and the context, level, content and status of the studies that were pursued and successfully completed.*
>
> **The EEC are not sure if CUT provide graduates with an EDS (European Diploma Supplement) on graduation. CUT should simply confirm if they do provide an EDS. If they do not, then CUT should put an EDS in place for all students.**

*Findings*
*A short description of the situation in the Higher Education Institution (HEI), based on elements from the application for external evaluation and on findings from the onsite visit.*

The programme meets most of the standards in terms of student admission, recognition, and certification.

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

n/a

*Areas of improvement and recommendations*
*A list of problem areas to be dealt with, followed by or linked to the recommendations of how to improve the situation.*

No recommendations for improvement.

**Please select what is appropriate for each of the following sub-areas:**

| Sub-area | | Non-compliant/ Partially Compliant/Compliant |
|---|---|---|
| **4.1** | Student admission, processes and criteria | Compliant |
| **4.2** | Student progression | Compliant |
| **4.3** | Student recognition | Compliant |
| **4.4** | Student certification | Compliant |

ΦΟΡΕΑΣ ΔΙΑΣΦΑΛΙΣΗΣ ΚΑΙ ΠΙΣΤΟΠΟΙΗΣΗΣ ΤΗΣ ΠΟΙΟΤΗΤΑΣ ΤΗΣ ΑΝΩΤΕΡΗΣ ΕΚΠΑΙΔΕΥΣΗΣ
ΔΙΠΑΕ
CYQAA CYPRUS AGENCY OF QUALITY ASSURANCE AND ACCREDITATION IN HIGHER EDUCATION

eqar//// enqa.

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

> **Sub-areas**
>
> **5.1 Teaching and Learning resources**
> **5.2 Physical resources**
> **5.3 Human support resources**
> **5.4 Student support**

---

**5.1 Teaching and Learning resources**

*Standards*

- *Adequate and readily accessible teaching and learning resources (teaching and learning environments, materials, aids and equipment) are provided to students and support the achievement of objectives in the study programme.*

**YES, overall. See 2.1 on the need to provide technical fabrication workshops ('Maker Space').**

- *Adequacy of resources is ensured for changing circumstances (change in student numbers, etc.).*

**YES, the Department has already broken ground on its new campus space; the new space will help accommodate the students as the programme doubles from approx. 60 to 120 students over the next 4-5 years.**

- *All resources are fit for purpose*

**YES, on the whole, but, again, please see 2.1 on the need to provide technical fabrication workshops ('Maker Space').**

- *Student-centred learning and flexible modes of learning and teaching, are taken into account when allocating, planning and providing the learning resources.*

**YES**

**5.2 Physical resources**

*Standards*

- *Physical resources, i.e. premises, libraries, study facilities, IT infrastructure, are adequate to support the study programme.*

**The CUT has a good library with both physical and ebooks available for students on the programme. Students have JSTOR access albeit limited. Students can access and borrow from the Limassol municipal library as well as university libraries in Nicosia and elsewhere in Cyprus. Students can also access interlibrary loans if they can't find what they need through these means.**

**Students on the programme are given materials to create artworks; this is very commendable as it helps establish parity between students.**

- *Adequacy of resources is ensured for changing circumstances (change in student numbers, etc.).*

**The programme, which is entering its 5th year, is housed in a brand-new building which is purpose-built and generally well equipped. It has some issues with a lack of wall space; hopefully this will be ironed out with the new campus currently being built. The new building will be the newest purpose-built art school in Europe (currently KUVA, UniArts Helsinki); something worth promoting.**

- *All resources are fit for purpose and students are informed about the services available to them.*

 **YES**

**5.3 Human support resources**

*Standards*

- *Human support resources, i.e. tutors/mentors, counsellors, other advisers, qualified administrative staff, are adequate to support the study programme.*

**YES**

- *Adequacy of resources is ensured for changing circumstances (change in student numbers, etc.).*

**YES**

- *All resources are fit for purpose and students are informed about the services available to them.*

**YES**

**5.4 Student support**

ΔΙΠΑΕ
CYQAA

ΦΟΡΕΑΣ ΔΙΑΣΦΑΛΙΣΗΣ ΚΑΙ ΠΙΣΤΟΠΟΙΗΣΗΣ ΤΗΣ ΠΟΙΟΤΗΤΑΣ ΤΗΣ ΑΝΩΤΕΡΗΣ ΕΚΠΑΙΔΕΥΣΗΣ
CYPRUS AGENCY OF QUALITY ASSURANCE AND ACCREDITATION IN HIGHER EDUCATION

eqar//// enqa.

*Standards*

- *Student support is provided covering the needs of a diverse student population, such as mature, part-time, employed and international students and students with special needs.*

**YES**

- *Students are informed about the services available to them.*

**YES**

- *Student-centred learning and flexible modes of learning and teaching, are taken into account when allocating, planning and providing student support.*

**YES**

- *Students' mobility within and across higher education systems is encouraged and supported.*

**YES. Erasmus+ staff and student mobility is a particular strength and is impressive given that the programme is only just over 4 years old. There are good Eramus+ partners in place, new ones lined up and a good consortium of European Technical Universities to work with too (EUt).**

*Findings*
*A short description of the situation in the Higher Education Institution (HEI), based on elements from the application for external evaluation and on findings from the onsite visit.*

The programme meets the standards in terms of teaching and learning resources, physical resources (libraries, IT infrastructure), mentors and counsellors, and other student support.

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

The programme will double its student intake in the next years, as CUT builds new facilities; when this happens, it will be the newest purpose-built art school in Europe. It is impressive that the department provides artistic materials to the students. Students are highly mobile within and across higher education systems in Europe.

*Areas of improvement and recommendations*
*A list of problem areas to be dealt with, followed by or linked to the recommendations of how to improve the situation.*

**1. The EEC recommends that the new building incorporate technical fabrication facilities ('Maker Space')**

**Please select what is appropriate for each of the following sub-areas:**

| Sub-area | | Non-compliant/ Partially Compliant/Compliant |
|---|---|---|
| **5.1** | Teaching and Learning resources | Compliant |
| **5.2** | Physical resources | Compliant |
| **5.3** | Human support resources | Compliant |
| **5.4** | Student support | Compliant |

ΔΙΠΑΕ ΦΟΡΕΑΣ ΔΙΑΣΦΑΛΙΣΗΣ ΚΑΙ ΠΙΣΤΟΠΟΙΗΣΗΣ ΤΗΣ ΠΟΙΟΤΗΤΑΣ ΤΗΣ ΑΝΩΤΕΡΗΣ ΕΚΠΑΙΔΕΥΣΗΣ
CYQAA CYPRUS AGENCY OF QUALITY ASSURANCE AND ACCREDITATION IN HIGHER EDUCATION

eqar//// enqa.

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

> **Sub-areas**
>
> **6.1 Selection criteria and requirements**
> **6.2 Proposal and dissertation**
> **6.3 Supervision and committees**

---

### 6.1 Selection criteria and requirements

*Standards*

- *Specific criteria that the potential students need to meet for admission in the programme, as well as how the selection procedures are made, are defined.*
- *The following requirements of the doctoral degree programme are analysed and published:*
    - *the stages of completion*
    - *the minimum and maximum time of completing the programme*
    - *the examinations*
    - *the procedures for supporting and accepting the student's proposal*
    - *the criteria for obtaining the Ph.D. degree*

### 6.2 Proposal and dissertation

*Standards*

- *Specific and clear guidelines for the writing of the proposal and the dissertation are set regarding:*
    - *the chapters that are contained*
    - *the system used for the presentation of each chapter, sub-chapters and bibliography*
    - *the minimum word limit*
    - *the binding, the cover page and the prologue pages, including the pages supporting the authenticity, originality and importance of the dissertation, as well as the reference to the committee for the final evaluation*
- *There is a plagiarism check system. Information is provided on the detection of plagiarism and the consequences in case of such misconduct.*
- *The process of submitting the dissertation to the university library is set.*

### 6.3 Supervision and committees

*Standards*

- *The composition, the procedure and the criteria for the formation of the advisory committee (to whom the doctoral student submits the research proposal) are determined.*
- *The composition, the procedure and the criteria for the formation of the examining committee (to whom the doctoral student defends his/her dissertation), are determined.*
- *The duties of the supervisor-chairperson and the other members of the advisory committee towards the student are determined and include:*
    - *regular meetings*

> - o *reports per semester and feedback from supervisors*
> - o *support for writing research papers*
> - o *participation in conferences*
> - *The number of doctoral students that each chairperson supervises at the same time are determined.*

*Findings*

*A short description of the situation in the Higher Education Institution (HEI), based on elements from the application for external evaluation and on findings from the onsite visit.*

**NOT APPLICABLE**

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

**NOT APPLICABLE**

*Areas of improvement and recommendations*
*A list of problem areas to be dealt with, followed by or linked to the recommendations of how to improve the situation.*

**NOT APPLICABLE**

**Please select what is appropriate for each of the following sub-areas:**

| Sub-area | | *Non-compliant/* *Partially Compliant/Compliant* |
|---|---|---|
| **6.1** | Selection criteria and requirements | Not applicable |
| **6.2** | Proposal and dissertation | Not applicable |
| **6.3** | Supervision and committees | Not applicable |

**D. Conclusions and final remarks**

*Please provide constructive conclusions and final remarks which may form the basis upon which improvements of the quality of the programme of study under review may be achieved, with emphasis on the correspondence with the EQF.*

The EEC really enjoyed the visit. As two EEC members were part of previous visit two years ago it was great to see how the BA Fine Art is evolving and developing to become a competitive provider

in Cyprus. The course provides students with excellent educational opportunities. The staff team are active and committed in their fields and continuously reviewing the modules in both national and international context.

Students were inquisitive, articulate and clearly engaged in the development of their education. Staff were very forthcoming and transparent regarding the SWOT. The programme, departmental and institutional weaknesses were very clearly identified by staff and aligned with what students had to say. This shows, very clearly, that staff and students are in open dialogue. This frank approach was much welcomed and made the work of the EEC so much more straightforward and effective.

Issues related to assessment and feedback are primarily things to be addressed at the CUT level. CUT is a new HEI that is transitioning from a European technical institute (with a more quantitative approach to evaluation) into a European University (with a more complex, qualitative approach to assessment for learning). The Quality Assurance and enhancement culture will evolve accordingly and engage with the issues the EEC have raised. The Fine Art Department itself can spearhead the cultural change required here.

## E. Signatures of the EEC

| Name | Signature |
|------|-----------|
| **Professor Neil Mulholland** | |
| **Professor Susanne Clausen** | |
| **Professor Jan von Bonsdorff** | |
| **Marios Tsangaris** | |

**Date:** 31st March 2023