

Doc. 300.1.1

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

Date: 22 May 2024.

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

- **Higher Education Institution:** University of Nicosia
- **Town:** Nicosia
- **School/Faculty (if applicable):** School/Faculty
- **Department/ Sector:** Law
- **Programme of study- Name (Duration, ECTS, Cycle)**
In Greek: Ποινικό Δίκαιο και Εξαρτήσεις (Μάστερ)
In English: Criminal Law and Addictions (1,5 years, 90 ECTS, Masters), Joint with AUTH
- **Language(s) of instruction:** Greek
- **Programme’s status:** Currently in operation
- **Concentrations (if any):**
In Greek: Α. Ποινικό Δίκαιο των Εξαρτήσεων
Β. Νομική και Θεραπευτική Μεταχείριση των Εξαρτήσεων
In English: A) Criminal law for Addictions, B) Legal and Therapeutic Treatment for Addictions



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





A. Introduction

This part includes basic information regarding the onsite visit.

The committee visited the premises of the University of Nicosia (UNIC) and held meetings with the key stakeholders from all three co-operating institutions (UNIC; Aristotle University, Greece; and ΚΕΘΕΑ); current students and graduates of the programme; and members of the teaching and administrative staff. The visit took place on Monday, May 20, 2024 between 9am–5pm. During the meeting, the committee attended and received copies of presentations in addition to the pre-circulated material. There were several Q&A sessions which addressed questions raised by the members of the committee and additional information. The committee would like to comment favourably on the hospitality, warm co-operation and openness of all the participants.



B. External Evaluation Committee (EEC)

<i>Name</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>University</i>
Prof. Roger Leng	Chair of the committee	University of Warwick
Prof. Saskia Hufnagel	member	University of Sydney
Prof. Emmanuel Voyiakis	member	LSE
Prof. Aikaterini Pantazatou	member	University of Luxemburg
Prof. Antonios Kyprianides	student member	University of Cyprus
Name	Position	University

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*
 - *supports the organisation of the quality assurance system through appropriate structures, regulations and processes*
 - *supports teaching, administrative staff and students to take on their responsibilities in quality assurance*
 - *ensures academic integrity and freedom and is vigilant against academic fraud*
 - *guards against intolerance of any kind or discrimination against the students or staff*
 - *supports the involvement of external stakeholders*

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

- *is designed so that it enables smooth student progression*
- *is designed so that the exams' and assignments' content corresponds to the level of the programme and the number of ECTS*
- *defines the expected student workload in ECTS*
- *includes well-structured placement opportunities where appropriate*
- *is subject to a formal institutional approval process*
- *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*
- *is regularly monitored in the light of the latest research in the given discipline, thus ensuring that the programme is up-to-date*
- *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*
- *is reviewed and revised regularly involving students and other stakeholders*

1.3 Public information

Standards

- *Regarding the programme of study, clear, accurate, up-to date and readily accessible information is published about:*
 - *selection criteria*
 - *intended learning outcomes*
 - *qualification awarded*
 - *teaching, learning and assessment procedures*
 - *pass rates*
 - *learning opportunities available to the students*
 - *graduate employment information*

1.4 Information management

Standards

- *Information for the effective management of the programme of study is collected, monitored and analysed:*

- *key performance indicators*
 - *profile of the student population*
 - *student progression, success and drop-out rates*
 - *students' satisfaction with their programmes*
 - *learning resources and student support available*
 - *career paths of graduates*
-
- *Students and staff are involved in providing and analysing information and planning follow-up activities.*

You may also consider the following questions:

- *What is the procedure for quality assurance of the programme and who is involved?*
- *Who is involved in the study programme's design and development (launching, changing, internal evaluation) and what is taken into account (strategies, the needs of society, etc.)?*
- *How/to what extent are students themselves involved in the development of the content of their studies?*
- *Please evaluate a) whether the study programme remains current and consistent with developments in society (labour market, digital technologies, etc.), and b) whether the content and objectives of the study programme are in accordance with each other?*
- *Do the content and the delivery of the programme correspond to the European Qualifications Framework (EQF)?*
- *How is coherence of the study programme ensured, i.e., logical sequence and coherence of courses? How are substantial overlaps between courses avoided? How is it ensured that the teaching staff is aware of the content and outputs of their colleagues' work within the same study programme?*
- *How does the study programme support development of the learners' general competencies (including digital literacy, foreign language skills, entrepreneurship, communication and teamwork skills)?*
- *What are the scope and objectives of the foundation courses in the study programme (where appropriate)? What are the pass rates?*
- *How long does it take a student on average to graduate? Is the graduation rate for the study programme analogous to other European programmes with similar content? What is the pass rate per course/semester?*



- *How is it ensured that the actual student workload is in accordance with the workload expressed by ECTS?*
- *What are the opportunities for international students to participate in the study programme (courses/modules taught in a foreign language)?*
- *Is information related to the programme of study publicly available?*
- *How is the HEI evaluating the success of its graduates in the labor market? What is the feedback from graduates of the study programme on their employment and/or continuation of studies?*
- *Have the results of student feedback been analysed and taken into account, and how (e.g., when planning in-service training for the teaching staff)?*
- *What are the reasons for dropping out (voluntary withdrawal)? What has been done to reduce the number of such 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 committee was provided with extensive documentation on the quality assurance mechanisms at all three co-operating institutions. On the day of our visit, we attended detailed presentations by members of UNIC and AUTH. Representatives of ΚΕΘΕΑ were present during the discussions and contributed as appropriate.

The programme's learning outcomes are clear and specific to the purpose and content of the Joint Degree programme. The lead institution of the programme is AUTH. Co-operation between the three institutions seemed to be very smooth in every respect.

The programme has two concentrations, one focusing on criminal law and addictions, and other on legal and therapeutic responses to addictions. The thesis component allows students to develop useful research skills.

Overall, the committee found the quality assurance mechanisms to be robust and effective. Such mechanisms, typically in the form of a monitoring committee, are present at programme-, School-, and university-level. We did not identify any issues with regard to the inclusiveness of the process of programme design and quality assurance. Prospective students are provided with sufficient information about the programme. The documentation did not include specific information on graduation and drop-out rates, but the committee received answers to its questions in that regard during the visit. The general drop-out rate for postgraduate programmes appears to be in the region of 5%, though the rate for this particular programme appears to be even lower.

The programme duration is 1.5 years, and the programme is currently weighted at 90 ECTS. Admission to the programme is highly competitive, with close to 200 applications for 70 positions. This ensures that students are strongly committed to the programme.

Strengths

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

- Robust quality assurance mechanisms
- Adequate information provided to prospective students and students registered on the programme
- Very competitive admission process, which ensures that registered students are strongly committed to the programme.
- Excellent co-operation between the three institutions.

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 documentation states (at p.25) that if a staff member receives a student evaluation score of less than 3 (out of 5) for two consecutive semesters, they will be removed from the course. In discussion, neither UNIC nor AUTH representatives recognised this rule, and they agreed with the committee that it is far too draconian. The committee believes that it should be possible to remove this particular rule, and replace it with a more general provision that ensures that student evaluations are taken seriously and that students are informed of actions taken to address the points that they have raised.
- The learning outcomes do not currently include the development of research skills. As the programme does provide students with several opportunities in that regard, including empirical research, the committee recommends that an outcome to that effect be included explicitly.

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

Sub-area		<i>Non-compliant/ Partially Compliant/Compliant</i>
1	Policy for quality assurance	Compliant
1.2	Design, approval, on-going monitoring and review	Compliant
1.3	Public information	Compliant
1.4	Information management	Compliant

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

Sub-areas

2.2 Process of teaching and learning and student-centred teaching methodology

2.3 Practical training

2.4 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.*
- *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.*
- *Students are encouraged to take an active role in creating the learning process.*
- *The implementation of student-centered learning and teaching encourages a sense of autonomy in the learner, while ensuring adequate guidance and support from the teacher.*
- *Teaching methods, tools and material used in teaching are modern, effective, support the use of modern educational technologies and are regularly updated.*
- *Mutual respect within the learner-teacher relationship is promoted.*
- *The implementation of student-centred learning and teaching respects and attends to the diversity of students and their needs, enabling flexible learning paths.*
- *Appropriate procedures for dealing with students' complaints regarding the process of teaching and learning are set.*

2.2 Practical training

Standards

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

2.3 Student assessment

Standards

- *Assessment is consistent, fairly applied to all students and carried out in accordance with the stated procedures.*
- *Assessment is appropriate, transparent, objective and supports the development of the learner.*
- *The criteria for the method of assessment, as well as criteria for marking, are published in advance.*
- *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.*
- *Assessment, where possible, is carried out by more than one examiner.*
- *A formal procedure for student appeals is in place.*
- *Assessors are familiar with existing testing and examination methods and receive support in developing their own skills in this field.*
- *The regulations for assessment take into account mitigating circumstances.*

You may also consider the following questions:

- *How is it monitored that the teaching staff base their teaching and assessment methods on objectives and intended learning outcomes? Provide samples of examination papers (if available).*
- *How are students' different abilities, learning needs and learning opportunities taken into consideration when conducting educational activities?*
- *How is the development of students' general competencies (including digital skills) supported in educational activities?*
- *How is it ensured that innovative teaching methods, learning environments and learning aids that support learning are diverse and used in educational activities?*
- *Is the teaching staff using new technology in order to make the teaching process more effective?*
- *How is it ensured that theory and practice are interconnected in teaching and learning?*
- *How is practical training organised (finding practical training positions, guidelines for practical training, supervision, reporting, feedback, etc.)? What role does practical training have in achieving the objectives of the study programme? What is student feedback on the content and arrangement of practical training?*
- ***Are students actively involved in research? How is student involvement in research set up?***
- *How is supervision of student research papers (seminar papers, projects, theses, etc.) organised?*

- *Do students' assessments correspond to the European Qualifications Framework (EQF)?*
- *How are the assessment methods chosen and to what extent do students get supportive feedback on their academic progress during their studies?*
- *How is the objectivity and relevance of student assessment ensured (assessment of the degree of achievement of the intended learning outcomes)?*

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 under accreditation is a very popular programme that attracts students from different areas, including law, psychology and social sciences in general. The programme is a 1,5 year joint programme between UNIC and AUTH. The programme is highly interdisciplinary and is taught by a number of very competent academics from different disciplines. It is built around two concentrations: the Criminal law for addictions and the legal and therapeutic treatment for addictions. The programme is a 90 ECTS programme that offers 30 ECTS of compulsory courses, 15 ECTS of compulsory concentration courses, 15 ECTS of elective concentration courses and 30 ECTS for the master thesis. Furthermore, the programme offers two optional introductory courses that aim to introduce students with no relevant background to criminal law and therapeutic treatment of addictions, respectively. Elective courses require a minimum registration of 10 people in order to be offered. Feedback from the students attests that the teaching approach of the staff includes theory and practice, which was very much appreciated by the students.

Courses are offered on site during weekends in two premises in Thessaloniki (AUTH) and Athens (in the premises of UNIC there). KETHEA who is a collaborating partner in this joint programme has offices in both (and other) places. The programme addresses by and large students with other occupations, thus, the format of the programme (teaching taking place during weekends) is appropriate for those. Presence is compulsory (with reasonable accommodations as described below, under 'strengths'). E-learning platforms are put in good use by the teaching staff and different tools (e.g. videos) and types of assignments are used by the teaching staff to promote research.

Strengths

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

The committee applauds the flexibility of the teaching staff in finding ways to accommodate students who would like to pursue some elective courses, even when the minimum number of students is not met.

Teaching staff can accommodate students if they justifiably cannot attend some lectures (e.g. through streaming services, or providing the recorded lecture).

The communication with teachers is easy and regular and the teachers take into account students' feedback. The teaching staff was described by the students as very approachable.

The students learn both how to do research through the course on master thesis writing and how to connect theory and practice (connecting law to addictions).

Students were particularly happy with the interactive teaching. The flipped classroom approach and the experiential learning methods applied were particularly appreciated.

The methods of assessment are clearly explained in the 'booklet' that is distributed to the students.

The introductory courses on law and therapeutic treatment respectively were particularly appreciated.

The research component of the programme has encouraged some students to produce their own original publications in the field. Staff should be congratulated for their strong support of the research ambitions of their students.

Students appreciated very much the internship offered in the context of the programme. Internships cannot be pursued by students working full time and this is regrettable, but the committee understands that this is not to be blamed on the two Universities but the legislation and practice in place.

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.

We would encourage programme and course convenors to be as clear as they can about the split between law-related and therapeutic science-related content in each pathway and course, so as to better manage student expectations.

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

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

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.*
- *Fair, transparent and clear processes for the recruitment and development of the teaching staff are set up.*
- *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.*
- *The teaching staff is regularly engaged in professional and teaching-skills training and development.*
- *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.*
- *Innovation in teaching methods and the use of new technologies is encouraged.*
- *Conditions of employment that recognise the importance of teaching are followed.*
- *Recognised visiting teaching staff participates in teaching the study programme.*

3.2 Teaching staff number and status

Standards

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

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).*
- *Scholarly activity to strengthen the link between education and research is encouraged.*
- *The teaching staff publications are within the discipline.*
- *Teaching staff studies and publications are closely related to the programme's courses.*
- *The allocation of teaching hours compared to the time for research activity is appropriate.*

You may also consider the following questions:

- *How are the members of the teaching staff supported with regard to the development of their teaching skills? How is feedback given to members of the teaching staff regarding their teaching results and teaching skills?*
- *How is the teaching performance assessed? How does their teaching performance affect their remuneration, evaluation and/or selection?*
- *Is teaching connected with research?*
- *Does the HEI involve visiting teaching staff from other HEIs in Cyprus and abroad?*
- *What is the number, workload, qualifications and status of the teaching staff (rank, full/part timers)?*
- *Is student evaluation conducted on the teaching staff? If yes, have the results of student feedback been analysed and taken into account, and how (e.g., when planning in-service training for the teaching staff)?*

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 University of Nicosia (UNIC) has very competent teaching staff who are charged with teaching on the programme. Qualifications of UNIC staff members are impressive and they are all active researchers and have international qualifications and/or research profiles.

Aristotle University Thessaloniki is the largest university in Greece and the leading institution on the programme as it has more resources and experience in the area of addiction research than UNIC. It is a public university in Greece and the teaching staff involved in the programme are excellent teachers and researchers with an international profile.

KETHEA staff teaching on the programme are practitioners with a specialisation on addictions, but they also have academic qualifications and research experience.



All the teachers employed to teach on the programme seem very capable and enthusiastic to achieve the learning outcomes and work on improving their teaching skills as well as responding to student feedback to improve their courses and make the student experience excellent.

The conditions of staff employed depend on the institutions and in the case of Aristotle University Thessaloniki the financial restraints were mentioned as well as frequent changes to the law that affected staff and the way the programme was taught. Furthermore, as a result of the pandemic teaching staff was reduced from 120 to 68 increasing the workload for staff. However, staff appeared to have adapted to these conditions and they did not generally affect the way the programme was organised and taught.

With a view to research and research-teaching synergies Aristotle University Thessaloniki staff is extremely research active but has very limited research support (and only about 500 Euros available per year for research dissemination, such as conference participation). UNIC has very good strategies in place to encourage research and dissemination. The successful grant applicant at UNIC can keep the grant money with a very limited 20% overhead which effectively means they can double their salary over the time of the grant while not having to do teaching. The research dissemination is supported with 1,500 Euros for conference travel per year and encouraged.

KETHEA is not a research institution, but staff seem nevertheless very research active.

In relation to feedback, students are sent evaluation forms to fill in and submit. A special programme specific committee regularly discusses these evaluations and takes informal actions. For example, one student complaint was that too many people were teaching on courses. As a response the number of people teaching was reduced to 1 to a maximum three teachers per course. The closing of the feedback loop was hence done informally, but efficiently. Students also reported that they were very happy with the course and responses to feedback.

Strengths

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

The University of Nicosia (UNIC), Aristotle University Thessaloniki and KETHEA have very competent teaching staff and they are all active researchers and have international qualifications and/or research profiles. All the teachers employed to teach on the programme seem very capable and enthusiastic to achieve the learning outcomes and work on improving their teaching skills as well as responding to student feedback to improve their courses and make the student experience excellent.

With a view to research and research-teaching synergies UNIC has very good strategies in place to encourage research and dissemination.

In relation to feedback, the closing of the feedback loop was done informally, but very efficiently.

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.

With a view to research and research-teaching synergies Aristotle University Thessaloniki staff is extremely research active but has very limited research support (and only about 500 Euros available per year for research dissemination, such as conference participation). More formal support would be desirable.



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

Sub-area		<i>Non-compliant/ Partially Compliant/Compliant</i>
3	Teaching staff recruitment and development	Compliant
3.2	Teaching staff number and status	Compliant
3.3	Synergies of teaching and research	Compliant

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

4.2 Student progression

Standards

- *Pre-defined and published regulations regarding student progression are in place.*
- *Processes and tools to collect, monitor and act on information on student progression, are in place.*

4.3 Student recognition

Standards

- *Pre-defined and published regulations regarding student recognition are in place.*
- *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.*
- *Appropriate recognition procedures are in place that rely on:*
 - *institutional practice for recognition being in line with the principles of the Lisbon Recognition Convention*

- *cooperation with other institutions, quality assurance agencies and the national ENIC/NARIC centre with a view to ensuring coherent recognition across the country*

4.4 Student certification

Standards

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

You may also consider the following questions:

- *Are the admission requirements for the study programme appropriate? How is the students' prior preparation/education assessed (including the level of international students, for example)?*
- *How is the procedure of recognition for prior learning and work experience ensured, including recognition of study results acquired at foreign higher education institutions?*
- *Is the certification of the HEI accompanied by a diploma supplement, which is in line with European and international standards?*

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 recruits about 70 students per annum who are currently taught in two cohorts based at the Aristotle University and at UNIC premises in Athens. Demand for the programme is strong with in the region of 220 applicants per year. The published criteria for admission are appropriate and include a subjective element which is tested by an interview conducted by either two or three teachers on the programme representing the two universities and KETHEA. Because of the high ratio of applications to places, the programme can be very selective and as a result the quality of students is very high.

Experience of practice in criminal law, psychology, social work and therapy is given appropriate weight in the admissions process.

Students are provided with clear information about the requirements for progression within the programme. Failures in attendance may lead to a requirement to re-take a course. However, the programme has clear procedures for accommodating students who are unable to attend for medical or other reasons and in such cases students are permitted access to recorded learning sessions in lieu of attendance.

Students are drawn from two groups: (i) those with law qualifications, many of whom are practitioners; (ii) students from social science backgrounds, typically psychology, sociology, social work and counselling, many of whom are practitioners.

Strengths

- The interview process places a significant burden on staff members but is indicative of a strong commitment to the quality of the programme.
- The interview stage of the admissions process, ensures that students admitted to the programme are not only well qualified but also strongly motivated. It also facilitates counselling of students from non-law backgrounds in relation to the challenge of legal studies.
- The recruitment of students from law and social science academic and professional backgrounds facilitates true inter-disciplinarity in the programme.
- The minimum attendance requirements are important because of the value of interaction between students with different professional backgrounds.

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

Click or tap here to enter text.

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 committee has no recommendations for improvement.



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

Sub-area		<i>Non-compliant/ Partially Compliant/Compliant</i>
4	Student admission, processes and criteria	Compliant
4.2	Student progression	Compliant
4.3	Student recognition	Compliant
4.4	Student certification	Compliant

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.*
- *Adequacy of resources is ensured for changing circumstances (change in student numbers, etc.).*
- *All resources are fit for purpose.*
- *Student-centred learning and flexible modes of learning and teaching, are taken into account when allocating, planning and providing the learning resources.*

5.2 Physical resources

Standards

- *Physical resources, i.e. premises, libraries, study facilities, IT infrastructure, are adequate to support the study programme.*
- *Adequacy of resources is ensured for changing circumstances (change in student numbers, etc.).*
- *All resources are fit for purpose and students are informed about the services available to them.*

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.*
- *Adequacy of resources is ensured for changing circumstances (change in student numbers, etc.).*
- *All resources are fit for purpose and students are informed about the services available to them.*

5.4 Student support

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.*
- *Students are informed about the services available to them.*
- *Student-centred learning and flexible modes of learning and teaching, are taken into account when allocating, planning and providing student support.*
- *Students' mobility within and across higher education systems is encouraged and supported.*

You may also consider the following questions:

- *Evaluate the supply of teaching materials and equipment (including teaching labs, expendable materials, etc.), the condition of classrooms, adequacy of financial resources to conduct the study programme and achieve its objectives. What needs to be supplemented/ improved?*
- *What is the feedback from the teaching staff on the availability of teaching materials, classrooms, etc.?*
- *Are the resources in accordance with actual (changing) needs and contemporary requirements? How is the effectiveness of using resources ensured?*
- *What are the resource-related trends and future risks (risks arising from changing numbers of students, obsolescence of teaching equipment, etc.)? How are these trends taken into account and how are the risks mitigated?*
- *Evaluate student feedback on support services. Based on student feedback, which support services (including information flow, counselling) need further development?*
- *How is student learning within the standard period of study supported (student counselling, flexibility of the study programme, etc.)?*

- *How students' special needs are considered (different capabilities, different levels of academic preparation, special needs due to physical disabilities, etc.)?*
- *How is student mobility being supported?*

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.

Overall, the committee found that the existing mechanisms of student support are perfectly adequate for the level of the courses and the demands of the programme as a whole. Students are registered in both UNIC and AUTH systems and have access to resources from both. The teaching materials are up to date, very well informed by research. During our discussions, it became clear that physical resources appear to be fully adequate to the needs of staff and students.

The programme pays particular emphasis on the diverse needs of different cohorts of students. Those with a law background receive adequate instruction on therapeutic methods and practices, while those with a therapeutic background receive adequate induction into law and legal thinking.

Strengths

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

- Support for diverse needs of students
- Research-led teaching and excellent resource support

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 committee did not have any suggestions for improvement, the programme seems to be running very smoothly.

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

Sub-area		<i>Non-compliant/ Partially Compliant/Compliant</i>
5	Teaching and Learning resources	Compliant



5.2	Physical resources	Compliant
5.3	Human support resources	Compliant
5.4	Student support	Compliant

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

You may also consider the following questions:

- *How is the scientific quality of the PhD thesis ensured?*
- *Is there a link between the doctoral programmes of study and the society? What is the value of the obtained degree outside academia and in the labour market?*
- *Can you please provide us with some dissertation samples?*

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.

Click or tap here to enter text.

Strengths

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

Click or tap here to enter text.

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.

Click or tap here to enter text.

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

Sub-area		<i>Non-compliant/ Partially Compliant/Compliant</i>
6	Selection criteria and requirements	Choose answer
6.2	Proposal and dissertation	Choose answer
6.3	Supervision and committees	Choose answer

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 committee is grateful to the Law Department, the University of Nicosia, and the Aristotle University, Greece for their gracious hospitality, the thoroughness of the documentation they put before us, and their openness in discussing every aspect of their application. We are also grateful to the representatives of ΚΕΘΕΑ, who were with us online during the day of the visit, and were ready to respond to our questions.

We have found the proposed Joint Degree programme to be original, very well designed, with good quality assurance mechanisms, delivered by qualified, committed and enthusiastic academic colleagues, and producing excellent graduates with a competitive advantage in the field. We are also satisfied that the new programme is well integrated in the University's and the Law School's strategic development plans, and increases the two co-operating institutions' academic profile.

On the whole, the committee gladly recommends that the programme be accredited. The very few points that we have raised in the 'areas of improvement' sections are meant solely as recommendations, which we believe will help strengthen the programme and make it even more attractive to its target market.



E. Signatures of the EEC

<i>Name</i>	<i>Signature</i>
Prof Roger Leng	
Prof Saskia Hufnagel	
Prof Emmanuel Voyiakis	
Prof Aikaterini Pantazatou	
Mr Andreas Kyprianides	
Click to enter Name	

Date: May 22, 2024