



Quality Assurance Policy

Version history

Issue Number	Date of Issue	Comments
1	09/12/2025	

1. Quality Assurance as a Strategic Pillar for the Implementation of the Vision and Mission of the University Legal Entity (U.L.E.)

1.1 Introduction

Quality assurance is one of the key pillars for the effective operation of any Higher Education Institution. Particular emphasis is placed on students, as they are at the heart of every educational process. For The University of Keele, Greece – University Legal Entity (hereinafter referred to as U.L.E.), the goal is to provide high-quality education that promotes their personal and academic development, contributing to the achievement of academic excellence. At the same time, the administrative and academic functions of the U.L.E. are being strengthened in order to meet the needs of society and provide an environment that inspires knowledge, innovation and progress.

The purpose of this document is to present the U.L.E.'s quality assurance strategy and to describe the objectives, procedures and tools used in the implementation of the Internal Quality Assurance System (IQAS). The ultimate goal is the continuous improvement of the quality of education and support services provided by the U.L.E., with the participation and cooperation of all stakeholders.

1.2 Linking Quality Assurance to the Mission and Vision of the U.L.E.

The U.L.E. seeks to establish itself as a model of academic excellence and social contribution, offering high-quality higher education that promotes equality and access for all.

At the heart of this is the promotion of scientific knowledge, interdisciplinarity and innovative research. The U.L.E.'s Quality Assurance strategy aims to develop internal structures and processes in order to promote and implement continuous improvement of operations within the framework of the vision, mission and strategy of Keele University (hereinafter referred to as the parent university).

Within this vision, the aim of the U.L.E. is to cultivate students' skills, values and critical thinking, while promoting sustainable development, social cohesion and inclusion. The U.L.E. also aims to create responsible citizens who will actively participate in society and contribute to its development.

An important part of the U.L.E.'s strategy is to connect students with the job market through collaborations with organisations in Greece and internationally. This approach aims to promote education, technology and culture, ensuring that our graduates are ready to meet the challenges of an ever-changing professional environment.

The mission of the U.L.E. is at the core of its development strategy and academic goals. In this context, the U.L.E. seeks to align its academic obligations with its social responsibility, promoting knowledge, employability and innovation in response to the needs of modern society. The academic and social mission of the U.L.E. highlights its commitment to providing high-quality, student-centred education, developing research activities, and promoting collaborations that connect the academic community with the labour market and social institutions.

1.2.1 Academic Mission

- **Offering High-Quality Education:** the U.L.E. is committed to offering higher education that is accessible to all, without exclusion. This approach is based on the principles of academic freedom, meritocracy and the social role of higher education. The main objective is to produce and transmit knowledge through teaching and research, preparing students to apply this knowledge in professional and social contexts. In addition, the promotion of science, arts, letters and culture, with the aim of developing well-rounded personalities who will actively contribute to society, complete our objectives.
- **Organisation of Educational Programmes:** The development and provision of study programmes in three cycles (first, second and third) are fundamental activities of the U.L.E. At the same time, short-term and lifelong learning programmes are being designed with a view to flexibility and adaptation to the needs of students and professionals. This strategy reinforces continuing education and lifelong learning, which are essential factors in modern society.

- **Application of Modern Teaching Methods:** The promotion of interdisciplinarity and innovative research is central to the academic mission of the U.L.E. Internationally recognised teaching standards are applied, encouraging student participation and the development of critical thinking. The use of modern technologies and learning methods contributes to an enriched educational experience.
- **Development of Student Skills:** Within the framework of education, the cultivation of abilities and skills in students is reinforced, providing them with the necessary tools for a successful scientific career. Favourable conditions are created for the emergence of new researchers and the attraction of talented scientists, promoting a dynamic research culture focused on solving real social and professional issues.
- **Promoting Research and Innovation:** Conducting innovative research is vital to the mission of the U.L.E. The U.L.E. is committed to disseminating knowledge to society and utilising research results, while adhering to the principles of scientific and research ethics. Sustainable development, social cohesion and inclusion are fundamental values that guide its research activity, while ensuring freedom in research and teaching.

1.2.2 Social Mission

- **Promoting Collaborations:** Strengthening collaborations with higher education institutions, research and technology organisations, public and international organisations, as well as productive and private entities is a fundamental objective of the U.L.E. These collaborations, both nationally and internationally, enhance the exchange of knowledge and experience, promoting collaborative research and innovation.
- **Promotion of Educational and Research Activities:** The U.L.E. is committed to developing activities that promote education, research, technology and culture. These activities will include seminars, conferences and educational programmes that will provide participants with the opportunity to actively participate in shaping the academic and social context.
- **Service to Society:** The U.L.E. responds to the needs of society and the labour market by promoting the dissemination of knowledge and the utilisation of research results. Its aim is to strengthen social cohesion and promote the common good. It constantly strives to create active citizens who will be able to contribute to solving social challenges and connect theory with practice in their professional lives.

1.3 The Quality Assurance Strategy of the U.L.E.

The vision of the U.L.E. focuses on providing high-quality, student-centred learning and education without exclusion, preparing students for the professional opportunities of the future. To achieve this vision, U.L.E. has established a system of procedures (internal and external mechanisms) to ensure and continuously improve quality. These procedures are based on a set of principles that guide the Institution's approach to quality control and assurance. A clear understanding and acceptance of these principles by all staff guarantees the effective operation of the quality assurance system and full compliance with internal and external requirements.

1.3.1 Principles

- **Priority in ensuring the quality of the student experience:** Quality assurance and improvement processes are not only about maintaining academic standards, although this is crucial to meeting student needs. The aim is to ensure the overall experience of students during their studies, recognising that all areas of the operation of the U.L.E. directly or indirectly affect the quality of the student experience, and have an impact on student performance and development.
- **Collective responsibility for quality:** Quality is considered everyone's responsibility, and the contribution of each member of staff is vital to achieving this goal. It is necessary to establish clear guidelines, responsibility, and accountability in every area of operation, while adequate support and evaluation from management is considered crucial to the success of quality objectives. The central axis of this collective effort is the commitment to continuous improvement through evaluation and action plans in all areas that govern the student experience.
- **Participation of peers (professional bodies and academic partners) in quality assurance:** Quality assurance requires regular review and comparison with the approaches of other peer institutions and professional bodies in direct relation to the U.L.E. study programmes. This ensures that appropriate standards are maintained and that there is accountability to external bodies, specific professional association specifications and future employers. At the same time, the adoption of procedures and policies is fully aligned with the academic standards and principles of the parent university, while the close and continuous relationship of support and control forms the core of the quality assurance procedures.
- **Appreciation and integration of student perspectives:** Students are considered key contributors to quality assurance and evaluation at the U.L.E. Their opinions are

regularly sought and used to continuously improve the quality of their experience. Their contribution is crucial in the design, modification, monitoring and review of study programmes.

- **Alignment with international standards to enhance quality:** The U.L.E. already follows the UK quality framework, which is guided by international standards and guidelines that promote good practice and innovation in higher education. At the same time, compliance with the requirements of professional, regulatory and supervisory bodies (PSRB) as well as with the standards and guidelines for quality assurance in the European Higher Education Area (ESG) is ensured. The Internal Quality Assurance System will also be adapted to the requirements of the National Authority for Higher Education Standards, once it is published, in accordance with the specific provisions of Law 5094/2024. The aim is to develop robust internal quality assurance systems, undergo regular external evaluations, and maintain a constant commitment to providing high-quality educational experiences.

2. Structure, organisation and operation of the Internal Quality Assurance System (IQAS)

2.1 Structure and Organisation of the IQAS

2.1.1 Staffing of the Quality Assurance and Standards Department of the U.L.E.

The Quality Assurance and Standards Department of the U.L.E. is staffed by the Dean of Quality Assurance and the department's executives. More specifically:

The **Dean of Quality and Standards** plays a central role in ensuring academic standards and overseeing the quality processes of the U.L.E. Key responsibilities include leading projects that support the development of academic collaborations, and ensuring that quality processes meet the requirements of the parent university. The Dean reports directly to the Rector of the U.L.E., providing strategic guidance and support on quality issues. He/she coordinates the management of quality assurance procedures in collaboration with staff, while recommending the implementation of initiatives to enhance quality, such as monitoring the implementation of policies and ensuring compliance with the regulations of the parent university. He/she also participates in the management of quality controls and staff training for the implementation and improvement of quality procedures.

Quality Assurance and Standards Officers have primary responsibility for the day-to-day implementation and monitoring of quality procedures. They support the Dean of Quality Assurance and Standards in the development and management of programmes and courses,

focusing on compliance with the policies and procedures of the U.L.E. and the parent university. They collaborate with executives of the parent university and external bodies to develop and implement academic collaborations, providing guidance and training to staff on the implementation of quality policy. In addition, the Officers/Executives are responsible for collecting and analysing performance data, evaluating the quality of educational provision, and managing issues arising from external examiner reports and student evaluations. They ensure the effective operation of quality procedures, monitor the progress of improvement plans and actively participate in the development of quality policies and the support of course and programme teams. They also play an active role in monitoring international developments and PSRB and QAA protocols to ensure alignment with the latest higher education requirements.

The Quality Assurance and Standards Department ensures cooperation with the administrative and academic staff of the U.L.E. through regular meetings of the U.L.E. Quality and Academic Standards Committee. Chaired by the Dean of Quality Assurance and Standards, the committee includes senior U.L.E. executives such as the Chief Executive Officer, the Vice-Rector for Academic Affairs, the Quality Assurance and Standards Department, and the Vice-Rector for Research and Innovation, and meets once a week. Its objectives are to monitor the implementation of the internal quality assurance system within the U.L.E., based on procedures and in accordance with the quality assurance system of the parent university and the national Authority for Higher Education, to collaborate with the Teaching and Learning Committee on the development and implementation of strategy and policy in relation to the student experience and teaching within the Departments/Schools. The Committee's actions are reported to the Teaching and Learning Committee and in the meetings of the Deputy Directors of Academic Affairs, where appropriate, as well as to the corresponding Quality Assurance bodies of the parent university through regular meetings. In addition, the executives of the Quality Assurance and Standards Department of the U.L.E. participate in the Committee of Deputy Directors of Academic Affairs, the Senior Management Team (SMT) of the U.L.E. and the Examination Boards. The committees within the U.L.E. ensure the uniform academic operation of the study programmes.

The Quality Assurance and Standards Department plays a central role in monitoring the quality of educational work in the buildings of the U.L.E. Its role includes the evaluation and continuous feedback on educational processes and student support services, and is ensured in the following ways:

- Creating and implementing clear internal quality control procedures (based on the U.L.E. Internal Regulations and this document) and informing U.L.E. executives

- through regular training, posting of material and presentations.
- Regular evaluation of study programmes, teaching methods and services provided, through questionnaires and annual programme reports.
 - Establishment of joint protocols with the parent University for quality monitoring and evaluation.
 - Organisation of regular meetings with the corresponding Quality Assurance departments of the parent university to exchange best practices.
 - Participation of the Dean of Quality Assurance and Standards in the meetings of the Senior Management Committee.
 - Holding regular meetings between Quality Assurance and Standards Officers and the Rector and Vice-Rector for Academic Affairs.

2.1.2 Cooperative relationship between the Quality Assurance Departments of the U.L.E. and the parent university.

The Quality Assurance and Standards Department of the U.L.E. maintains close and constructive cooperation with the Quality Assurance Department of the parent university. Communication between the two departments takes place regularly through scheduled meetings and open channels of communication, ensuring ongoing monitoring of quality issues and immediate response to new developments. This cooperation allows for the effective management of academic and quality challenges, the promotion of good practices, and the prevention of potential problems before they arise. At the same time, compliance with the regulations and procedures set out in the parent university's quality manuals is ensured, ensuring that academic procedures and educational programmes remain fully aligned with international quality standards, guidelines and the requirements of regulatory and supervisory bodies. This close cooperation allows for the timely identification and correction of potential omissions or weaknesses, ensuring that the educational experience remains of high quality and fully compliant with the requirements of the parent university.

Further information can be found in the quality manuals of the parent university:

- [Keele University Quality Manual](#)

2.2 Operation of the IQAS

The review, evaluation and setting of quality policy objectives are critical elements of the operation of the U.L.E.'s IQAS. This process involves setting annual targets to address weaknesses and improve the parameters of the U.L.E.'s educational, research and administrative work, in line with its strategic framework. Within the framework of the operation of the IQAS, continuous monitoring and systematic review of the U.L.E.'s policy is carried out

with the aim of creating a functional quality assurance framework. This framework defines the procedures and mechanisms that must be followed by the academic and administrative units of the U.L.E.

The quality objectives, which are set in accordance with the principles of the SMART framework, focus on the continuous improvement of the U.L.E.'s operations, ensuring the achievement of measurable, time-bound and understandable results. Through the IQAS procedures, the aim is to continuously develop and upgrade the quality of the academic and administrative services of the U.L.E., enhancing domestic and international recognition, student satisfaction and the overall competitiveness of the U.L.E.

2.2.1 *Objectives and Performance Indicators*

Quality policy objectives guide the formulation of strategic goals, such as improving the operation of the U.L.E., enhancing the quality of academic infrastructure, and increasing the satisfaction of students and market players. At the same time, key performance indicators (KPIs) assess the effectiveness of quality policy based on specific criteria, such as service improvement, academic unit participation, and the approval of new and reviewed study programmes.

In addition, the Research and Innovation Committee develops and promotes the Research and Innovation Strategy (RIS), develops policies and procedures, and ensures the monitoring of KPIs related to funding, networking, research activity and the involvement of students and academic staff in R&I, as well as the connection with the economy and society. The Research and Innovation Committee reports to the Vice-Rector for Research and Innovation and its activities are reported to the Academic Council.

Through its Internal Quality Assurance System (IQAS), the U.L.E. seeks to incorporate a culture of quality into all its activities. Quality assurance objectives are set for each field of activity, including education, research, innovation, administration, services and human resource development, and are reviewed periodically. This process is based on the use of measurable qualitative and quantitative targets, with the aim of continuously improving the operations of the U.L.E.

1. Quality Objectives for Educational Work

The objectives for educational work concern learning outcomes, the learning process and student satisfaction. The Quality Assurance and Standards Department, in collaboration with the administrative and academic units, draws up annual target plans based on the

criteria of the parent university (OfS, QAA). Performance indicators include graduation rate, progression rate, dropout rate and averages per study programme. The process includes:

- Collection of academic performance data.
- Preparation of quality target plans based on evaluation.
- Collaboration with Deans and approval of targets by the Academic Council.
- Monitoring performance indicators and submitting reports.

2. Quality Objectives for Infrastructure and Services

The development, operation and restructuring of infrastructure and services is supported by measurable objectives, such as the evaluation of equipment and infrastructure so as to serve academic programmes. The process includes:

- Collection of infrastructure operation data.
- Preparation of quality target plans in collaboration with academic and administrative units.
- Approval of targets by the Academic Council and their integration into information systems.

3. Quality Objectives for Human Resources

The objectives focus on staff evaluation, training and support, with indicators such as improvement of skills and knowledge. The process includes:

- Collection of data on staff distribution and employment.
- Preparation of quality target plans based on evaluation and strategy.
- Cooperation with academic and administrative units.
- Approval of objectives by the Board of Directors and release of decisions.

4. Timetable

The establishment of quality objectives is an annual and recurring process that begins at the start of each year. All parties involved coordinate to ensure quality, with the ultimate goal of continuous improvement and strengthening of the academic and administrative operation of the U.L.E.

2.2.2 *Evaluation Procedures and Remedial Action*

The Quality Policy evaluation process is part of annual reviews conducted by the Management and the Quality Assurance and Standards Department of the U.L.E. The evaluation procedures include data collection, comparative analysis of performance indicators, and the preparation of reports to Management with suggestions for

improvement. The Quality Assurance and Standards Department, in collaboration with the Academic Council and the parent University, is responsible for the ongoing monitoring of quality procedures and for promoting improvements where necessary. Improvement actions include reviewing the Quality Policy and approving the necessary changes to enhance the quality and effectiveness of the Institution's academic and administrative functions.

2.2.3 Quality Assurance Manual Review and Revision

The revision of the Quality Assurance Manual (QAM) is an ongoing process that ensures its relevance and timeliness. The review is carried out by the Quality Assurance and Standards Department and approved by the Board of Directors and the Academic Council of the U.L.E. Any change to the quality assurance manual replaces the previous version, and the new versions are distributed to the holders of controlled copies.

2.2.4 Processes and Procedures for Continuous Quality Improvement

The purpose of the IQAS is to develop, ensure the effective operation and promote the continuous improvement of the activities of the U.L.E. in all areas, focusing on education, research and innovation. Through collaboration with the Academic Council and the respective Quality Departments of the parent university, the IQAS guides the implementation and evaluation of quality procedures, recognises successful practices and manages issues that require intervention.

3. Internal Evaluation

The internal evaluation mechanisms of the U.L.E. are a key element of the internal quality assurance system, ensuring academic quality and contributing to the continuous improvement of its operations.

Systematic monitoring and strict adherence to academic regulations and standards are critical to the effectiveness of the evaluation and quality assurance process. At the same time, the existence of a unified quality framework is necessary to maintain the consistency of operations and to strengthen and ensure the uniformity of academic work, adapted to the needs, strategy and structure of the U.L.E.

3.1 Alignment of the U.L.E. with the quality policies of the parent university

The systematic supervision exercised by the parent university in collaboration with the U.L.E. reflects a comprehensive approach to ensuring that educational standards are aligned with established policies. More specifically, the parent university exercises systematic control

over the operation of the U.L.E. through regular inspections, approval of teaching staff, control of exam and assignment topics, and control of student assessment grading. In addition, exam results are validated by committees of the parent university. This rigorous approach to monitoring academic regulations strengthens the quality assurance process and guarantees that students receive the right education and assessment, with the aim of successfully completing their studies and obtaining a reliable and recognised degree.

Systematic supervision and guidance by the parent university focuses on the following practices:

- **Academic Standards and Quality Control:** The academic standards maintained by the parent University in collaboration with the U.L.E. are fundamental to ensuring the quality of education and academic excellence. In addition to general standards for teaching, assessment and student outcomes, the parent university also sets out detailed academic regulations on critical issues such as complaints and appeals procedures, conditions and procedures for resits, requirements for student promotion and conditions for graduation.
- **Approval of Teaching Staff:** The appointment of academic staff is one of the most critical aspects of maintaining high educational standards. The U.L.E. is asked by the parent University to submit candidate academic staff for approval, and will assess whether the candidates meet the required academic qualifications, professional experience, and teaching abilities. The parent university has the final say on the approval of teaching roles, ensuring that teaching staff meet the required academic standards, while the process ensures that only qualified and experienced academics undertake the teaching of students and the supervision of practical or research work.

3.2 Quality assurance in the provision of education

In light of this particularity, the U.L.E.'s concern is to ensure the quality of educational work and academic standards in all building complexes, promoting the greatest possible uniformity and equality in procedures, facilities and student experience. The simultaneous operation programmes necessitates the existence of a unified framework for quality assurance. In order for the U.L.E. to ensure the homogeneity of standards, it implements a series of mechanisms and procedures to achieve this goal, and are as follows:

3.2.1 Central support for academic teams by academic coordinators from the parent university

The central support provided to academic teams by academic coordinators from the parent

university is important for ensuring consistency and quality in the educational process. The coordinators are appointed by the parent university itself and are responsible for ensuring the harmonisation of academic procedures, with the approval of common study manuals, course guides, exam topics, etc., which are implemented in exactly the same way for each programme in each building. Academic coordinators are usually bilingual and provide significant support to academic teams through regular meetings during the academic semester, per programme of study, providing guidance and detailed feedback on student assessment and compliance with the required academic criteria.

3.2.2 Staff Development and Support – Training and Education

The continuous professional development and support of teaching and administrative staff is crucial to the success of partnerships. The U.L.E., in collaboration with the parent University, provides training and development programmes for staff so as to ensure that teaching and administrative staff have the necessary skills and knowledge to meet the demands of the modern educational environment. Teachers are encouraged to participate in training seminars, develop new teaching methods and keep up to date with the latest developments in the field of education. At the same time, support and resources are provided for the professional development of staff, as continuous training contributes to maintaining high teaching standards and the ongoing improvement of the educational process.

3.2.3 Action Plan Monitoring and Programme-Level Monitoring

At programme level, action plans are developed aiming to improve specific areas, enhance teaching quality and meet student needs. These plans are common to all programmes of study, but include references to specific points, such as issues related to building complex, highlighting any problems. The action plan is drawn up by the programme's academic team and approved by the Dean of the School. It is then submitted to the relevant academic department of the parent University, which is responsible for monitoring it in collaboration with the relevant bodies of the U.L.E. throughout the academic year.

3.3 Internal evaluation mechanisms: data collection and processing, & quality improvement

3.3.1 Building complex evaluation process (Enhancement Process)

The process of evaluation and improvement of the building complexes of the U.L.E. is supported and coordinated by the Quality Assurance and Standards Department, with the assistance and support of the Departments/Schools of the building complex, and takes place once every six months. The process is geared towards highlighting good practices, but also areas for improvement, as identified through the investigation and evaluation of the academic and

administrative work of the building complex at all levels of operation.

1. Objectives

The desired outcomes of the building complex evaluation process are as follows:

- Ensuring that all executives (academic and administrative staff) in the building complex are fully aligned with the mission of the U.L.E.
- Ensuring equivalence of practices and procedures within the building complex, both at a local level and at a School/Programme level.
- Identifying areas for improvement and highlighting needs for further staff development.

2. Procedure

The process (see Annex 1a) consists of three phases and is completed within 8-10 weeks of the initial planning meeting, depending on the number of programmes offered in each building complex.

2.1 Planning Stage (Phase 1)

During the planning stage, the Quality Assurance and Standards Department communicates with the Director and Deputy Director of Academic Affairs of the building complex. At the planning meeting:

- The objectives and scope of the process are discussed.
- The methodology is explained and participants are confirmed for the focus groups.
- Time constraints, requirements and available resources are taken into account.
- The meeting may take place in person or online, if necessary. Following the meeting, a self-assessment document (see Appendix 1b) must be submitted by the Director and Deputy Director of Academic Affairs of the building complex within two weeks.

3. Evaluation Stage (Phase 2)

It consists of two phases:

Document Evaluation

Within 3-4 weeks of the initial meeting, the Quality Department examines the following:

- Course and programme information material via the online platform (see Appendix 1c.1).
- A collection of various documents related to learning, teaching and overall quality assurance of the building complex, the School or the Programme. The documents

include faculty reports, external examiner reports, lists of available resources and library materials, as well as student satisfaction indicators. All of the above are collected by the Deputy Director of Academic Affairs in relevant electronic folders on OneDrive (see Appendix 1c.2).

No meetings are held at this stage. The Quality Assurance and Standards Department has access to the documents, and the findings are recorded in reports that are sent to the Director and Deputy Director of Academic Affairs of the building complex.

Focus groups

During visits by members of the Quality Assurance and Standards Department to the building complex, face-to-face discussions are held with:

- **Administrative Staff:** Course management, quality, research support.
- **Heads of Study Programmes and Clinical Placement/Internship Coordinators:** Teaching, student support, quality management.
- **Teaching Staff:** Teaching, student progress, quality.
- **Administrative Staff of Support Services:** Student support (Counselling Centre, Academic Support Centre, Support Centre for Students with Special Learning Needs, etc.).
- **Students:** Teaching and support experience.

Data processing - Key performance indicators (KPIs)

- **Quantitative Data:** Analysis of the quantitative indicators resulting
 - i. through the self-assessment report, such as student retention rates, teaching staff to student ratio and administrative staff to student ratio in relation to the study programmes offered by the parent University,
 - ii. through the submission of reports from student support centres, such as student participation rates in the support services offered under evaluation per academic semester,
 - iii. through the study submitted by the Head of Studies of each programme per academic semester, such as the percentage of successful completion of the programme per year of study (average grade and percentage of successful completion of courses per semester), course participation and attendance rate (through the student absence index relative to the total hours of the course offered in the semester), percentage of graduates within the expected time frame.
- **Qualitative Data:** Analysis of qualitative data from focus groups, teaching and learning

reports, evaluation documents and comments from staff and students.

3.2 Reporting and Action Plan Stage (Phase 3)

- Within the next four weeks, the Quality Assurance and Standards Department will prepare and submit a report summarising the findings, the actions required and best practices.
- The Quality Assurance and Standards Department will formulate and propose to the Director and Deputy Director of Academic Affairs of the building complex a corrective action plan, which includes clear responsibilities and timelines.
- The report and action plan (see Annex 1d) are reviewed and approved by the Deputy Director of Academic Affairs, as well as the Deans of the Schools and Heads of Study Programmes. All recommendations and corrective measures are also approved by the Management of the building complex before their implementation.
- The final report is communicated to all interested parties, including the building management, while the progress of the action plan is monitored at regular intervals by the Quality Assurance and Standards Department in collaboration with the building management.
- The findings, necessary improvements and progress on the planned actions are communicated to students and academic staff to ensure transparency and the participation of all stakeholders.

3.3.2 Academic Staff Evaluation Process

The academic staff evaluation process is based on specific and measurable evaluation criteria, such as the quality of educational content, innovation and variety of teaching and evaluation methods, the effectiveness of interaction with students, and the contribution of academic staff to research output and the academic community. The evaluation system incorporates regular feedback that allows for ongoing monitoring and identification of areas for improvement, while encouraging the continuous professional development of staff.

1. Objectives

The evaluation policy aims to create a comprehensive feedback system that includes multiple evaluation methods and procedures. Through this system, the performance of academic staff is monitored at different levels, ensuring a fair, accurate and comprehensive evaluation.

The desired outcome of the process is:

- The maintenance of high academic standards,
- Identifying the needs for further support and development of academic staff,

- Ensuring the continuous improvement and professional development of academic staff,
- Enhancing the quality and effectiveness of educational work.

2. Key performance indicators (KPIs)

- Student satisfaction rating (including course organisation and teaching materials, teaching quality and classroom presence, as well as responsiveness and support to students, guidance and academic counselling).
- Degree of achievement of learning outcomes by students (course success statistics, average grades, etc.)
- Degree of participation in administrative duties
- Degree of participation in personal and professional development and research activities
- Degree of compliance with the strategic objectives of the U.L.E.

3. Data Collection, Analysis, Assessment Tools

Data is collected through a series of assessment tools, such as anonymous lecturer evaluation questionnaires, peer teaching observation reports, self-assessment reports, and relevant discussions/interviews with School Deans/Deputy Director of Academic Affairs. The questionnaires and other procedures take place on a regular basis (semiannually and annually). The analysis of data from these specific sources of information in the context of staff evaluation leads to the identification of good practices and areas for improvement and development.

The assessment tools used to evaluate academic staff are as follows:

- Bi-annual and annual evaluation by students (anonymous), via electronic questionnaires, covering the quality of teaching and the courses offered at course and programme level (see Appendix 2).
- Semester evaluation through live teaching observation by colleagues in senior or equal positions (Peer Review), which examines teaching methods, teaching materials, the quality of teaching and support for students (see Appendix 3). The process includes providing a written report to the teacher using a special form, as well as holding a meeting between the teacher and the reviewer to discuss the findings.
- Annual evaluation by the Head of Study Programmes, which takes place through an in-depth discussion. For new lecturers, this takes place once per term during their

first year of service. Annual self-assessment by the lecturer to review their personal performance in terms of their overall scientific and educational activity, which is submitted for discussion with the Head of Study Programmes / Deputy Director of Academic Affairs (see Appendix 4).

- Assessment of the productivity of teaching staff in research and publications by the Head of Study Programmes. This assessment aims to ensure that teachers enrich their knowledge and contribute to the academic progress of the organisation.

4. Action Plan

Based on the data compiled, the Heads of Study Programmes formulate structured action plans for each Study Programme, for each reviewed member of the academic staff, with the aim of identifying areas for improvement and promoting development and training actions within the U.L.E.

The results of the evaluation are recorded by the Academic Registry and communicated to the Human Resources Department, while they are sent electronically to the members of the academic staff. At the same time, the action plan is examined by the Academic Management of the building complex, which validates the proposed improvements, determines the next steps to be taken and monitors the progress of the actions within the specific timetable that has been set, in the context of the action plan.

3.3.3 Evaluation process for administrative staff/infrastructure and services

The evaluation process for administrative staff and administrative structures/services is based on specific and measurable criteria, such as effectiveness in serving the needs of the building complex of the U.L.E., the quality of services, the organisation and coordination of administrative procedures, compliance with its regulations and strategy, and commitment to continuous development and improvement. The evaluation system incorporates feedback mechanisms, allowing for the monitoring and identification of areas for improvement, while encouraging the continuous professional development of staff. Evaluation is a critical tool for ensuring the effective operation of the U.L.E., while enhancing the professional development and satisfaction of employees.

Through transparent and fair criteria, the evaluation process ensures that the professional aspirations of staff are aligned with the organisation's strategies and priorities, while fostering an organisational culture of continuous improvement and development.

1. Objectives

The evaluation policy aims to create a comprehensive feedback system that includes multiple

evaluation methods and procedures. Through this system, the performance of management staff and services is monitored at different levels, ensuring a fair, accurate and comprehensive assessment.

The desired outcome of the process is:

- Improving the quality of administrative and support services
- Identifying the needs for further support and development of administrative staff,
- Ensuring the continuous improvement and professional development of administrative staff,
- Strengthening the team spirit and achieving high team results,
- Creating individual development plans that are aligned with the strategic objectives.

2. Performance indicators (KPIs)

- Degree of student satisfaction with the use of administrative and support services
- Response time to requests and procedures
- Degree of compliance with schedules and deadlines
- Degree of participation of administrative staff in personal and professional development activities
- Degree of efficiency and contribution to ensuring a positive student experience,
- Degree of efficiency of administrative staff and compliance with the strategic objectives of the annex.

3. Data Collection and Analysis

Data is collected through anonymous questionnaires (see Appendix 2) completed electronically by students, as the primary users of administrative services, monitoring of procedures by senior administrative staff and targeted discussions/interviews with building managers and heads of administrative structures. New tools supporting the process include the introduction of electronic data recording and analysis systems, which allow performance to be compared against predefined criteria.

Questionnaires and other evaluation procedures are carried out on a regular basis (half-yearly and annually). The analysis of data from these sources of information in the context of staff evaluation leads to the identification of good practices and areas for improvement and development.

4. Procedure - Assessment Tools

The evaluation of administrative staff and administrative services is carried out using

various evaluation tools, such as:

- Bi-annual evaluation by service users (students) covering the quality of administrative procedures and services provided (see Annex 2).
- Annual evaluation by the Head of the building complex, which is carried out through a detailed discussion.
- Annual self-assessment of administrative staff to review personal performance, submitted for discussion with the Director of the building complex (see Annex 5).
- Use of key performance indicators (KPIs) and modern methods, such as coaching and participation in important initiatives that enhance knowledge and experience.

5. Action Plan

Based on the data compiled, the Heads of Administrative Staff, in collaboration with the Quality Assurance and Standards Department, formulate structured action plans for each administrative service or sector, with the aim of identifying areas for improvement and promoting development and training actions within the U.L.E.

The action plan includes the formulation of individual development plans for each employee, which focus on key areas of development and include specific actions and timelines.

The results of the assessment and the action plan are reviewed by the Management of each sector or department, which approves the proposed improvements, determines the next steps for their implementation, and monitors the progress of the actions within the action plan within a specific timetable.

3.3.4 Academic Programme Evaluation Procedure

3.3.4.1 Academic Programme Committee

The Academic Programme Committee of the U.L.E. is one of the key mechanisms for ensuring quality and continuous improvement of study programmes. Through its operation, academic activities are evaluated, areas for improvement are identified, and the quality of the student experience is promoted. The Academic Programme Committee is chaired by the Head of the Study Programme and meets once every academic semester. Members include members of the programme's academic staff, the internship coordinator (if any), the programme's academic registry and student representatives (per year of study). Attendees may include the Deans of the School and the Department Chairs. (see Appendix 6).

1. Objectives

The main objective of the Committee is to review all academic processes, such as maintaining and enhancing the academic standards of the programme by monitoring and evaluating the objectives, goals, and structure of the programme and monitoring student feedback. The process involves collecting and analysing qualitative and quantitative data, evaluating teaching and academic regulations, and developing strategies for improving the programme.

2. Subject of discussion/Desired outcomes

The Committee examines the following areas of application of the Study Programmes by applying the relevant performance indicators (KPIs):

- **Curriculum relevance, integration of contemporary content:** Number of courses that include new trends, technologies and recent research developments.
- **Curriculum updating and alignment with academic and professional standards:** Percentage of courses that have been updated to align with the requirements of professional bodies and standards, or as part of the programme's re-accreditation.
- **Student Performance:** Percentage of students who pass exams and meet progress indicators per academic period.
- **Innovative Teaching and Assessment Methods:** Percentage of courses that apply innovative teaching methods, such as technology-supported learning, as well as a variety of assessment methods.
- **Student satisfaction and feedback integration:** Student satisfaction ratings in course and teaching evaluation surveys / Percentage of comments and suggestions from students, staff and external examiners that are incorporated into programme improvement actions.
- **Professional Settlement and Employability:** Percentage of graduates employed in their field of study within 6-12 months of graduation.

3. Data Collection and Analysis

The Committee relies on:

- **Quantitative Data:** Statistics on student progress, performance, graduation and transition to the labour market or further studies.
- **Qualitative Data:** feedback from students and the academic team, suggestions and comments from the parent university and External Examiners, as well as information from the Minutes of the relevant Committees.

4. Action Plan

The action plan includes:

- **Clear Goals and Priorities:** Defining key goals and actions to improve the programme's performance targets (KPIs).
- **Allocation of Responsibilities:** Personalised allocation of responsibilities to each member of the Committee for the implementation of the proposals.
- **Implementation Timelines:** Planning and appointment of people responsible for carrying out the proposed actions.

5. Approval and Monitoring of the Action Plan

The Academic Registry of the programme is responsible for drafting the minutes (see Annex 6), including the Committee's proposals and findings, which are then submitted for approval by the Head of Study Programmes and the Deputy Director of Academic Affairs of the building complex. Copies of the minutes are then sent by email by the Head of Academic Registries of the building complex to the Quality Assurance and Standards Department, as well as to the academic coordinator of the parent university. The results and the action plan that is formulated are part of the annual evaluation at a programme level, while the progress of the actions is monitored by the subsequent committee, which will also renew the action plan.

3.3.4.2 Annual Monitoring Report

The Schools and Departments of the U.L.E. compile annual reports to evaluate the flow and quality of their academic programmes. Annual monitoring of programmes is a key process for ensuring the quality of the education offered, taking into account quantitative and qualitative data, as well as the External Examiner's report.

1. Objectives and Procedure

The Annual Monitoring Report (see Appendix 7) is compiled at the beginning of each academic year and provides a qualitative and quantitative review of the previous academic year. The drafting process aims to provide an overall assessment of the study programme and is carried out by the Head of Study Programmes in collaboration with the academic staff and the Deputy Director of Academic Affairs. It is approved by the Dean of the School and submitted to the Quality Assurance and Standards Department for review. After consultation, the final report is submitted for review and final approval by the corresponding academic School of the parent university. The respective academic department of the parent university is responsible for monitoring the programme in collaboration with the relevant bodies of the U.L.E. throughout the academic year.

2. Content, KPIs, Data Collection and Analysis

The annual report includes an analysis of quantitative and qualitative data related to students' academic progress and developments in teaching. It covers the overall evaluation of programmes and proposes corrective actions to improve the quality of educational work. The sources from which the data are collected and the performance indicators used to evaluate them are presented here:

- **Quantitative Data**

- i. **Student performance per programme of study:** rates of successful completion of studies, rates of students continuing their studies or enrolling in postgraduate programmes, graduate employment rates.
- ii. **Student performance per course:** average grade per course, pass and fail rates for the programme under evaluation.

- **Qualitative Data**

- i. **Evaluation by External Examiners:** Summary of observations and recommendations.
- ii. **Evaluation by students and academic staff:** student satisfaction through questionnaires or other sources, evaluations by teaching staff on the quality of content and teaching, minutes of academic programme committees).
- iii. **Analysis of improvement measures:** percentage of implementation of recommendations from the previous academic year, effectiveness of corrective actions.
- iv. **Personal and professional development activities:** number of students/academic staff participate in training courses or conferences.
- v. **Compliance with SMART objectives within the action plan:** percentage of objectives achieved within the specified time frame.
- vi. **Effectiveness of the action plan:** percentage of corrective measures successfully implemented, assessment of progress on external evaluation recommendations.

3. Action Plan

Following data processing, the Action Plan is a schedule of actions to be carried out using the necessary resources, which will contribute to the achievement of the proposed improvements and the removal of weaknesses identified in the Annual Evaluation Report of the curriculum.

In particular, the Action Plan contains the following elements:

- **Recommendations:** the actions formulated by the External Examiners Committee

and the academic programme team, having studied the performance of the programme's academic team in terms of key evaluation indicators, with a view to achieving the expected results.

- **Objectives:** the desired changes expected to result from the completion of the planned actions designed to implement these recommendations. The objectives meet the SMART criteria and are therefore: Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant and Timed.
- **Actions:** planned actions to achieve the objectives. There may be more than one planned action for an objective.
- **Timeframe:** the period of time during which the objective is expected to be achieved.

In this context, the necessary resources required, such as financial, human resources, etc., for the implementation of the planned action are also taken into account.

The organised process of monitoring the progress of the action plan by the relevant academic department of the parent university includes reviewing it to measure the effectiveness of the changes made, the identification of any ongoing problems and the adjustment of approaches or actions where necessary.

Continuous monitoring of these plans is crucial to ensuring ongoing improvement and maintaining high academic standards.

After one year, assessment is made of the actions taken and the progress made in implementing the Action Plan, and a results monitoring table is drawn up, which includes the following:

- the results achieved,
- the degree to which the results have been achieved,
- the actions taken to comply with the recommendations of the external evaluation and certification

3.3.4.3 Internal Review of existing academic programmes

All programmes that are already accredited must be reviewed and reaccredited before the end of their accreditation period. The programme team and support staff at the parent university are responsible for knowing when a programme requires review. The academic team of the U.L.E. programme may propose changes to upgrade the programme, based on its needs and weaknesses.

1. Objectives and Procedure

The main objective of the review is to assess the quality of the programme, identifying examples of good practice and recognising areas that require change in order to ensure that the programme is up to date and in line with academic standards, as well as the external requirements and strategies of the collaborating professional body. The process involves reviewing the existing programme and developing the revised programme in order to obtain re-accreditation.

2. Review and Revision Process

2.1 Data Collection and Analysis

- **Quantitative data:** Student academic performance (e.g., success rates, grades, graduation and graduate employment rates, statistics on student participation in courses and assessments).
- **Qualitative data:** Student feedback via questionnaires and focus groups, evaluations by teaching staff, reports from external examiners, feedback from professional bodies, where required.

2.2 Assessment of Compliance with Quality Standards

- Internal standards of the annex, External standards (e.g., National Authority for Higher Education standards, national or international regulations, professional body expectations and labour market requirements, government policies, QAA standards).

2.3 Review of Programme Structure and Content

- Analysis of the relevance of the content to current developments in science and the market, evaluation of the appropriateness of learning outcomes in relation to education levels (e.g., undergraduate, postgraduate), review of teaching and learning methods.

2.4 Comparison with Strategic Objectives

- Checking the alignment of the programme with the strategy of the U.L.E., such as promoting research, supporting sustainability and social responsibility.

2.5 Proposal and Implementation of Modifications

- Identification of necessary changes, such as adding and removing courses, revising teaching strategies, updating learning objectives, and incorporating changes proposed by the evaluation committees.

3. Data Collection and Analysis

Data collection is carried out by reviewing the existing programme, incorporating the results

The University of Keele, Greece - University Legal Entity

of the programme quality assessment and renewal needs. This data helps to develop a revised programme that will meet the new requirements.

4. Action Plan

Once the data have been analysed, the academic team develops an action plan to modify the programme. This includes correcting deficiencies, updating content and aligning with external standards and strategies.

5. Review and Approval

The revised programme is submitted for approval by the parent university and the relevant authorities. Final approvals are based on meeting accreditation or reaccreditation requirements, and reaccreditation of the programme depends on the successful implementation of the necessary adjustments.

Students are informed of any changes to the programme through communication channels defined by the academic team, mainly through the Academic Programme Committee. These updates include new requirements, opportunities and programme modifications that affect them.

4. External evaluation and certification of the IQAS

External evaluation is an integral part of the overall quality assurance system of the U.L.E., serving as the final stage of verification and validation of the internal evaluation. Once the internal evaluation process is complete, the external evaluation reinforces the transparency, objectivity and credibility of the Annex, providing an independent assessment of the quality of its academic programmes and procedures. The external evaluation and certification of the Internal Quality Assurance System, following the licensing of the U.L.E., will be carried out by the National Authority for Higher Education, in accordance with the provisions of Greek law (Law 5094/2024 and Law 4653/2020).

The external evaluation of the Quality Assurance system for academic programmes is currently carried out by independent experts and internationally recognised bodies, such as the British Accreditation Council (BAC) and the Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) of the United Kingdom. External evaluators also examine the alignment of the U.L.E. with international standards and assess the quality of educational work, teaching, research and strategic development.

This process ensures continuous improvement and strategic alignment with the needs of students, teachers and the labour market, while highlighting the strengths of the U.L.E. and identifying areas for improvement. Through this approach, the U.L.E. is:

- Strengthening its international recognition, which attracts high-calibre teaching and research staff, as well as students.
- Improving the quality of education, research and innovation, in line with the needs of the international and Greek community.
- Developing partnerships with universities, businesses and organisations abroad, strengthening the extroversion of the U.L.E.

In addition, independent evaluation bodies use multidimensional criteria, such as teaching, research activity, transparency, extroversion and connection with society. Through these processes, the U.L.E. strengthens its position in international rankings and offers improved student experience.

External evaluations and certifications contribute significantly to the creation of a comprehensive and dynamic quality assurance system. Through the synergy of internal and external processes, the U.L.E. ensures academic excellence and the continuous improvement of its services, promoting the trust of both the academic community and external stakeholders.

4.1 Certification of Academic Programmes by the National Authority for Higher Education

The national Authority for Higher Education periodically certifies institutions, study programmes at all levels, as well as lifelong learning programmes, distance learning programmes and international collaborations. New programmes are certified before they start- at the request of the U.L.E.

The accreditation process:

- It is carried out using uniform criteria and in accordance with national legislation and European commitments.
- It is impartial, transparent and meritocratic, under the supervision of independent experts.
- It is based on evidence.
- It determines whether programmes comply with the minimum certification criteria.
- Its results are published and available to everyone.

Procedure

1. Preparation and Organisation

- The Quality Assurance and Standards Department prepares a public call for tenders

with the aim of preparing the U.L.E. and its Departments for evaluation by the National Authority for Higher Education in accordance with the applicable guidelines.

- Participation of the Quality Department in briefings to ensure the implementation of the guidelines.
- Organisation of working meetings with academic and administrative units for the planning of the project.
- Scheduled Internal invitation to units to collect and submit the required reports and materials.

2. Internal Evaluation and Submission of Proposal

- Implementation of an internal evaluation process to verify and validate information and correct the file.
- Approval and submission of the external evaluation proposal file by the Quality Assurance and Standards Department to the Department Chair, the Vice-Rector for Academic Affairs and the Rector.

3. External Evaluation and Accreditation

- Collaboration with the National Authority for Higher Education to determine the programme for the on-site visit of the External Evaluation Committee.
- Informing the parties involved about the agenda through an online meeting or on-site visit.
- Monitoring and support of the external evaluation process by the Quality Assurance and Standards Department.

4. Issuing of Decision and Publication of Results

- Submission of the Report to the National Authority for Higher Education as a result of the external evaluation.
- Issuance of a decision by the National Authority for Higher Education.
- Receipt of the final report from the Quality Assurance and Standards Department, with the results of the evaluation and the decision.
- Notification of the competent bodies of the U.L.E. (Departments, Schools, Administration) regarding the final decision.
- Submission of an appeal, if deemed necessary, against the decision of the external evaluation body.

5. Monitoring and Review

- Continuous monitoring of the progress of the Study Programme by the IQAS and submission of a progress report within two years of accreditation.
- Preparation of a Monitoring Report by the Quality Assurance and Standards Department, recording actions and comments, and submission to the Administration of the U.L.E.
- Repetition of the process every four years.

4.2 Individual Evaluations

4.2.1 Quality Assurance Assessment by the Quality Assurance Agency (QAA)

The Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education (QAA) assessment process aims to ensure quality in higher education by evaluating the programme, its procedures and its performance. The main objective is to determine whether the programme meets the required standards of quality and excellence, while identifying opportunities for continuous improvement. More specifically, the evaluation focuses on three main areas:

- **Quality and excellence evaluation:** Ensuring that the programme meets the standards of quality and excellence in higher education.
- **Compliance with international practices:** Examining the programme's compliance with international quality standards, as defined in the European Higher Education Area.
- **Continuous improvement:** Identifying areas for improvement in order to enhance the quality of education and support for students.

In addition, the academic and administrative accountability of the U.L.E. is assessed in order to ensure the effective management of the programme and its resources. This process contributes to the ongoing development and improvement of programmes, ensuring that quality requirements are met at all levels of education.

The QAA's inspection process of the parent university involves several stages, which typically include the following:

1. Preparation Phase:

- **Self-assessment:** The U.L.E., in collaboration with the parent University, must conduct an internal evaluation of its procedures, academic practices and quality assurance procedures. This may include a review of curriculum design, teaching methods, resources, student outcomes and feedback mechanisms.
- **Submission of Documents:** The U.L.E. submits evidence and documents demonstrating its compliance with the required standards. These may include policies, strategies, reports, and data related to student experience and academic performance.

2. Initial Review:

- The team of external assessors (usually subject specialists) appointed by the QAA

reviews the submitted materials to understand the quality assurance practices of the institution. This stage can identify areas of strength as well as areas requiring further consideration.

3. On-site visit

- **Visit by External Reviewers to the U.L.E.:** The QAA team of external reviewers visits the institution to conduct a more in-depth evaluation. In some cases, however, meetings may be held online. The evaluation includes meetings with academic staff, the School, students and administrative staff to gain an understanding of the academic culture of the U.L.E. and its compliance with quality assurance practices.
- **Observation of Academic Practices:** External reviewers observe teaching methods, student learning experiences, and resource effectiveness. They also evaluate how the U.L.E. implements feedback mechanisms, internal quality assurance, and improvement initiatives.

4. Evaluation and Decision

- **Assessment of Compliance with Standards:** External reviewers assess the extent to which the U.L.E. meets established standards in areas such as academic quality, student support, curriculum design, assessment methods and learning outcomes.
- **Quality Decision:** After the visit, the evaluation team makes a decision on whether the U.L.E. meets the required quality standards. This decision may include recommendations for improvement or highlight good practices that can be shared with other institutions.

5. Report and Feedback

- **Assessment Report:** A detailed report is drawn up listing the strengths of the annex, areas for improvement and the overall assessment. This report usually includes recommendations and any actions that need to be taken by the U.L.E. to address the issues identified.
- **Action Plan:** The institution is expected to develop an action plan that sets out how it will address the recommendations and implement the improvements.

6. Monitoring and Re-evaluation

- **Implementation of Improvements:** The U.L.E. is responsible for addressing the recommendations and making the necessary changes. Monitoring reports or reviews may be required to track progress.
- **Periodic Re-evaluation:** Depending on the outcome of the evaluation, a review or re-evaluation may be scheduled to ensure that improvements remain sustainable over time.

7. Ongoing Evaluation and Support

- **Continuous Improvement:** Following the formal evaluation, the U.L.E. is encouraged to continue monitoring and improving its academic and administrative processes. The QAA may provide ongoing guidance or further assessments in subsequent years.

5. Planning and Resource Allocation

5.1 Available Resources

The U.L.E. is committed to ensuring the high quality of its academic programmes through the rational management and allocation of the necessary resources to personnel, infrastructure and equipment, so that the applied IQAS can operate and be maintained, but also, so that its operational capacity, effectiveness and efficiency can be continuously improved. The U.L.E. verifies the necessary material and technical infrastructure, the appropriate working environment and the development of its human resources, so as to meet the needs for the effective execution of the system's processes.

To this end, the U.L.E. implements a systematic policy to ensure the availability of resources, which includes the following:

5.1.1 Infrastructure

In order to fulfil its mission and strategic objectives, the U.L.E. has developed a comprehensive system of information and physical infrastructure that supports teaching, study, research and other academic innovation activities. This infrastructure ensures a high-quality educational experience and research performance, while fully complying with internal and external regulatory frameworks. Below is a detailed list of the infrastructure and systems provided.

- *Physical Infrastructure*

Classrooms and Laboratories

- Classrooms equipped with modern audiovisual media and interactive whiteboards.
- Laboratories specially designed for the needs of individual study programmes.
- Laboratory equipment with cutting-edge technology, such as 3D printers and simulation systems.
- Specialised laboratories that support interdisciplinary research between Schools and Departments. The laboratories focus on supporting courses and research projects directly related to approved study programmes, ensuring a link with the parent University.
- Strengthening existing infrastructure to support innovative research projects equipped with modern tools and software that meet the needs of students and researchers.

Library and Virtual Library

- Physical study space equipped with computers and internet connection.
- Access to electronic sources, scientific articles and databases via the Koha platform.
- Electronic lending and bibliography management service.

Network and Security Infrastructure

- High-speed network with full coverage in all areas.
 - Data protection through firewalls and multi-factor authentication.
 - Cyberattack detection and prevention system (IDS/IPS).
- *Information Infrastructure*

Central Information System (SIS)

- Integration of all U.L.E. functions.
- Possibility of interconnection with the National Authority for Higher Education.
- Support for student records, attendance monitoring and internship management.

Course Management Platform (LMS)

- Implementation to support interactive teaching and collaboration.
- Integration of assessment tools, such as quizzes and assignments.

Virtual Classrooms and Laboratories

- Provision of practical exercises through simulations and virtual experiments.
- Virtual reality (VR) support for educational purposes.

Distance Learning Platform

- Ability to live stream lectures and record them for future reference.
- AI integration for personalised student support.

Digital Platforms for Research

- Electronic Repository: Storage and dissemination of theses, dissertations and research activities of academic staff and students.
- Research and Innovation Portal: Creation of a comprehensive information hub for academic staff and students.

5.1.2 Human Resources

It is ensured that academic and administrative staff have the necessary qualifications, appropriate training and support to provide quality teaching through checks carried out by the parent University. At the same time, the continuous training and development of staff is reinforced through targeted actions and structures within the U.L.E., such as the following:

The U.L.E. Staff Training Academy, a strategic training centre that focuses on the continuing education and development of academic and administrative staff, supporting the ongoing professional development of executives and aligning training needs with the organisation's strategic priorities. The Academy promotes investment in lifelong learning, personalised learning paths and the enhancement of collective expertise through mentoring. In this context, the continuous training and support of teaching staff is central to the development strategy of the U.L.E., with the aim of achieving academic excellence and quality teaching.

The Teaching and Learning Committee aims to design and monitor training, adapting it to the needs of the organisation. The main phases of training include the induction of new members at the beginning of the academic year, training seminars throughout the year, and specialised programmes from the Centre for Teaching, Research and Technology. This investment enhances teaching, academic excellence and talent development, ensuring the competitiveness and adaptability of staff to the modern demands of the academic environment. Overall, the Academy contributes to increasing efficiency, service quality, talent retention and the promotion of innovation, thus, strengthening the strategic development of the organisation.

The human resources management of the U.L.E. is carried out through the Pylon HRMS (Human Resources Management System) software, which undertakes

functions such as recruitment, payroll, performance monitoring and staff training. This system enhances transparency and efficiency in human resource management, enabling effective staff monitoring and development. In addition, with the help of Power BI, personalised reports are created that analyse complex data to enhance strategic decision-making and monitor key performance indicators (KPIs).

5.1.3 Technical Support and Technology

Teaching and research work is supported by cutting-edge technological equipment, and the tools used in educational processes are frequently updated. In addition, students are provided with access to electronic platforms and specialised software.

Note: The above conditions are subject to the approval of the parent university based on the procedure described below.

5.1.4 Student Support

A range of services are provided to facilitate students in their studies, such as counselling support, remedial teaching programmes and access to high-quality information sources. The Quality Assurance and Standards Department analyses student satisfaction as recorded through anonymous questionnaires and the Academic Programme Committee and communicates the results to the Administration and the Deans of the Schools.

5.2 Continuous Review and Improvement

The U.L.E. has established internal regulations covering the use, maintenance and monitoring of infrastructure, ensuring its efficient operation and compliance with applicable safety standards. The regulations include procedures for crisis management, regular inspection of facilities, efficient allocation of resources, as well as the assessment of needs and continuous improvement of service quality.

The U.L.E. implements resource monitoring and evaluation procedures in order to immediately identify any deficiencies and take corrective measures. A comprehensive IT Helpdesk system for managing and monitoring C assets infrastructure allows for the centralised management of all facilities and equipment through specialised software. This system records the status of the infrastructure, creates scheduled maintenance schedules and records any technical anomalies or emergencies.

Through these policies and procedures, U.L.E. ensures that it has the necessary infrastructure and appropriate resources to achieve the highest possible level of academic education and research. Furthermore, the programmes offered are in full compliance with the scientific standards, teaching staff and learning objectives of the parent university,

following the QAA standards (Subject Benchmark Statements, Framework for Higher Education Qualifications, UK Quality Code for Higher Education).

5.3 Allocation and management of programme resources

5.3.1 Resource approval process for new programmes

The U.L.E. ensures that resources are allocated correctly and effectively, while in collaboration with the parent University, it assesses the programme's needs in terms of human resources, material, and technical infrastructure for its success:

1. Initial Support and Approval:

- The process begins with the submission of the approval file to the parent University by the Dean of the School (if approved by the Board of Directors) to confirm that the new programme is in line with the strategic plan and priorities of the U.L.E.
- The submitted file includes the availability of U.L.E. staff and resources for the development of the programme, as well as the support framework from other services (administrative and support services).

2. Cost and Resource Analysis:

- During the cost analysis stage, the parent university examines the resources required to develop and implement the programme. These resources include academic and administrative staff, as well as infrastructure, logistical support, and other services (e.g., libraries, student support, promotional materials).
- The costs include both the academic hours required to develop the programme and the material resources needed, such as libraries, laboratories and equipment. The parent university also controls the programme's profit margin, based on expected enrolments and costs.

3. Strategy and Market Needs:

- The parent university analyses the market need for the new programme, as well as competition from other programmes. This includes understanding the target audience, assessing demand from interested students and employers, and evaluating the programme's viability.
- In addition, the U.L.E.'s strategy for developing new programmes is examined, which may include promoting enrolment growth or strengthening specialisation in specific areas.

4. Collaborations and Infrastructure:

- Collaboration with other Schools or Departments within the U.L.E. is examined for the development of the programme and the utilisation of existing infrastructure and resources.
- Contacts with services such as the library, technical services, student services and advertising are critical for the comprehensive assessment and allocation of the resources required for the programme's success.

As defined in the Internal Quality Assurance Manual of the U.L.E., the parent University has the overall responsibility for ensuring the quality and academic standards of all programmes offered within the U.L.E. Once initial approval for a proposed collaboration has been obtained, programmes are approved through a validation process that includes a thorough review of the dossier by a committee of the parent university, with appropriate external representation chaired by a senior member of the parent university. This process usually includes an event at the course location to validate the local provision and facilities available to prospective students.

If the parent university gives a positive decision, the proposed programme is incorporated into the operation of the U.L.E. Subsequently, the complete file for the new programme is submitted to the Ministry of Education.

5.3.2 Process for evaluating the resources of existing programmes

The updating and continuous upgrading of available resources is a critical process for ensuring the quality of the U.L.E.'s academic programmes. This process includes the following steps:

1. Needs Analysis

Each academic semester, data and information are collected for the analysis of the services offered (teaching, administrative and support staff), infrastructure, equipment and material resources, while suggestions for the maintenance, strengthening or replacing existing resources are recorded and submitted to the parent University.

2. Review of Existing Resources

- An inventory and assessment of the status of available infrastructure and equipment is carried out.
- Obsolete or non-functional elements that need to be replaced are identified.
- The adequacy of resources is compared with the requirements of academic programmes.

3. Planning a Review

- A Prioritised Resource Upgrade Plan is designed, taking into account:
 - i. The importance of the resource for the educational process.
 - ii. The cost of upgrading.
 - iii. The expected lifespan of the resource.
- The necessary resources are included in the building complex budget.

4. Implementation of Updates and Upgrades

- New or renewed resources are procured through transparent procurement procedures.
- The new resources are immediately integrated into educational and administrative processes. Staff training is provided, where necessary, on the use of new technologies or equipment.

5. Monitoring and Evaluation

- After the changes have been implemented, the effectiveness of the new resources is evaluated.
- Comments from staff and students are recorded for any further improvements.
- The results of the evaluation are communicated to the relevant administrative units.

6. Continuous Improvement

- The process is fed back with the data collected to enhance the effectiveness of future upgrades.
- New technologies and best practices resulting from developments in education and research are incorporated.

The tools for monitoring the resources offered include a series of organisational and evaluation procedures that ensure the effectiveness and quality of academic work. More specifically, the Academic Programme Committee is responsible for guiding the design and monitoring of study programmes. In addition, the Annual Programme Evaluation Reports provide regular feedback on the progress and needs of the programme. Student Questionnaires serve to record students' views on the quality of teaching and resources. At the same time, the Faculty Assembly and the Senior Management Team (SMT) play a decisive role in strategic direction and decision-making at the academic and administrative management level.

By implementing this procedure and the tools mentioned above, the U.L.E. ensures the timely adaptation of available resources to the needs of the academic community, thereby enhancing the overall quality of education provided.

5.4 Information Infrastructure and Systems of the U.L.E.

The U.L.E. has developed a comprehensive ecosystem of Information Systems, which includes a range of systems, infrastructures and services to support education and interaction between students, professors and administrative staff. At a minimum, these include:

1. Central Information System (CIS) – Student Information System (SIS):

- **Description:** The U.L.E. has a central information system that integrates all university functions, from student and staff management to financial and administrative procedures.
- **Functions:** Student enrolment, course and grade management, financial management, library management, and research activity support.
- **Interconnection:** The KPS is interconnected with the information systems of the National Authority for Higher Education for data exchange and to ensure compliance with national regulatory requirements.

2. Course Management System (LMS):

- **Description:** The U.L.E. uses a Learning Management System (LMS) to support teaching and learning.
- **Functions:** Provision of educational material, management of assignments and exams, communication between students and professors, and monitoring of student progress.

3. Library Management System:

- **Description:** The U.L.E. has a comprehensive library management system for recording, organising, and distributing books, journals, and electronic resources.
- **Functions:** Search and reserve books, manage loans, and access electronic databases.

4. Research Data Management System:

- **Description:** The U.L.E. has developed a research data management system to support the university's research activities.
- **Functions:** Storage, organisation and analysis of research data, and management of research projects and publications.

5. Network and Security Infrastructure:

- **Description:** The U.L.E. has advanced network infrastructure to support the

connectivity and security of information systems.

- **Functions:** High-speed network, wireless access throughout the university, and cyberattack protection systems.

6. IT Services:

- **Technical Support:** The U.L.E. provides technical support services for students and staff, including assistance with the use of information systems and troubleshooting technical problems.
- **Education and Training:** The U.L.E. offers education and training programmes on the use of information systems and information technologies.
- **Data Management:** The U.L.E. implements data management policies to protect personal data and ensure the integrity and confidentiality of information.

7. Quality and Security Measures:

- **Data Protection:** The U.L.E. implements personal data protection policies in accordance with the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR).
- **Information Systems Security:** The U.L.E. uses advanced security technologies to protect information systems and user data.
- **Internal and External Audits:** The U.L.E. conducts regular internal and external audits to ensure the quality and security of its information infrastructure and systems.

8. The U.L.E. website:

- **Description:** The U.L.E. has a fully functional website where all necessary information for students and staff will be posted.
- **Content:** Details of academic staff members, study programmes, tuition fees and financial charges, academic and research structures, administrative staff, and the Internal Regulations of Operation.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1 - BUILDING COMPLEX EVALUATION PROCEDURE

A) Description of the procedure

Building complex Assessment Procedure

The mission of the U.L.E. building complex assessment process is to enhance and protect the value of the building complex by providing objective assurance and risk-based advice. The advisory support, the nature and scope of which is agreed with the staff of the building complex, aims to add value and improve processes within the U.L.E.

Objectives of the process:

- To ensure that all key stakeholders in a building complex are fully aligned with the mission of the U.L.E.
- Ensuring the equivalence of practices and procedures both at the level of building complex and at the level of schools/programmes, as described in the U.L.E. Quality Management Manual.
- Identifying areas for improvement and needs for further staff development.

The Quality Assurance Department of the U.L.E. holds meetings in the building complex. The Director or Academic Deputy Director of the building complex, the academic and administrative teams, as well as the academic teaching staff and students will be informed in good time before the meeting. In this way, all participants will have sufficient time to prepare adequately and respond to the requirements of the agenda.

The meeting agenda includes the following items:

- **At the building level:**
The main elements to be considered at the building complex level relate to staffing and service provision, facility requirements, student support and library resources,

student retention and satisfaction with their studies, as well as administrative procedures related to the parent university.

- **At the School/Programme level:**

The main elements to be considered at the School/Programme level include annual reporting, stakeholder feedback, leadership, staff guidance and development, student performance, and basic documentation requirements.

The Quality Assurance Department leads the process of evaluating building complexes, with the support of the Academic Deputy Directors and the Departments/Schools. In addition, the Quality Assurance Department will have full access to the website pages relating to the study programmes offered in the building complex.

The process consists of the following three stages and is expected to be completed within 8-12 weeks (depending on the number of programmes offered per building complex) from the initial planning meeting:

1. Planning stage

During the planning stage, the Quality Assurance Department will contact the Director/Academic Deputy Director of the building complex and the Head Registry, and a meeting will be scheduled. The Dean of the Schools will be informed of the evaluation process in order to provide clarification or guidance as appropriate.

During this meeting, the following will take place:

- The objectives and scope of the process will be discussed.
- The methodology and stages of the process will be explained, and the participants for each focus group will be confirmed in accordance with evaluation stage 2.2 below.
- The estimated timeline, requirements and relevant resources will be determined - any potential issues (constraints, deadlines, etc.) that could affect the arrangements related to the process should be mentioned at this time.
- Any questions about the process will be answered.

Note: Face-to-face meetings are preferred, but this can be achieved through groups if necessary. Following the planning meeting, the Director and Academic Deputy-Director of the building complex are to complete and submit a Campus Internal Evaluation document to the Quality Department within two weeks of the meeting.

2. Evaluation stage

The evaluation stage consists of two phases: Evaluation of the building complex/programme documents and focus groups by key stakeholders of the building complex.

2.1. Document Evaluation

The evaluation will include the examination of documents relating to learning/teaching and the overall quality assurance of the building complex/School/Programme, including:

- Programme handbooks (School/Courses)
- Curriculum vitae of academic staff
- Programme committee meeting minutes/School meeting minutes
- Weekly reports for each Programme (building complex/school/specific courses)
- Annual monitoring reports (for each school/programme)
- Peer observation forms (teachers/specific to the course – Peer Review)
- Forms for selecting new teaching staff members (microteaching evaluation)
- Reports and responses from external examiners (for each school/programme)
- Examination committee minutes / joint study committee minutes (School / specific course)
- List of library facilities/resources
- Student retention rates and satisfaction ratings (especially for the campus)
- Evidence of building complex meetings
- Reports from student support services to the building complex administration
- Staff Evaluations
- Webpages (related to programmes offered at the building complex level)

At this stage, no meeting will be held. The Quality Assurance Department will have full access to the webpages relating to the programmes offered (and to the documents relating to the implementation of the programmes). The Quality Assurance Department will request certain documents that are not available to be provided via One Drive by the Academic Deputy Director and/or the Head Registry of the building complex (as applicable).

2.2. Focus groups for the building complex

The Quality Assurance Department will discuss the procedures and actions related to the implementation of the programme with the following focus groups as follows:

2.2.1 Meeting with the Senior Management of the building complex (Director and Academic Deputy Director)

The following topics will be covered:

- Management of academic structures
- Development, approval and operation of study programmes
- Curriculum management
- Academic Quality Systems
- Support for staff in carrying out research activities
- Other issues, as appropriate

2.2.2 Meeting with programme heads, practical/clinical training supervisors

The following topics are covered:

- Teaching, learning and assessment
- Support, guidance and development of students
- Quality management, assurance and improvement
- Discussion of other issues as appropriate

2.2.3 Meeting with the academic teaching staff

The following topics are covered:

- Teaching, learning and assessment
- Support and guidance for students
- Quality management, assurance and improvement
- Discussion of other topics as appropriate

2.2.4 Meeting with administrative staff (programme registry) & student support services managers

The following topics are covered:

- Student support, guidance and progress
- Quality management, assurance and improvement
- Facilities, Infrastructure and learning resources
- Other topics as appropriate

2.2.5 Meeting with students

The following topics are covered:

- Teaching, learning and assessment
- Support, guidance and development of students
- Other topics as appropriate

3. Report submission stage and final meeting with the building management

Within four weeks of the group discussions, the results of the discussions (per focus group) and the review within the improvement process will be incorporated into a written report to be submitted and signed by the Dean of the Quality Assurance Department, identifying strengths, the actions required and the recommended areas for improvement (to be reviewed at the next meeting).

When recommendations are made, a corrective action plan must be drawn up in collaboration with the building manager and the Academic Deputy Director, detailing the following:

- The issue or area for improvement
- Measures to be taken
- The persons responsible for implementing corrective actions and the manner in which they will be monitored and evaluated
- Completion Schedule

Any examples/instances of good practice per course should also be identified and compiled

The results of the reports will be communicated to all stakeholders in the programme, and the final versions will be communicated to the U.L.E. Management.

B) Sample Internal Evaluation Form

Address:

Date:

Part A: Numbers & Statistics of Personnel and Students

Administrative Staff	
Full Time	
Part Time	

Teaching Staff	
Full Time	
Part Time	
Academic Teaching Staff-to-Student Ratio	
Staff-to-Student Ratio	
Number of Programmes (undergraduate, postgraduate)	
Number of Students for the Current Academic Year	

Part B: Open-Ended Questions on Structures and Operations

1. What do you consider to be the most important achievements and actions of the building complex? How do you believe these contributed to the success of the building complex? What factors supported these achievements?
2. What activities did you initiate or actively participate in to encourage cooperation and teamwork within your team, your building complex, and/or the wider U.L.E. community?
3. What were, if any, the most significant obstacles that made it difficult for your staff to perform their work? Were you able/not able to overcome them? Please explain.

Part C: Sample findings record

C1. Building complex Evaluation Process – Stage 2: Review and Evaluation of Programme/Course Content on LMS

ACADEMIC YEAR:

BUILDING COMPLEX:

Programme Title	Course Handbook/Internship Handbook YES/NO	Code of Conduct	Information with regard to Student Support Services	Module Guides	Content per Module YES/NO (comments)

C2.

Building complex Evaluation Process – Stage 2: Review & Evaluation of Electronic Files

ACADEMIC YEAR:

FILE	CONTENT	COMMENTS FOLLOWING A MEETING WITH THE DIRECTOR AND THE DDA
CVs of teaching staff		
Samples of staff meeting minutes		
Samples of weekly reports from Programme Leaders		
Record of facilities of the building complex and library		
Self-evaluation of the building complex		
Forms for selection of new teaching staff members		
Observation forms by peers		
Staff Evaluations		
Student satisfaction scores		
Reports of student support services		

Part D: Sample results report

PROCEDURE FOR IMPROVING BUILDING COMPLEXS U.L.E.

Report on results

BUILDING COMPLEX:

DATE OF INSPECTION:

DATE OF REPORT:

PART A. DOCUMENT CHECKLIST

The following checklist has been completed based on information received by the Quality Assurance Department from documentation provided by the Building complex.

Study Programme/Course Guides (School/Course)	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
Student welcome package - Internal Regulations of the U.L.E. Programmes	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
Current staff CVs (Building complex / School / Course)	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
Programme Meeting Minutes / Teaching Staff Meeting Minutes	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
Weekly Reports by programme coordinators (Faculty / Course-specific)	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
Annual Programme/Course Evaluation Reports (School/Course)	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
Peer Teaching Observation Forms (School / Course)	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
New forms for selecting teachers (micro-teaching evaluation) (School / Course)	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
External Examiner Reports and Responses (School/Programme)	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

Minutes of Examination Committees / Minutes of Joint Study Committees (Teaching Staff / Special Course)	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
Evidence of meetings of the building complex	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
Evidence of reports from the student support services of the building complex	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
Staff Evaluations	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
List of facilities / Library sources (especially for the building complex)	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
Comments	

PART B. COMMENTS AND EVIDENCE OF THE SMT OF THE BUILDING COMPLEX

1	The building complex is managed effectively.	
1.	The administrative organisation is clearly defined, documented and understood by all stakeholders, including programme managers, administrative staff, academic staff and students.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
1.2	Are there clearly defined responsibilities and reporting arrangements at the level of the building complex and curriculum?	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
1.3	The stakeholders involved in the building complex have clear and appropriate terms of reference and meet regularly. The meetings are accurately recorded with a clear action plan.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

1.4	The building complex has formal mechanisms in place to monitor the information it provides internally and externally and to make any improvements deemed necessary, ensuring that it is accurate and fit for purpose.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
This criterion is considered to be:	☐ Satisfied ☐ Partially satisfied ☐ Not satisfied	
Comments		

2.	The building complex employs and continues to support suitably trained and experienced staff.	
2.1	There are appropriate policies and effective procedures for the recruitment and ongoing training of suitably trained and experienced staff, designed to ensure the safety of trainees.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
2.2	All staff have the appropriate qualifications and experience, understand their specific responsibilities and perform them effectively.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
2.3	There are clear and appropriate job specifications for all staff.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
2.4	There are effective procedures for the integration of all staff.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
2.5	Management monitors and reviews the performance of all staff through a clearly documented and transparent evaluation system, which includes regular observations of teaching staff in the classroom.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
2.6	Staff professional development needs are identified through evaluation and other means, and measures are taken to support staff in addressing these needs and acquiring additional qualifications, where appropriate.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
This criterion is considered to be:	☐ Satisfied ☐ Partially satisfied ☐ Not satisfied	
Comments		

3.	The building complex takes reasonable care to admit and enroll students who are suitable for the programmes of study in which they enroll	
3.1	Through a formal application process, it is ensured that students meet the entry requirements and that their stated qualifications are verified.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
3.2	All student questions regarding the application are answered promptly and appropriately.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
3.3	Prospective students are properly informed about the nature and requirements of the programme they are interested in and are given advice on choosing their programme.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
3.4	The Registries of the building complex and the Heads of study programmes have a clear understanding of the recognition of courses based on mechanisms for the certification of prior learning and prior experiential learning, which is communicated to prospective students.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
This criterion is considered to be:	☐ Satisfied ☐ Partially satisfied ☐ Not satisfied	
Comments		

4.	The building complex regularly receives and records feedback from students and other stakeholders and takes appropriate action where necessary.	
4.1	The views of all stakeholders are regularly recorded, objectively examined, thoroughly analysed and evaluated, and appropriate measures are taken where necessary.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
4.2	Student feedback is obtained through appropriate formal mechanisms & student representation.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
4.3	The building complex has appropriate formal feedback mechanisms for informing all stakeholders for any action taken as a result of their views.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
This criterion is considered to be:	☐ Satisfied ☐ Partially satisfied ☐ Not satisfied	
Comments		

5.	The building complex has effective systems for reviewing its own standards and evaluating its performance (at the level of building complex and curriculum).	
5.1	All quality management policies and procedures are clearly documented and communicated to staff and, where appropriate, students and other stakeholders.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
5.2	The policies and procedures for ensuring the quality of the building complex are appropriately reflected in the management strategy.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
5.3	Quality assurance principles are integrated throughout the building complex to ensure quality ethos.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
5.4	The building complex undertakes regular and systematic monitoring of its operations and reviews all aspects of its performance based on clearly defined and appropriate performance indicators.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
5.5	Management prepares regular reports presenting the results of the building complex's reviews and incorporating action plans.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
5.6	Particular attention is paid to the quality of the learning experience of students and to ensuring fair treatment of all students.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
5.7	The Head of the Study Programme, based on reports from the courses that comprise it, compiles an annual programme report, which includes an analysis of the annual results regarding student satisfaction, performance levels, completion rates and progression to further study or employment.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

5.8	Key performance indicators include an analysis of student results in terms of annual performance, highlighting any significant fluctuations.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
This criterion is considered to be:	☐ Satisfied ☐ Partially satisfied ☐ Not satisfied	
Comments		

6.	The building complex has a strong commitment and procedures that facilitate the continuous improvement of its services.	
6.1	Good practices are identified and disseminated effectively throughout the building complex.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
6.2	End-of-term course reports and annual programme reports include improvements and ongoing developments and further identify areas requiring improvement.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
6.3	Action plans for improvement are implemented and reviewed regularly within the framework of the building complex committees.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
6.4	Seminars and workshops are organised specifically for staff to address their needs.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

6.5	Are there appropriate policies and effective procedures for acquiring academic resources to support programmes in the building complex?	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ No
This criterion is judged to be:		☐ Satisfied ☐ Partially satisfied ☐ Not satisfied
Comments		

PROGRAMME MANAGERS AND PRACTICAL TRAINING COORDINATORS

7.	Teaching, learning and assessment	
7.1	Academic staff use a mix of group and individual activities to encourage the active participation of all students and effectively support their learning.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
7.2	There is clear information about the internship year in the course handbook and contact points (internship coordinator).	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
7.3	Academic staff have access to appropriate learning and study materials and other resources, and the institution encourages and supports their use.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
7.4	Academic staff shall ensure that students receive a timetable for assessment in good time, in which the required assignments and deadlines are clearly stated.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

8	Support, guidance and development of students	
8.1	Staff are available to help students resolve general and/or technological issues. All student queries are dealt with promptly.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
8.2	Staff, including part-time staff, are available to assist students outside of teaching and learning periods.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
8.3	Staff provide appropriate support to students to enable regular review of their academic progress.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
8.4	The results of the assessment are monitored so that students who are not making satisfactory progress can be identified and, where necessary, immediate intervention is taken.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
8.5	Staff ensure that all student-related documents (e.g. course handbooks, course guides, etc.) are available on the LMS and that students know how to access them.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
8.6	There is an effective system for identifying students with special educational needs and disabilities (SEND) so that appropriate support can be provided.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
8.7	There is a clear and published policy regarding student attendance and punctuality.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
8.8	The staff (including internship coordinators and/or programme managers) support students in finding internship positions.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

8.9	The staff (including coordinators and/or programme managers) has an effective system for monitoring student attendance during the internship.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
This criterion is considered to be:		☐ Satisfied ☐ Partially satisfied ☐ Not satisfied
Comments		

9	Quality management, assurance and improvement	
9.1	All new and existing staff have access to documentation related to the institution and courses.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
9.2	The management monitors and reviews the performance of all staff through a clearly documented and transparent evaluation system, which includes regular observations of teaching staff in the classroom.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
9.3	Staff professional development needs are identified through evaluation and other means, and measures are taken to support staff development and for staff to acquire the appropriate additional qualifications, as appropriate.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

9.4	Are there effective procedures for the induction and integration of all staff?	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
9.5	The views of all stakeholders are regularly investigated and recorded, objectively examined, thoroughly analysed and evaluated, and, where necessary, appropriate measures are taken.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
9.6	Programme managers are informed in a timely and appropriate manner of developments in the U.L.E.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
9.7	Staff are aware of and take advantage of opportunities for improvement (e.g. CIRT seminars, applications for PGCert and PhD, staff development plan).	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
9.8	The appointed Programme Head, based on reports from the courses that comprise the programme, compiles an annual Programme Evaluation Report, which includes an analysis of the annual results regarding student satisfaction, the levels of achievement of the programme's learning outcomes, and the overall quality of the programme.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
9.9	Programme coordinators are aware of the policy on the recognition of prior learning and prior experiential learning, which is taken into account for prospective students.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
This criterion is considered to be:		☐ Satisfied ☐ Partially satisfied ☐ Not satisfied
Comments		

TEACHING STAFF

10	Teaching, learning and assessment	
10.1	Teaching staff receive clear guidance and instructions from programme managers.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
10.2	There is a clear channel of communication between teaching staff and programme managers.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
10.3	There are effective procedures for introduction of teaching staff, and they are encouraged to participate in research that informs their teaching.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
10.4	There are regular scheduled and documented meetings of academic staff at which academic programmes are reviewed.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
10.5	Teaching staff use a mix of group and individual activities to encourage the active participation of all students and effectively support their learning.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
10.6	Clear information about the internship year is provided in the course handbook and contact details (internship coordinator).	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
10.7	Academic staff have access to appropriate learning and study materials and other resources, and the institution encourages and supports their use.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
10.8	Academic staff ensure that students receive a timetable for assessment in good time, in which the required assignments and revision periods are described in detail in advance with clear submission dates.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
10.9	Academic staff provide detailed and supportive verbal and written feedback	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

	on assessments and overall performance and progress, which is monitored effectively.	
10.10	The institution takes appropriate measures to detect and discourage plagiarism, including collusion and other misconduct, and to impose sanctions on offenders.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
10.11	There are clear policies and procedures for students to invoke mitigating circumstances and appeal against academic decisions based on the regulatory framework of the parent university.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
This criterion is judged to be:		☐ Satisfied ☐ Partially satisfied ☐ Not satisfied
Comments		

11	Support, guidance and development of students	
11.1	Staff are available to help students resolve general and/or academic issues. All student queries are dealt with promptly.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A.
11.2	Staff, including part-time staff, are available to help students with their studies outside teaching and learning periods.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

11.3	Staff provide appropriate support to students to enable regular review of their academic progress.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
11.4	The results of the assessment are monitored so that students who are not making satisfactory progress can be identified and, where necessary, immediate intervention is taken.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
11.5	Staff ensure that all student-related documents (e.g. course handbooks, course guides, etc.) are available online and that students know how to access them.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
11.6	There is an effective system for identifying students with special educational needs and disabilities (SEND) so that appropriate support can be provided.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
11.7	There is a clear and published policy regarding student attendance and punctuality.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
11.8	Staff (including internship coordinators and/or programme managers) support students in finding internship positions.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
11.9	The Staff (including coordinators and/or programme directors) have an effective system of monitoring student attendance during the internship.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
This criterion is considered to be:		☐ Satisfied ☐ Partially satisfied ☐ Not satisfied

--	--

Comments

12	Quality management, assurance and improvement	
12.1	There are effective procedures for the induction and integration of all teaching staff.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
12.2	A peer observation system is in place to ensure that staff needs and good practices are identified.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
12.3	Student feedback is obtained through appropriate formal student representation mechanisms and communicated to the teaching staff.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
12.4	The building complex has appropriate formal feedback mechanisms in place to inform all stakeholders of any action taken as a result of their feedback.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
12.5	The academic teaching staff have attended seminars on teaching methods, grading, feedback, coordination and assignment design.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
This criterion is considered to be:		☐ Satisfied ☐ Partially satisfied ☐ Not satisfied

Comments

STUDENT VOICE / STUDENT EXPERIENCE

13.	Assessment is fair and appropriate to the level and nature of the courses, and students receive timely and supportive feedback on their work.	
13.1	Students are provided with an assessment schedule, in which the required assignments and revision periods are described in detail & in advance with clear submission dates.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
13.2	Assessment tasks are clearly written, indicating what students need to do to achieve the specified performance levels.	☐ Yes ☐ No N/A
13.3	Students receive detailed and supportive oral and written feedback on their assessments and overall performance and progress, which is monitored effectively.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
13.4	The institution takes appropriate measures to detect and discourage plagiarism, including collusion, and penalises offenders.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
13.5	There are clear policies and procedures for students to invoke exceptional circumstances and appeal against the decisions of Examination Boards on the basis of the regulatory framework of the parent university.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

This criterion is considered to be:		☐ Satisfied ☐ Partially satisfied ☐ Not satisfied
Comments		
14	The material provided to students is appropriate for the delivery methods and effective.	
14.1	The course material is presented appropriately and is sufficiently comprehensive to enable students to achieve the programme objectives.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
14.2	The course material is accurate, reflects current knowledge and practices, and is reviewed regularly.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
14.3	Programme designers and module leaders make effective use of appropriate teaching aids and learning resources.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
14.4	Students receive clear information on how to access the institution's library resources and the resources of the parent e-university library, and the accessible material is useful and appropriate for their programme of study.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
14.5	The institution provides students effective access to all resources.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
This criterion is considered to be:		☐ Satisfied ☐ Partially satisfied ☐ Not satisfied

Comments		
15.	Students receive comprehensive introductory training upon joining the programme and personalised support	
15.1	Students receive comprehensive information upon enrolment in the programme and guidance on the use of facilities such as the library and other amenities.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
15.2	Students receive a comprehensive course handbook at the beginning of their studies.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
15.3	Students receive appropriate information about pastoral and academic services support available to them.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
15.4	The institution has policies in place to prevent discrimination and a published procedure for dealing with any abusive behaviour. There are effective arrangements in place to protect participants from the risks associated with radicalisation and extremism.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
15.5	Staff are available to help students resolve issues of a general and/or technological issues. All student queries are dealt with promptly.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
15.6	There are effective systems for communicating with students beyond teaching hours.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
15.7	Effective safety arrangements are in place and are regularly reviewed for the safety of all participants.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

This criterion is considered to be:	☐ Satisfied ☐ Partially satisfied ☐ Not satisfied	
Comments		

16.	Students receive appropriate academic support and guidance	
16.1	Students have adequate access to teaching staff beyond teaching and learning periods.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
16.2	Students have access to appropriate support for regular review of their academic progress (meetings with Academic Advisors, meetings with heads of Programmes).	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
16.3	The results of the assessment are monitored so that students who are not making satisfactory progress can be identified and, where necessary, immediate intervention can be taken.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
16.4	Students have access to appropriate career and study guidance for further studies, as well as any exemptions from professional bodies that may be available.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
16.5	The institution has a fair- complaint procedure and a clear appeal process.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

16.6	Guidance and tips on academic writing and studying are provided to help students learn effectively and efficiently.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
16.7	Students with special educational needs are identified so that appropriate support can be provided.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
16.8	Students facing personal difficulties are offered personalised counselling, if they so choose.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
This criterion is considered to be:		☐ Satisfied ☐ Partially satisfied ☐ Not satisfied
Comments		

17	The voice of students is heard and taken into account through formal mechanisms	
17.1	There are appropriate arrangements for student representation.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
17.2	Students receive information on the role and importance of representatives.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

17.3	Students provide feedback through formal and informal mechanisms (e.g. questionnaires, research committees, open-door policy, etc.)	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
17.4	Students have access to the findings and actions resulting from the feedback and evaluation process, as part of completing the feedback cycle	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
17.5	The students' opinion is taken into account in every process concerning the programme and related to the implementation of their programme, e.g. consultation on a new programme or a programme undergoing revalidation.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
This criterion is considered to be:		☐ Satisfied ☐ Partially satisfied ☐ Not satisfied
Comments		

ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATION

18.	Administration and support of building infrastructure	
18.1	The size of the administrative team is sufficient for the effective daily operation of the programmes.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
18.2	The administrative support available to management is clearly defined, documented, understandable, and appropriately focused on supporting its activities.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

18.3	The policies, procedures and management systems are well documented and effectively disseminated in the building complex.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
18.4	Classes have a timetable and classrooms are allocated appropriately for the courses offered.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
18.5	Data collection and compilation systems are well documented, accurate and disseminated effectively.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
18.6	Comprehensive administrative records (staff and student records) are organised and stored effectively, are easily accessible and are used effectively.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
18.7	The Registries receive timely information and updates on their programmes from the programme Heads and/or the parent university.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
18.8	The Registries receive appropriate guidance, support and training to facilitate their role in the U.L.E.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
This criterion is considered to be:		☐ Satisfied ☐ Partially satisfied ☐ Not satisfied
Comments		

--

19.	Student attendance is recorded regularly, and effective corrective measures are taken where necessary.	
19.1	There is an appropriate, clear and published policy regarding student attendance and consistency.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
19.2	There are effective procedures and systems in place to enforce attendance and punctuality.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
19.3	Accurate and secure attendance records are kept for each session for all students, which are reviewed regularly and absences are monitored immediately.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
This criterion is judged to be:		☐ Satisfied ☐ Partially satisfied ☐ Not satisfied
Comments		

PART C. RESPONSE TO THE ACTIONS OF THE INSPECTION-REPORT

PART D. RESPONSE TO THE AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT RECOMMENDED IN THE LAST INSPECTION REPORT

PART E - GENERAL SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

To be completed by the Quality Assurance Department.

PART F – ACTION PLAN SPECIFIC TO THE BUILDING COMPLEX.

To be completed by the Quality Assurance Department (in collaboration with the Director of the Building complex and the Deputy Director of Academic Affairs.

Building complex:					
Study Programmes					
Identified issue or area for development	Actions to be taken	Why is it necessary?	Who is responsible for the action and how will it be monitored and evaluated?	Deadline for implementation	Final update – Completion of the action

PART G – BEST PRACTICES

To be completed by the Quality Assurance Department (in collaboration with the Director of Facilities and the Deputy Director of Academic Affairs).

Building complex:			
Study programmes			
Key Performance Indicator/Area of Activity	Description of good practice/impact of good practice	Evidence of good practice (including hyperlinks)	How will it be disseminated?

APPENDIX 2 - STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

A. COURSE EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE

Dear students,

Please tell us your opinion about the courses in your study programme. Your response will help us identify good practices and improve teaching and the student experience. The results of this survey are anonymous, and individual comments will not be identified.

Please do not refer to individuals (including staff names) in your comments.

Please always use polite and appropriate language.

Data protection

Your participation in this questionnaire is voluntary and you can stop at any time without your answers being included in the data set.

In order to participate, please click below to confirm that you consent to the disclosure of your data to The University of Keele Greece U.L.E. As the awarding body for the degree, The University of Keele Greece U.L.E. requires the supervision of this data in order to ensure the quality of the learning opportunities provided to students and the academic standards of its degrees.

I consent

Academic Staff/Course Content

Course title:

1. The professor of the course is good at explaining the material.
2. The course instructor often makes the course interesting.
3. The course lecturer often presents the topics and skills in a way that builds on what I have already learned.
4. Taking this course has helped me develop the skills and knowledge I believe I will need for my future career.
5. The information about the assessment schedule and grading criteria was clear.
6. I often receive useful feedback on my progress and/or any assignments (feedback may relate to graded assignments, but may also include responses given to a student or group of students during teaching or via email, VLE or Teams).
7. It is easy to contact the academic staff of the course when I need to.
8. The course is well organised.
9. Any changes to this course were announced in a timely manner.

10. The resources and services I needed specifically for the course (e.g. books, journals, laboratory equipment, facilities, IT, software) were easy to access.
11. The course instructor takes our opinions into account.
12. Overall, I am satisfied with the quality of the course.
13. What is particularly good about this course? (Open-ended question)
14. What aspects of this course could be improved? (Open-ended question)

Student Support Services

1. I am satisfied with the operation of the Academic Support Centre.
2. I am satisfied with the operation of the Counselling Centre.
3. I am satisfied with the operation of the Support Centre for Students with Special Learning Needs.
4. I am satisfied with the operation of the library at The University of Keele, Greece U.L.E.

Internship/Clinical Placement

Does your study programme include an internship/clinical placement?

- a. Yes (answer all questions in this section)
- b. No (skip this section)
1. I am fully engaged in the Internship/Clinical Placement.
2. I am well aware of what is expected of me in the Internship/Clinical Placement.
3. I am satisfied with the support I received from The University of Keele, Greece U.L.E. during my Internship/Clinical Placement.
4. I am satisfied with the support I received from the Internship/Clinical Placement provider.
5. I have received useful feedback during the Internship/Clinical Placement.
6. The Internship/Clinical Placement process is well organised and runs smoothly.
7. The skills and knowledge I developed during the Internship/Clinical Placement will be useful for my future career.
8. Overall, I am satisfied with the quality of the Internship/Clinical Placement.

Academic staff

Name of Academic Registry:

1. They are always available to help (in person and online).
2. They are always willing to provide services.
3. They have provided assistance whenever needed.
4. I am satisfied with the response of the Academic Registry via email or via the e-registry platform.

Name of Head of Study Programme:

1. He/she is always available to help (in person and online).
2. He/she is always willing to provide services.
3. He/she has provided assistance whenever needed.
4. I am satisfied with the response of the Head of Studies via email or Teams.

PROGRAMME EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE

B. Evaluation of Undergraduate Programmes

Dear students,

Please tell us your opinion about your programme of study. Your response will help us identify areas of good practice and improve teaching and the student experience. The results of this survey are anonymous, and individual comments will not be identified.

Please do not refer to individuals (including staff names) in your comments.

Please always use polite and appropriate language.

Data protection

Your participation in this questionnaire is voluntary and you can stop at any time without your answers being included in the data set.

In order to participate, please click below to confirm that you consent to the sharing of your data with The University of Keele Greece U.L.E. As the awarding body for the degree, The University of Keele Greece U.L.E. requires oversight of this data in order to ensure the quality of the learning opportunities provided to students and the academic standards of its degrees.

☐ I consent

Teaching

1. The teaching staff are good at explaining the course.
2. The teaching staff often makes the course interesting.
3. The course is often interesting.
4. The course helps me achieve the best results.

Learning opportunities

1. I had the opportunity to explore ideas and concepts in depth.
2. My programme introduces topics and skills in a way that builds on what I have already learned.
3. I have had the opportunity to gather information and ideas from different subjects.
4. My programme has the right balance of guided and independent study.
5. My course has developed the knowledge and skills that I think I will need for my future.

Grading, assessment and feedback

1. The grading criteria used to evaluate my work were clear.
2. The grading and assessment were fair.
3. My assessment allowed me to demonstrate what I had learned.
4. I received timely feedback on my work.
5. The comments helped me improve my work.

Academic support

1. It was easy to contact teaching staff when needed.
2. The teaching staff supported my learning.

Organisation and management

1. My programme of study is well organised.
2. Any changes to my course were well communicated.

Teaching Materials

1. IT services and facilities supported my learning.
2. Library facilities/services (e.g. books, online services and learning spaces) supported my learning.
3. It is easy for me to access the facilities and services I need specifically for the programme (e.g. equipment, facilities, software).

Student voice

1. I have adequate opportunities to provide feedback on my programme.
2. Student opinions about the programme are valued by staff.
3. Student feedback is implemented in the programme.

Mental well-being support services

1. I have been adequately informed about the mental wellbeing support services provided at The University of Keele, Greece U.L.E.

Professional Career

1. The programme has improved my career prospects.
2. The career advice was good.
3. The advice on further study opportunities was good.

Employability and Skills

1. My experience in higher education helped me plan my future career.
2. The University of Keele, Greece U.L.E. offered me activities and resources designed to prepare me for the next step in my career.
3. The skills I acquired during my time in higher education will be useful for my future career.

Thesis/dissertation (only for final-year students)

Did your programme include a thesis?

- a. Yes (answer all questions in this section)
- β. No (skip this section)

1. I have fully participated in all available support for my thesis.
2. I understand what is expected of me in my thesis.
3. My supervisor has the skills and knowledge to support my work.
4. I am satisfied with the contact I have with my supervisor.
5. The staff provided useful feedback to support my dissertation.
6. The dissertation process is well organised and runs smoothly.
7. I received useful feedback to support my dissertation.
8. The online educational material supporting the dissertation process is useful for my learning.
9. I have been able to access specific resources for my dissertation (e.g. books, journals, equipment, facilities, IT, software).
10. The skills and knowledge I have gained by completing this thesis will be useful for my future career.

Internship/Clinical Placement

Did your programme include an Internship/Clinical Placement?

- a. Yes (answer all questions in this section)
- b. No (skip this section)

1. I received adequate support and advice from the U.L.E. regarding the organisation of my internship/clinical placement.
2. The Internship/Clinical Placement was valuable in enhancing my learning.
3. The Internship/Clinical Placement helped me develop my skills related to my programme.
4. The Internship/Clinical Placement helped me develop more general life skills.
5. The taught part of my programme prepared me well for the Internship/Clinical Placement period.

Overall satisfaction

1. Overall, I am satisfied with the quality of this programme.
2. Looking back on the programme, are there any particularly positive or negative aspects you would like to highlight?

About you (DEMOGRAPHIC DATA)

To help us understand whether the services offered at The University of Keele, Greece U.L.E. meet your needs, we would like to ask you a few questions about yourself and your programme. As with the rest of the questionnaire, the entire report will be anonymous, and your answers will be kept confidential.

1. How old are you? (Enter your date of birth in dd/mm/yy format)
2. What is your gender?
 - Female
 - Male
 - Other
 - I prefer not to answer
3. Do you have a disability, health problem or learning difficulty that has a significant or long-term impact on your ability to carry out everyday activities?
 - Yes
 - No
 - I prefer not to answer

About your study programme (DEMOGRAPHIC DATA)

4. I am currently enrolled as a student:
 - Full-time
 - Part-time
5. I am enrolled to obtain the following degree:

Thank you very much for taking the time to complete this questionnaire.

Rating scale:

- 1: I completely agree
- 2: I mostly agree
- 3: Neither agree nor disagree
- 4: Mostly disagree
- 5: Strongly disagree
- 6: This does not apply to me / Not applicable

A. MODULE-EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE

Dear Students,

This survey invites you to share your experiences with the modules in your programme of study. Your response will help us identify areas of good practice and improve teaching and student experience. The results of this survey are anonymous, and individual comments are not identifiable.

Please do not identify any individuals (including staff names) in your comments.

Please always use respectful and appropriate language.

Data Protection

Your participation in this questionnaire is voluntary, and you can stop at any point without your responses being included in the dataset.

To participate, please tick below to confirm that you consent to your data being shared with the University of Keele, Greece. As the awarding body, the University of Keele, Greece requires oversight of this data, to assure the quality of learning, opportunities provided to students and the academic standards of its awards.

☐ I agree

Module Staff/Content

Module Title:

1. Module staff have been good at explaining things.
2. Module staff have often made the subject engaging.
3. Module staff have often introduced subjects and skills in a way that builds on what you have already learned.
4. Studying this module has well developed my knowledge and skills that I think I will need for my future career.
5. Information about the timing of assessments and marking criteria has been clear.
6. I often receive helpful feedback on my progress and/or any work (Feedback may be on marked work but may also include responses given to an individual or group in teaching sessions or online, or via email).
7. It has been easy to contact staff on this module when I needed to.
8. This module has been well organised.
9. Any changes to this module were well communicated.
10. It has been easy to access the module-specific resources I needed (for example books, journals, equipment, facilities, IT, software, collections).
11. The module leader has listened to students' opinions.
12. Overall, I am satisfied with the quality of this module
13. What is especially good about this module? (Open-ended question)
14. What elements of this module could be improved? (Open-ended question)

Student Support Services

1. I am satisfied with the operation of the Academic Learning Centre.
2. I am satisfied with the operation of the Counselling Centre.
3. I am satisfied with the operation of the Learning Disabilities Centre.
4. I am satisfied with the operation of the University of Keele, Greece library.
5. I am satisfied with the operation of the Centre for Instruction, Research, and Technology (CIRT).

Work Placements

Does your course involve any work placements?

- a. Yes (answer all questions in this section)

b. No (skip this section)

1. I have fully engaged with this work placement.
2. I understand what is expected of me in this work placement.
3. I am satisfied with the support I have had from the University of Keele, Greece during this work placement.
4. I am satisfied with the support I have had from the placement provider during this work placement.
5. I have been provided with helpful feedback during this work placement.
6. The work placement process is well organised and runs smoothly.
7. The skills and knowledge I have developed on this work placement will be useful for my future career.
8. Overall, I am satisfied with the quality of this work placement.

Academic Staff

Name of Registry:

1. He/she is always available for assistance (face to face and online).
2. He/she is always willing to provide service.
3. He/she has provided assistance whenever needed.
4. I am satisfied with the response of the registry via email or via the e-registry platform.

Name of Programme Leader:

1. He/she is always available for assistance (face to face and online).
2. He/she is always willing to provide service.
3. He/she has provided assistance whenever needed.
4. I am satisfied with the response of the Programme Leader via email or via Teams.

COURSE-EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE

B. Evaluation of Undergraduate Courses

Dear Students,

This survey invites you to share your experiences of your undergraduate degree. Your response will help us identify areas of good practice and improve teaching and student experience. The results of this survey are anonymous, and individual comments are not identifiable.

Please do not identify any individuals (including staff names) in your comments.

Please always use respectful and appropriate language.

Data Protection

Your participation in this questionnaire is voluntary, and you can stop at any point without your responses being included in the dataset.

To participate, please tick below to confirm that you consent to your data being shared with the University of Keele, Greece. As the awarding body, the University of Keele, Greece requires oversight of this data, to assure the quality of learning opportunities provided to students and the academic standards of its awards.

☐ I consent

Teaching on my course

1. Teaching staff are good at explaining things.
2. Teaching staff make the subject engaging.
3. The course is often intellectually stimulating.
4. The course challenges me to achieve my best work.

Learning opportunities

1. I had the chance to explore ideas and concepts in depth.
2. My course introduces subjects and skills in a way that builds on what I have already learned.
3. I had the chance to bring together information and ideas from different topics.
4. My course has the right balance of directed and independent study.
5. My course developed my knowledge and skills that I think I will need for my future.

Marking, assessment and feedback

1. The marking criteria used to assess my work were clear.
2. The marking and assessment have been fair on my course.
3. The assessments have allowed me to demonstrate what I have learned.
4. I have received assessment feedback on time.
5. Feedback helped me to improve my work.

Academic support

1. It was easy to contact teaching staff when I needed to.
2. Teaching staff have supported my learning.

Organisation and management

1. My course is well organised.
2. Any changes to teaching on my course were well communicated.

Learning resources

1. The IT resources and facilities have supported my learning.
2. The library resources (e.g., books, online services and learning spaces) have supported my learning.
3. It is easy to access subject-specific resources (e.g., equipment, facilities, software) when I need them.

Student voice

1. I get the right opportunities to give feedback on my course.
2. Students' opinions about the course are valued by staff.
3. Students' feedback is acted upon in the course.

Wellbeing Support

1. The information about mental wellbeing support services at the University of Keele, Greece has been well communicated.

Careers

1. The course has improved my career prospects.
2. The advice for making career choices has been good.
3. The advice on further study opportunities has been good.

Employability and Skills

1. My Higher Education experience has helped me plan for my future career.
2. The University of Keele, Greece has offered activities and resources designed to prepare me for the next step in my career.
3. The skills I have developed during my time in Higher Education will be useful for my future career.

Dissertation (only for final year students)

Did your course involve a dissertation?

a. Yes (ask all questions in this section)

b. No (skip this section)

1. I have fully engaged with all support available for my dissertation.
2. I understand what is expected of me in my dissertation.
3. My supervisor has the skills and subject knowledge to support my work.
4. I am satisfied with the contact I have with my supervisor.
5. Staff have provided helpful feedback to support my dissertation.
6. The dissertation process is well organised and runs smoothly.
7. I was provided with helpful feedback to support my dissertation.
8. Online materials for supporting the dissertation process are helpful in supporting my learning.
9. I have been able to access the specific resources for my dissertation that I have needed (for example, books, journals, equipment, facilities, IT, software, collections).

10. The skills and knowledge I have developed completing this dissertation will be useful for my future career.

Work Placements

Did your course involve any work placements?

a. Yes (ask all questions in this section)

b. No (skip this section)

1. I received sufficient support and advice from my university about the organisation of my placements.
2. The placement was valuable in helping my learning.
3. Placement has helped me to develop my skills in relation to my course.
4. Placement has helped me to develop my general life skills.
5. The taught part of my course prepared me well for my placement.

Overall Satisfaction

1. Overall, I am satisfied with the quality of this course.
2. Looking back on the experience, are there any particularly positive or negative aspects you would like to highlight? (Open-ended question)

About yourself (DEMOGRAPHIC DATA)

To help us understand whether provisions at the University of Keele, Greece meet the needs of all undergraduate students, we would like to ask some questions about you and your course. As with the rest of the survey, all reporting will be anonymous, and your responses will be treated confidentially.

1. What is your age? (Enter date of birth in format dd/mm/year)
2. What is your gender?
 - Male
 - Female
 - Other
 - Prefer not to say
3. Do you have an impairment, health condition or learning difference that has a substantial or long-term impact on your ability to carry out day-to-day activities?
 - Yes
 - No
 - Prefer not to say

About your Course

1. I am currently registered as studying
 - Full-time
 - Part-time

2. I am registered (currently studying at the University of Keele, Greece) for the qualification of:

Thank you very much for your time in completing this questionnaire.

Rating Scale

- 1: Totally agree
- 2: Mostly agree
- 3: Neither agree nor disagree
- 4: Mostly disagree
- 5: Totally disagree
- 6: This does not apply to me / Not applicable

APPENDIX 3 - SAMPLE FORM FOR SEMESTER EVALUATION OF TEACHING STAFF (PEER REVIEW)

Peer observation

Preparation form for observation

Subject and level _____ Date _____

Type of session and duration _____ Number of students _____

Observer _____

- What are the objectives and outcomes of the session? What other contextual information is relevant?

- What topic would you like feedback on?

(e.g. use of the new approach, interaction with students, use of technology, pace and time, etc.)

- What criteria are relevant to the observation?

(e.g. good use of activities to engage students, evidence of student attention and interest, good presentation skills)

- What information should your observer know?

(e.g. any changes you have incorporated, problems or issues with the group)

1. Peer teaching observation Observer's comments (Form 1)

(Personal record of the teacher)

The characteristics listed below are intended to be used as **a guide or prompt** for the observer. They are not exhaustive, and it may not be appropriate or useful to comment on every category each time you observe a class.

Subject and level _____ Date _____

Type and duration of session _____ Number of students _____

Observer _____

Teaching traits

Comments

1. Organisation

Appropriate selection of aims, objectives and content. Appropriate organisation of content. Planning of the use of resources and materials.

2. Presentation

Clear introduction, continuity with other sessions and students' knowledge. Clarity of aims and objectives. Clear presentation and organisation.

Appropriate pace and timing. Effort to respond to students' needs. Behaviour towards students (manner, style). Summary and reference to future assignments.

--

3. Teaching approach and methodology

Choice of teaching/learning approach and its relevance to the group of students. Methods used to monitor/assess learning. Selection and use of teaching activities. Effective use of questions and answers. Encouraging student interaction. Management of the session, including opening and closing.

--

4. Student response

Level of participation. Level of attention and interest. General atmosphere in the classroom.

--

5. General comments

--

Observation of teaching by peers

Observer's comments (Form 2)

(Teacher's personal file)

Subject and level _____ Date _____

Type and duration of session _____ Number of students _____

Observer _____

Notes on the observed session

(may be attached as separate pages)

- Things that went very well (approximately three)

- Suggestions for the future (approximately three)

Reflective notes of the observed teacher (Form 3)

(Teacher's personal notes)

Topic and level _____ Date _____

Type of session and duration _____

Observer _____

- What I learned about my practice is...

- The changes I would like to make to my practice are... because...

- The professional development I need is...

- The actions I will take are...

This teaching observation file must be sent to the Dean of the School.

- Academic year:
- Name and Faculty of the observed teacher:
- Name and School of the observer:
- Observed teaching, date and time:
- Title of the programme, type of session (e.g. seminar, workshop, practical training), level and number of students:

Signatures of the observer and the observed and date:

APPENDIX 4 - SAMPLE ANNUAL TEACHER SELF-ASSESSMENT FORM

Full name:

Study programmes:

Self-assessment philosophy

The evaluation of academic work is a continuous, dynamic process, fully aligned with the overall strategic planning of the U.L.E., which aims at the continuous improvement of the quality of educational work.

As part of the overall process, self-assessment aims to foster a culture of evaluation based on the production and use of educational evidence by academics themselves and the establishment of an environment of trust through the development of relationships of responsibility and cooperation within the academic community of the U.L.E.

Self-assessment is not intended to be a means of control, but rather a means of improving the quality of educational work, enabling academics to identify weaknesses, clarify problems, create conditions for initiatives, and highlight educational practices that could be more widely disseminated in the academic community of the U.L.E.

ENOTHTAA

Instructions for completion: Answer the following questions as clearly and honestly as possible. Your answers will not be judged, but will simply record your personal perception of your work. Please do not hesitate to include any information that may be useful in a comprehensive discussion of your work at the U.L.E., as well as the further prospects of your work there. Once you have completed the form, please submit it signed to the Head of the Study Programme, who will then follow up with a meeting to discuss its content.

Describe your most significant achievements during this academic year:

Describe any issues that you believe hindered your efforts to complete your work:

Describe your most important strengths:

Describe the areas in which you believe you can improve in the future:

In which areas of activity/development of the U.L.E. would you see yourself involved in the near future?

Please note any other issues you consider relevant to the self-assessment process and should be taken into account:

SECTION B

Instructions for completion: Answer the following self-assessment questions using the following scale:

1 = It does not apply to me at all

2 = It characterises me to a small extent

3 = It characterises me to a considerable extent

4 = It characterises me to a large extent

5 = It characterises me completely

A. Student orientation

- | | | |
|----|--|---|
| A1 | I am constantly informed about the students in my course so that I know exactly how they are progressing or any problems they may be facing | ? |
| A2 | I make sure to share the information I gather about the students in my class with the appropriate recipients. | ? |
| A3 | I am constantly looking for ways to enhance the educational experience of the students in my course | ? |
| A4 | I am always willing to support my students in their endeavours, showing understanding of their needs but also setting boundaries in my relationship with them. | ? |

B. Cooperation – Communication

- | | | |
|----|---|---|
| B1 | I have established harmonious cooperation with the other colleagues in my department | ? |
| B2 | I am an active listener, and I make sure to pay attention and respect to my conversation partner. | ? |
| B3 | I am able to resolve cooperation and communication issues in a diplomatic manner, defusing tensions and ensuring that they do not affect the educational work in my class | ? |

- B4 I take great care with what is being delivered on my part, when this affects my colleagues in the department, so as to serve the needs of the department for quality cooperation ?

C. Initiative

- C1 I look for opportunities to take initiatives that will contribute to further development of the curriculum ?
- C I am willing to take on responsibilities, going beyond the strict framework defined by my role ?
- C3 I submit ideas and proposals, appropriately structured so as to contribute to improving the quality of my department's educational work. ?
- C4 I feel confident in contributing with personal choices and initiatives to the overall delivery of my department's educational work. ?

D. Planning – implementation

- D1 I know how to prioritise and manage my responsibilities in a way that allows for successful completion within the specified time frames ?
- D2 I manage my time effectively so that I never miss deadlines. ?
- D3 I know and follow the procedures for the proper implementation of the educational project. ?
- D4 I demonstrate the necessary flexibility in the implementation of the educational project, if this is necessary to deal with unexpected difficulties. ?

The Head of the Programme

Date:

Signature

The Professor

Date:

Signature

APPENDIX 5 - SAMPLE SELF-ASSESSMENT FORM FOR ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF

Self-Assessment Form/Questionnaire for Administrative Staff Philosophy

Statement and Purpose of Self-Assessment

Self-assessment/evaluation is part of the U.L.E. Evaluation-Performance System. The purpose of the latter is the continuous improvement of institutional and individual performance within the framework of a development cycle that begins with the identification of best practices and challenges.

Self-assessment is in fact a vital activity that contributes to making the performance assessment process more effective. It provides staff with the opportunity to contribute significantly to both their own professional development and their working relationships with their superiors.

As a key and relevant variable in the performance management process, self-assessment/evaluation also enables employees to play an active role in further informing and strengthening performance evaluation mechanisms. By completing the self-assessment form, employees have the opportunity to better understand their role in the U.L.E., appreciate the value of periodic performance reviews and, based on their own assessment, engage in constructive discussions with their supervisors about their further development.

Aims and Objectives

- It strengthens the two-way communication about work performance and periodically evaluates goals and opportunities.
- It establishes a mutually understood set of performance expectations.
- It recognises employees' contributions.
- It opens up opportunities for growth and development.
- It provides constructive feedback when the performance does not meet expectations.
- It aligns employee performance with the mission and objectives of the U.L.E.

Instructions for completing this form

- Employees should fill in the blanks and answer all questions.
- The form should be completed prior to the annual performance review meeting with their supervisor.
- The completed form must be signed by the employee, and a copy of the signed form must be submitted to their supervisor before the performance review meeting.

Employee Information	
Name	
Position	
Period (Academic Year)	

PART A

1. What have you achieved beyond the minimum requirements of your position?

--

2. Please describe any difficulties you may have encountered in performing your job. Were there any obstacles beyond your control that prevented you from performing your duties effectively?

--

3. Which tasks related to your position do you perform best?

4. Which tasks related to your position do you perform less well?

5. Are there any skills, aptitudes or knowledge that you believe could be further utilised in your current position? If so, what are they and how could they be utilised?

6. Suggest areas of further training that could help improve your performance or development.

PART B

Performance Evaluation Instructions	
For each competency, select the rating that best describes your performance. Select N/A if the competency does not apply. In the sections Narrative Assessment, provide answers with reference to specific examples.	
Assessment scale	Definition
5= Excellent/Exceptional	Goals and standards are clearly and substantially exceeded. Consistently and significantly exceeds all expectations and performance standards. Highest level of performance. Demonstrates personal commitment to high levels of performance and results, even under demanding work objectives.
4= Exceeding expectations	Often exceeds job requirements. Contributes far beyond job requirements. Takes initiative in developing and implementing demanding work goals. Every task is completed meticulously and on time. Thinks beyond the details of the task, working towards broader goals.
3= Successful/Meeting expectations	All goals and standards are met. Consistently meets all expectations and performance standards. Good work. Errors are minimal and rarely repeated. Prioritising problems and projects well. Requires regular supervision and monitoring. Almost always completes tasks or projects according to schedule.

2 = In need of development	Objectives and standards are generally achieved, but not fully achieved, with consistent results. Occasionally falls short of meeting expectations and performance standards. Some performance standards are not met – improvement is needed.
1= Poor/unsatisfactory performance	Goals and standards are not consistently achieved. Consistent failure to meet performance expectations. Significant improvement is needed. Excessive attention is required from the supervisor. Corrective Action is required.
N/A = not applicable	It does not apply in terms of job role expectations.

BASIC SKILLS	NARRATIVE ASSESSMENT	SCORING
I. WORK-RELATED KNOWLEDGE		
Understanding how my position supports the strategic plan of the U.L.E.		
Achieving the required level of knowledge and skills required for the effective performance of my work		
Applying knowledge and skills to critical work issues and areas related to the position		
Demonstrating willingness to learn new skills, methods, and procedures to improve my performance		

Performing the full range of tasks and responsibilities related to my position		
II. INTERPERSONAL SKILLS, COOPERATION, TEAMWORK		
Demonstration/provision of effective and positive student service		
Timely response to all questions		
Good knowledge of documents relevant to the position (manuals, regulations, calendars, etc.)		
Development of professional working relationships with Internal and External colleagues		
Encouraging cooperation and the exchange of information with colleagues		
Seeking opportunities to improve services to meet the needs of students		
Taking action, where appropriate		
Proposing methods and procedures to improve the operation of the programme/department for which I am responsible		
III. COMMUNICATION SKILLS		
I write and communicate clearly and accurately		

I listen carefully and actively. I respond to questions, instructions and suggestions.		
I am able to use diplomacy and discretion. I am able to comfortably manage high-pressure situations		
I submit regular reports to my supervisor/manager		
IV. PLANNING, ORGANISATION AND ACHIEVEMENT OF RESULTS		
Developing plans and priorities to achieve objectives		
Thorough knowledge of procedures/processes related to the position		
Evaluation of objectives and achievements		
Meeting deadlines and goals		
Efficiency in the use of resources and systems of the U.L.E.		
V. PROBLEM ANALYSIS AND DECISION MAKING		
Collection and analysis of relevant information prior to decision-making		
Taking measures in accordance with the objectives of the department		
Seeking information from others, depending on the circumstances		
Undertaking independent Actions, even beyond what is required, when necessary, to solve problems		

Developing and implementing preventive and effective solutions to Problems.		
VI. LEADERSHIP		
I demonstrate commitment and provide leadership through personal example and professional expertise		
I demonstrate the ability to motivate colleagues		
I demonstrate openness to new ideas and support an environment of continuous development		

COMMENTS

Date of submission:

Signature:

APPENDIX 6

AGENDA AND TEMPLATE FOR THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COMMITTEE OF STUDENT/STAFF REPRESENTATIVES

**Student Representative Committee (Student Voice) and Staff Representative
Committee (SSVC) [Topic/Agenda]**

The meeting will take place on [date] in the room [location]

AGENDA

1. APOLOGIES AND ABSENCES

2. MINUTES

To approve the attached minutes of the previous meeting held on [date]

3. ACTIONS

Review the list of actions and receive updates on progress since the last meeting

4. TERMS OF REFERENCE AND MEMBERS ***[only for the first meeting of the year]***

POINTS FOR DISCUSSION

5. ISSUES RAISED BY STUDENT REPRESENTATIVES

6. ISSUES RAISED BY STAFF REPRESENTATIVES

Note: as determined by Student Voice Reps and staff committee members, for example:

- Consultation on developments in the School
- External examiner Reports
- National Student Survey (NSS) results

DATA TO BE REPORTED

7. ISSUES RAISED AT OTHER MEETINGS

7.1 Programme Committee

7.2 Annual programme Review meeting

Note: Add other individuals as needed

8. MISCELLANEOUS

9. DATE AND TIME OF FUTURE MEETINGS

APPENDIX 7 - Monitoring and Review of Educational Partnerships

Excerpt from ([Educational Partnerships Code of Practice 2023.pdf](#) p.36-37)

A) Annual Review of the Relationship between Keele University and the U.L.E.

The guiding principles for the annual partnership review process are as follows:

- to review the learning experience of students in order to provide assurance to the parent University that the programme provided meets the recognised standards of the UK sector and those set by the Office for Students (OfS) for registered providers in England.
- to identify and reflect on any feedback and/or concerns arising from external examiner reports, feedback from students, staff and stakeholders, the appropriateness of entry criteria, and trends in academic achievement and student retention.
- assess the overall performance of the partnership in terms of recruitment, student participation, commitment, achievements and retention, staff resources and development, and that the partnership continues to meet its original objectives, identifying any areas for improvement and using the review to promote improvements where necessary.

Keele University will be asked to review the annual partnership review report and feed in any actions arising for the Schools/ Study Programmes from the report to the U.L.E. action plan, which should be updated after the annual programme review meetings. The completed Annual Programme Evaluation Forms will be submitted to the Educational Partnerships Committee (EPC) and will normally be reviewed at its first autumn meeting for the new academic year.

Where the EES identifies any good practice, it will be disseminated to the relevant stakeholders at the University by the Educational Partnerships Team, which may work with the respective Schools to consider how this practice could be incorporated into other partnerships.

Where the EES identifies any relevant trends or general concerns, these will be communicated to the relevant stakeholders at the University and the U.L.E. for further investigation, with the expectation that, where necessary, action will be taken to address the issues during the academic year. In this case, the governance structures established for the partnership are expected to oversee the implementation of the identified actions, submitting regular reports to the EES, which will continue to monitor the implementation and

effectiveness of the actions until they are corrected.

B) Annual Review of Strategic Performance

The Schools, with the contribution of the Academic Deputy Director and the Heads of Study Programmes, are required to complete an annual review of the strategic performance of all active educational functions, assessing the ongoing strategic benefits of the partnership through key performance measures, identified and potential areas of risk, and ongoing alignment with quality expectations and standards across the UK sector, including those set by the OfS in England, and the ongoing financial sustainability of the partnership.

Between July and December, each School with active educational partnerships classified as Collaborative Delivery and meeting the criteria for the Annual Strategic Performance Review must complete the [Annual Strategic Performance Review Form](#). The annual strategic performance reviews will then be reviewed by the EEC in January, followed by the Student Recruitment and Admissions Group (SRAG), which may forward any key findings, if deemed necessary, to the University Executive Committee (UEC).

APPENDIX 8 - EXTERNAL REVIEWER ANNUAL REPORT TEMPLATE

Please email your completed report to externalexaminers@keele.ac.uk within **four weeks** of the examination committee.

Keele's code of practice for external examination requires all external examiners to provide a full annual report on the quality and standards of the programmes and modules they are appointed to oversee.

You are asked to respond freely and fully to all questions in this report form (except C.10 and Part D, unless applicable), highlighting specific concerns, identifying good practices and supporting your comments with sufficiently detailed evidence. Your comments are extremely important to us, and all external examiner reports will be made available to various internal committees and teams and to the appropriate statutory and professional bodies. This report will also be shared with students.

If you are the external examiner for provision delivered in collaboration with more than one partner, please ensure that your comments differentiate appropriately between cohorts.

Please also ensure that your report does not name or otherwise identify individuals (either staff or students) in the programme and/or modules.

Part A: External examiner details and report overview

External examiner's full name	
Institution of origin of external examiner (or other affiliation)	
Title of course and/or courses examined (e.g. BSc Human Biology)	
School where the examination took place	
Name(s) and location(s) of collaborating partner(s) (where applicable –only to be completed when the University has an official relationship with a partner institution)	

Date(s) of participation of the examiners committees (if you were unable to attend the examination committee, please also submit Proforma B1)	
--	--

A.1 Defined standards		
"In my opinion, the standards set for the awards are appropriate."	Yes	No

A.2 Student performance			
"In my opinion, the standards of student performance are comparable to similar programmes or courses at other UK institutions with which I am familiar."	Yes	No	N/A*
* Not applicable – if you are a professional and are not in a position to assess the comparability of standards, please indicate this here.			

A.3 Student performance		
"In my opinion, students have the opportunity to achieve beyond the minimum standards."	Yes	No

A.4 Conduct of procedures		
	Yes	No

¹ Link to the form: _

<https://www.keele.ac.uk/qa/externalexaminingandassessment/examinationboards/>

"In my opinion, the procedures implemented by the University for the evaluation, examination and determination of the awards were correct and conducted fairly."		
<i>Please submit any comments you may have.</i>		

A.5 Meetings with students		
Was it possible to meet with students this academic year? If so, did you meet with students from the programme via an online platform? Please comment on how this was arranged and the insights you gained from the meetings.	Yes	No
<i>Please submit any comments.</i>		

Part B: External Examiner's Report Checklist

Please answer Yes, No or N/A to the following questions.

Questions 1 and 2 should only be answered by external examiners in their first year of appointment.

B.1 Were you adequately briefed on your duties as an external examiner?

B.2 After your appointment, did you receive sufficient documentation on the programme/modules to enable you to perform your role as an external examiner?

B.3 Assessed work

- i. Have you received assessment information notes and marking criteria?
- ii. Was a sufficient sample of lessons provided?
- iii. Did you receive a sufficient number of scripts from timed assessments?
- iv. Was the choice of topics for dissertations/project reports appropriate?
- v. Were the general template and criteria of marking consistent?
- vi. Was assessment feedback provided to students in an electronic form?

B.4 Presentations/performances/interventions

- i. Were the appropriate arrangements made to get a picture of this type of assessment activity, where possible?

B.5 Assessment Committee(s)

- ii. Did you participate in the Examination Committee(s) for the modules for which you are responsible?
- iii. Were these meetings well organised and conducted?
- iv. Did you agree with the results of the board?

Any comments on questions B1-5

Part C: Detailed comments

C.1	Measures taken in response to issues raised in previous external examiner reports <i>Please comment on the extent to which issues raised by you (or your predecessor) in previous external examiner reports have been or are being addressed. Copies of previous external examiner reports are available at www.keele.ac.uk/qa/externalexaminers/reportsandresponses/</i>

C.2	Overall student performance <i>Comment on the overall performance of students and their level of achievement in relation to the performance and level of students across the United Kingdom.</i>

C.3	Academic standards of the award <i>Please comment on the academic standards set for the award(s) by referring to published benchmarking statements, qualification descriptors and institutional programme specifications.</i>

C.4	Quality of teaching and learning <i>Please comment on aspects of teaching and the learning environment for students, as indicated by student performance in the modules.</i>

C.5	Student comments <i>Please comment on the quality and quantity of feedback given to students on their assessed work, focusing, specifically, on whether, in your opinion, the feedback helped students understand how they could improve in future assessments.</i>

C.6	Assessment procedures <i>Please comment on the extent to which you believe that the assessments for which you are responsible have been conducted rigorously, fairly and with due regard for the equal treatment of students.</i>

C.7	Board procedures <i>Comment on the procedures of the examination board that you followed. To what extent did you consider that the procedures were conducted strictly and in accordance with the regulations and that the anonymity of the candidates was duly maintained?</i>
-----	--

--	--

C.8	Comments on Good Practice <i>Please highlight any aspects of good practice in relation to the programme and/or its modules that should be shared with the University and/or external audiences.</i>

C.9	Recommendations for the School <i>Based on your comments above, please detail any recommendations that, in your opinion, would contribute to strengthening/improving the teaching provision and student experience in the subject area. These recommendations can help the School develop its programmes. The School will carefully consider your recommendations and will respond formally in due course to inform you of the actions it intends to take in response to your recommendations.</i>
	1) 2) 3) [Add more if necessary]

C.10	Overall performance of students at the parent University (where applicable) <i>Comment on the performance and achievements of students at the U.L.E., compared to the Keele-based cohort.</i>

Part D: Optional comments

D.1	Other comments <i>Please provide the University with any other comments relating, for example, to our regulatory framework and procedures.</i>

D.2	Final exit report <i>If you have reached the end of your term as an external examiner at Keele University, we would like to thank you and ask you to provide an overview of your term. Your comments may be used by us to market our programmes in the future.</i>

Examiner's signature: _____

Date of completion of this report: _____

On behalf of the Vice-Chancellor, I would like to take this opportunity to thank you for your contribution to maintaining and enhancing academic provision at Keele University. Your work is greatly appreciated.

Please note:

1. *The University reserves the right to amend information contained in external examiners' reports prior to publication solely for reasons of:*
 - a. *staff or student confidentiality;*
 - b. *inappropriate comments about University policies, regulations or procedures that are not within the remit of the External Examiner.*

You will be notified if such modifications are made to your report prior to publication.

2. *If you have identified a serious cause for concern, you can report it directly and confidentially to the Vice-Chancellor. In such a case, please send an email to:*
vc@keele.ac.uk