



THE PHILIPS COLLEGE

QUALITY ASSURANCE POLICY

THE PHILIPS COLLEGE

1. Quality Assurance Policy

Considering the principles of humanitarianism the Philips College envisages becoming a European institution in Higher Education capable of adding to the intellectuals, social, economic development of Cyprus, and providing quality education and research.

The system is built around established central values. It is committed to Excellence, Student Centered, People Oriented, Innovative, Accountable, and Socially Responsible. Focused on the student, it is balanced along the main axes of Teaching, Research and Service. The student focus is reflected in the quality management system. The College strongly believes that it is better to involve students as active participants. The College aims to sensitize students and staff to this practice of accountability and social responsibility.

Philips College draws upon the potential of motivated people in a motivating and intellectually stimulating workplace. Management, therefore, is also focused on rewarding positive new practices and sharing them rather than overly controlling and disseminating existing practices. The quality assurance targets innovation and flexibility, and wants to avoid rigidity. Staff working at the College are intrinsically motivated by customer focus and social responsibility. The fact that staff choose to work in a College with a dynamic profile and a focus on performance reward, is an important element in human resources management (HRM).

Philips College meets the requirements and the scope of the European Standards and Guidelines on Quality Assurance (ESG) utilizing a method of sustainable and Integrated Quality Management (IQM). It focuses both on institutional quality assurance and program quality management.

Programs are described according to the European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System (ECTS). Course descriptions contain the learning outcomes, competence goals, content and study materials, study volume, teaching hours and teaching methods, and methods for assessment. The level of each course is set according to the European Qualification Framework (EQF) guidelines and national requirements.

Policy data, guidelines and decisions regarding quality management are communicated throughout the organization. Staff and student representatives are actively involved in outlining the quality management policy.

Student evaluations are also very important. Teaching personnel also carry out self-evaluations, and process of collecting and analyzing data.

2. Internal Evaluation Committee (Table 11)

The Internal Evaluation Committee has the following composition:

The Internal Evaluation Committee deals with the preparation of the General Internal Quality Evaluation Report. The Committee convenes at least once per semester under the Chairmanship of the Principal. The Committee has the following composition:

1. Principal, Chairperson
2. Two members of the Academic Staff
3. One member specializing on issues of quality assurance
4. One member representative of the Administrative Staff
5. The President at the time, Representative of the Students' Association
6. The Secretary at the time, Representative of the Students' Association.
- 7.
- 8.

Please refer to Table 11.

TABLE 11 – INTERNAL EVALUATION COMMITTEE	
NAME	TITLE
Constantinou Philippos, CPA	Principal, Chairperson
Raftis Athanasios, PhD	Representative, Academic Staff
Kounadeas Theodoros, PhD	Representative, Academic Staff
Bourletides Konstantinos, PhD(cand)	Ex-member, Internal Evaluation Committee, Kapodistrian University.
Constantinou Soteris, MSc	Director of MIS, Representative of Administration Staff
The President at the time	Representative of the Students' Association
The Secretary at the time	Representative of the Students' Association

3. Quality Assurance System

Internal Quality Assurance at Philips College is carried out in accordance with the *European Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Area (ESG)* and the relevant national legislation.

The Internal Evaluation Committee has the overall control and supervision of the quality assurance system of the College, whereas the central Quality Manager/Coordinator supervise(s) the quality management processes of teaching and learning, research, service-provision, and administration, without being responsible for the results of these key domains.

The quality manager is responsible for:

- the coordination and updating of QM procedures and action plans as a central section in the QM handbook.
- the monitoring of the efficiency and use of the central mechanisms and indicators of quality assurance at the institutional level and at the program level.
- the supervision of QM reporting for internal and external quality assurance, in cooperation with the academic and the administrative units responsible for providing information.
- the preparation and presiding of the decision-making process in the Internal Evaluation Committee, and reporting to the top managerial group for final decision-making.
- the coaching of staff working in the QM unit and the supervision of key performance factors that are specific for QM.
- the communication about QM issues and the provision of QM information within Philips College.
- the training of QM competences in personnel (with a special focus on managerial functions and QSG-members, the development of QM methods and the deployment of mechanisms specific to QM.

4. System and Evaluation Criteria of Students

Examination and Assessment Policy

The Academic Committee believes that an effective student performance assessment system is crucial to academic standards and that such systems are conducive to student academic development and welfare. The application of continuous student assessment is just as important as end-of-semester assessment.

Students should be assessed fairly and the assessment should be related to the teaching objectives of the course. The College also believes that the student assessment procedures

should be well documented, known and presented to the student well in advance, and applied in a timely and fair manner.

Since student performance is closely linked to by the teaching methods adopted, these methods are also assessed. As a result, the College ensures that student performance is maximized, and that students receive the fullest benefit from their educational experiences. Peer review and evaluation are significant components of the assessment of teaching methods. In this regard, the College encourages, and in practice enforces, a policy of peer evaluation where peers act in good faith and with the welfare of the student and their colleague in mind. The peer review of teaching staff is undertaken once every semester. Each member of the teaching staff is assessed by their peers in class with a view to evaluating the effectiveness of the teaching methods used and to recommending improvements where necessary.

Students are also encouraged to play a key role in the assessment of the teaching methodology employed because as pivotal figures of the College they should carry out this role. Thus, at least once a year, students are asked to evaluate the performance and effectiveness of their lecturers in class with the aim of providing feedback and helping the lecturer improve their performance.

Examinations are normally held at the College and are invigilated by members of Academic Staff. Guidelines for invigilators are issued periodically.

Academic Staff are provided with assistance from the secretarial staff and by the Faculty Office which provides the stationery and other examination requisites. The Faculty operates a policy of the anonymous marking of examination scripts. Students are thus required to enter their College id number and not their names on exam scripts. They are also required to complete an attendance register, so as to be informed about any missing students, and to have information in the event of the loss of scripts or fraud.

Assessment

Each subject has a minimum of 70% (50% semester exam and 20% term exam) attributable to the end of semester examinations. A maximum of 30% (class attendance, participation in the class, mock exams, projects, case studies etc.) is attributable to continuous assessment of coursework during the semester based primarily on class participation, tests and quizzes,

assignments and attendance, oral presentation and workshops. Depending on the nature of the course, the lecturer may choose, at their discretion and on the approval of their Program Leader, assessment methods which they judge to be the most appropriate for the course.

Each Departmental Head is responsible for notifying students of the assessment requirements for each course offered. This, however, does not absolve the student from the responsibility of acquainting himself/herself with the assessment requirements by referring to the relevant publications.

Students who fail to submit coursework by the due date, and who do not have an extension or certified mitigating circumstances, fail in that piece of work. Departmental Head normally permit a student to resubmit one piece of coursework per subject. Coursework may also take the form tests which are held under examination conditions. Coursework is normally marked and returned to students within one week.

Grading System

- The assigning of grades is the exclusive right of the lecturer. Change of a grade by the lecturer is possible only in exceptional cases and only with the written approval of the Program Leader.
- The grading system is numerical and ranges from 0 to 100. The minimum passing grade is forty (40).

The Philips College employs the grading system as shown in the table below:

Grade	Description	Quality Points
A 75-100%	Pass	4.00
B+ 70-74%	Pass	3.60
B 65-69%	Pass	3.30
B- 60-64%	Pass	3.00
C+ 55-59%	Pass	2.60
C 50-54%	Pass	2.30
C 45-49%	Pass	2.00
D 40-44%	Pass	1.00
F Below 40%	Fail	None

INC Incomplete	NC	None
Auditor (Listener)	NC	None
Withdrawal	NC	None

Note: The Grade Point Average (GPA) is determined by dividing the total Grade Points by the total number of credits.

Marking Scheme and Assessment Policy

The work of each student for each course is graded according to the following grading scale: A, B+, B-, C+, C, C-, D or F. The lowest grade that is a pass is D (40%). The symbol F (Fail) means that the student is not entitled to any credits. Students who for any reason have not completed the requirements for a particular course, do not receive credits for the course. The symbol (NC) does not affect the GPA. The designation INC (incomplete) indicates that an examination was not taken, or that part of classwork was not completed. Students receive this grade only when a small part of the work of the semester has not been completed and the student has presented convincing reasons to the lecturer as to why they have not been able to complete the course requirements during the specified timeframe. The pending work should be completed within the following semester. The lecturer and the students should mutually agree on a work schedule so that the course does not remain incomplete.

- The designation 'AU' denotes that the student attends the course as an auditor. Students who wish to attend a course regularly but do not wish to receive a grade or credit, may audit the course provided that there is sufficient space and consent from the Department.
- Grades awarded at the end of the semester are final grades and cannot be changed even if additional work is submitted.
- Students wishing to improve their grades must repeat the course/courses before graduation.
- Students wishing to withdraw from the Philips College should consult the Program Leader. The official letter given to the student will indicate the date of departure from the College and the designation (NC) No credit will appear alongside to each course.
- The pass grade for each course is 40%.
- The exam results at the end of the semester contribute to 70% of the grade. 30% of the grade is based on course participation (continuous assessment).

- In order to successfully pass a course, the student should achieve the minimum grade of 40%.
- If assessment of a course is based solely on the completion of assignments, students must achieve the minimum pass grade, 40%, in order to pass the course. The provisions of the Internal Regulations are applied for all other cases.

Compensation

- (a) A student who scores below 40%, but not below 30%, in one subject in any semester, may nevertheless pass the subject by compensation provided that their overall performance merits the pass.
- (b) The project in Years III and IV must be passed independently of the other subjects and may not be used as compensation for a subject failed.
- (c) The compensation mechanism does not operate where a student is required to resit one or more papers. Compensation may not be carried forward to resit examinations.
- (d) A candidate who scores less than 40% in the project and does not benefit from a discretionary recommendation issued by the examiners may submit a new project not later than two years after the submission date of the original project.
- (e) In the case of a revised project being presented for consideration in the Autumn Examination in the same year, the examiners may, at their discretion, decide not to call the candidate for a viva-voce examination.

Resits

- Where a student does not pass by compensation, the student will be allowed to re-sit the subjects failed on one or more examination occasions.
- An average mark of 40% must be attained in all re-sit subjects.
- A student who successfully passes a failed subject is credited with the mark earned in the re-sit examination.
- A student who fails to achieve a minimum of 50% in a subject assessed solely by coursework will be referred in the subject. The Head of Department will offer the student the opportunity of completing the subject by examination, or through additional coursework.

Project

- In Year IV, when a candidate has satisfied the examiners in all subjects, but has not yet met the stipulated criteria in relation to a compulsory project, the Examiners shall deem the student's results deferred pending satisfactory completion of the project.
- The project must be passed on the second attempt

Appeals Procedure for Examination Results

Students have the right of appeal against their results, within 5 days of the publication of the

results. Appeals must be made in writing to the Departmental Head. The grade appeal procedure is itemized below and should be followed in all instances making sure each step is fully exhausted before going on to the next one.

Step 1 The lecturer should be contacted to discuss the grade disparity and every effort should be made to resolve the problem at this level.

Step 2 The student must make the appeal in writing to the Principal, noting specific objections to the grade received. After consultation with the Departmental Head concerned, the Principal will decide accordingly and may refer the case to the Appeals Committee.

Step 3 An Appeals Committee will be appointed to mediate in the dispute. The Committee will review both the written and oral arguments in the case. The committee will consist of:

- I. one Administrative Officer of the program;
- II. one Faculty member who teaches in the program; and
- III. one student who is currently enrolled in the program appointed by the Students' Association

Step 4 The student and lecturer will be informed of the Committee's decision and, barring no written objections by either party, the recommendation of the Committee will be accepted.

Graduation

Upon completion and graduation from their field of study, students should:

- **Have successfully completed at least 240 European Credit Transfer units (ECTS) for their undergraduate studies and at least 90 credits for postgraduate studies (MA, MSc, MBA);**
- **Have completed the exam material;**
- **Have obtained the necessary ECTS from the core and elective courses;**
- **Have obtained a Grade Point Average (GPA) of at least 2.00 during the last four years;**

Undergraduate Degrees are classified as follows:

3.60 to 4.00	First Class
--------------	-------------

3.20 to 3.59	Second Class. 1 st Division
2.80 to 3.19	Second Class. 2 nd Division
2.40 to 2.79	Third Class
2.00 to 2.39	Ordinary Degree

- only courses that have been graded with 40 and above are taken into account for the calculation of the Grade Point Average (GPA), because only those courses can be awarded with credits. The courses which are calculated collectively cover the required credits. This includes all the courses that the student has successfully passed, even if they have successfully completed more courses than their program of studies requires.
- students wishing to improve their grades in a course which has been graded above 40, have to re-sit the exam. Re-sits are allowed only once.
- If a student has repeated a course because they have to or in order to improve their grades, and the number of credits has changed, the new number of credits will be recorded.
- An Incomplete grade is given only in exceptional substantiated circumstances (certified medical or personal reasons). The procedure for grading an Incomplete course, is the following:
 - a form is completed by the lecturer and the student is directed to the Council of the Department and the Student and Welfare Services of the College. The form contains the approval of the Chair of the Department
 - there must be provisions for completing the mark before the end of the following semester
 - if the mark is not completed within an agreed deadline the incomplete mark is automatically changed to zero (0).
- The marking and assessment of a thesis that is carried out for two or more semesters, is conducted in the following way:
 - At the end of each semester, before the final semester of completion of the thesis, the supervisor submits written assessment of the student's progress to the Department.
 - The assessment is communicated to the student. The designation Satisfactory (S) and US (Unsatisfactory) is given in the assessment.
 - The carrying out of the thesis and the assessment are subject to the regulations recommended by the Council of the Department and approved by the Council of the Faculty.

- **The final mark of the thesis is submitted within the deadline specified for all subjects.**
- **The analytic grading in all subjects, as well as all possible failures, withdrawals, or exemptions from subjects, are registered in the final report of the analytic grading. The weighting of each subject grade in European Credit Units (ECTS) is registered in the Program Study Guide and the Analytic Grade report. Additionally, each graduate is provided with a Diploma Supplement in English free of charge.**
- **Seven days following the completion of an exam, the final grading is submitted to the Director of Student Affairs and Student Welfare. In the case of subjects attended by more than 25 students, the final grades can be submitted 10 days after the completion of the examination. In the case of programs being involved in the process of grade approval by the Program Council, any changes to grades, should be submitted to the Student and Welfare Services of the College within a timeframe of 10 days.**
- **The Academic Committee approves student grades and the conferring of awards.**
-

5. Quality Indicators for Programs of Studies and Their Monitoring

A central indicator is the percentage of the courses of the program for which all course descriptions (learning outcomes, teaching methods, assessment criteria, etc.) are adequately present in the program, both from the perspective of the student and the educational expert. The other core indicator sections are:

- **Periodic assessment of the program and its courses**
 - **The extent to which the goals, objectives, learning outcomes and methods are achieved.**
 - **The adequacy with which the program has changed in the last 3 to 5 years.**
 - **The successful implementation of requirements formulated by a previous check-up or audit.**
- **Student attraction and student admission**
 - **Success of the program in relation to similar programs in other institutions**
 - **Validation of previously acquired competences**
- **Curriculum design**
 - **flexibility of the program**
 - **coherence of the program**
- **Teaching and learning methods**
 - **adequacy of teaching methods**
 - **innovative approaches**
 - **adequacy of teaching**
 - **Research Projects related to the Program**
- **Assessment**

- adequacy of assessment methods
- innovative approaches
- adequacy of assessment for written exams and projects
- Study load and study progress
 - retention rates
 - passing rates
 - performance outcomes (performance of students who pass)
- Quality management
 - adequacy of quality control in the program
 - quality of diagnostics and improvement plans
 - performance of the improvement projects
- Organization
 - adequacy of academic staff in number and competence
 - working conditions and opportunities for academic staff
 - evaluation and support for academic staff
 - adequacy of environment and equipment for teaching and learning

Programs perform measurement and analysis based on objective data and satisfaction questionnaires with personnel, students, graduates, and employers on an annual basis. In the implementation, program coordinators focus on the efficiency of diagnostics by using a three-step procedure in which the teachers are the process-owners. For example, for the measurement of the study load, it is essential that all necessary requirements are fulfilled (i.e., the program contains descriptions, it is clear on what basis the estimate is made, teachers have explicit expectations about study load, know the entry profile, and also know the credit system calculation). Secondly, it is expected that teachers themselves monitor the engagement and study load of students during the course, on the basis of their interaction with students. Thirdly, a system of quick scanning can identify course units which may present challenges (i.e. simply by asking successful students whether they had to study much more or much less than what was prescribed).

6. Policy and Process of Preventing and Dealing with Plagiarism

1. Definitions

1.1 Academic integrity means honesty and responsibility in scholarship and research. It involves creating and expressing one's own ideas in coursework and published works, acknowledging all sources of information. It also implies completing assignments independently, or acknowledging collaboration (when it is required). Furthermore, it requires honesty during examinations and the accurate reporting of results when conducting research.

1.2 Academic writing misconduct is any action or attempted action that may result in an unfair academic advantage for oneself, or an unfair academic advantage or disadvantage for any other member(s) of the academic community. Academic writing misconduct includes, but is not limited to, unacknowledged appropriation of the work of others; altering academic documents or transcripts; falsification or fabrication of data; misrepresentation of data to gain access to materials before they are intended to be available; failure to declare conflicts of interest; failure to follow accepted procedures or meet legal or ethical requirements, or to exercise due care in carrying out responsibilities for avoiding unreasonable harm or risk to humans, animals and/or the environment; and helping anyone to gain an unfair academic advantage.

1.3 Plagiarism is the use of words, inventions, ideas, opinions, discoveries, artwork images, music recordings, or computer-generated work (from any printed, digital or internet-based source, whether published or not) of another person, even if the content is openly licensed, and presenting it as one's own work without acknowledging the source. Plagiarism may be the result of intentional, inattentive or unintentional behavior.

Plagiarism cannot be confirmed by mere similarities between words in the source text and the borrowed text, as in the case of terminology, commonly used phrases and known facts. Plagiarism should be distinguished from other forms of academic writing misconduct, such as, but not limited to:

- collusion and fabrication or falsification of data;
- purchasing of assignments, dissertations, and theses via the Internet, or using a ghost writer and presenting this person's documents as one's own work;
- presenting the same work for more than one course or in consecutive years; and
 - the re-use of one's previously evaluated or published material without acknowledgment or any kind of indication.

1.4 Acknowledgment is the use of references in academic writing to indicate the source of previously expressed ideas or published material and the details of the publication.

2.0 Background

Academic integrity is the moral code of academia and the foundation of academic excellence. It requires honest as well as responsible scholarship and is an expression of personal integrity and honesty. Upholding the practice of academic integrity is, therefore, a reflection of individual, personal and professional integrity.

3.0 Dealing with a Student's Plagiarism

Where plagiarism is identified, it will be necessary to decide:

- Whether the plagiarism should be dealt with at an informal or a formal level; and
- If a formal response is required, the level of response which is appropriate

This decision requires a determination as to whether the alleged plagiarism is significant or not. When a teacher suspects an instance of plagiarism, the following steps will be taken:

The teacher who is marking the paper or assessing the creative project will initially assess the degree of plagiarism, taking into account how much material was plagiarized, how much it impacted on the work presented as original, and the percentage load of the particular assessment task within the course.

The teacher will inform the Departmental Head, who will assist in determining whether there is plagiarism and, if so, whether it is non-significant plagiarism or significant plagiarism.

In determining whether plagiarism is non-significant or significant, and assessing its seriousness, consideration is given to the student's apparent level of intention to deceive. The level and effect of that intention will be the primary consideration in determining penalties or further action.

If the plagiarism in the assignment or project is judged as non-significant the Departmental Head and the teacher concerned will discuss this with the student, will listen to the student's viewpoint and, if appropriate, issue a verbal warning to the student. The matter will also be noted on the student's file and a copy of the note will be provided to the student.

If the plagiarism in the assignment or project is judged as significant, the Departmental Head and the teacher concerned will discuss this with the student. The student will be given advance notice of the purpose of the meeting and may bring a support person to the interview. The purpose of the interview will be to determine whether and how much plagiarism has occurred and gives the student the opportunity to respond. If requested, the student will be given the opportunity to respond in writing before any decision is taken regarding penalties.

During the interview, should the student's work be confirmed as containing plagiarism, the range of likely penalties will be discussed. Depending on the level of significance of the plagiarism:

- the student may be required to undertake an additional assessment task in that subject, or to re-submit the original assessment task after re-working it
- the student's work may be assessed as Fail (F) for the subject for the relevant time period
- the student may receive a grade of Fail (F) as their final assessment for the subject for the year, which could lead to failure of the course
- the most serious cases of significant offences could be considered as serious misconduct and, after investigation, penalties could include failure in the course and exclusion from Philips College.

In all these cases, the matter will be noted on the student's file and a copy of the note will be provided to the student.

If a student disagrees with the penalty issued as a result of an allegation of plagiarism, the student may submit a grievance to the Disciplinary Committee for examination.

For more details please refer to Annexes 2 and 3- *Institutional Internal Regulations, Rules and Policies*, SECTION IV: Student Studies, Admission, Registration, Grading and Graduation.

8. Criteria and Student Admission Process

For more details please refer to Annexes 2 and 3- *Institutional Internal Regulations, Rules and Policies*, SECTION IV: Student Studies, Admission, Registration, Grading and Graduation.

Application and Admission

The admission policies of Philips College are set out by the Academic Committee and are implemented and administered by the Office of the Registrar.

The following principles underlie the admissions policy of the College:

- The College is committed to offering a fair and transparent means for admission for all applicants to training and education programs delivered by the Institute.
- Admission to programs of study is subject to the availability of places.
- Places will be offered on a competitive basis until all places have been filled.
- The College reserves the right to refuse admission to any applicant failing to meet entry criteria.
- The information contained in the College prospectus and on the College's website is intended as a guide for individuals seeking admission and does not constitute a contract, or the terms thereof, between the College and a student or any third party.
- Philips College reserves the right to cancel, suspend or modify its programs at any time.
- An applicant only becomes a student of the Philips College when fully registered.

Philips College is open to all those who have the required qualifications as outlined in the Admission Regulations of the College and the relevant regulations or bye-laws for the course of their choice.

Regulations and buy-laws governing all courses offered include important details concerning the programs and are available at the Registrar's office.

Learner Admission

The Learner Admission, Progression and Recognition Policy of the Philips College serves to ensure that prospective and/or admitted learners:

- are substantially and accurately informed regarding Philips College, the programs of education and associated pathways offered, and the learning environment and experience provided;
- are at an appropriate stage in their learning development to be admitted to their specified programs of education;
- have appropriate recognition of education and training qualifications, periods of study and prior learning, including the recognition of non-formal and informal learning; and
- are assisted and supported in their introduction and transition to tertiary education.

The learner-center College approach of the College is promoted at each stage of a student's studies.

9. Quality Assurance in Relation to Learning Resources

Quality Assurance Processes

Quality assurance processes are in operation to ensure that our services and supports are fit-for-purpose, accessible and that our learners are aware of the resources that exist.

Information about the range of services available is communicated to our learners through:

- *Pre-admission activities*: College prospectus and website, service presentations and provision of information leaflets for College visits, recruitment fairs, open days, interviews for mature students, and link modules on Further Education.
- *Inductions and orientation programs*: Information sessions delivered by Student Services and Supports during new and continuing learner inductions and orientations
- *Learner materials*: Learner handbooks, induction folders, service information leaflets, electronic noticeboards within the College.
- *The Students' Association*: Information boards, emails, and 'shout-outs' in class.

- *Staff communication:* Resources and support are actively provided to academic, administrative and support staff through meetings at the beginning of the academic year and by regular emails sent to the College staff throughout the year.
- *Follow-up learner communication:* Follow-up emails sent to learners informing and advising them about the services and support available, College events, information campaigns and workshop schedules.

10. Quality Assurance and Control of the Learning Process

From induction to graduation, the College monitors learner perspectives on the quality of resources and learner supports through learner feedback surveys. These assist the understanding of learners' needs and allow the College to continue developing and improving the support and services offered. Evaluations and any arising recommendations are considered on a cyclical basis and are reported through the strategic management processes of the College. Learner representation is actively sought, encouraged, valued and influential.

Our commitment to continuous quality improvement is evidenced by the importance placed on professional development through individual membership held by staff in their respective professional bodies.

Internally, regular team meetings are held for each function which are supported by the Learner Resources Committee, a representative sub-committee of the Academic Council responsible for overseeing the promotion, co-ordination, monitoring and development of the learning resources, services and supports available to the student body.

From induction to graduation, the College monitors learner perspectives on the quality of resources and learner supports through learner feedback surveys. Learner feedback surveys assist our understanding of our learners' needs and allow us to continue developing and improving the services and supports we offer. Evaluations and any other recommendations are considered on a cyclical basis and are reported through the College strategic management processes.

Learner representation is evident at all levels within the College decision-making structure: the Council of Management; the Academic Committee and associated sub-committees. The College also operates Program Boards which include one learner representative from each stage of the program. Program Boards typically meet three times annually and learners are invited to meetings and encouraged to participate. Feedback from learners is a standing agenda item and offers an opportunity for class representatives to give their opinions regarding the programs offered and to bring forward any issues their classes might have for discussion.

11. Quality Assurance and Sufficiency of Student Resources (ANNEX 10 – N/A)

For more details please refer to Annexes 2 and 3 - *Institutional Internal Regulations, Rules and Policies*, SECTION IV: Student Studies, Admission, Registration, Grading and Graduation.

Quality Assurance Policy

Introduction

The vision of Philips College is to be a leading College in the region, by creating and offering Excellence in Teaching, Research and Service with a strong student focus. The predefined mission of (a) educating our students, for successful careers and life achievement, (b) understanding and underpinning the needs and evolutions of our society, (c) creating knowledge and progress, through research and innovation, generate the College's commitment to continuous improvement of Quality Assurance, in which Accountability, Responsibility, Consistency, Transparency and Innovation are *sine qua non*.

The system is built around established central values: Commitment to Excellence, Student Centered, People Oriented, Innovative, Accountable, and Socially Responsible. It is focused on the student, and it is balanced along the main axes of Teaching, Research and Service. The student focus is reflected in the quality management system. The College not only believes that it is better to involve students as active partners, but also endeavors to underline that quality management, by involving customers and key persons, is an essential element of public or private, and business or social-profit organizations. The College aims to sensitize students and staff to this practice of accountability and social responsibility.

Philips College draws upon the potential of motivated people in a motivating workplace. Management, therefore, is also focused on rewarding positive new practices and sharing them rather than overly controlling and disseminating existing practices. The quality assurance targets innovation and flexibility, and wants to avoid rigidity. Staff working at the College are intrinsically motivated by customer focus and social responsibility. The fact that they elect to work in a College with a dynamic profile and a focus on performance reward, is an important element in human resources management (HRM). Innovation and flexibility are reflected in the Quality Management System (QMS), and the system itself is subject to regular reviews of efficiency and user-friendliness by the Internal Quality Committee.

Philips College meets the requirements and the scope of the European Standards and Guidelines on Quality Assurance (ESG) utilizing a method of sustainable and Integrated Quality Management (IQM). It focuses both on institutional quality assurance and program quality management.

Programs are described according to the European Credit Transfer System (ECTS). Course descriptions contain the learning outcomes, competence goals, content and study materials, study volume, teaching hours and teaching methods, and methods for assessment. The level of subjects is set according to the European Qualification Framework (EQF) guidelines and national requirements.

Policy data, guidelines and decisions regarding quality management are communicated throughout the organization. Staff and student representatives are involved in outlining the quality management policy.

Internal Evaluation Committee

The Internal Evaluation Committee deals with the preparation of the General Internal Quality Evaluation Report. The Committee convenes at least once per semester under the Chairmanship of the Principal. The Committee has the following composition:

1. Principal, Chairperson
2. Two members of the academic staff
3. One member specializing on issues of quality assurance
4. One member representative of the administration staff
5. The President at the time, Representative of the Students' Association
6. The Secretary at the time, Representative of the Students' Association

The System of Internal Quality Assurance

- Internal Quality Assurance at Philips College is conducted in accordance with the *European Standards and Guidelines (ESG)* and the relevant national legislation.
- The Internal Evaluation Committee has the overall control and supervision of the College quality assurance system, whereas the central Quality Manager/Coordinator supervise(s) the quality management processes of teaching and learning, research, service-provision, and administration, without being responsible for the results of these key domains. The quality manager is responsible for:
 - a. The coordination and updating of QM procedures and action plans as a central section in the QM handbook.
 - b. The monitoring of the efficiency and use of the central mechanisms and indicators of quality assurance, on institutional level and on program level.
 - c. The supervision of QM reporting for internal and external quality assurance, in cooperation with the academic and the administrative units responsible for providing information.
 - d. Preparing and presiding the decision-making process in the Internal Evaluation Committee, and reporting to the top managerial group for final decision-making.

- e. The coaching of staff working in the QM unit and the supervision of key performance factors that are specific for QM.
- f. The communication about QM issues and the provision of QM information within Philips College.
- g. The training of QM competences in personnel (with a special focus on managerial functions and QSG-members, the development of QM methods and the deployment of mechanisms specific to QM.

Quality Assurance Procedure for Programs of Study

- The QA Coordinator submits the SAR (Self- Assessment Report) template to Program Coordinators, via the Departmental Internal Evaluation Committee. A selection of a minimum of five faculty members is created by the Program Coordinators, in order to participate in a quantitative research for the quality of a Program.
- A qualitative research is conducted by interviewing ten students by the Program Coordinator. The completed questionnaires are submitted to the Principal's office for any other reference.
- For the production of the *SAR (Self- Assessment Report)*, cooperation is necessary among the different departments of the College such as the Erasmus Office, the Office of Student Affairs, the Research Centre, the Department of Enrollment, the MIS Department, the Administrators and the QA Coordinator.
- Administrators are responsible for submission of a SAR template complete with the following data to the Programs Leader:
 - (i) Student and Faculty Mobility
 - (ii) Students' Employability
 - (iii) Research Projects related to the Program
 - (iv) Assessment Scores
 - (v) Study progress
 - (vi) Students' Demographics
 - (vii) Students' Progress
 - (viii) F2015 Instructor's Evaluation Results
 - (ix) Curriculum
 - (x) Semester Breakdown
 - (xi) Syllabi
 - (xii) Faculty info

(xiii) Faculty CVs

Each Departmental Head is responsible, to develop the SAR and then the Program Internal Evaluation Committee finalizes it and proposes actions for improvement.

Formulation of action plans concerning the suggestions for further actions made in the SARs, were decided. For this purpose, *Quality Improvement Plan for the Program form* is used in setting priorities for Improvement Plans.

The SAR and the *Quality Improvement Plan for the Program form* obtain approval from Program Leader and finally both are submitted to the Internal Evaluation Committee.

Following a brief presentation of the SAR conclusions with emphasis on the Quality Improvement Plan of the Program from, by the Departmental Head involved, a meeting of the Internal Quality *Committee* is scheduled. The meeting is intended, for discussion and endorsement of the Self-Assessment Reports of the reviewed programs.

The Internal Evaluation Committee supervises the strategic quality management of the College, i.e. the choice of models and mechanisms in Quality Management, the key performance factors and indicators (KPF/KPI), the definition and the performance of working groups.

Finally, the Departmental Heads deliver a *Final Implementation Report - Quality Improvement Plan of the Program form* to the Internal Evaluation Committee, in order to validate the procedure.

Quality Assurance Procedure for Administration Departments:

The Policy of Quality Assurance is the main pillar of a coherent institutional Quality Assurance system that forms a cycle for continuous improvement and contributes to the accountability of the institution. The Quality Assurance Policy of Philips College and the Mission statement are crucial documents that are visible to all people involved in the College, while the review on how Philips College scores on the strategic elements in this mission, based on quality indicators, is a quality management document.

Learning Resources and Student Support

High-quality teaching is not possible without high-quality teaching facilities.

In addition to their teachers, students rely on a range of resources to assist their learning. These vary from physical resources such as libraries or computing facilities to human support in the form of tutors, counsellors, and other advisors.

Learning resources and other support mechanisms are readily assessable to students. Designers can have the needs of students in mind and be responsive to feedback from those who use the services provided.

Proper material facilities – teaching locations, study material, Information Technology facilities and information material – are essential for the delivery of the programs.

Many factors are involved in assuring the quality of these elements. Implementation issues arise at a high, central level (i.e., availability of a digital learning environment) and at the course level (the lecturer can set up an effective blackboard site for the course). Thus, the gathering of information about the facilities available is important at all levels so that a targeted inventory of possible improvements can be created.