

Doc. 300.3.1

Date: 29.03.2025

# External Evaluation Report (Departmental)

- **Higher Education Institution:**

University of Cyprus

- **Town:** Nicosia

- **School/Faculty:** Faculty of Social Sciences and Education

- **Department:** Department of Law

- **Department's Status:** Currently operating

- **Programme(s) of study under evaluation:**  
Name (Duration, ECTS, Cycle)

- **Programme(s) of study**

- **Programme 1 – Law degree (LLB)**

- **In Greek:**

- Πτυχίο Νομικής

- **In English:**

- Law degree

- Language(s) of instruction:** Greek

- **Programme 2 – LLM European Business Law**

- **In Greek:**

- Μάστερ στο Ευρωπαϊκό Εμπορικό Δίκαιο

- **In English:**

- LLM European Business Law

- Language(s) of instruction:** Greek

- **Programme 3 – PhD in Law**

- **In Greek:**

- Διδακτορικό στη Νομική

- **In English:**

- PhD in Law

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



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

Department's programmes (to be filled by the CYQAA officer and verified by the EEC):

DEPARTMENT	PROGRAMMES OF STUDY

## A. Introduction

The on-site visit took place on March 26-27, 2025 at the current premises of UCY. The EEC met with various members of the academic and support staff and visited several buildings, including the library. The EEC understood that the department of law is not located in a single building but is dispersed in various buildings. The site visit lasted from 9:00 to 17:00 on both days and followed closely the posted schedule. The overwhelming majority of scheduled participants were present. The climate of communication was positive, open and constructive. During the last meeting with the dean of the SSH School and certain law professors, the EEC had the opportunity to clarify various remaining questions and to communicate and briefly discuss certain preliminary yet substantive findings. This report describes in greater detail the conclusions and recommendations of the EEC regarding the newly established department of law.

## B. External Evaluation Committee (EEC)

<i>Name</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>University</i>
Xavier Grousot	Professor	Lund University
Panagiotis Delimatsis	Professor	Tilburg University
Werner Haslehner	Professor	University of Luxembourg
Chara Pangalou	Student	Open University of Cyprus
Constantinos Lambriades	Member, Cyprus Bar Association	

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

- *The external evaluation report refers to the Department as a whole (programmes offered, teaching staff, administrative staff, infrastructure, resources, etc.).*
- *The external evaluation report follows the structure of assessment areas and sub-areas.*
- *Under each assessment area there are quality indicators (criteria) to be scored by the EEC on a scale from one (1) to five (5), based on the degree of compliance for the above mentioned quality indicators (criteria). The scale used is explained below:*

1 or 2:	Non-compliant
3:	Partially compliant
4 or 5:	Compliant

- *The EEC must justify the numerical scores provided for the quality indicators (criteria) by specifying (if any) the deficiencies.*
- *It is pointed out that, in the case of indicators (criteria) that cannot be applied due to the status of the Department, N/A (= Not Applicable) should be noted and a detailed explanation should be provided on the Department's corresponding policy regarding the specific quality indicator.*
- *In addition, for each assessment area, it is important to provide information regarding the compliance with the requirements. In particular, the following must be included:*

### Findings

*A short description of the situation in the Department based on evidence from the Department's application and the site - visit.*

### Strengths

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

### Areas of improvement and recommendations

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

- *The EEC should state the compliance for each sub-area (Non-compliant, Partially compliant, Compliant), **which must be in agreement with everything stated in the report.***
- ***The report may also address other issues which the EEC finds relevant.***

## 1. Department's academic profile and orientation

(ESG 1.1, 1.2, 1.4, 1.5, 1.6, 1.7, 1.8, 1.9)

### Sub-areas

- 1.1 Mission and strategic planning (including SWOT analysis)
- 1.2 Connecting with society
- 1.3 Development processes

Mark from 1 to 5 the degree of compliance for each quality indicator/criterion

1 or 2: *Non-compliant*

3: *Partially compliant*

4 or 5: *Compliant*

Quality indicators/criteria		
1. Department's academic profile and orientation		
1.1 Mission and strategic planning (including SWOT analysis)		1 - 5
1.1.1	The Department has formally adopted a mission statement, which is available to the public and easily accessible.	5
1.1.2	The Department has developed its strategic planning aiming at fulfilling its mission.	5
1.1.3	The Department's strategic planning includes short, medium-term and long-term goals and objectives, which are periodically revised and adapted.	5
1.1.4	The programmes of study offered by the Department reflect its academic profile and are aligned with the European and international practice.	5
1.1.5	The academic community is involved in shaping and monitoring the implementation of the Department's development strategies.	4
1.1.6	Stakeholders such as academics, students, graduates and other professional and scientific associations participate in the Department's development strategy.	4
1.1.7	The mechanism for collecting and analysing data and indicators needed to effectively design the Department's academic development is adequate and effective.	5
Justify the numerical scores provided for the quality indicators (criteria) by specifying (if any)		

**The EEC considers that in developing strategy and particularly in the design and developments in the curriculum and modules the department could have closer cooperation with professional and scientific associations, ie the external stakeholders.**

Additionally, provide information on the following:

1. Coherence and compatibility among programmes of study offered by the Department.
2. Coherence and compatibility among Departments within the School/Faculty (to which the Department under evaluation belongs).

There is a high degree of coherence and compatibility of LL.B., LL.M. and Ph.D. programmes within the Department. The Department has a clear European and international orientation within the programmes offered by the Department. This focus is welcomed by the EEC since it ensures coherence among the programmes and is also beneficial for improving the quality of the teaching and the internationalisation of the research. The programmes of study offered by the Department reflect a full academic profile and are designed to ensure a high degree of coherence and compatibility. The Department aligns with the policies of the School of Social Science and Education. There is a high degree of coherence and compatibility between the Department and the School of Social Science and Education.

Provide suggestions for changes in case of incompatibility.

NA

## 1. Department's academic profile and orientation

1.2 Connecting with society		1 - 5
1.2.1	The Department has effective mechanisms to assess the needs and demands of society and takes them into account in its various activities.	5
1.2.2	The Department provides sufficient information to the public about its activities and offered programmes of study.	5
1.2.3	The Department ensures that its operation and activities have a positive impact on society.	5
1.2.4	The Department has an effective communication mechanism with its graduates.	5

Justify the numerical scores provided for the quality indicators (criteria) by specifying (if any) the deficiencies.

The Department is very strong in connecting with society. In that respect, the EEC was particularly impressed by the number and richness of activities organized by the Department.



## 1. Department's academic profile and orientation

### 1.3 Development processes

1 - 5

1.3.1	Effective procedures and measures are in place to attract and select teaching staff to ensure that they possess the formal and substantive skills to teach, carry out research and effectively carry out their work.	3
1.3.2	Planning teaching staff recruitment and their professional development is in line with the Department's academic development plan.	5
1.3.3	The Department applies an effective strategy of attracting high-level students from Cyprus and abroad.	5
1.3.4	The funding processes for the operation of the Department and the continuous improvement of the quality of its programmes of study are adequate and transparent.	4

Justify the numerical scores provided for the quality indicators (criteria) by specifying (if any) the deficiencies.

**The Department is able to attract and select excellent staff and students. However, the EEC has noticed that the selection procedure for the academic staff is very lengthy and bureaucratic. This clearly impairs the effectiveness of the employment's procedure of new staff. It is clear from the Department's application and notably its SWOT analysis that the department is facing a serious understaffing that impedes its full effectiveness and growth.**

Additionally, write:

- Expected number of Cypriot and international students
- Countries of origin of international students and number from each country

Click to enter text.

### Findings

The Department was established in 2006 and is dedicated to excellence. It aims at establishing itself in the international academic and scientific environment as a pioneering centre of excellence in research and teaching, continuously contributing to social progress and culture. It specifically aims at contributing to the development of Cyprus law, the study of European systems and European integration, including their impact on Cyprus law, as well as to develop the methodological research and writing skills of the students. Due to structural deficiencies confirmed during our site visit, the EEC considers that the Department should be elevated to a School of Law in order to improve its effectiveness, competitiveness, perennity and growth.

### Strengths

- The Department is a leader in Cyprus. It produces excellent research and teaching in an increasingly competitive milieu.
- The staff of the Department shows strong dedication and engagement in both research and teaching and collectively works for the development and improvement of the Department.
- The staff of the Department is helpful and accessible towards the LLB, LLM and PhD students and guides them in a very suitable way.
- The Department has popular and high-quality programmes; and it attracts excellent students.
- The Department makes a strong contribution to society in Cyprus by organizing multiple and qualitative events and seminars.
- The staff of the Department intensively participates in multiple committees and advisory bodies.
- The Department has managed to build an excellent LL.B. program and a very good LL.M. programme.

#### Areas of improvement and recommendations

- The Department faces structural deficiencies that must be remedied as soon as possible in order to improve its effectiveness and growth.
- The structural deficiencies can be tackled by an elevation of the Department into a School of Law to increase its effectiveness and proper functioning but also face competition effectively.
- The Department is understaffed. The staff is thus overburdened.
- The increase of staff may be financed by private donations.
- According to representations made, 50% of the grants are retained, thus presenting a potential challenge in respect to allocation of resources.
- According to representations made, budgetary issues may be causing competition between the law departments and other schools in the university. It appears that the law department cross-subsidizes other departments, an element showing that investment in the law department's academic staff pays off.
- According to representations made, securing the budget is challenging.
- The Department should pay attention to gender equality when recruiting new staff.
- The PhD programme is not efficient enough. The Department should provide more fully funded positions in order to ensure the effective production and publication of the dissertations.
- The number of postdocs is insufficient, and their number could be increased. External funding applications made available by the European Union (eg Jean Monnet postdocs or ERC) could be used in order to find the budgetary resources necessary to hire new postdocs and thus also develop the number and competences of the staff.

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

Sub-area	<i>Non-compliant / Partially Compliant / Compliant</i>
1.1 Mission and strategic planning	<b>Compliant</b>
1.2 Connecting with society	<b>Compliant</b>
1.3 Development processes	<b>Compliant</b>

## 2. Quality Assurance

(ESG 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.6, 1.7, 1.8)

### Sub-areas

**2.1 System and quality assurance strategy**

**2.2 Quality assurance for the programmes of study**

Mark from 1 to 5 the degree of compliance for each quality indicator/criterion

*1 or 2: Non-compliant*

*3: Partially compliant*

*4 or 5: Compliant*

Quality indicators/criteria		
<b>2. Quality Assurance</b>		
<b>2.1 System and quality assurance strategy</b>		<b>1 - 5</b>
2.1.1	The Department has a policy for quality assurance that is made public and forms part of the Institution's strategic management.	<b>5</b>
2.1.2	Internal stakeholders develop and implement a policy for quality assurance through appropriate structures and processes, while involving external stakeholders.	<b>4</b>
2.1.3	The Department's policy for quality assurance supports guarding against intolerance of any kind or discrimination against students or staff.	<b>5</b>
2.1.4	<b>The quality assurance system adequately covers all the functions and sectors of the Department's activities:</b>	
	2.1.4.1 Teaching and learning	<b>5</b>
	2.1.4.2 Research	<b>4</b>
	2.1.4.3 The connection with society	<b>5</b>
	2.1.4.4 Management and support services	<b>5</b>
2.1.5	The quality assurance system promotes a culture of quality.	<b>4</b>
2.1.6	Students' evaluation and feedback	<b>4</b>

Justify the numerical scores provided for the quality indicators (criteria) by specifying (if any) the deficiencies.

**The external stakeholders could be more involved in the design and development of the programs. A clearer procedure could be adopted in relation to the students' evaluation and feedback. The quality assurance within specifically the PhD sector could be improved.**

## 2. Quality Assurance

2.2 Quality assurance for the programmes of study		1 - 5
2.2.1	The responsibility for decision-making and monitoring the implementation of the programmes of study offered by the Department lies with the teaching staff.	5
2.2.2	The system and criteria for assessing students' performance in the subjects of the programmes of studies offered by the Department are clear, sufficient and known to the students.	5
2.2.3	The quality control system refers to specific indicators and is effective, which have been presented and discussed.	5
2.2.4	The results from student assessments are used to improve the programmes of study.	3
2.2.5	The policy dealing with plagiarism committed by students as well as mechanisms for identifying and preventing it are effective.	4
2.2.6	The established procedures for examining students' objections/ disagreements on issues of student evaluation or academic ethics are effective.	3
2.2.7	The Department publishes information related to the programmes of study, credit units, learning outcomes, methodology, student admission criteria, completion of studies, facilities, number of teaching staff and the expertise of teaching staff.	5
2.2.8	Names and position of the teaching staff of each programme are published and easily accessible.	5
2.2.9	The Department has a clear and consistent policy on the admission criteria for students in the various programmes of studies offered.	5
2.2.10	The Department flexibly uses a variety of teaching methods.	5
2.2.11	The Department systematically collects data in relation to the academic performance of students, implements procedures for evaluating such data and has a relevant policy in place.	3

2.2.12	The Department analyses and publishes graduate employment information.	3
2.2.13	The Department ensures adequate and appropriate learning resources in line with European and international standards and/or international practices, particularly:	
2.2.12.1	Building facilities	5
2.2.12.2	Library	5
2.2.12.3	Rooms for theoretical, practical and laboratory lessons	5
2.2.12.4	Technological infrastructure	5
2.2.12.5	Academic support	5
2.2.14	There is a student welfare service that supports students in regard to academic, personal problems and difficulties.	5
2.2.15	The Department's mechanisms, processes and infrastructure consider the needs of a diverse student population such as mature, part-time, employed and international students as well as students with disabilities.	5
2.2.16	Mentoring of each student is provided and the number of students per each permanent teaching member is adequate.	5
2.2.17	The provision of quality doctoral studies is ensured through doctoral studies regulations, which are publicly available.	5
2.2.18	The number of doctoral students, under the supervision of a member of the teaching staff, enables continuous and effective feedback to the students and it complies with the European and international standards.	3
2.2.19	The Department has mechanisms and funds to support writing and attending conferences of doctoral candidates.	4
2.2.20	There is a clear policy on authorship and intellectual property.	5

Justify the numerical scores provided for the quality indicators (criteria) by specifying (if any) the deficiencies.

**The policy on plagiarism could be improved. The established procedures to evaluate the student assessment and the complaints could be improved. There is no collection of data regarding the performance of students. The information regarding graduate employment information is not collected/published. The number of doctoral students attributed to a supervisor of the staff is too high.**

### Findings

The EEC considers that the Department ensures a high level of quality assurance which is implemented through a culture of continuous improvement. Notably, the recommendations to improve quality assessment made by the previous committee of evaluation in 2020 have been taken into consideration by the Department. This is evidenced by the Department's application and was made clear during the site visit of the EEC.

Quality assurance processes and mechanisms are, in general, effectively implemented within the Department. Indeed, there is regular evaluation of existing curricula, the teaching provision, the performance and career advancement and performance of teaching and research staff, a policy on plagiarism, course assessment, and quality standards for the study programs. Student admission criteria and student performance are clearly communicated. In addition, the classroom and library facilities are excellent, and all classrooms are equipped with adequate technological infrastructure. Furthermore, there is a policy on disability and the student welfare provision is suitable. Finally, the EEC has also found some areas of improvement which are discussed below in more detail.

### Strengths

- There is proof of a culture of improvement within the Department when it comes to quality assurance.
- All members of the Department share the responsibility for ensuring the quality of teaching and learning.
- The Department has prepared and constantly updates handbooks for each program of study providing timely and adequate information to students on their studies, on the academic staff members and the facilities.
- There is a high level of student satisfaction within the Department.

### Areas of improvement and recommendations

- There is no sufficiently clear procedure to evaluate the student assessment for improving the programmes of study.
- There is no sufficiently clear procedure for assessing the students objections when it comes to student assessment or academic ethics.
- There is no collection of data regarding the performance of students such as average grades or dropouts.
- The information regarding graduate employment information is not collected/published.
- The policy on plagiarism is not fully complete since it is not yet connected to the problems related to the use of artificial intelligence and a relevant policy on this matter.
- The number of PhD students tutored by the members of the staff is too high.
- There is no compulsory procedure to force a PhD student to discontinue the dissertation when the PhD student has failed the required examinations.
- Clear procedures could be adopted to evaluate complaints or feedback made by students by involving a student committee to discuss the issue with the department.
- The department could gather collection of data regarding the performance of students.
- The department could gather information regarding graduate employment. Information is currently not collected/published.
- An AI policy should be adopted as soon as possible and the policy on plagiarism could be linked to it.
- The number of PhD students tutored by a member of the staff could be reduced and the department could adopt a compulsory policy to terminate a PhD position when the required

examinations are failed by the PhD student. This will help to reduce the cohort of the PhD students and thus render the management of the programme more effective.

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

Sub-area	<i>Non-compliant / Partially Compliant / Compliant</i>
2.1 System and quality assurance strategy	<b>Compliant</b>
2.2 Quality assurance for the programmes of study	<b>Compliant</b>



### 3. Administration (ESG 1.1, 1.3, 1.6)

Mark from 1 to 5 the degree of compliance for each quality indicator/criterion

1 or 2: *Non-compliant*  
3: *Partially compliant*  
4 or 5: *Compliant*

Quality indicators/criteria		
3. Administration		1 - 5
3.1	The administrative structure is in line with the legislation and the Department's mission.	5
3.2	The members of the teaching and administrative staff and the students participate, at a satisfactory degree and on the basis of specified procedures, in the management of the Department.	5
3.3	The administrative staff adequately supports the operation of the Department.	4
3.4	Adequate allocation of competences and responsibilities is ensured so that in academic matters, decisions are made by academics and the Department's council competently exercises legal control over such decisions.	5
3.5	The Department applies effective procedures to ensure transparency in the decision-making process.	5
3.6	Statutory sessions of the Department are held and minutes are kept.	5
3.7	The Department's council operates systematically and autonomously and exercise the full powers provided for by the law and / or the constitution of the Department without the intervention or involvement of a body or person outside the law provisions.	4
3.8	The manner in which the Department's council operates and the procedures for disseminating and implementing their decisions are clearly formulated and implemented precisely and effectively.	4
3.9	The Department applies procedures for the prevention and disciplinary control of academic misconduct of students, teaching and administrative staff, including plagiarism.	3
3.10	The Department has appropriate procedures for dealing with students' complaints.	4



3.11	Internationalization of the Department and external collaborations.	5
------	---	---

Justify the numerical scores provided for the quality indicators (criteria) by specifying (if any) the deficiencies.

**The Department has well-thought and transparent administrative procedures. As a small Department, decisions are taken collectively and in principle by consensus. It does not seem to be the case that students participate in the management of the Department. In view of the centralized way that the University operates, the Department has limited autonomy on most issues. The Department has in place procedures for the prevention of academic misconduct of students, teaching and administrative staff, including plagiarism. Procedures are in place for addressing complaints but they do not seem to be too detailed nor transparent. More clarity would be needed in this respect. Adopting the European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity (ALLEA, 2023) would be beneficial. It was also unclear whether there is a Committee/Board at the University level dealing with ethical issues on research.**

### Findings

The Law department apparently is short on staff, both academic and administrative. On the basis of information provided by the Dean of the School of Humanities, the number of administrative personnel is in line with the practice of all other Schools. Nevertheless, it is understood that the 2 administrative officers are undertaking a wide variety of duties, including but not limited to financial budgeting and payments, social media administration, scheduling/ organising meetings and minute taking, event planning, student and academic staff support etc. We understood that the burden of duties increases exponentially on the administrative staff, as soon as one of the members is absent, as the remaining member undertakes the duties of the absent member.

In respect to the academic staff, it is understood that the Department is in the process of hiring 3-4 additional members but this process has been going on for some time. The prospective hiring is justified since 2 members of the academic staff have already resigned/ left the University. But then again, a member of the academic staff is close to the retirement age which would mean that further hiring should be done to anticipate the aforementioned retirement.

Having said the above, there is nevertheless the impression (formed under the information received) that the academic staff is not only burdened with teaching, researching duties but also undertakes extensive administrative duties that may sidetrack the academic staff from pure academic work.

Overall, the administrative personnel appears to be competent and conscientious and works smoothly with the academic staff.

### Strengths

- The competency of the administrative personnel and their ability to carry out an extensive variety of duties.
- The experience of administrative staff.
- Many collaborations with other universities and part of academic networks at the European level, witnessing an extrovert mentality

### Areas of improvement and recommendations

- The EEC recommends the hiring of additional administrative personnel. This would not only relieve the pressure on the current administrative staff but it would also improve the quality of the services as the reallocation of duties would allow improved focus.
- The EEC would recommend the adoption of the European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity (ALLEA, 2023).
- The EEC recommends the introduction of an electronic system that deals with payments/reimbursements (eg Declaree). This would alleviate administrative burden from support staff who currently do everything manually.

**Please select what is appropriate for the following assessment area:**

Assessment area	<i>Non-compliant / Partially Compliant / Compliant</i>
3. Administration	<b>Compliant</b>

#### 4. Learning and Teaching (ESG 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.9)

##### Sub-areas

- 4.1 Planning the programmes of study  
4.2 Organisation of teaching

Mark from 1 to 5 the degree of compliance for each quality indicator/criterion

- 1 or 2: *Non-compliant*  
3: *Partially compliant*  
4 or 5: *Compliant*

Quality indicators/criteria		
4. Learning and Teaching		
4.1 Planning the programmes of study		1 - 5
4.1.1	The Department provides an effective system for designing, approving, monitoring and periodically reviewing the programmes of study.	4
4.1.2	Students and other stakeholders, including employers, are actively involved on the programmes' review and development.	3
4.1.3	Intended learning outcomes, the content of the programmes of study, the assignments and the final exams correspond to the appropriate level as indicated by the European Qualifications Framework (EQF).	4
4.1.4	The programmes of study are in compliance with the existing legislation and meet the professional qualifications requirements in the professional courses, where applicable.	5
4.1.5	The Department ensures that its programmes of study integrate effectively theory and practice.	4

Justify the numerical scores provided for the quality indicators (criteria) by specifying (if any) the deficiencies.

**The department has an adequate system for designing the programme of study, building on the expertise of existing staff. Stakeholders were not actively involved in the development of the programme but it appears that they agree that the programmes largely cover market needs. Since stakeholders were not involved in the development of the programmes under review, it would be necessary to ensure that stakeholders are involved in the assessment and future review of the programme, notably when it comes**

to legal practitioners. This may also improve students' self-confidence in litigation-related skills. Intended learning outcomes (ILO) are well-designed but it further needs to be ensured that the ILOs of each course match the ILOs of the programme as well as to how each course's ILOs contribute to achieving the objectives of the programme. Following the Bloom's taxonomy would allow some level of standardization here, offering clarity to the students. Other than bringing legal practitioners in class or arranging internship after their studies, the Department should consider introducing short masterclasses to complement the programme (this could be done in a full day via visiting lecturers) but also explore the potential for introducing legal clinics, notably in timely areas such as refugee/migration law (this would be a low-hanging fruit in view of the Department's cooperation with the ministry of Justice and the Law Council).

#### 4. Learning and Teaching

4.2 Organisation of teaching		1 - 5
4.2.1	The Department establishes student admission criteria for each programme, which are adhered to consistently.	5
4.2.2	Recognition of prior studies and credit transfer is regulated by procedures and regulations that are in line with European standards and/or international practices.	5
4.2.3	The number of students in the teaching rooms is suitable for theoretical, practical and laboratory lessons.	5
4.2.4	The teaching staff of the Department has regular and effective communication with their students, promoting mutual respect within the learner-teacher relationship.	5
4.2.5	Student-centred learning and teaching plays an important role in stimulating students' motivation, self-reflection and engagement in the learning process.	4
4.2.6	The teaching staff of the Department provides timely and effective feedback to their students.	4
4.2.7	The criteria and the method of assessment as well as the criteria for marking are published in advance.	4
4.2.8	The assessment allows students to demonstrate the extent to which the intended learning outcomes have been achieved.	4

The EEC found that the teaching methods tools and material used in teaching appeared modern and effective and support the use of modern educational technology. There is combination of formative and summative assessments but there is no coordination regarding the variation offered in each semester to ensure students enjoy potentially different modes of assessment. Variation is important in the use of teaching, learning and assessment methods to allow for an overall rewarding but also fair learning experience.

### Findings

The process of teaching and learning was found by the EEC to be designed to support students' individual and social development. The programme places a strong emphasis on its salience to the local legal community and student-centered teaching that enhances gradually student skills.

The process of teaching and learning appears to be flexible and open to new methods and issues (eg AI tools) although this can be expanded. Innovation in teaching though does not seem to be a central point and could definitely be given more serious consideration, in view of the very good relationships the department has with the local legal community and public authorities/ministries. The programme's ILOs are clear and straightforward, however there seems to be a disconnect as to how these are achieved per each course.

The teaching encourages a sense of autonomy in the learner, while ensuring adequate guidance and support from the teachers. Yet a regular and embedded form of training for academic teachers is missing, an element that we consider as a serious flaw in the current departmental setting. The Learning Center at the university level appears to offer relevant courses, from time to time, but there is no regular scheme, as noted.

The implementation of student-centred learning and teaching appeared to the EEC to respect and attend to the diversity of students and their needs, enabling flexible learning paths to combine with their professional activities.

The criteria for and method of assessment, as well as criteria for marking, were putatively indicated to be published in advance. Assessment as envisaged appeared to the EEC to enable students to demonstrate the extent to which the ILOs have been achieved. Students were likely to receive feedback linked to advice on the learning process, although it did not appear to be systematic and equally extensive across courses. Assessment plans appeared overall focused upon partial coursework. The EEC would consider it important to ensure that there is central coordination at the departmental level as far as the different methods of assessment across semesters and courses are concerned.

The EEC found that appropriate procedures for dealing with students' complaints regarding the process of teaching and learning were set by assessment processes and procedures of the University. However, quality assurance procedures were not as detailed and adequate levels of oversight, accountability and transparency appeared to be missing. Feedback loops would need to be carefully considered and established in written form at the departmental level.

The EEC met with stakeholders who provided extensive feedback. As a result, it was concluded that practical and theoretical studies are interconnected as evidenced by the high commendation of the local bar association and law firms but also ministries and public authorities regarding the place of practice in studies. The EEC is of the view that more practical aspects of legal training could be introduced in the programme of study both at the undergraduate and masters' levels, including moots and legal clinics.

The EEC understood and was satisfied to hear that the legal market acknowledges the high quality of training that UCY graduates display. This meant that placement of graduates did not seem to be an important concern.

The EEC found that assessment procedures and the ensuing accountability-related mechanism were not very clear. This appeared to be a common observation during our visit. While the EEC appreciates that the academic staff recognizes the challenge, it has understood that several important steps to improve the situation are yet to be taken. While the EEC is aware of the problems and delays a university bureaucracy can cause, we urge the institution to establish such a policy/mechanism as soon as possible, as it would benefit both teachers and students.

### Strengths

- The programme of study satisfies expectations of the legal market and is well-thought-out. At the master level, more innovative courses are being introduced, which is a welcome development.
- Teaching and learning methods take into account special circumstances and the students' needs.
- The programme is run by highly motivated academics who are interested to engage with contemporary cutting-edge issues of salience to a newer generation of law students and law studies in the era of digitization and geopolitical uncertainty.
- The programme is highly appreciated by the past and present students. This was clearly confirmed by the onsite visit and the EEC's meeting with alumni and students representatives.

### Areas of improvement and recommendations

- The EEC found that a broader diversity of more contemporary teaching and learning practices could readily be in-built into the programme to engage better with the considered views of stakeholders but also more cutting-edge pedagogical practice.
- The quality assurance procedures between the university and departmental level were not very clearly delineated, giving the impression of shifting responsibilities. The EEC would think that a peer-review and mentoring system in this relatively small group of academic staff would work well as a short-term measure; however, the department should give this issue a serious long-term consideration as well, notably as far as quality of teaching and research is concerned, thereby giving a sense of consistency and fairness to both students and staff.
- As the Department is currently understaffed and hiring processes are very slow, it would benefit from introducing a visiting scholar/professorship scheme within the percentage that is allowed by the Agency, to build essential expertise. This would enhance quality assurance as to assessment and benefit the younger staff in particular as they aim to grow in their capacity as full-fledged academics. It would also allow for some teaching load decrease for existing staff.

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

Sub-area	<i>Non-compliant / Partially Compliant / Compliant</i>
4.1 Planning the programmes of study	Compliant
4.2 Organisation of teaching	Compliant



## 5. Teaching Staff (ESG 1.5)

Mark from 1 to 5 the degree of compliance for each quality indicator/criterion

1 or 2: *Non-compliant*  
3: *Partially compliant*  
4 or 5: *Compliant*

Quality indicators/criteria		
5. Teaching Staff		1 - 5
5.1	The number of teaching staff - full-time and exclusive work - and the subject area of the staff sufficiently support the programmes of study.	3
5.2	The teaching staff of the Department has the relevant formal and substantive qualifications for teaching the individual subjects as described in the relevant legislation.	5
5.3	The visiting Professors' subject areas adequately support the Department's programmes of study.	NA
5.4	The special teaching staff and special scientists have the required qualifications, sufficient professional experience and expertise to teach a limited number of programmes of study.	4
5.5	The ratio of special teaching staff to the total number of teaching staff is satisfactory.	4
5.6	The ratio of the number of subjects of the programme of study taught by teaching staff working fulltime and exclusively to the number of subjects taught by part-time teaching staff ensures the quality of the programme of study.	4
5.7	The ratio of the number of students to the total number of teaching staff is sufficient to support and ensure the quality of the programme of study.	3
5.8	Feedback processes for teaching staff in regard to the evaluation of their teaching work, by the students, are satisfactory.	4

**The EEC finds that the department is currently understaffed. If one considers that supervision of master theses and PhD does not count towards calculating teaching time, then it becomes clear that research time is actually less than officially allocated. Understaffing then seriously undermines not only teaching quality but also research output. Special teaching staff helps on certain topics but this appears to occur on an ad hoc basis. As two members of the department left recently, one is released from teaching duties due to teaching duties at the Senate level and one is close to retirement, the centralization of the hiring process (and the ensuing delays resulting therefrom) is a very significant impediment to the progress of the department. In the meantime, the Department should capitalize on its proximity to the public authorities**



**and general legal market present in the capital and work with experienced professionals who can fill in teaching lacunae (eg on intellectual property law).**

Also, write the following:

- Number of teaching staff working full-time and having exclusive work: 10
- Number of special teaching staff working full-time and having exclusive work: 6
- Number of visiting Professors: 0
- Number of special scientists on lease services: NA

### Findings

Resident faculty members count altogether 10 people. Each one of them has a total of six hours of teaching per week, which is a rule centrally decided upon at the University level. The number of special teaching staff varies and seems to have increased lately as certain senior staff have administrative roles at the department or University level. Taken together over an academic year, it appears that the ratio of special teaching staff to permanent staff has increased lately, getting closer to 1:1, suggesting that the current hiring process is untenable.

The EEC is thus left with the impression that the Department is seriously understaffed to accomplish its objectives or simply maintain operations in crucial modules in both private and public law-related topics. The EEC is impressed by the qualifications and performance of the resident department members. However, the EEC was taken aback by the lack of regular review and development of skills for teaching staff regardless of seniority. Such training notably relates to introduce a balanced blended learning mix in each course but can also help in streamlining supervision. The latter would appear necessary because it can help staff to assess student performance fairly but also address the issue of late submissions of theses or other challenging circumstances in their interaction with students.

### Strengths

- Very competent teaching staff
- Good mix of senior and junior staff
- As the only public institution and a department with good reputation in the Greek-speaking community, the University is quite attractive for young academics
- Relatively low teaching load compared to the national practice, leaving room for teaching.

### Areas of improvement and recommendations

- The EEC recommends that the institution advertises new hires in key areas of law to complement existing staff. Accordingly, the number of support staff should grow as well.
- Gender balance should be taken into consideration when hiring new staff
- Gender balance is equally important when promoting existing staff. This would mean that at each level (full professor, associate, assistant) should strive for equal representation of male and female academics.
- The hiring and promotion process for academic staff should be expedited for the sake of academic excellence and talent retention, and not be hindered by bureaucratic or other considerations.
- Thesis supervision should count towards teaching time so that staff get a clearer picture of their actual research time.

- In view of the fact that research output is the most important component for promotion decisions, the EEC recommends that the institution sets an overall rule of at least 40% for research.
- the Department can explore the possibility of introducing part-time positions (eg, endowed chairs or professor of practice, which are positions that can be funded by private or public funds) to be filled by experienced legal professionals with a PhD or unique and extensive work experience in a given field (tax law; data protection; AML). This could address teaching and supervision needs and complement the existing departmental expertise.
- The Department should capitalize on its proximity to the public authorities and general legal market in the capital and work with experienced professionals who can fill in teaching lacunae (eg on intellectual property law).

Please ✓ what is appropriate for the following assessment area:

Assessment area	<i>Non-compliant / Partially Compliant / Compliant</i>
Teaching staff number, adequacy and suitability	<b>Partially Compliant</b>
Teaching staff recruitment and development	<b>Compliant</b>
Synergies of teaching and research	<b>Compliant</b>

## 6. Research

(ESG 1.1, 1.3, 1.5, 1.6)

Mark from 1 to 5 the degree of compliance for each quality indicator/criterion

1 or 2: *Non-compliant*

3: *Partially compliant*

4 or 5: *Compliant*

Quality indicators/criteria		
6. Research		1 - 5
6.1	The Department has a research policy formulated in line with its mission.	5
6.2	The Department consistently applies internal regulations and procedures of research activity, which promote the set out research policy and ensure compliance with the regulations of research projects financing programmes.	5
6.3	The Department provides adequate facilities and equipment to cover the staff and students' research activities.	4
6.4	The Department has the appropriate mechanisms for the development of students' research skills.	5
6.5	The results of the teaching staff research activity are published to a satisfactory extent in international journals which work with critics, international conferences, conference proceedings, publications, etc. The Department also uses an open access policy for publications, which is consistent with the corresponding national and European policy.	4
6.6	The Department ensures that research results are integrated into teaching and, to the extent applicable, promotes and implements a policy of transferring know-how to society and the production sector.	5
6.7	The Department provides mechanisms which ensure compliance with international rules of research ethics, both in relation to research activity and the rights of researchers.	5
6.8	The external, non-governmental, funding of research activities of teaching staff is similar to other Departments in Cyprus and abroad.	5
6.9	The policy, indirect or direct of internal funding of the research activities of the teaching staff is satisfactory, based on European and international practices.	4
Justify the numerical scores provided for the quality indicators (criteria) by specifying (if any) the deficiencies.		

**The department's research is adequately funded and supported by infrastructure. Output by academic staff is impressive given the overall burden stemming from teaching, administration and outreach activity. Significant efforts in research are dedicated towards the development of Cypriot legal doctrine, in line with the Department's mission. Available funding is in line with European and international practices, although the discretionary element of that funding support and its somewhat opaque allocation by a university committee risks not taking full account of the particularities of the Law Department's research output.**

### Findings

The Law Department is a leader in legal research in Cyprus, taking on a crucial role for the society it serves, in particular with respect to its work on the development of Cypriot legal doctrine. The Department's focus on research is fully aligned with the University's policy to be a Research University. The EEC urges the University to give full recognition to the importance of the work on Greek language publications (Commentaries, case notes, text books) and activity in support of governmental bodies when assessing the output of members of the law department for purposes of allocating research funds and promotions.

With a permanent academic staff of 10, the Department is small in international comparison, which is exacerbated by the administrative workload taken on by many of its members. In addition to the high administrative and teaching workload falling among them, this also makes it difficult to cover all aspects of the law that are of high importance for Cyprus. The EEC would consider it advisable for the University to adopt a medium to long-term strategic plan to double the size of the Department's academic staff, and to ensure hiring and promotion procedures aligned with that plan. This should go hand in hand with increasing its independence with a view to establishing a separate Faculty/Law School with adequate infrastructural and administrative resources to operate as such. As part of its growth strategy, the Department is encouraged to take particular account of the interest to have senior faculty cover areas of law that are considered "core subjects" for a law school according to international standards; this may be achieved through a combination of new hires and promotion of existing colleagues.

The faculty aligns its teaching with its research expertise, ensuring high-quality learning that is as evidenced in excellent reputation of its graduates. Professors show great dedication to develop students' specialist knowledge as well as analytic and research skills.

The research infrastructure is adequate for a department of its size; in particular, the ability to acquire academic literature via the library and individual research budgets is aligned to the needs of a still young institution in need of building up the stock of books. The library is an excellent and impressive place for learning and research. While an individual research budget is available to staff members, including PhD students, allowing them not only to buy crucial literature but also to participate in international seminars and conferences, the process of allocation seems somewhat opaque.

The department is actively engaged in applications to obtain additional research funding and appears to have a good success rate both with respect to participating in University-internal competitive funding procedures and in relation to external funding opportunities. Given the small size and existing workload of the academic staff, the University could do more to support faculty

members' ambitions to obtain even more prestigious international/European project funding by offering writing grants.

### Strengths

- The Law Department has been successful in attracting excellent researchers, resulting in a culture of excellence in research.
- The Law Department stands out from other institutions engaged in higher education in law in Cyprus through its integrated approach towards research, as well as through its dedication to the development of Cypriot legal doctrine.
- Both academic and administrative staff are highly intrinsically motivated to contribute to the mission of the Department and the University, going to great lengths in dedicating their time to research, outreach and supervision of some of the brightest young minds in Cyprus.

### Areas of improvement and recommendations

- The University should give more consideration to output related to the mission of the law department to develop Cypriot legal doctrine through publications and direct engagement with governmental bodies in addition to participating in excellent international research for purposes of allocation of research funding and promotions.
- While the University has a great record of attracting excellent talent to the Law Department, more should be done to increase the attractiveness and ensure the long-term retention of its academic staff. Key elements of recommendation are:
  - the overall growth of the department to ensure a lessening of the administrative burden,
  - further support for participating in international grant calls and research consortia (e.g. through writing grants),
  - taking full advantage of the possibilities for collaboration and exchange of staff created by the department's participation in European consortia,
  - clearer recognition of crucial but time-consuming supervisory tasks (Master dissertations, PhD theses) and
  - possibilities for faster promotion procedures that gives full recognition to experience gained outside the University of Cyprus.
- The EEC further urges the Department to carefully take account of its faculty's gender balance in the development of expected growth.

Please ✓ what is appropriate for the following assessment area:

Assessment area	<i>Non-compliant / Partially Compliant / Compliant</i>
Research mechanisms and regulations	<b>Compliant</b>
External and internal funding	<b>Compliant</b>
Motives for research	<b>Compliant</b>
Publications	<b>Compliant</b>

## 7. Resources (ESG 1.6)

Mark from 1 to 5 the degree of compliance for each quality indicator/criterion

1 or 2: *Non-compliant*

3: *Partially compliant*

4 or 5: *Compliant*

Quality indicators/criteria		
7. Resources		1 - 5
7.1	The Department has sufficient financial resources to support its functions, managed by the Institutional and Departmental bodies.	5
7.2	The Department follows sound and efficient management of the available financial resources in order to develop academically and research wise.	5
7.3	The Department's profits and donations are used for its development and for the benefit of the university community.	5
7.4	The Department's budget is appropriate for its mission and adequate for the implementation of strategic planning.	4
7.5	The Department carries out an assessment of the risks and sustainability of the programmes of study and adequately provides feedback on their operation.	5
7.6	The Department's external audit and the transparent management of its finances are ensured.	5
7.7	The fitness-for-purpose of support facilities and services is periodically reviewed.	4
<p>Justify the numerical scores provided for the quality indicators (criteria) by specifying (if any) the deficiencies.</p> <p><b>The Department has sufficient operational funds and an effective system of management of its funds. It has also accumulated a good level of its own reserves. However, further expected (and necessary) growth raises risks related to the existing available infrastructure and support facilities.</b></p>		

### Findings

The Department receives sufficient direct and indirect funding to support its research and teaching activities. The academic staff has several possibilities to apply for internal funds that support their participation in international seminars and conferences and to acquire legal literature and access to crucial databases.



The EEC understands that the Department is able to retain all tuition funds from its teaching at Master level to further support its research and outreach activity.

However, the limited availability of office space is a concern. It is crucial for the effective creation of an effective legal research environment that academics of every level (including PhDs and post-doctoral researchers, as well as visiting researchers) are given office space in close proximity to create the ability to engage in informal and unplanned intellectual exchanges that can inspire collaboration and foster a rich academic atmosphere.

### Strengths

- The financial support to acquire necessary research material and travel funds is generous and includes junior researchers (PhDs).
- The Department's ability to generate supplemental funds through its teaching at Master level that feeds back into its research and outreach activities.

### Areas of improvement and recommendations

- The infrastructure available to the Law Department, in particular with respect to office space, is not ideal and at risk of being inadequate in light of the expected growth of faculty. Therefore, the new strategy of the university would need to set out an ambitious and realistic plan about the law department infrastructure issue.
- The administrative support, while much improved compared to past years, and broadly in line with other departments at the university, is still at the low end, requiring academic staff to allocate an excessive amount of time towards administrative tasks connected to teaching and event organization and detracting from their core responsibilities.
- In view of the rising level of its own reserves, the EEC recommends that the Department's Council sets out an investment strategy with clearly delineated priorities for the next five-year period.

Please ✓ what is appropriate for the following assessment area:

Assessment area	<i>Non-compliant / Partially Compliant / Compliant</i>
7. Resources	<b>Compliant</b>

#### **D. Conclusions and final remarks**

The EEC is grateful to the institution and also the Agency for their hospitality, the thoroughness of the documentation they put before us, and their openness in discussing every aspect of their application. We are also grateful to all participants for their openness during the day of the visit.

The institution seeking accreditation had prepared an exciting and thoughtful case for accreditation. We have found the programmes under review to be well-thought, with good quality assurance mechanisms and delivered by enthusiastic academic colleagues. At the same time, several areas of improvement identified in this report will have to be addressed, ranging from staffing and hires of academics to increasing resources for students and staff to ensuring a continuous balance between research and teaching time throughout the academic year.

On the whole, the EEC recommends that the programmes under review be accredited. We hope that the institution will find this committee report an essential component of its growth strategy and its ambition to become an independent school that competes with its European counterpart as well as a source of reflection in its efforts to run exciting, sustainable and rewarding academic programmes for Greek-speaking students.





## E. Signatures of the EEC

Name	Signature
Xavier Grousot	
Panagiotis Delimatsis	
Werner Haslehner	
Constantine Lambrianides	
Chara Pagkalou	
FullName	

**Date:** 29.03.2025

