

Doc. 300.3.1

Date: 1 July 2021

External Evaluation Report (Departmental)

- **Higher Education Institution:**
University of Nicosia
- **Town:** Nicosia
- **School/Faculty:** School of Humanities and Social Sciences
- **Department:** Architecture
- **Department's Status:** Currently Operating

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

Programme 1

In Greek:

Programme Name

In English:

BA/MArch Architecture

Programme 2

In Greek:

Programme Name

In English:

BA Interior Design

Programme 3

In Greek:

Programme Name

In English:

MSc Computational Design and Digital Fabrication



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 2019” [N. 136 (I)/2015 to N. 35(I)/2019].



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

DEPARTMENT	PROGRAMMES OF STUDY
	BA/MArch Architecture
	BA Interior Design
	MSc Computational Design and Digital Fabrication



A. Introduction

This part includes basic information regarding the onsite visit.

Meetings were held via Zoom all day on Wednesday 30 June 2021.

All arrangements were satisfactory, including documentation, presentations and discussions.

All additional information requested was supplied quickly.

B. External Evaluation Committee (EEC)

<i>Name</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>University</i>
Iain Borden	Professor	University College London
Koen Van Balen	Professor	KU Leuven
Laura Malighetti	Associate Professor	Politecnico di Milano
David Kalashnikov	Student	University of Cyprus
Elena Christodoulou	Professional architect	Technical Chamber of Cyprus
Name	Position	University

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:	<i>Non-compliant</i>
3:	<i>Partially compliant</i>
4 or 5:	<i>Compliant</i>

- *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.*



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





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.	3
1.1.2	The Department has developed its strategic planning aiming at fulfilling its mission.	3
1.1.3	The Department's strategic planning includes short, medium-term and long-term goals and objectives, which are periodically revised and adapted.	3
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.	5
1.1.6	Stakeholders such as academics, students, graduates and other professional and scientific associations participate in the Department's development strategy.	5
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 deficiencies.		



1.1.1 Although a developed and coherent mission statement was included in documentation and during presentations to the panel, this information is not fully included in departmental websites, brochures and other public-facing media.

The department is also advised to consider ways to measure their achievement against objectives and goals identified in the mission statements. Key performance indicators (KPIs) would be useful here.

1.1.2 and 1.1.3 Although the department is aware of its current situation and challenges, an explicit strategic plan for future years is not so evident. The department is very dynamic in their current operation, but have yet to translate this into future-oriented planning. An explicit forward-facing strategy should be developed.

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).

[Click to enter text.](#)

All four programmes (BA/MArch Architecture, BA Interior Design and MSc Computational Design) relate strongly to architectural and spatial design, and there are some synergies between programmes, particularly between the BA/MArch combination, and with the BA Interior Design.

Provide suggestions for changes in case of incompatibility.

n/a

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.	4
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.

1.2.1 The way in which the programmes engage with community and local-related issues is well developed very welcome.

1.2.2 Although the department has a good website, more could be said about the department's long term ambitions and goals, including research directions.

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.	5
-------	--	---

5

1.3.2	Planning teaching staff recruitment and their professional development is in line with the Department's academic development plan.	4
-------	--	---

4

1.3.3	The Department applies an effective strategy of attracting high-level students from Cyprus and abroad.	4
-------	--	---

4

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.	5
-------	--	---

5

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

[Click to enter text.](#)

1.3.2 A clear development plan is lacking, and so it is difficult to ascertain the degree to which staff development is coordinated with the future direction of the department.

Additionally, write:

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

Approximately 40% of students are from non-Cypriot countries (including Greece)

International students predominantly come from Greece, with others from various Middle Eastern and African countries. The students we talked to included those from Palestine, Iran, Uganda. We did not see any other numbers in the documentation.

Findings

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

Overall, the department has a clear focus on the education of professional architects through the BA and MArch Architecture programmes.

Strengths

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

- Focus on architectural education

- Engagement with local community
- Commitment and engagement of teaching staff
- Diversity of age and gender of teaching staff
- Benefits of a smaller-sized teaching cohort, resulting in good students results including quality of work, high progression rate and overall atmosphere.
- Different educational backgrounds of many teaching staff, including international experience

Areas of improvement and recommendations

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

- Develop an explicit future-facing strategy, and ensure staff development is planned accordingly
- Enhance website and other public-facing materials to include future goals, including research directions.
- Be more explicit about the strong research-by-design approach to research
- Consider opportunities for PhD and other masters programmes

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	Partially Compliant
1.2 Connecting with society	Compliant
1.3 Development processes	Partially Compliant

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		
2. Quality Assurance		
2.1 System and quality assurance strategy		1 - 5
2.1.1	The Department has a policy for quality assurance that is made public and forms part of the Institution's strategic management.	4
2.1.2	Internal stakeholders develop and implement a policy for quality assurance through appropriate structures and processes, while involving external stakeholders.	5
2.1.3	The Department's policy for quality assurance supports guarding against intolerance of any kind or discrimination against students or staff.	4
2.1.4	The quality assurance system adequately covers all the functions and sectors of the Department's activities:	
2.1.4.1	Teaching and learning	5
2.1.4.2	Research	3
2.1.4.3	The connection with society	5
2.1.4.4	Management and support services	5
2.1.5	The quality assurance system promotes a culture of quality.	5
2.1.6	Students' evaluation and feedback	4

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

Click to enter text.

2.1.1 We are unclear as to how much of the QA system is publicly available, and the degree to which certain details specific to the Architecture department (such as the exemption from the requirement for all teaching staff to have a PhD) is also made explicit. Documentation supplied to the panel is detailed, but this does not appear to be publicly accessible.

2.1.4 Policies towards staff and students with disability are clear, but other categories of potential discrimination (gender, ethnicity, sexuality etc) should be equally explicit.

2.1.4.2 From our visit and discussions, this was not clear at a departmental level.

2.1.6 The panel was informed about the student evaluation occurring on a regular and informal basis, but we were not provided with evidence of any formal system. This may exist, but should be made more explicit in future documentation. This should included details as to how student anonymity is preserved.

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.	3
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.	5
2.2.5	The policy dealing with plagiarism committed by students as well as mechanisms for identifying and preventing it are effective.	5
2.2.6	The established procedures for examining students' objections/ disagreements on issues of student evaluation or academic ethics are effective.	5

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.	4
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.	4
2.2.12	The Department analyses and publishes graduate employment information.	5
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.	n/a
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.	n/a

2.2.19	The Department has mechanisms and funds to support writing and attending conferences of doctoral candidates.	n/a
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.

2.2.2 Although learning outcomes are stated in module and programme documentation, there are no explicit assessment criteria by which grades are judged and awarded.

2.2.9 Admission criteria should be explicitly available on the departmental website.

2.2.11 We recommend that systematic monitoring be made of marks and grades awarded in relation to gender, ethnicity and disability.

Findings

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

As above

Strengths

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

- Purpose-designed building and other physical resources
- The limited number of students allows staff to monitor and measure the student progress closely and effectively

Areas of improvement and recommendations

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

- Some areas should be developed and made more explicit – particularly regarding assessment criteria and admission criteria.

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	Compliant
2.2 Quality assurance for the programmes of study	Partially Compliant

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.	4
3.6	Statutory sessions of the Department are held and minutes are kept.	4
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.	5
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.	5
3.9	The Department applies procedures for the prevention and disciplinary control of academic misconduct of students, teaching and administrative staff, including plagiarism.	4

3.10	The Department has appropriate procedures for dealing with students' complaints.	4
3.11	Internalization of the Department and external collaborations.	5

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

3.3 Additional administrative support would help academic staff concentrate on key responsibilities for teaching and research.

3.4 and 3.6 Unclear if these occur. Additional information and explanation on this point would have been useful.

3.9 and 3.10 Again, details on these matters were not explicit.

Findings

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

As above

Strengths

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

- A close-knit and coherent academic team, offering support to each other.

Areas of improvement and recommendations

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

- Additional administrative support for academic staff
- More explicit details and documentation for issues under 3.4, 3.6, 3.9 and 3.10

Please select what is appropriate for the following assessment area:

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

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.	5
4.1.2	Students and other stakeholders, including employers, are actively involved on the programmes' review and development.	5
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).	5
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.	5
Justify the numerical scores provided for the quality indicators (criteria) by specifying (if any) the deficiencies. Click or tap here to enter text.		
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.	5
4.2.6	The teaching staff of the Department provides timely and effective feedback to their students.	5
4.2.7	The criteria and the method of assessment as well as the criteria for marking are published in advance.	3
4.2.8	The assessment allows students to demonstrate the extent to which the intended learning outcomes have been achieved.	5

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

4.2.7 Although learning outcomes are stated in module and programme documentation, there are no explicit assessment criteria by which grades are judged and awarded.

Findings

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

As above

Strengths

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

- Very strong and regular interaction between staff and students which contributes to high quality learning outcomes.
- Regular engagement with international contributors ("University of Universities" project, ad hoc teaching sessions etc)
- Engagement with local communities and issues
- Participation in international competitions, workshops and site-based studies

Areas of improvement and recommendations



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

- Explicit assessment criteria should be developed, used and made available to students.

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	Partially 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.	5
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.	n/a
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.	n/a
5.5	The ratio of special teaching staff to the total number of teaching staff is satisfactory.	n/a
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.	n/a
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.	5
5.8	Feedback processes for teaching staff in regard to the evaluation of their teaching work, by the students, are satisfactory.	4

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

5.8 The panel was informed about the student evaluation occurring on a regular and informal basis, but we were not provided with evidence of any formal system. This may exist, but should be made more explicit in future documentation. This should included details as to how student anonymity is preserved.

Also, write the following:

- Number of teaching staff working full-time and having exclusive work



10-12, plus c6 part-time staff (typically professional architects contributing to studio and other modules).

Click to enter text.

Findings

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

As above

Strengths

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

- Commitment of staff and engagement with teaching
- Collaboration between staff
- Range of academic interests and specialisms

Areas of improvement and recommendations

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

- Staff should be given explicit time allocation to undertake research duties, and so to continuously develop these interests in relation to teaching.

Please ✓ what is appropriate for the following assessment area:

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

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.	3
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.	4
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.	5
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.	5

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

6.1 Although a research policy is implicit in the department's documentations and discussions, there is nothing developed in an explicit and detailed manner.

Findings

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

Although staff are actively engaged in research activities, and relate this research to their teaching, there is less of an overall strategy regarding this research, such as the range and diversity of research expertise offered across staff members, and with regard to research-support policies such as those relating to sabbaticals.

Strengths

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

- Commitment of staff to individual research and research-related teaching

Areas of improvement and recommendations

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

A more coherent and explicit strategy for research across the department should be developed.

In addition, at times the boundary between staff research and student research is unclear, and could benefit from further separation and clarification.

Please ✓ what is appropriate for the following assessment area:

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

6 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.	4
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.	4
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.	5

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

7.5 Although implicit in the department's constant review of students numbers and in their awareness of changes in the economy of the built environment sector, more long term and wholistic analysis of the sector could be undertaken.

Findings

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

As above

Strengths

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

- Strong support from the University for the department to respond to and meet changing needs and requirements.

Areas of improvement and recommendations

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

- More long term and wholistic analysis of the sector, including risk analysis.

Please ✓ what is appropriate for the following assessment area:

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

D. Conclusions and final remarks

Please provide constructive conclusions and final remarks, which may form the basis upon which improvements of the quality of the Department under review may be achieved.

Overall, the department is a small-sized and highly-focused operation, with a clear and appropriate concentration on the education of professional architects and related studies.

The staff are highly motivated and committed, and have a dynamic and close relationship with students.

Resources at the ARC building are very good.

Additional administrative support would be beneficial, allowing academic staff to focus on core teaching and research responsibilities.

All of this results in high quality student learning and outcomes, for which the department should be commended.

The department shows some indications of its relative youth, and could benefit from explicitly considering aspects of its existing and potential new areas of operation, including strategies for:

- developing existing and new programmes and areas of study
- research and areas of staff expertise
- risks and opportunities within the built environment sector as a whole



E. Signatures of the EEC

<i>Name</i>	<i>Signature</i>
Iain Borden	
Koen Van Balen	
Laura Malighetti	
David Kalashnikov	
Elena Christodoulou	
FullName	

Date: Click to enter date 1 July 2021

