

Doc. 300.3.1

Date: 2025-06-28

External Evaluation Report (Departmental)

- Higher Education Institution: University of Nicosia
- Town: Nicosia
 - School/Faculty: School of Sciences and Engineering
- Department: Computer Science
- Programme(s) of study - Name (Duration, ECTS, Cycle)
Programme 1 – Bachelor
In Greek:
Πληροφορική (4 ακαδημαϊκά έτη, 240 ECTS, Πτυχίο(BSc))
In English:
Computer Science (4 academic years, 240 ECTS, Bachelor(BSc))
Language(s) of instruction: English
Programme 2 – Doctorate
In Greek:
Πληροφορική (3 ακαδημαϊκά έτη, 180 ECTS, Διδακτορικό(PhD))
In English:
Computer Science (3 academic years, 180 ECTS, Doctorate(PhD))
Language(s) of instruction: English
Programme 3 – [Program of stud]
In Greek:
Programme Name
In English:
Programme Name
Language(s) of instruction: Language(s)



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
Department of Computer Science	Computer Science (4 academic years, 240 ECTS, Bachelor(BSc)) Πληροφορική (4 ακαδημαϊκά έτη, 240 ECTS, Πτυχίο(BSc))
	Computer Science (3 academic years, 180 ECTS, Doctorate(PhD)) Πληροφορική (3 ακαδημαϊκά έτη, 180 ECTS, Διδακτορικό(PhD))

A. Introduction

This part includes basic information regarding the onsite visit.

The onsite visit to the Department of Compute Science (henceforth: “the Department”) at the University of Nicosia (henceforth: “UNIC”) took place on June 26, 2025, during which the External Evaluation Committee (henceforth: “EEC”) was accompanied by Ms. Natasa Kazakeou from the Cyprus Agency of Quality Assurance and Accreditation (henceforth: “CYQAA”). The EEC was tasked with evaluating the Department, as well as the two programmes:

- The BSc in Computer Science
- The PhD in Computer Science

This onsite visit followed a visit by the same EEC to the emerging Athens campus of UNIC (henceforth: “UNIC-Athens”), on May 29, 2025, where the EEC evaluated the Athens extension of the Department, as well the opportunity for delivery of two Bachelors programmes in Computer Science and in Data Science, already existing at UNIC, within UNIC-Athens.

As such, in advance of the onsite visit to UNIC, the Department had received the EEC report from the UNIC-Athens evaluation regarding the Department and the BSc in Computer Science — and were able to respond to those by proposing procedural and curriculum updates.

As part of the evaluation of the extension of the Department at UNIC-Athens, the EEC had already seen (on 29/5) presentations of the University, the School, and the Department structures, policies, and procedures, as well as the presentation of the BSc in Computer Science. To this end, the EEC requested that the corresponding presentations during the visit to UNIC on 26/6 concentrated on any updates introduced since the 29/5.

This report will — as appropriate — make references to these updates, and to their relative impact on the evaluation of compliance within the different areas and sub-areas.

The EEC particularly, appreciated the agility of especially the Department head and the Rector, in reacting to and providing constructive proposals for, addressing the different recommendations that the EEC had advanced in the reports following the UNIC-Athens visit.

As the EEC was tasked with also evaluating the PhD programme, the EEC met with its Director, and with several PhD supervisors, and had a comprehensive presentation of the programme, followed by a discussion on its vision, strategy, and attractiveness.

The EEC met with the administrative staff (Registrar, Library, Campus and Health, Advising, Admissions) at UNIC as well as with student and graduate representatives and external stakeholders.

In particular, from among university, school, and Department management, the EEC met with P. Pouyioutas (Rector), P. Angelides (Vice Rector of Academic Affairs), D. Drikakis (Dean of the School of Sciences and Engineering), M. Nestoros (Associate Dean of the School of Sciences an Engineering, UNIC), A. Stassopoulou (Head of the Department, UNIC), I. Dionysiou (Associate Head of Department), N. Ioannides (Director of Academic Affairs, UNIC), C.

Mavromoustakis (Programme Director, PhD in Computer Science), V. Stylianou (Programme director, BSc in Computer Science, UNIC).

The ECC also met with L. Agathokleous (Office of the Vice Rector for Academic Affairs), C. Theocleous (Director of Academic Advicing, UNIC), M. Charalambous (Director of Library, UNIC), M. Panayiotou (Registrar, UNIC), E. Theodorou (Head of the Office of the Vice Rector for Faculty and Research), E. Theodoulou (Libraty Officer), and M. Michael (Head of Erasmus office)

From among the network of industrial partners of UNIC, the ECC met with K. Kosta (Head of Security, ISFX Financial), D. Kotzias (Software Engineer, Google Brain), G. Pallis (Department of Computer Science, University of Cyprus), G. Mastorakis (Department of Management Science and Technology, Hellenic Mediterranean University)

The EEC wishes to express its gratitude to these staff members and external stakeholders for having made themselves available, and for engaging in intense, deep, and constructive discussions and exchanges —as well as to all the faculty members from the Department that were present, and participating in constructive and interesting discussions.

Finally, the EEC had the privilege to meet with a set of students and graduates from the BSc programmes in Computer Science, as well as with PhD students both in their first, and last year. This provided us with — in additional to insights on the programme structure and “academic” attractiveness — valuable insights in the experience of being a student in a programme in the Department at UNIC.

A couple of days prior to the site visit, and by way of the Ms. Kazakaiu from CYQAA, the EEC shared an extensive list of requested information and documents with UNIC. The EEC wishes to express its gratitude to the presenters during the sessions of the site-visit, who had made last-minute changes to their presentations, to provide us with the information requested.

The EEC was granted access to all the information, and to all the people/stakeholders, that we requested, from UNIC. The students and graduates, from the programmes being assessed, were thoughtful and respectful in their comments — and patient with the numerous questions, whose answers greatly helped in writing this report.

The EEC wishes to thank both the officer from the CYQAA and the personnel from UNIC, for making the site visit both pleasant and informative.

B. External Evaluation Committee (EEC)

<i>Name</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>University</i>
Thomas Heide Clausen	Professor (Chair)	Ecole Polytechnique, FR
Damal K. Arvind	Professor (Member)	University of Edinburgh, UK
Mykola Pechenizkiy	Professor (Member)	Eindhoven University of Technology, NL
Yiannis Zapitis	Professional Body Representative (Member)	Cyprus Scientific and Technical Chamber (ETEK)
Elina Mavrikiou	Student (Student Member)	University 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:	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. Mission and strategic planning (including SWOT analysis)
2. Connecting with society
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.	4
1.1.2	The Department has developed its strategic planning aiming at fulfilling its mission.	4
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.	4
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.

The Department has a mission statement, albeit one which is fairly generic (hence the score in 1.1.3).

Notwithstanding, the department does clearly appear to have a vision for the short and medium term, shared amongst the faculty members in the department, and verbally during the site-visit (in summary: *"consolidate the three current competency centres of the department, and expand successfully to UNIC-Athens"*), that would merit being documented, and systematically refreshed periodically.

Given that the processes are in place for reviewing the course offering with external stakeholder involvement, that was presented during the site visit by the Head of the Department, the areas 1.1.5 and 1.1.6 are compliant.

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).

The department offers programs at all levels (BSc, MSc, and PhD) in Computer Science, and a BSc and MSc in Data Science. While this EEC evaluated only the BSc and PhD in CS, the same committee previously evaluated (within the last month) the BSc in Data Science in UNIC-Athens — and, took an informal look at the MSc in CS and DS. Overall, the programmes offered appear credible in terms of the competencies within the department, and provide a comprehensive and coherent path from the undergraduate degree all the way to a doctorate degree.

The programmes in CS and DS are naturally within the Computer Science department within the School of Engineering.

Provide suggestions for changes in case of incompatibility.

Not Applicable

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. During the site visit the Head of Department presented formal processes that are now in place for reviewing the course offering with external stakeholder involvement, thus area 1.2.1 is now compliant.		
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
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.	3

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
Justify the numerical scores provided for the quality indicators (criteria) by specifying (if any) the deficiencies. The Department is well run by a group of dedicated faculty members, administered by strong and competent leadership of the Head of Department. The score in area 1.3.3 is justified on the basis of evidence in the reports that the EEC examined, as well as in discussions during the site-visit, that the Department does not manage to attract a satisfactory number of PhD students, commensurate to the strength of the teaching faculty. The EEC sensed during the site-visit a certain degree of fatalism in the department in face of this. The EEC provides (below) suggestions for how the department may overcome this situation, and encourages that a multi-pronged strategy for increasing the visibility and attractiveness of the Doctoral programme. The EEC requests the department to commit to reconsider the SWOT analysis for the doctoral program, and to develop a strategy for its further development accompanied by an investment plan to support it. Additionally, write: - Expected number of Cypriot and international students - Countries of origin of international students and number from each country		

Findings

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

- The Department was established in 2007, and has been offering successful courses in Computer Science since then.
- The teaching faculty in the Department are energetic, dedicated, enthusiastic, and committed
- As a small Department, decisions are made in a collegial and democratic manner, although not always consensual
- The Department describes its mission statement in high-level terms: to deliver quality education, to engage in high-impact research, to attract grant funding, and to contribute to society.
- The Department counts a balanced pyramid of a number of promoted staff - Full Professors, Associate Professors, and faculty members of junior rank
- The Department has an Advisory Board group of industry professionals whose services it can call upon for ensuring the relevance of the material taught in the degree programmes. Some of them also hold Adjunct Professor positions and lecture at the university.

- Hitherto faculty members would talk regularly, but informally, with this group of industry professionals. One of the stakeholders that the EEC met with during the evaluation of the UNIC-Athens extension of the Department expressed *“I think I was on an advisory board, but I am not sure if I still am, since I haven’t been called to meet with them for a year or so.”*

Following the recommendation by the EEC evaluating the UNIC-Athens extension of the Department, the Department has formulated and documented a formal process for (i) creating a formal advisory board, (ii) soliciting their feedback both periodically and as needed, and (iii) involving this Advisory Board in the processes of keeping the programmes up-to-date.

- The EEC finds the reactivity of the Department to this issue to be remarkable, and commends the Department Head on her agility in addressing this issue.
- The Department organises hackathons and delivers webinars on “hot topics” for non-specialist audiences.
- The Department counts 17 faculty member, including 7 full professors.
- The Department counts 4 female faculty members, 2 of whom are full professors (who also assumes the Department leadership), and one experienced associate professor.
- The EEC identified a potential issue during its evaluation of the UNIC-Athens extension of the department, specifically that the students with whom they met were reporting that the “workload” of the BSc programmes ***did not appear*** commensurate with the number of ECTS granted for each course (and for the whole programme).

In response, the Department provided complete and detailed course outlines to the EEC in advance of the site visit. During the site visit, these were discussed in detail with the individual faculty members. During its meeting with students and recent graduates from the BSc in CS, the EEC probed in-depth to understand the nature and volume of both in-class (contact) hours and outside-class workload experienced by the students.

The EEC finds that this was not an issue after all; and, that the workload of the BSc programme in CS appears commensurate with the number of ECTS granted for each course (and, therefore, also for the whole programme).

- The EEC found that the undergraduate students did not seem to understand fully what a PhD degree is, what a PhD student does during the course of their study, and the value of a PhD degree outside academia — this, in spite of the External Stakeholders expressing both recognition of the qualities of the PhD graduates from the Department, and their appreciations of the skills of a PhD holder, in various industrial roles. The Department should ensure that their undergraduate students are better informed in this matter.
- The EEC found that the department manages to attract only about 2 viable candidates/year for the PhD programme — far from filling the 10 or so positions that they claim to open annually, under otherwise attractive positions (all with tuition waivers ; about half with a stipend of various forms). The EEC also sensed a certain fatalism amongst the faculty members, in face of this situation, with no strategy for how to overcome it.

Strengths

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

- By way of its outreach activities targeting high-schools, the Department is making active efforts at attracting future students to its Degree programmes.
- The website of the Department is clear and informative about its activities (in both research and teaching).
- The EEC appreciates that the Department has several senior associate and full professors ensuring intellectual leadership, and is particularly encouraged to see that it manages to attract and promote female faculty members.
- The EEC was particularly impressed by the leadership of the Head of Department in general, by the transparency in making information available, and by her agility in responding to the findings and recommendations of the EEC report evaluating the UNIC-Athens extension of the Department some of which were relevant to the UNIC-Nicosia programme.

Areas of improvement and recommendations

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

- While the EEC appreciates that the Department has several senior associate and full professors ensuring intellectual leadership, and is particularly encouraged to see that it manages to attract and promote female faculty members, it strongly encourages that recruitments / promotions into positions at UNIC-Nicosia maintains that trajectory towards gender balance.
- The Department mission statement is somewhat generic — thus, difficult to disagree with, but also impossible to measure the Department performance against. The EEC would recommend that the department collectively reflects on a more specific, ambitious, and quantifiable strategic vision for the next 5+ years, documents this, and periodically review it. This could, for example, include ambitions of increasing visibility through organising a major international conference on one of the campuses; ensuring that at least 30% of the faculty members spend a semester on sabbatical abroad over the next 5 years, so as to widen your international academic network; establishing an “industrial PhD programme” to increase joint academic/industrial research; ensuring that 20% of your BSc graduates participate in research as evidenced by joint authorship with faculty. The EEC insists that this list of suggestions is not prescriptive, but intended to inspire reflections among the colleagues within the Department on “*where you want to be in 5 years time*”?
- The EEC believes that the Department, in view of its undeniable qualities, has a strong unexploited potential in terms of PhD student recruitment. While recruiting PhD students is always a delicate process, and while the EEC does not claim to have a *magic recipe*, it does recommend that rather than fatally accept the situation, the Department should develop a multi-pronged and multi-year strategy, better marketing the doctoral programme both internally and externally. The EEC respectfully provides the following — **non-prescriptive** — suggestions as inspiration for the department when constructing such a strategy:
 - Changing the messaging towards BSc and MSc students regarding what the “life of a PhD student” with the ambition to — over years — increase the conversion rate of Bachelors-to-PhD students

inside UNIC.

The current understanding among the students seems to be that it is *“write an endless stream of papers, for low pay”* — whereas a better, and more accurate, messaging would be *“work on a really cool topic for 3 years, without a boss/client breathing down your neck. And with really smart and cool people, while even getting paid for it”*.

It is likely that the current understanding is due to BSc students simply never having been proactively informed about what a PhD entails.

- Exposing BSc and MSc students to research earlier. For example, through:
 - Inviting them to the departmental “Research Days”, relevant seminar series, engage high-achieving students in presenting their theses, industry lab internship outcomes.
 - Offering BSc/MSc final-year-projects that are related to research projects, in which PhD students are involved and naturally can be engaged in co-supervision of the student project.
 - Allowing BSc students to do their “industry placement” (COMP-492) as a “research lab placement”, encouraging students to get a taste of research. Consider introducing a choice between internal research lab and external academic or industry lab internships.
 - Consider broader and more systematic engagement of relevant industry in branding and defining the image and essence of the PhD program.
- Engaging with external stakeholders and making strategic agreements on branding and defining the image and essence of the department's PhD program.
 - Consider broader and more systematic engagement of relevant industry. During the meeting, EEC heard concrete and enthusiastic suggestions from the department's academic and industry partners on how to make the PhD positions more attractive.
 - Involve industrial partners to make the industrial value of the PhD known.
 - Consider defining joint co-funded PhD projects, industry lab internships for PhDs, joint research events etc.
 - Organise regular seminars with representatives from industry, who themselves have a PhD, to illustrate the value of this degree in a multitude of different careers.
 - Consider making an agreement with Meta, Google Brain and other connections at top industry labs such they can commit to mentor 1 PhD per year and potentially to offer an internship as a follow up.
- Conducting market research, developing a strategy on attracting talented international PhDs and making an investment plan to support it, *e.g.*, as simple as offering a possibility for the 1st year PhD students to attend a top conference or summer school even if they did not get publishable results yet.
- Solicit the academic support services for assistance and inspiration. The EEC asked, during the site visit with the administrative personnel, if they had any ideas, and spontaneously the head librarian suggested that as the library has copies of all PhD theses, perhaps she could help create better visibility for those — to make the PhD programmes more well known. Similarly, the ERASMUS office has an impressive network, that perhaps can be solicited when sharing open PhD positions.

- The EEC notes that elsewhere in Europe, most PhD-students undertake their PhD fresh out of their BSc/MSc. Further, in many places in Europe, a PhD is a full-time occupation and PhD students are either salaried, or they have a stipend allowing them to not seek paid work in parallel to their PhD. The advantage of targeting students fresh out of their BSs/MSc is, that they are typically younger — and, thus, also generally more adventurous, interested in and able to move for their PhD (no family ties, no mortgage, no small children, ...)
- In view of that a considerable amount of the department funding is through EU projects, and given that in other EU countries, EU projects are able to provide PhD student salaries/stipends aligned with the local national market, the EEC encourages that the Department investigates such opportunities. The advantage of offering a PhD with a living salary/stipend is, that it makes it easier for foreign students to project themselves into a new country: no dependency on family support, no requirements to fend for a student-job, etc.
- Consider funding Teaching Assistant positions for PhD students to support teaching staff in delivering their courses, and involve them in their research.
- To conclude, the EEC sees a lot of potential to (1) making the currently available PhD position more attractive and (2) developing a more attractive ecosystem with a thriving PhD program.

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

1. System and quality assurance strategy
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.	4
2.1.3	The Department's policy for quality assurance supports guarding against intolerance of any kind or discrimination against students or staff.	5

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	4
	2.1.4.2	Research	4
	2.1.4.3	The connection with society	4
	2.1.4.4	Management and support services	4
2.1.5	The quality assurance system promotes a culture of quality.		4
2.1.6	Students' evaluation and feedback		5

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

The EEC had identified, during the UNIC-Athens evaluation, that the Department did not have a satisfactory process for involvement of external stakeholders in the QA process — and, therefore, had given the score of '3' for area 2.1.2.

The documentation that the Department submitted for accreditation at UNIC did, likewise, not contain a satisfactory process either. However, following the EECs recommendations from the UNIC-Athens visit, the Department presented a QA process with external stakeholders involvement which the EEC finds complete, credible, and promising. For this reason, in anticipation of this process being applied, the EEC now gives a score of '4' for area 2.1.2

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.	4
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.	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.	5
2.2.10	The Department flexibly uses a variety of teaching methods.	4
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.	5
2.2.12	The Department analyses and publishes graduate employment information.	4
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.		5
2.2.19	The Department has mechanisms and funds to support writing and attending conferences of doctoral candidates.		5
2.2.20	There is a clear policy on authorship and intellectual property.		4

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

[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.

- The Schools and Department have QA documentation for each of the 3 levels, inherited from UNIC.
- New faculty members undergo a 12-week onboarding programme, offering training in pedagogics, teaching operations, etc.
- The Department leadership, as well as programme leadership, includes a strong female representation.
- The curriculum change and update process of the Department is ad-hoc, and is largely taking place over email.
- No incidents of intolerance, bullying, etc., were reported. Furthermore, when questioned on the topic, students indicated no hesitation as to what processes to engage with, and where to find relevant information and assistance, should they be victim or witness such incidents.
- Exams, and their markings by junior or Adjunct faculty members are systematically reviewed by a senior faculty members.
- Exams are marked by the instructors and course leaders for a given course — except in the case of a grade appeal, where they are also marked by an independent faculty member. The exams are not anonymised.
- Courses clearly indicate significant information such as the name of the instructor, the syllabus, the division of marks between coursework, mid-term and final exams. Students indicated that this meant that they generally did not have any doubts as to their expected performances and grades at the finals in a course.
- Students were appreciative that grades and feedback for assignments and exams were provided within two weeks of the assignment/exam.

Strengths

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

- The EEC finds the commitment to teaching proficiency evidenced by the faculty on-boarding programme for incoming faculty members commendable.
- The Head of the Department of Computer Science and others in leadership roles such as Degree Co-ordinators are female — which is commendable as role models for gender balance in STEM subjects.
- During our conversations with stakeholders, the EEC was reassured that the QA policy of the department, in terms of grade fairness and predictability of student outcomes, is effective. The EEC is reassured that the policy ensured no reported incidents of intolerance, or bullying against students or staff.

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 notes that while an ad-hoc curriculum change process over email may be passable in a small and tightly-knit department, it has both scalability and tractability issues. As the Department is creating an extension at UNIC-Athens that will be delivering the same programmes, a formalisation of the curriculum

change processes is recommended. The EEC notes that rather than being an ad-hoc process, curriculum updates be done at regular and scheduled intervals (for example: at the end of a semester) for programs that need it, and be done in a more formal process through submission of a written proposal by the course leader, for approval by a given date. The EEC further recommends that mechanisms be put in place to record curriculum updates and ensure that all courses be examined and reviewed regularly. The EEC suggests that this, for example, can be through formalising feedback to all courses by stakeholders (graduates, students, industrial partners, faculty members) by soliciting at least every 3 years on a rolling schedule. The EEC notes that it made these comments when evaluating the UNIC-Athens extension of the Department, and that the Department during the site-visit confirmed that it had taken steps towards this — and recommends continuing refining this process, as it gets experience with running it.

- The EEC suggests that it would increase fairness and further reduce potential biases, if exams and assignments were anonymised, and/or graded by a 2nd grader.

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

Sub-area	<i>Non-compliant / Partially Compliant / Compliant</i>
1. System and quality assurance strategy	Compliant
2. Quality assurance for the programmes of study	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.	5
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	4

	Department without the intervention or involvement of a body or person outside the law provisions.	
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.	5
3.10	The Department has appropriate procedures for dealing with students' complaints.	5
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.

Regarding areas 3.1 and 3.2, the EEC rates those a '5' for the Department at UNIC, but rated the same '4' points for the extension of the Department at UNIC-Athens. This, '4' was principally due to the comparatively lesser recognition of faculty members from UNIC-Athens (no representation in the faculty senate, for example) — which is not an issue for faculty members at UNIC.

Findings

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

- The teaching faculty have regular Departmental meetings in which academic decisions are reached collectively.
- The Department is run in a collegiate fashion and works as a cohesive unit.
- The teaching staff and students are supported by centralised administrative units which provide support for Admissions, Library, Computing infrastructure, Human Resources, Mental wellbeing
- The Department has a well-defined procedure in place for dealing with plagiarism with the involvement of the Head of department in serious cases.
- Support is provided for international matters such as Erasmus mobility programmes and recruitment of overseas students.

Strengths

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

- The Department takes pride that decisions are reached in meetings in a democratic fashion after due discussion (see Areas of Improvement).
- The Department has a petition system in place for students who wish their performance in examinations to be reviewed within one month of the release of the marks. Students have access to their scripts and can discuss the marking decisions with their instructors.

Areas of improvement and recommendations

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

- Whereas it is a virtue that academic matters are deliberated in open meetings, it could also result in decisions being stalled due to lack of agreement. For example, the introduction of Machine Learning as a compulsory course in the early years of the BSc in CS has been debated but a decision to implement this move had been postponed (Though the EEC is content to see that it, following its recommendations from the UNIC-Athens evaluation, has finally been introduced in that programme). On occasion the department needs to be decisive in reaching decisions promptly based on academic merit, especially when the Department is distributed in different locations — as will be the case soon.
- The Department should consider appointing a Departmental Academic Misconduct Officer who will review issues of academic misconduct such as plagiarism and free the Head to concentrate on strategic decisions.
- The Department should consider marketing their programs more widely to attract overseas students from Europe, Middle East and Africa to augment student numbers on the program.

Please select what is appropriate for the following assessment area:

Assessment area	<i>Non-compliant / Partially Compliant / Compliant</i>
3. Administration	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.	4
4.1.2	Students and other stakeholders, including employers, are actively involved on the programmes' review and development.	4
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.

The EEC had, in its evaluation of the extension of the Department at UNIC-Athens, found a suboptimal process for reviewing and revising the programmes, and for including stakeholders in the process. The presentation made by the Department Head during the site-visit at UNIC by the EEC indicates that this finding had given rise to development, formalisation, and documentation, of a process for periodically monitoring, reviewing and revising the courses that involves internal and external stakeholders.

On the assumption that this new process will be implemented promptly, the EEC therefore consider areas 4.1.1, 4.1.2 to be compliant (*i.e.*, '4')

The EEC further notes that since the evaluation of the extension of the department at UNIC-Athens, the Department had competently reflected a number of recommendations in an update of the BSc in Computer Science programme. The EEC therefore consider all of areas 4.1.3, 4.1.3, and 4.1.5 to be compliant.

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.	5
4.2.8	The assessment allows students to demonstrate the extent to which the intended learning outcomes have been achieved.	4
Justify the numerical scores provided for the quality indicators (criteria) by specifying (if any) the deficiencies. 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.

- A curriculum committee exists within the department, which is consulted when designing, and changing, program curricula. This "curriculum committee" monitors the ACM curriculum models, monitor the "competition" from other programmes within the field, and seeks input — in an ad-hoc fashion — from external stakeholders and alumni.
- Proposed changes to specific program or course curricula are reviewed by at least 2 relevant full-time faculty members. There are no documented, formal, format for submitting proposals for changes to the curriculum committee.
- Any programmes delivered by the Department are evaluated and approved by this curriculum committee.

- Programmes are reviewed and refreshed on a schedule synchronised to the (re)accreditation processes, i.e., every ~2 years (when submitting a CYQAA accreditation application, and when responding to a CYQAA EEC report).
- In addition, the Department is proposing to introduce an annual review process, involving both internal and external stakeholders. The goal of this process is to avoid the program going “stale” by being able to — within the limits of the framework of the CYQAA — update the programme incrementally between accreditation cycles. The EEC finds that this is an excellent addition, and commends the department for introducing it.
- Through discussions with students and graduates, the EEC learned that some courses were too “unbalanced”: providing a good theoretical coverage, but less exercises and “hands on” experiences that would have been helpful. As an example, some courses which have a high degree of practical applicability were reportedly comprising just a single hour of “lab exercises”.
- While not a finding directly related to this particular area, the EEC wants to insist both external stakeholders, graduates, and students, affirmed that the faculty members were extremely attentive and reactive to the students.

Strengths

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

- Students appreciate receiving timely elaborate feedback on their work.
- Students appreciate availability of teaching staff for face-to-face meetings.
- The Department has been reactive to feedback received from the EEC when evaluating the extension of the Department at UNIC-Athens, and has been agile in introducing both curriculum updates, and additional processes.

Areas of improvement and recommendations

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

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



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



eqar /// enqa.

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.	5
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.	5
5.5	The ratio of special teaching staff to the total number of teaching staff is satisfactory.	5
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.	5
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.	5
Justify the numerical scores provided for the quality indicators (criteria) by specifying (if any) the deficiencies. Click to enter text. Also, write the following: - Number of teaching staff working full-time and having exclusive work - Number of special teaching staff working full-time and having exclusive work - Number of visiting Professors - Number of special scientists on lease services 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.

- The Department is currently composed of fourteen full-time faculty members, with an adequate seniority distribution, several full professors covering the different expertise areas.
- Additionally, the department counts 4 adjunct faculty members.

Strengths

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

- The current faculty members are active researchers in their fields. They conduct application-inspired research aiming to make societal impact. They contribute to Open Science, e.g., by publishing open datasets that can foster research development on societally important topics, notably, in healthcare.
- There are indicators of a very good faculty–student engagement within the Department
- There are indicators of a very good engagement between Alumni and the Department.
- Faculty members are well-informed about quality assurance aspects including individual course improvement, and with how to deal with potential misconduct of students.
- Faculty members is well-informed about the student safety aspects.
- The Department provides mentorship for new hires, and informs them about expectation for promotion to higher ranks.
- New hires may apply for, and can obtain, an UNIC Seed-grant.

Areas of improvement and recommendations

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

Click to enter text.

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.	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.	5
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.	N/A
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.

Regarding area 6.8, the EEC is not able to provide a rating. The funding attracted by the Department, appears to be exclusively public/governmental — no information about external non-governmental funding was provided. The EEC notes that in computer science, it is not an unusual situation that the majority of funding stems from governmental agencies — and so in that sense, the Department is aligned with other, similar, departments. That being said, industrial sponsorship of research, Foundations (such as Gates) and charities may be potential sources for the Department to explore?

Findings

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

- The research policy of the department is: 40-40-20 proportion for teaching-research-admin by default. 40% teaching translates to 12-15 contact hours of teaching per week.
- The department mission is to engage in high-impact research in the fields that drive the 4th Industrial revolution. The department has three key research areas and three corresponding labs: AI Lab, Mobile Systems Lab, and Informatics Security Lab.
- Despite the considerable teaching load, the faculty members are all active researchers in their fields. They are also active in their research communities through serving on editorial boards, organising workshops, and participating in various program/organising/advisory committees at the national and European levels.
- The department participates in the outreach activities and contributes to Open Science.

- The faculty members publish to a satisfactory extent in peer-reviewed international journals and conference proceedings. It is commendable that at UNIC, faculty members also publish regularly jointly with BSc and MSc students they supervise, and the EEC assumes that this will not just continue, but will be accelerated, to encourage some of these students into a doctoral degree.
- The department encourages students and staff to follow the open access policy – where possible, publications are put in open access formally or to arXiv. Digital copies of students' theses are made publicly available through the library.
- Incorporating research findings into the curriculum to provide students with up-to-date knowledge and practical experience is part of the department's mission statement. The EEC was not presented with concrete evidence that the Department ensures that research results are integrated into teaching. Based on the analysis of the current educational program curricula and course syllabi the EEC observed that the students might be exposed to the recent research advances in the area only occasionally as the courses offered in one programme evaluated (BSc) are mostly at a fundamentals/introductory level — and the other programme (PhD) is research-based, and so course-light.
- The funding attracted by the Department, appears to be exclusively public/governmental — no information about external non-governmental funding was provided. The EEC could not assess the policy, indirect or direct of internal funding of the research activities of the teaching staff. A seed grant exists, for which newly appointed faculty members can apply. So far only one member applied and got it.

Strengths

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

- The academic staff is active in research, serves on the relevant committee and engages into outreach activities, despite of the heavy teaching load.
- The faculty members are moderately successful in attracting European funding.
- The faculty members published jointly with MSc and BSc students at UNIC.

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 encourages the Department to develop their research mission and vision — and a strategy for achieving them.
- The EEC encourages faculty members to engage stronger in research collaborations with industry, including co-publications with industrial partners and bring this research collaboration more actively into education.
- The EEC encourages a stronger reflection on the alignment between research policy and recruitment policy. This can help to increase synergies between research and teaching.
- The EEC encourages the Department to develop a strategy for helping students to acquire research skills .
- The EEC encourages the Department to stimulate top quality research and targeting A/A* ranked venues in computer science and data science and/or venues with higher visibility in application domains for its dissemination.

- The EEC encourages to establish PhD-TA program and/or internal funding of the research activities such that faculty members have more time and support for research, establishing research collaboration nationally and internationally with other faculty and with industry. In a longer term this should become self-sustained through project development and attracting funding.
- The EEC encourages to establish support for enabling visiting researchers (both incoming and outgoing).

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	Compliant
Publications	Compliant

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.	4
7.6	The Department's external audit and the transparent management of its finances are ensured.	N/A
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.

Regarding area 7.6, the EEC was not provided information to make an evaluation.

Findings

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

- The EEC observed:
 - That the department does have budget-autonomy over research project funding
 - That the department otherwise does not have an independent budget over which it exercises autonomy
 - That expenses outside of those that can be imputed to a research project, are subject to approval centrally through UNIC, via a process that is perceived as bureaucratic.

Strengths

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

Click to enter text.

Areas of improvement and recommendations

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

Click to enter text.

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.

The Department is successful, in as much as that it produces science of a high quality, publishes in good conferences and journals, is able to attract competitive research funding, and that the programmes it delivers which the EEC was tasked to evaluate, produces highly employable graduates.

The department is efficiently and competently run by its Head, who impressed the EEC by her ability to produce constructive and comprehensive responses to the previous EEC report from the onsite visit to UNIC-Athens just one month prior to this site visit.

In particular, the EEC recognise that any problem areas identified in the EEC reports for UNIC-Athens have been addressed: satisfactory procedures put in place, programmes updated, etc.

Specifically for the BSc in Computer Science, for which the EEC submitted a report as part of the UNIC-Athens visit on May 31, 2025, the EEC notes that the programme was updated as it recommended: new courses were introduced, other courses repositioned, as part of an effort to update the programme. The EEC fully approves of these updates to the programme — and appreciated the long and detailed discussions during the onsite visit of the individual courses.

While the BSc is shaping up (and the department deserves to be commended for their reactivity and agility), these discussions permitted confirming a couple of courses where there still was room for modernisation, and some “thematic areas” where there still is room for evolution. The EEC will, in the programmatic report, provide detailed recommendations.

The EEC is cognisant of the fact that there is a deadline for accreditation in the very near future, and wants to reassure the Department that it is convinced that none of the recommendations will impede their ability to easily meet that deadline.

The EEC has a positive impression about the Department: an efficient and dynamic Head, a group of strongly motivated and dynamic faculty members with a healthy seniority pyramid, and an appetite for facing the challenges that lie ahead.

In view of this appetite for challenges, while the most immediate certainly is the UNIC-Athens extension of the Department, the EEC would like to throw another major challenge at the Department for the 5-year period to follow: to bring the Doctoral programme up to the strength that their Department merits.

The EEC finds that the programme (through the central University rules) has robust procedures and policies in place — and that the Department is implementing them competently and rigorously: meetings and plans are documented, processes are in place for tracking progress, there are adequate safeguards in place, etc.

The EEC also finds that the Doctoral programme produces graduates with comparable qualities to elsewhere in Europe — graduates who are satisfied with their experiences as PhD students at the Department.

While the EEC thus finds the Doctoral programme to be qualitatively satisfactory, it also finds that there is a significant unrealised potential: the number of current PhD students is significantly inferior to what it should be, both given the number of faculty members of the Department, and the needs of society.

The EEC would like to impress on the faculty members of the Department the value (both as a scientific collaborator, and as a Teaching Assistants to support teaching of their courses) of competent PhD students, and believes that the Department should consent a concentrated effort in producing a multi-year strategy for developing and growing its Doctoral programme, and its recognition both internally among BSc/MSc students at UNIC, and externally.



E. Signatures of the EEC

<i>Name</i>	<i>Signature</i>
Thomas Heide Clausen	
Damal K. Arvind	
Mykola Pechenizkiy	
Yiannis Zapitis	
Elina Mavrikiou	
FullName	

Date: 2025-06-28

