

Doc. 300.1.2

Date: 01/06/2026

Higher Education Institution's Response

- **Higher Education Institution:**
University of Nicosia

- **Town:** *Nicosia*

- **Programme of study**
Name (Duration, ECTS, Cycle)

In Greek:

Αρχιτεκτονική (4 έτη / 240 ECTS, Πτυχίο)

*Αρχιτεκτονική (5 έτη / 300 ECTS, Ενοποιημένος Τίτλος Σπουδών
Μεταπτυχιακού Επιπέδου Αρχιτεκτονικής)*

In English:

Architecture (4 years / 240 ECTS, Bachelor of Arts in Architecture)

Architecture (5 years / 300 ECTS, Integrated Master in Architecture)

- **Language(s) of instruction:** *English*
- **Programme's status:** Currently Operating
- **Concentrations (if any):**

In Greek: Concentrations

In English: Concentrations



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](#)].

A. Guidelines on content and structure of the report

- *The Higher Education Institution (HEI) based on the External Evaluation Committee's (EEC's) evaluation report (Doc.300.1.1 or 300.1.1/1 or 300.1.1/2 or 300.1.1/3 or 300.1.1/4) must justify whether actions have been taken in improving the quality of the programme of study in each assessment area. The answers' documentation should be brief and accurate and supported by the relevant documentation. Referral to annexes should be made only when necessary.*
- *In particular, under each assessment area and by using the 2nd column of each table, the HEI must respond on the following:*
 - *the areas of improvement and recommendations of the EEC*
 - *the conclusions and final remarks noted by the EEC*
- *The institution should respond to the EEC comments, in the designated area next each comment. The comments of the EEC should be copied from the EEC report without any interference in the content.*
- *In case of annexes, those should be attached and sent on separate document(s). Each document should be in *.pdf format and named as annex1, annex2, etc.*

Introduction

We refer to the report of the External Evaluation Committee (EEC) on the evaluation and accreditation of the Bachelor of Arts in Architecture and Integrated Master in Architecture, which was prepared following the EEC members' on-site visit on the 24th February 2026. We would like to thank the EEC for their professional and thorough work during the evaluation and for conducting it in such a collegial and constructive manner. We have carefully considered the report and set out our response to each point raised by the EEC below. We address the programme's strengths, as identified by the EEC, briefly in the introductions. Our responses to the areas for improvement and recommendations made by the EEC, along with the actions we have taken, are set out in column 2 of the table in each section.

1. Study programme and study programme's design and development (ESG 1.1, 1.2, 1.7, 1.8, 1.9)

The EEC has found the programme to be Compliant in sub-areas 1.1, 1.3 and 1.4, and Partially Compliant in 1.2. We are pleased to note that the EEC confirmed that the Department's quality assurance processes and policies effectively support the successful operation of the programme. We also particularly value the recognition of the active engagement of students in course development processes, as well as the strong support expressed by external stakeholders for the programme and their ongoing collaboration with staff and students.

Areas of improvement and recommendations by EEC	Actions Taken by the Institution	For Official Use ONLY
External practitioners are typically involved in design reviews, and there are various opportunities for informal feedback from practice. The EEC also noted the previous existence of an External Advisory Committee (2007-11), which was comprised largely of external academics. The EEC recommend that the Department considers establishing a formal feedback mechanism for external stakeholder engagement. This could be through establishing an Advisory Board that might meet annually to discuss potential developments in the programme. This may include practitioners, representatives related sectors and other external stakeholders. Such a board may also help extend and reinforce the Department's networks within practice, industry and the wider society, which may produce additional benefits for the programme. Minutes from these meetings would be a formal record of periodic external engagement.	The Department welcomes the Committee's recommendation regarding the further formalisation of external stakeholder engagement. We recognize the value of structured and periodic dialogue with practitioners, academics, industry representatives, and other stakeholders in strengthening the programme's academic, professional, and societal connections. At the same time, we would like to note that formal mechanisms for stakeholder engagement already exist through the University's Internal Programme Evaluation Process (IPEP), as outlined in Chapter 3 "Policies for Programmes of Study" of the University's Internal Regulations. [presented in the submitted application form under sections "E.3: Quality indicators for Programmes of Studies and their monitoring" and "G.3: Process of introducing new Programmes of Study"]. Within this framework, programmes are regularly monitored, reviewed, and revised with the involvement of students and external stakeholders, following the quality assurance procedures aligned with the CYQAA evaluation framework. The External Team of Reviewers (ETR) includes both academic experts from other universities and industry	Choose level of compliance:

	representatives relevant to the discipline. In this regard, during the accreditation visit, the Committee met one of the Department's external reviewers, namely the President of the Cyprus Architects Association, during the stakeholder session. Nevertheless, the Department appreciates the Committee's suggestion and will consider further strengthening and formalizing stakeholder consultations through annual formal meetings.	
The Committee found difficulty in identifying some elements of programme information as listed in section 1.4. The Committee suggest it may be helpful to establish a dashboard of the key components of the programme information so that these are readily accessible.	We acknowledge the Committee's observation regarding the accessibility of programme-related information listed in Section 1.4. The university has recently transitioned from Moodle to Blackboard, implementing a more comprehensive and structured approach to the data collection, monitoring and reporting processes. This process involves strengthening our administrative mechanisms with custom-made AI tools, which are expected to significantly improve the organisation, accessibility and presentation of programme-related information. Much of the data referenced in Section 1.4 is collected and monitored centrally by the relevant administrative support departments of the University, including Academic Affairs, Recruitment and Admissions, the Erasmus Office, and Career Services. This data is systematically made available to the Department and is directly accessible to the Head of the Department and to the Dean of the SHSS via the university's information systems (Exelixis, Portal etc.). In line with the Committee's recommendation, the Department will work towards creating a more	Choose level of compliance:

	consolidated, user-friendly overview/dashboard of key programme information and indicators, utilising all the above. This will make the relevant data easier to access and clearer for internal and external stakeholders.	
--	--	--

2. Student – centred learning, teaching and assessment (ESG 1.3)

The EEC has found the programme to be Compliant in all sub-areas. We are pleased to note the Committee's highly positive assessment of the teaching and learning environment, particularly the recognition of the programme's strong studio culture, student-centred approach, and the high level of support provided to students across all years of study. We also value the acknowledgement of the programme's success in fostering flexible and inclusive learning experiences, as well as the strong support received from employers through internship opportunities for all students.

Areas of improvement and recommendations by EEC	Actions Taken by the Institution	For Official Use ONLY
As the Department's research activities develop over the next five years, in accordance with the Department's research strategy, there will be opportunities to further develop the relationship between research and teaching.	The relationship between research and teaching has long been a cornerstone of the Department's academic identity. Faculty members are carefully selected to reflect a broad range of research areas and expertise, and are assigned to courses and thematic areas directly aligned with their scholarly work. This strategy ensures that research and teaching remain mutually reinforcing activities, benefiting both staff and students by fostering a dynamic two-way exchange between the classroom and the broader research environment. In particular, the 4th and 5th year of studies are designed to foster independent, research-led teaching and learning, and critical engagement through thematic research "units". These units are practice and research based, and theme oriented. Each unit adopts a distinct working methodology through which students investigate contemporary architectural, political, social, technological, and environmental issues, enabling them to define and test their own position within current architectural discourse. These research units are closely aligned with the principal research clusters in which faculty members are actively engaged.	Choose level of compliance:

	The Department is committed to further strengthening this relationship by expanding and diversifying the research expertise of its faculty. This will be achieved primarily through the careful appointment of additional adjunct teaching staff with complementary and diverse research specialisations. Future postgraduate programmes and an increase in research projects engagement will also reflect the research strengths of the faculty, creating further opportunities for meaningful synergies between teaching and research.	
The Committee suggests that in developing the programme attention is given to exploiting modern teaching methods, tools and materials to support student learning. This might include the use of new educational technologies.	The Department has long embraced the integration of emerging technologies within its teaching methodologies. It remains committed to expanding the use of innovative digital tools as integral components of the teaching and learning environment. Over the next five years, the Department aims to further enhance and broaden the application of technologies such as the metaverse, data analytics models, 3D scanning, virtual reality, artificial intelligence, simulation modelling, robotics, digital fabrication, and drone-derived data. Please refer to <i>Appendix 1</i> for a list of tools that the Department aims to gradually acquire in the next few years. In <i>Appendix 2</i> you may see the items that have already been requested in the 2026-2027 budget. Through this continued investment in technological innovation, the Department seeks to strengthen experimental learning, enhance research-informed teaching, and equip students with the advanced	Choose level of compliance:

	digital skills required for contemporary architectural practice and research.	
The Committee suggest that the programme would benefit from further addressing current and urgent societal challenges related to the political context and the climate and ecological crises. Utilising new educational methods may help in addressing these concerns.	The Department acknowledges the Committee's recommendation and notes that many of these themes are already embedded within the structure and pedagogical approach of the programme, particularly in the 4th and 5th year of studies. These years are specifically designed to foster independent, research-led teaching and learning, and critical engagement through thematic research "units". These units are practice and research based, and theme oriented. Each unit adopts a distinct working methodology through which students investigate contemporary architectural, political, social, technological, and environmental issues, enabling them to define and test their own position within current architectural discourse. The research units directly engage with urgent societal challenges including sustainability, environmental and ecological crises, community involvement, displacement and multiple identities, emergent urban paradigms, commoning and social space, innovative future living, and the impact of AI and digital technologies. These research units are closely aligned with the principal research clusters in which faculty members are actively engaged. The unit thematics are further reinforced through advanced theory and technology elective courses, all of which encourage informed academic debate and interdisciplinary inquiry.	Choose level of compliance:

	The Department will continue to strengthen these directions through evolving research clusters, research-informed teaching, and the integration of emerging educational methodologies and technologies that support critical, experimental, and socially responsive forms of architectural education. The Department also plans to further strengthen its commitment to society and the environment by increasing the number and depth of: live projects, community reach and cooperation with local governmental organisations such as municipalities, planning authorities and a diverse group of local and European NGOs.	
The staff reported the importance of the critical thinking as part of the distinctive programme offer. The Committee suggest that this might be usefully supported by more formal teaching in relation to appropriate methodologies for applied critical thinking.	The Department strongly supports the Committee's observation regarding the importance of critical thinking as a distinctive element of the programme. Critical and applied thinking methodologies are already embedded across the curriculum through studio-based, project-based, problem-solving, and reflective learning approaches that encourage students to analyse, question, evaluate, and develop evidence-based design responses. More formal methodologies for applied critical thinking are particularly integrated within design studio and laboratory-oriented courses, where methods such as case-study analysis, questioning and exploratory learning, peer coaching and debate, concept mapping, and metacognitive reflection are extensively employed. Teaching strategies are intentionally structured to foster dialogue, interdisciplinary inquiry, peer	Choose level of compliance:

	learning, reflective practice, and self-regulated learning, while formative assessment processes continuously support the development of students' analytical and critical capacities. Please refer to section "G.1: Department's Policy for Teaching" of the submitted application form for Departmental evaluation for further details.	
--	---	--

3. Teaching staff (ESG 1.5)

The EEC has found the programme to be Compliant in all sub-areas. We are pleased to note the Committee's positive assessment of the Department's dedicated and collaborative teaching staff, and its recognition of the strong emphasis placed on student learning and the overall student experience. We also value the acknowledgement of the important contribution made by practising architects within the design studios, which significantly enriches the professional and educational character of the programme.

Areas of improvement and recommendations by EEC	Actions Taken by the Institution	For Official Use ONLY
As the Department's research activities increase, we suggest the Department may have to allow for proportionally more staff time to be dedicated to research. The Committee noted that within the staff web pages there was often relatively little information provided on the research interests and activities of the staff. We suggest the staff biographies could be usefully updated to include this information more extensively.	The Department acknowledges the Committee's observation regarding the increasing demands of research activity and the importance of allocating adequate staff time to support research development. Time allocation for research is governed through the Research Time Release (RTR) mechanism, in accordance with "Chapter 6.5; Policy on Research Time Release (RTR) from Teaching", of the University of Nicosia Internal Regulations. RTR is granted by the on an individual basis, following the eligibility guidelines and criteria specified within the Regulations, thereby ensuring that research-active staff are appropriately supported as research activity continues to expand. In collaboration with the School of Humanities and Social Sciences, the Department has also contributed to the development of a clearer institutional framework for research evaluation that more appropriately reflects the nature of practice-based and creative disciplines. This framework introduces broader evaluation criteria that recognise both traditional scholarly outputs and creative or professional practice-based work. With regard to staff biographies and research visibility, the Department notes that the current website format follows institutional	Choose level of compliance:

	templates aligned with CYQAA requirements. Nevertheless, we welcome the EEC's recommendation and intend to revisit and update the Department website following the CYQAA evaluation process and in line with the Committee's feedback. A broader reappraisal of the website, including staff profile pages, has therefore already been initiated in order to provide more extensive information on staff research interests, activities, and outputs.	
--	--	--

4. Student admission, progression, recognition and certification (ESG 1.4)

The EEC has found the programme to be Compliant in all sub-areas. We are pleased to note the Committee's positive assessment of the Department's recruitment, progression, and student recognition processes, recognising them as clear, proportionate, and effectively implemented. We also particularly value the acknowledgement of the accessibility and strength of the admissions process, reflected in the programme's increasing student intake.

Areas of improvement and recommendations by EEC	Actions Taken by the Institution	For Official Use ONLY
The Committee found difficulty in identifying data on student progression. The Committee suggest it may be helpful to include this information as part of the suggested dashboard of the programme information, so that this is readily accessible.	We acknowledge the Committee's observation regarding the accessibility of programme-related information listed in Section 1.4. The university has recently transitioned from Moodle to Blackboard, implementing a more comprehensive and structured approach to the data collection, monitoring and reporting processes. This process involves strengthening our administrative mechanisms with custom-made AI tools, which are expected to significantly improve the organisation, accessibility and presentation of programme-related information. Much of the data referenced in Section 1.4 is collected and monitored centrally by the relevant administrative support departments of the University, including Academic Affairs, Recruitment and Admissions, the Erasmus Office, and Career Services. This data is systematically made available to the Department and is directly accessible to the Head of the Department and to the Dean of the SHSS via the university's information systems (Exelixis, Portal etc.). In line with the Committee's recommendation, the Department will work towards creating a more consolidated, user-friendly overview/dashboard of key programme information and indicators, utilising all the above. This will make the relevant data	Choose level of compliance:

	easier to access and clearer for internal and external stakeholders.	
--	--	--

5. Learning resources and student support (ESG 1.6)

The EEC has found the programme to be Compliant in all sub-areas. We are pleased to note the Committee's positive assessment that the resources available to the programme are adequate to support teaching and learning across all years of study. We also value the recognition of key strengths, particularly the contribution of visiting practitioners within the design studios, the diversity of part-time staff, and the strong support provided to students for participation in Erasmus mobility programmes.

Areas of improvement and recommendations by EEC	Actions Taken by the Institution	For Official Use ONLY
As student numbers increase the Committee recommend that careful attention is paid to ensuring physical, learning & teaching, and human resources are maintained appropriately to support the programme. This includes the studio, workshop and lab facilities.	We appreciate the Committee's observation regarding the pressures on studio space arising from the recent increase in student numbers and fully acknowledge the importance of aligning any future growth of the Department with a corresponding expansion and strengthening of the physical resources that support our studio-centred pedagogy. The Department is committed to ensuring that strategic planning for student recruitment and programme development is undertaken in parallel with careful consideration of spatial capacity, teaching infrastructure, and the overall quality of the learning environment. We will continue to monitor closely the relationship between student numbers, studio provision, and pedagogical needs, and will incorporate the Committee's recommendation into future strategic and operational planning. At present, the Department operates efficiently through careful scheduling of teaching activities and through the strategic and flexible use of the ARC building, whose adaptable spatial configuration	Choose level of compliance:

	allows spaces to accommodate a range of studio, teaching, and review activities. This flexibility has enabled the Department to respond effectively to current operational and pedagogical demands while remaining compliant with existing space allocation requirements. Infrastructural provisions, including printing facilities and laboratory equipment, have significantly increased in line with growing student numbers.	
As the Department's research activities increase there are likely to be further opportunities to develop research-led teaching through engagement in research projects.	The Department appreciates the Committee's positive observation regarding the growing potential for strengthening research-led teaching. We fully agree that the continued expansion of the Department's research activity will create further opportunities for students to engage in research projects. While acknowledging the particular scale and funding landscape of Cyprus, we recognize the importance of strengthening the Department's research funding profile and will continue to support and encourage greater engagement with competitive international and interdisciplinary funding opportunities. In fact, since 2025 we have significantly increased our participation in funded research applications. Currently, the 4th and 5th year of studies are designed to foster independent, research-led teaching and learning, and critical engagement through thematic research "units". These units are practice and research based, and theme oriented. Each unit adopts a distinct working methodology through which students investigate	Choose level of compliance:

	contemporary architectural, political, social, technological, and environmental issues, enabling them to define and test their own position within current architectural discourse. These research units are closely aligned with the principal research clusters in which faculty members are actively engaged.	
--	--	--

6. Additional for doctoral programmes (ALL ESG)

Not applicable

Areas of improvement and recommendations by EEC	Actions Taken by the Institution	For Official Use ONLY
Click or tap here to enter text.	Click or tap here to enter text.	Choose level of compliance:
Click or tap here to enter text.	Click or tap here to enter text.	Choose level of compliance:
Click or tap here to enter text.	Click or tap here to enter text.	Choose level of compliance:
Click or tap here to enter text.	Click or tap here to enter text.	Choose level of compliance:
Click or tap here to enter text.	Click or tap here to enter text.	Choose level of compliance:

7. Eligibility (Joint programme) (ALL ESG)

Not applicable

Areas of improvement and recommendations by EEC	Actions Taken by the Institution	For Official Use ONLY
Click or tap here to enter text.	Click or tap here to enter text.	Choose level of compliance:
Click or tap here to enter text.	Click or tap here to enter text.	Choose level of compliance:
Click or tap here to enter text.	Click or tap here to enter text.	Choose level of compliance:
Click or tap here to enter text.	Click or tap here to enter text.	Choose level of compliance:
Click or tap here to enter text.	Click or tap here to enter text.	Choose level of compliance:

B. Conclusions and final remarks

Conclusions and final remarks by EEC	Actions Taken by the Institution	For Official Use ONLY
Overall, the EEC was impressed by the excellence of the programme in relation to the quality of its academic staff and the high-quality work produced by its students. We witnessed a dedicated and committed team of academics and support staff delivering an excellent student experience.	The Department would like to sincerely thank the External Evaluation Committee for its highly encouraging remarks. We are particularly honoured by the recognition of the excellence of the programme, the dedication and commitment of our academic and support staff, and the high quality of work produced by our students. The Committee's positive assessment is greatly appreciated by the Department and serves as a strong encouragement for our continued efforts to provide an intellectually rigorous, creative, and supportive learning environment. We remain committed to the ongoing development of the programme and to further strengthening the quality of education, research, and student experience.	Choose level of compliance:
Comments and recommendations for improvements in the body of this report are made in the context of a programme that is performing well across all areas of activity.	The Department appreciates the Committee's constructive comments and recommendations, which are received in the positive spirit in which they were intended. We value the recognition that these recommendations are made within the context of a programme performing strongly across all areas of activity and will carefully consider them in our ongoing development and enhancement processes.	Choose level of compliance:
The areas of improvement and recommendations of the EEC are detailed within the report sections above. In summary the main recommendation is as follows. The EEC recommend that the	We welcome the EEC's constructive suggestions. All areas identified for further development have been addressed in detail in sections above.	Choose level of compliance:

Department considers establishing a formal feedback mechanism for external stakeholder engagement. This could be through establishing an Advisory Board which might meet annually to discuss potential developments in the programme and review its on-going performance.		
Finally, the EEC wishes to thank the Department for their excellent preparation for the visit. We were also grateful for the open and constructive engagement of all those we met during our visit. We were especially impressed by the contribution of the students, with all the students and graduates providing a compelling testimony of the qualities of the Department.	We would like to thank the External Evaluation Committee (EEC) for their professional and thorough work during the visit of the Department of Architecture. We would also like to express our appreciation for the collegial and constructive approach with which they conducted their evaluation. We are especially pleased that the contributions of our students and graduates were positively recognised, as their engagement, commitment and achievements remain central to the identity and strength of the programme.	Choose level of compliance:

C. Higher Education Institution academic representatives

<i>Name</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>Signature</i>
Ioulia Papageorgi	Dean	
Markella Menikou	Head of Department / Architecture Programme Coordinator / Associate Professor	
Angela Kyriacou-Petrou	Associate Head of Department / Associate Professor	
Maria Hadjisoteriou	Associate Professor	
Costandino Joannides	4 th year Architecture student	

Date: 01/06/2026

