



Doc. 300.3.1

Date: November 27, 2021

External Evaluation Report (Departmental)

- **Higher Education Institution:**
 - Neapolis University Pafos
- **Town:** Pafos
- **School** of Architecture, Engineering, Land and Environmental Sciences
- **Department** of Architecture, Land & Environmental Sciences
- **Department's Status:** Currently Operating
- **Programme of study under evaluation:**
 - Architecture (4 years / 240 ECTS, Bachelor – 5 years / 300 ECTS, Diploma)



The present document has been prepared within the framework of the authority and competencies of the Cyprus Agency of Quality Assurance and Accreditation in Higher Education, according to the provisions of the “Quality Assurance and Accreditation of Higher Education and the Establishment and Operation of an Agency on Related Matters Laws of 2015 to 2019” [N. 136 (I)/2015 to N. 35(I)/2019].



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

DEPARTMENT	PROGRAMMES OF STUDY

A. Introduction

This part includes basic information regarding the onsite visit.

The visit, conducted remotely on the 24th of November, was made of an intense sequence of meetings with members of the University management team, the rector of the University Prof. Pantelis Sklias, the Dean and Head of the Department Prof. Solon Xenopoulos, the members of the teaching staff and administration and support staff.

The EEC had the important opportunity to interview some alumni and present students, collecting a spectrum of different opinions and experiences. Before the visit, the EEC received informational material on the structure and contents of the Department, the members of staff and management, and students' outputs, the University organization and life. The EEC received a limited number of recorded lectures and samples of students' work. All meetings had the form of a free and open discussion; University members gave, cooperatively, a considerable amount of information and were very open to the dialogue.

The members of the EEC had the opportunity to place questions and to ask for further explanation on all aspects of the Department. The members of the EEC would like to thank the Education Officer George Aletraris and Faculty, Staff, and Students of Neapolis University Pafos for their open reception and cooperation.



B. External Evaluation Committee (EEC)

<i>Name</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>University</i>
Alessandro Rocca	Professor	Politecnico di Milano
Alexander Wright	Professor	University of Bath
Vassilis Ganiatsas	Professor	National Technical University of Athens
Elena Rousou	Student	University of Cyprus

C. Guidelines on content and structure of the report

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

1 or 2: *Non-compliant*

3: *Partially compliant*

4 or 5: *Compliant*

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

Findings

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

Strengths

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

Areas of improvement and recommendations

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

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

1. Department's academic profile and orientation

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

Sub-areas

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

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

1 or 2: *Non-compliant*

3: *Partially compliant*

4 or 5: *Compliant*

Quality indicators/criteria		
1. Department's academic profile and orientation		
1.1 Mission and strategic planning (including SWOT analysis)		1 - 5
1.1.1	The Department has formally adopted a mission statement, which is available to the public and easily accessible.	4
1.1.2	The Department has developed its strategic planning aiming at fulfilling its mission.	3
1.1.3	The Department's strategic planning includes short, medium-term and long-term goals and objectives, which are periodically revised and adapted.	3
1.1.4	The programmes of study offered by the Department reflect its academic profile and are aligned with the European and international practice.	4
1.1.5	The academic community is involved in shaping and monitoring the implementation of the Department's development strategies.	4
1.1.6	Stakeholders such as academics, students, graduates and other professional and scientific associations participate in the Department's development strategy.	4
1.1.7	The mechanism for collecting and analysing data and indicators needed to effectively design the Department's academic development is adequate and effective.	5

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

The strategic plan providing building and infrastructure facilities of the Department is still pending.

Additionally, provide information on the following:

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

[Click to enter text.](#)

Provide suggestions for changes in case of incompatibility.

[Click to enter text.](#)

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.	4
1.2.2	The Department provides sufficient information to the public about its activities and offered programmes of study.	4
1.2.3	The Department ensures that its operation and activities have a positive impact on society.	4
1.2.4	The Department has an effective communication mechanism with its graduates.	4

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

The Department is involved to the local society by architectural studies of analysis in several modules, and with architectural, urban and landscape design proposal in the framework of local architectural competitions. The educational output is communicated through exhibitions.

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.	4
1.3.2	Planning teaching staff recruitment and their professional development is in line with the Department's academic development plan.	4
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.	3
<p>Justify the numerical scores provided for the quality indicators (criteria) by specifying (if any) the deficiencies.</p> <p>The profile of academic staff is high, versatile, and complementary to the programme. Recruiting and development are efficiently managed. However, there is no clear strategy for international collaborations and programmes for visiting staff from other schools of architecture. Funding is adequate and transparent but not enough to ameliorate the building and equipment infrastructure and provide exchange programmes for visiting staff.</p> <p>Additionally, write:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Expected number of Cypriot and international students - Countries of origin of international students and number from each country <p>The total number of students consists of equal number of Cypriot and Greek students. In each year there can be occasionally 1 Greek-speaking student from other countries (Syria, Greek and Cypriot diaspora).</p>		

Findings

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

Mission and strategic planning are not clearly presented, multifocal organization is not fully understandable. Recruiting and development of staff is satisfactory. The budget is well managed but limited not providing for international exchange of staff and amelioration of infrastructure.

Strengths

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

Connecting with society seems quite a good point, especially if we intend enterprises and job market.

Future developments are promising, with the promise of starting the construction of the new campus.

Areas of improvement and recommendations

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

Mission and strategies could be more clearly expressed.

Very elaborated documents don't highlight the specificity of the department.

The relationship with the heritage, historical and contemporary assets of the territory are little considered.

Social responsibility and engagement don't seem considered enough.

The possibility of attracting students from other cities and countries seem not strongly pursued.

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	Compliant
1.2 Connecting with society	Compliant
1.3 Development processes	Partially Compliant

2. Quality Assurance

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

Sub-areas

- 2.1 System and quality assurance strategy
- 2.2 Quality assurance for the programmes of study

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

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

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

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

[Click to enter text.](#)

2. 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.	4
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.	4
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.	4
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.	4
2.2.8	Names and position of the teaching staff of each programme are published and easily accessible.	4
2.2.9	The Department has a clear and consistent policy on the admission criteria for students in the various programmes of studies offered.	4
2.2.10	The Department flexibly uses a variety of teaching methods.	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.	4
2.2.12	The Department analyses and publishes graduate employment information.	5

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

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

The campus consists of two hotel wings and is well located within the town occupying a relatively central location. The existing campus offers a compact site with teaching and learning spaces in proximity to the support facilities. However, it still clearly retains some of the character of its previous use as a hotel and is not ideally suited to house a growing and aspiring school of architecture. We understand the plans are well advanced for the new campus, located near the existing site, and we anticipate that the new development will provide more suitable accommodation, additional facilities, and an overall distinct character that a school of architecture deserves.

Findings

Building facilities need strong improvement. The architectural quality is not adequate to a department of architecture.

Strengths

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

A good ratio between professors and students provides a strong tutoring and a positive personal relationship between students and faculty.

The Department has a good organization which keeps tracks of the main tasks, goals, and achievements.

Areas of improvement and recommendations

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

Improving the quality of spaces, indoor and outdoor, creating the appropriate atmosphere and comfort.

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

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

3. Administration (ESG 1.1, 1.3, 1.6)

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

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

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

3.11 Internationalization of the Department and external collaborations. 3

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

Internationalization seems little developed. The EEC didn't get any notice about foreign visiting professors or researchers and didn't meet any foreign student.

Findings

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

In the application is written that "The Department aims to attract high-level students from Cyprus, Greece, other neighboring countries especially of the southeast Mediterranean but also distant countries, through scholarships and other financial stipends, as well as attractive and competitive undergraduate and postgraduate programmes which focus on the professional development of its graduates." The EEC, in the visit, could not have any evidence that this aim takes to any result. It is possible that the aim looks at the near future, and this could be a good plus for the Department.

Strengths

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

Administration is highly efficient in dealing with running the programme and meeting the needs of the students.

Areas of improvement and recommendations

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

As already mentioned in previous sections, internationalization and collaboration should be strongly supported and reinforced.

Please select what is appropriate for the following assessment area:

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

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

Sub-areas

- 4.1 Planning the programmes of study
- 4.2 Organisation of teaching

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

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

Quality indicators/criteria		
4. Learning and Teaching		
4.1 Planning the programmes of study		1 - 5
4.1.1	The Department provides an effective system for designing, approving, monitoring and periodically reviewing the programmes of study.	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).	4
4.1.4	The programmes of study are in compliance with the existing legislation and meet the professional qualifications requirements in the professional courses, where applicable.	5
4.1.5	The Department ensures that its programmes of study integrate effectively theory and practice.	3

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

The students can participate in a practical training program as an option among four offered electives in seminar 6 at the fifth year.
The EEC recommends using the advantage of professors' background for doing studios with aboard Professors and collaboration in workshops with international schools of architecture. Professional component, and the engineering part of architectural education, should be reinforced.

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.	4
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.	4
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-centered 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.	4
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.

The study plan, in the first four years of the programme, seems well organized, with a good availability of professors and a clear interest towards design activities. Learning by doing seems largely adopted and chosen as the best training in architectural design.

The small number of students leads to their close supervision.

There is a good collaboration with local authorities through the studio work.

Strengths

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

The first 4 years of study are well organized, multidisciplinary, versatile, and targeted to provide a fertile educational ground to enhance the skills and creativity of the students. The fifth year concludes the integrated curriculum of forming the profile of architects.

Areas of improvement and recommendations

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

Teaching and learning should be further enhanced by invited academics and international collaboration.

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	Partially Compliant
4.2 Organisation of teaching	Compliant

5. Teaching Staff (ESG 1.5)

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

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

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

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

Staff is of high educational background and efficient in deploying their knowledge and skills to the students by encouraging their skills and creativity. Students benefit from the versatile competencies of staff. We see that a professor, who is indicated as an important faculty member covering a specific disciplinary field, is in service, since 2018, as a full-time associate professor in an Italian university. We suggest giving the faculty board more robustness with some well-established professors who can integrate the freshness of the young members.

The EEC didn't have any information about visiting professorship.

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 staff/student ratio of 1:7 and all staff is permanent. The educational background of all members is high, international, and versatile related to their studies for first and higher degrees. Choices on staff ensure complementarity in carrying out the programme of studies.

Strengths

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

The staff/studio is excellent for a school of architecture. Staff is of international education background and complementary. The size of the school allows for good synergies between staff members and between staff and students.

Areas of improvement and recommendations

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

The engineering and design part should be reinforced by permanent staff and mainly by visiting academics and collaboration with international schools of architecture.

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	Partially Compliant

6. Research

(ESG 1.1, 1.3, 1.5, 1.6)

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

1 or 2: *Non-compliant*

3: *Partially compliant*

4 or 5: *Compliant*

Quality indicators/criteria		
6. Research		1 - 5
6.1	The Department has a research policy formulated in line with its mission.	3
6.2	The Department consistently applies internal regulations and procedures of research activity, which promote the set out research policy and ensure compliance with the regulations of research projects financing programmes.	4
6.3	The Department provides adequate facilities and equipment to cover the staff and students' research activities.	3
6.4	The Department has the appropriate mechanisms for the development of students' research skills.	4
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.	3
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.	4
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.	4
6.8	The external, non-governmental, funding of research activities of teaching staff is similar to other Departments in Cyprus and abroad.	4
6.9	The policy, indirect or direct of internal funding of the research activities of the teaching staff is satisfactory, based on European and international practices.	4

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

The research seems carefully regulated but research activity has no evidence.

Findings

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

The research seems carefully regulated but the EEC didn't get any evidence of a relevant research activity. Publishing don't have a relevant role in the Department life.

Strengths

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

Evidence of research lies mainly in design research showcased in architectural competitions.

Areas of improvement and recommendations

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

Research is limited to design research in collaborative schemes and proposals in architectural competitions. Theoretical research on methodology and theory of design should be reinforced and further enhances especially since most of staff have doctorate degrees.

Please ✓ what is appropriate for the following assessment area:

Assessment area	<i>Non-compliant / Partially Compliant / Compliant</i>
Research mechanisms and regulations	Compliant
External and internal funding	Compliant
Motives for research	Partially Compliant
Publications	Partially 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.	4
7.2	The Department follows sound and efficient management of the available financial resources in order to develop academically and research wise.	4
7.3	The Department's profits and donations are used for its development and for the benefit of the university community.	4
7.4	The Department's budget is appropriate for its mission and adequate for the implementation of strategic planning.	3
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.	4
7.7	The fitness-for-purpose of support facilities and services is periodically reviewed.	3
<p>Justify the numerical scores provided for the quality indicators (criteria) by specifying (if any) the deficiencies.</p> <p>More resources should be allocated for the amelioration of building facilities and the upgrading of design studios.</p>		

Findings

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

We found good management of available resources providing for the departmental budget, recruiting of staff and keeping fees affordable.

Strengths

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

Efficient management that provides for the needs of the department.

Areas of improvement and recommendations

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

More resources should be allocated for the amelioration of building facilities and the upgrading of design studios with dedicated library and fully equipped conventional materials workshops as well as contemporary technologies of model making.

Please ✓ what is appropriate for the following assessment area:

Assessment area	<i>Non-compliant / Partially Compliant / Compliant</i>
7. Resources	Partially 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 External Evaluation Committee wishes to thank the University and the Department for the documentation provided in advance of our visit. We also wish to thank all the staff and students we spoke to during our visit for the open engagement throughout all our meetings.

Overall, the EEC was satisfied that the Department mostly meets the quality assurance standards required.

Although the department is small with enriched teaching staff and few students, they manage to have a strong bond between them that gives the opportunity for students to learn more. Additional facilities and equipment we recommend will improve the students' knowledge and techniques but also and cooperation opportunities with other students from the department. These suggestions will lead to improve the programme of study and the outcome quality of the students learning.

The documentation supporting the Department has been well prepared and indicates a clear knowledge and consideration of the main aims and needs.

The weakest parts, for the EEC, are the faculty, which could be more robust with the insertion of expert visiting or permanent researchers, and that could be more international. The publishing activity seems too limited and doesn't reflect a constant engagement in research. This activity could be also of great support in attracting students from abroad, in supporting the teaching activity, in developing the teaching staff careers and international relationship.



E. Signatures of the EEC

<i>Name</i>	<i>Signature</i>
Alessandro Rocca	
Alexander Wright	
Vassilis Ganiatsas	
Elena Rousou	

Date: November 26, 2021

