

Doc. 300.1.1/3

Date: 11th January 2024

External Evaluation Report (Joint – MUNDUS, conventional programme of study)

Institution:

European University Cyprus (EUC), Cyprus

District: Nicosia, Cyprus

Title of the programme of study in Greek:

Κοινό Μεταπτυχιακό στην Προηγμένη Κυβερνοασφάλεια (2 Έτη/120 ECTS, Μεταπτυχιακό)

Title of the programme of study in English:

Joint Master's in Advanced Cybersecurity (2 Years/120 ECTS, Master of Science)

Faculty (for universities):

School of Sciences

Department (for universities):

Department of Computer Science and Engineering

Sector (for non-universities):

Private University

Language(s) of instruction: English

Name the concentrations (if any):

In the Greek language: Concentrations

In the English language: Concentrations

Programme status (*check the box where applicable and complete accordingly*):

1. New programme of study:
 - 1.1. Expected to operate in the Winter/Spring semester of the academic year 2025-2026
2. Currently operating programme of study:
 - 2.1. Programme title on the last accreditation:
Click or tap here to enter programme title
 - 2.2. Reference number: Click or tap here to enter Reference Number
 - 2.3. Expiry date of the last accreditation: Click or tap to enter date of accreditation
3. Evaluated by CYQAA and did not get accreditation the academic year YYYY
 - 3.1. Programme title as it was submitted:
Click or tap here to enter the programme title as it was submitted
 - 3.2. Reference number: Click or tap here to enter number

Programme category (*check the box where applicable*):

1. Conventional
2. E - Learning
3. Joint (for universities)
(Name of collaborating university/ies)
Click or tap here to enter collaborating university/ies



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. Introduction

This part includes basic information regarding the onsite visit.

The Expert Evaluation Committee (EEC) convened at the European University of Cyprus for an on-site visit on the 10th January 2024. The EEC were provided with all necessary documentation, either before the meeting or in response to requests made during the visit. All the partner HEIs were represented across the different sessions that adequately covered all aspects of the evaluation. All partners contributed to the meeting and demonstrated a strong commitment to this joint course.

Two specific points are noted. Firstly, there are always likely to be technical difficulties during hybrid meetings. The EEC would like to thank all support staff who helped to address those issues during the visit and these issues did not materially affect our findings.

Secondly, because the course is yet to run many of the aspects of the evaluation related to planned approaches and activities. It was clear to the committee that the team had made careful plans and had anticipated many of our questions although some of these will have to be revised in the light of experience and direct student feedback.

B. External Evaluation Committee (EEC)

<i>Name</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>University</i>
Professor <u>Chris Johnson</u>	Pro Vice Chancellor, Engineering and Physical Science,	Queen's University, Belfast
Professor <u>Kevin Curran</u>	Professor of Cyber Security School of Computing, Engineering and Intelligent Systems Faculty of Computing, Engineering and the Built Environment,	Ulster University, Magee College, Derry, Northern Ireland
Professor <u>Santi Caballé Llobet</u>	Full Professor of Learning Engineering, Faculty of Computer Science, Multimedia and Telecommunications,	Open University of Catalonia
<u>Krinos A. Vasileiou</u>	Undergraduate Student, Computer Engineering and Informatics (BSc),	Cyprus University of Technology

C. Guidelines on content and structure of the report

- *The external evaluation report follows the structure of assessment areas.*
- *At the beginning of each assessment area there is a box presenting:*
 - (a) sub-areas*
 - (b) standards which are relevant to the European Standards and Guidelines (ESG)*
 - (c) some questions that EEC may find useful.*
- *The questions aim at facilitating the understanding of each assessment area and at illustrating the range of topics covered by the standards.*
- *Under each assessment area, it is important to provide information regarding the compliance with the requirements of each sub-area. In particular, the following must be included:*

Findings

A short description of the situation in the Higher Education Institution (HEI), based on elements from the application for external evaluation and on findings from the onsite 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 to be dealt with, 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. It is pointed out that, in the case of standards that cannot be applied due to the status of the HEI and/or of the programme of study, N/A (= Not Applicable) should be noted.*
- *The EEC should state the conclusions and final remarks regarding the programme of study as a whole.*
- *The report may also address other issues which the EEC finds relevant.*

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

Sub-areas

- 1.1 Policy for quality assurance
- 1.2 Design, approval, on-going monitoring and review
- 1.3 Public information
- 1.4 Information management

1.1 Policy for quality assurance

Standards

- *Policy for quality assurance of the programme of study incorporating practices from all participating institutions:*
 - *has a formal status and is publicly available*
 - *has a system which assures the quality of joint provision, and guarantees that the aims of programme are met; continuous information collection both for this purpose and for the further development of programme*
 - *supports the organisation of the quality assurance system through appropriate structures, regulations and processes*
 - *supports teaching, administrative staff and students to take on their responsibilities in quality assurance*
 - *has processes involving coordination of assessment across the whole programme*
 - *provides an adequate provision for teachers' academic and pedagogical development*
 - *publishes reports on results of QA activities that are publicly available.*
 - *ensures academic integrity and freedom and is vigilant against academic fraud*
 - *guards against intolerance of any kind or discrimination against the students or staff*
 - *supports the involvement of external stakeholders*
 1. *has a quality assurance policy developed with input from industry leaders to align with professional standards.*
 2. *integrates employer surveys to adapt to evolving workplace demands.*
 3. *regularly utilizes alumni feedback for long-term effectiveness assessment.*
 4. *establishes collaborations with accreditation bodies to ensure compliance with academic standards.*
 5. *conducts periodic reviews with external educational experts for policy improvements.*

1.2 Design, approval, on-going monitoring and review

Standards

- The programme of study:
 - is designed with overall programme objectives that are in line with the institutional strategy and have explicit intended learning outcomes (i.e. a joint syllabus, a language policy, the intended added value of the programme, a common funding strategy (i.e. resources for planning and coordinating the programme; resources for mobility: staff, students, management), study counselling, mobility plans of how to handle different semester periods (take into account the needs of different kinds of students)
 - is designed by involving students and stakeholders benefits from external expertise
 - reflects the four purposes of higher education of the Council of Europe (preparation for sustainable employment, personal development, preparation for life as active citizens in democratic societies, the development and maintenance, through teaching, learning and research, of a broad, advanced knowledge base)
 - is designed so that it enables smooth student progression
 - deserves a special attention in the social aspect and information-sharing between the students (i.e. a joint introductory course, a discussion area on the web)
 - guarantees the distinct quality of graduates from joint programmes
 - is designed so that the exams' and assignments' content corresponds to the level of the programme and the number of ECTS
 - defines the expected student workload in ECTS
 - includes well-structured placement opportunities where appropriate
 - is subject to a formal institutional approval process
 - results in a qualification that is clearly specified and communicated, and refers to the correct level of the National Qualifications Framework for Higher Education and, consequently, to the Framework for Qualifications of the European Higher Education Area
 - is regularly monitored in the light of the latest research in the given discipline, thus ensuring that the programme is up-to-date
 - is periodically reviewed so that it takes into account the changing needs of society, the students' workload, progression and completion, the effectiveness of procedures for assessment of students, student expectations, needs and satisfaction in relation to the programme
 - is reviewed and revised regularly involving students and other stakeholders
 - develops a system for keeping track of alumni in order to be able to get an overview of their careers and thus of the labour market available for graduates
 - includes an advisory panel of industry experts for curriculum development.
 - conducts joint reviews with external academic specialists maintain academic rigor.
 - performs periodic assessments with external stakeholders to ensure continuous alignment with market needs.
 - establishes collaboration with international educational institutions for a global perspective.
 - conducts regular feedback sessions with local community leaders for societal relevance.

1.3 Public information

Standards

- *Regarding the programme of study clear, accurate, up-to date and readily accessible information is published about:*
 - *selection criteria (minimum English language criteria, recognised degree or tertiary-level qualification)*
 - *aims of the programme that are clearly defined in terms of intended learning outcomes and in line with the EQF.*
 - *qualification awarded*
 - *teaching, learning and assessment procedures*
 - *links between programme contents, teaching and current up-to-date research-based knowledge*
 - *teaching and examination methods to support students' attaining their goals and contribute to their ability, in national and international contexts*
 - *pass rates*
 - *learning opportunities available to the students*
 - *depth and progression of the programme as planned and organised as a unit in which the courses contribute to the whole*
 - *programme relevance, up-to-date and realistic in relation to learning outcomes specified*
 - *length of programme*
 - *learning outcomes and generic skills*
 - *internal programme progression*
 - *graduate employment information*
 - *relevance for future professional careers: there is labour market demand for graduates;*
 - *programme makes graduates eligible for employment with high demands for independent work related to research and development or other qualified employments;*
 - *regular contacts between programme and employers.*
 - *the establishment of program mechanisms to confirm:*
 1. *Professional bodies validate program descriptions and outcomes.*
 2. *Community leaders contribute to the relevance of public communications.*
 3. *External auditors review public information for accuracy.*
 4. *Industry-specific information is regularly updated with expert inputs.*
 5. *Alumni testimonials are included for a realistic portrayal of program outcomes.*

1.4 Information management

Standards

- *Information for the effective management of the programme of study is collected, monitored and analysed:*
 - *key performance indicators*
 - *profile of the student population*

- *student progression, success and drop-out rates*
 - *students' satisfaction with their programmes*
 - *learning resources and student support available*
 - *career paths of graduates*
 - **Industry trend analysis for curriculum relevance.**
 - **Feedback mechanisms from external partners adjust course content.**
 - **Data exchanges with professional networks to inform teaching methodologies.**
 - **Employer insights guide career readiness components of the program.**
 - **Student outcome data is shared with external stakeholders for feedback.**
 - **Students and staff are involved in providing and analysing information and planning**
- **Students and staff are involved in providing and analysing information and planning follow-up activities.**

You may also consider the following questions:

- *What is the procedure for quality assurance of the programme and who is involved?*
- *Who is involved in the study programme's design and development (launching, changing, internal evaluation) and what is taken into account (strategies, the needs of society, etc.)?*
- *How/to what extent are students themselves involved in the development of the content of their studies?*
- *Please evaluate a) whether the study programme remains current and consistent with developments in society (labour market, digital technologies, etc.), and b) whether the content and objectives of the study programme are in accordance with each other?*
- *Do the content and the delivery of the programme correspond to the European Qualifications Framework (EQF)?*
- *How is coherence of the study programme ensured, i.e., logical sequence and coherence of courses? How are substantial overlaps between courses avoided? How is it ensured that the teaching staff is aware of the content and outputs of their colleagues' work within the same study programme?*
- *How does the study programme support development of the learners' general competencies (including digital literacy, foreign language skills, entrepreneurship, communication and teamwork skills)?*
- *What are the scope and objectives of the foundation courses in the study programme (where appropriate)? What are the pass rates?*
- *How long does it take a student on average to graduate? Is the graduation rate for the study programme analogous to other European programmes with similar content? What is the pass rate per course/semester?*
- ***How is it ensured that the actual student workload is in accordance with the workload expressed by ECTS?***
- *What are the opportunities for international students to participate in the study programme (courses/modules taught in a foreign language)?*
- *Is information related to the programme of study publicly available?*
- *How is the HEI evaluating the success of its graduates in the labor market? What is the feedback from graduates of the study programme on their employment and/or continuation of studies?*
- *Have the results of student feedback been analysed and taken into account, and how (e.g., when planning in-service training for the teaching staff)?*
- *What are the reasons for dropping out (voluntary withdrawal)? What has been done to reduce the number of such students?*
- ***How are external stakeholders involved in the quality assurance process of the program?***
- ***To what extent do external stakeholders participate in the program's design and development, and how do their contributions align with societal and labor market needs?***
- ***In what ways can external stakeholders enhance student involvement in developing the content of their studies?***

- How do external stakeholders ensure the program remains current with societal developments, like labor market trends and digital technologies?
- Do external stakeholders contribute to aligning the program with the European Qualifications Framework, and how do they assess its delivery effectiveness?
- How is external stakeholder feedback used to maintain coherence in the study program and avoid overlap between courses?
- What role do external stakeholders play in developing general competencies within the program, such as digital literacy and entrepreneurship?
- How do external stakeholders influence the objectives and pass rates of foundation courses in the program?
- What insights do external stakeholders provide regarding the program's graduation rate, workload alignment with ECTS, and comparison with similar European programs?
- How do external stakeholders enhance opportunities for international student participation in the program?
- In what ways do external stakeholders assist in making program information publicly available?
- How do external stakeholders contribute to evaluating graduate success in the labor market and obtaining feedback on employment outcomes?
- How is external stakeholder feedback analyzed and implemented, especially in planning in-service training for teaching staff?
- What insights do external stakeholders offer on reasons for student dropouts and strategies to reduce these numbers?

Findings

A short description of the situation in the Higher Education Institution (HEI), based on elements from the application for external evaluation and on findings from the onsite visit.

At present the course is being coordinated by the European University of Cyprus. However, this may change after negotiation prior to the Lot 1 funding application, expected in February 2024. If this is the case, then the EEC would expect that the commitments made during the evaluation would be followed.

The joint program provides a connection between research and teaching, offering opportunities for research projects, particularly in the master's thesis. However, this aspect was not demonstrated during the meetings.

There is clear involvement of external stakeholders, especially from the cybersecurity industry. There are plans to involve government bodies. However, cybersecurity is recognised as a challenge for “all of society”. The EEC would welcome involvement from wider end-user organisations – for example, healthcare organisations or national critical infrastructure providers who are at risk from future attacks.

Strengths

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

The proposed course addresses an area of key skills shortage across Europe.

The HEIs involved in the proposal have worked together to devise different tracks that enable students to follow a well-integrated course of study in different areas of cyber security. The overall structure and content

are appropriate. There are mechanisms in place to involve industry in the course design. There are mechanisms in place to enable student feedback and the role of future alumni in syllabus development.

The structure of a joint-MUNDUS course opens considerable areas for value-added. The students will benefit from international experience and the team have also considered the opportunities for staff to engage across the different partner sites. Proposals for Summer Schools are very welcome.

The proposed administrative handbook and the policies for information management are all in place.

Areas of improvement and recommendations

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

The EEC strongly recommends keeping students fully informed about the number of lectures, readings and learning activities, along with the expected study time, to help them plan their studies. This information should be included in both the study guides and the student handbook for easy access.

There is considerable variation in workload across different courses, with ECTS ranging from 1 to 10. Consequently, tracks of 120 ECTS comprise a varying number of courses, from 12 to 18, plus the master's thesis. This variation arises from the differing standards employed by HEIs in breaking down learning outcomes into efforts required for individual courses. Students will need to be guided to make sure they allocate an appropriate amount of time to courses with differing ECTS values. We note that some work may be required to validate the relationship between ECTS and actual/perceived student workload across the consortium.

There are areas in which the course might develop new opportunities for added value beyond those already addressed during the site visit. For instance, there was little discussion about how stakeholders both from industry and government in different countries might inform and support the work in other partner countries – providing international experience of new and emerging cyber threats or mitigations.

We note that some of the public information necessary to promote the course has still to be developed once Lot 1 funding has been secured.

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

Sub-area		<i>Non-compliant/ Partially Compliant/Compliant</i>
1.1	Policy for quality assurance	Partially compliant
1.2	Design, approval, on-going monitoring and review	Compliant
1.3	Public information	Partially compliant
1.4	Information management	Compliant

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

Sub-areas

- 2.1 Process of teaching and learning and student-centred teaching methodology**
- 2.2 Practical training**
- 2.3 Student assessment**

2.1 Process of teaching and learning and student-centred teaching methodology

Standards

- *The process of teaching and learning supports students' individual and social development.*
- *The process of teaching and learning is flexible, considers different modes of delivery, where appropriate, uses a variety of pedagogical methods and facilitates the achievement of planned learning outcomes.*
- *Students are encouraged to take an active role in creating the learning process.*
- *The implementation of student-centered learning and teaching encourages a sense of autonomy in the learner, while ensuring adequate guidance and support from the teacher.*
- *Teaching methods, tools and material used in teaching are modern, effective, support the use of modern educational technologies and are regularly updated.*
- *Mutual respect within the learner-teacher relationship is promoted.*
- *The implementation of student-centred learning and teaching respects and attends to the diversity of students and their needs, enabling flexible learning paths.*
- *Appropriate procedures for dealing with students' complaints regarding the process of teaching and learning are set.*

2.2 Practical training

Standards

- *Practical and theoretical studies are interconnected.*
- *The organisation and the content of practical training, if applicable, support achievement of planned learning outcomes and meet the needs of the stakeholders.*

2.3 Student assessment

Standards

- *Assessment is consistent, fairly applied to all students and carried out in accordance with the stated procedures.*
- *Assessment is appropriate, transparent, and objective and supports the development of the learner.*
- *The criteria for the method of assessment, as well as criteria for marking, are published in advance.*
- *Assessment allows students to demonstrate the extent to which the intended learning outcomes have been achieved. Students are given feedback, which, if necessary, is linked to advice on the learning process.*
- *Assessment, where possible, is carried out by more than one examiner.*
- *A formal procedure for student appeals is in place.*
- *Assessors are familiar with existing testing and examination methods and receive support in developing their own skills in this field.*
- *The regulations for assessment take into account mitigating circumstances.*

You may also consider the following questions:

- *How is it monitored that the teaching staff base their teaching and assessment methods on objectives and intended learning outcomes? Provide samples of examination papers (if available).*
- *How are students' different abilities, learning needs and learning opportunities taken into consideration when conducting educational activities?*
- *How is the development of students' general competencies (including digital skills) supported in educational activities?*
- *How is it ensured that innovative teaching methods, learning environments and learning aids that support learning are diverse and used in educational activities?*
- *Is the teaching staff using new technology in order to make the teaching process more effective?*
- *How is it ensured that theory and practice are interconnected in teaching and learning?*
- *How is practical training organised (finding practical training positions, guidelines for practical training, supervision, reporting, feedback, etc.)? What role does practical training have in achieving the objectives of the study programme? What is student feedback on the content and arrangement of practical training?*
- ***Are students actively involved in research? How is student involvement in research set up?***
- *How is supervision of student research papers (seminar papers, projects, theses, etc.) organised?*
- ***Do students' assessments correspond to the European Qualifications Framework (EQF)?***
- *How are the assessment methods chosen and to what extent do students get supportive feedback on their academic progress during their studies?*
- *How is the objectivity and relevance of student assessment ensured (assessment of the degree of achievement of the intended learning outcomes)?*

Findings

A short description of the situation in the Higher Education Institution (HEI), based on elements from the application for external evaluation and on findings from the onsite visit.

The student-centred learning, teaching, and assessment processes within the joint programme reveals a comprehensive and structured approach. Each participating HEI has procedures in place for student feedback, primarily through semester-end anonymous forms allowing students to assess and comment on individual courses.

As the programme is not deployed yet, there is a lack of hands-on information regarding the assessment of students and the efficacy of the learning process in newly introduced courses. The proposed approaches seem well considered but they will need to be reviewed in the light of experience in delivering the material.

The nature of the joint program is compatible with the conventional mode of delivery, and the teaching methodology provided is suitable for this specific program of study. It comprises a broad range of mainly face-to-face learning activities, including weekly lectures, laboratory sessions, guest speakers' talks, use cases, project-based learning, and case studies, as well as online activities supported by the different learning management systems of the HEIs. Interaction between teachers and students, as well as among students, primarily occurs face-to-face through weekly lectures. Each course provides on average at least two hours of weekly lecture sessions, ensuring an adequate amount of interaction time. Class participation is expected and assessed. Student collaboration is further encouraged through project-based learning activities in small teams, structured and guided by the instructor. This offers a complete set of diverse modes of delivery and learning activities.

Summative assessments are supported by final exams, accounting for an average of 45% of the final grade. Formative course assessments mainly include assignments and mid-term examinations, also accounting for an average of 45%. The remaining 10% is attributed to attendance and class participation. Laboratory courses rely solely on formative activities, with assignments accounting for 80% and attendance and class participation making up 20%. In addition, oral presentations, in-class discussions and group projects are included to evaluate key competencies, such as critical thinking, though these were not demonstrated during the meetings. This diverse assessment structure is designed to accommodate various learning styles and effectively support the achievement of the learning outcomes.

However, course assessment practices vary across HEIs due to differing accreditation processes and national standards. Within individual HEIs, assessment processes are consistent and clearly defined. It is notable that Politecnico di Milano, courses like EMC232 and EMC235 are assessed entirely through final exams, conforming to local regulations which do not apply in Cyprus. The EEC received details of the different national accreditation bodies for each of the partners. It is not clear to us that all of the courses that form part of this Joint-Mundus programme have been actively considered by their quality agencies. This evaluation is provided under the assumption that they will be.

It is outside the scope of this EEC to impose common criteria across each of the national systems. This being the case we find it **very important** that students are adequately informed of these important differences between the national systems of assessment.

Strengths

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

Courses seem to be well-balanced in terms of content, labs, assessments, theory, and material, with significant analysis undertaken to ensure this balance. Processes for providing student feedback and guidance on their learning journey are also well-established.

The EEC considers the design of the joint program to be aligned with the specific profile of mobile students, who can benefit from a diverse array of learning and assessment methods. In addition, the EEC recognizes

the many advantages of student collaboration fostered by activities, such as project-based learning and discussions in small teams.

As noted above, some partners rely on 100% exam based final assessment. The EEC feels that this may disadvantage some students who are used to more varied approaches to summative assessment but that these concerns can be mitigated by appropriate formative feedback. We would also state that across the proposal there is considerable strength and diversity both in terms of delivery and in terms of assessment practices.

The ability to draw on expertise across Europe is a significant strength of this programme. The use of defined tracks adds coherence and provides students with a defined trajectory that balances experience across institutions with a need to provide the different student cohorts on each track with a sense of structure. For teaching staff, the tracks will help to identify pre-requisites and to compare outcomes across the Joint-Mundus partners.

Areas of improvement and recommendations

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

Given the heterogeneity of learning activities and assessment structures across tracks and courses, which arise from different standards set by national accreditation agencies and the HEIs, the EEC suggests including clear, detailed assessment information in the student handbook to prevent confusion. Optional non-graded formative self-assessment tasks with indicative answers could be provided in the study guides, assisting students in self-assessing their understanding and competencies.

The introduction to the programme states there is a need to support “lifelong learning” in cybersecurity across Europe. The present proposals are naturally focussed on Masters provision for students exiting a recent Undergraduate degree. The Joint-Mundus programme is not structured to support part-time learning nor the distance education that might help those looking to reskill, or to support students with existing jobs/families to support. In the future, the EEC encourages the team to consider these areas for further development.

There are considerable opportunities to involve students in wider research programmes – although this was addressed in passing during the visit, the EEC would welcome further consideration of research-led teaching as the course develops.

Student assessment is noted as partially compliant based on the need to provide assurances of appropriate formative assessment at partners where a final exam forms the predominant mode of assessment.

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

Sub-area		<i>Non-compliant/ Partially Compliant/Compliant</i>
2.1	Process of teaching and learning and student-centred teaching methodology	Compliant
2.2	Practical training	Compliant



2.3	Student assessment	Partially compliant
-----	--------------------	---------------------

3. Teaching staff (ESG 1.5)

Sub-areas

- 3.1 Teaching staff recruitment and development**
- 3.2 Teaching staff number and status**
- 3.3 Synergies of teaching and research**

3.1 Teaching staff recruitment and development

Standards

- *Institutions ensure the competence of their teaching staff*
- *Fair, transparent and clear processes for the recruitment and development of the teaching staff are set up.*
- *Teaching staff qualifications are adequate to achieve the objectives and planned learning outcomes of the study programme, and to ensure quality and sustainability of the teaching and learning.*
- *The teaching staff is regularly engaged in professional and teaching-skills training and development i.e. teachers are active researchers and they possess pedagogical skills; there is an active and keen research environment which also provides PhD programmes and where students are involved etc.*
- *Promotion of the teaching staff takes into account the quality of their teaching, their research activity, the development of their teaching skills and their mobility.*
- *Innovation in teaching methods and the use of new technologies is encouraged.*
- *Conditions of employment that recognise the importance of teaching are followed.*
- *Recognised visiting teaching staff participates in teaching the study programme.*

3.2 Teaching staff number and status

Standards

- *The number of the teaching staff is adequate to support the programme of study.*
- *The teaching staff status (rank, full/part time) is appropriate to offer a quality programme of study.*
- *Visiting staff number does not exceed the number of the permanent staff.*

3.3 Synergies of teaching and research

Standards

- *The teaching staff collaborate in the fields of teaching and research within the HEI and with partners outside (practitioners in their fields, employers, and staff members at other HEIs in Cyprus or abroad).*
- *Scholarly activity to strengthen the link between education and research is encouraged.*
- *The teaching staff publications are within the discipline.*
- *Teaching staff studies and publications are closely related to the programme's courses.*
- *The allocation of teaching hours compared to the time for research activity is appropriate.*

You may also consider the following questions:

- *How are the members of the teaching staff supported with regard to the development of their teaching skills? How is feedback given to members of the teaching staff regarding their teaching results and teaching skills?*
- *How is the teaching performance assessed? How does their teaching performance affect their remuneration, evaluation and/or selection?*
- *Is teaching connected with research?*
- *Does the HEI involve visiting teaching staff from other HEIs in Cyprus and abroad?*
- *What is the number, workload, qualifications and status of the teaching staff (rank, full/part timers)?*
- *Is student evaluation conducted on the teaching staff? If yes, have the results of student feedback been analysed and taken into account, and how (e.g., when planning in-service training for the teaching staff)?*

Findings

A short description of the situation in the Higher Education Institution (HEI), based on elements from the application for external evaluation and on findings from the onsite visit.

The HEIs have strong teams of lecturers who are knowledgeable in the field and possess relevant international experience. Under the Erasmus+ program, they have opportunities for mobility, allowing them to visit colleagues at other involved HEIs to share good practices and improve overall teaching methodologies. The EEC views this as a great opportunity for faculty staff, although predefined plans for faculty mobility were not presented during the meetings nor did we receive targets to measure staff mobility.

Some of the partners mentioned links with staff in other HEIs in their country – specifically providing expertise in wider areas of cyber security, such as management, law and ethics. The EEC welcomes these plans.

The staff involved in the programme cover many different aspects of cybersecurity from networks through cryptography to human and social aspects. Cybersecurity is a young and very dynamic area, as new modes of attack and defence develop especially involving machine learning. The EEC welcomes the proposals for reviewing the match between staff expertise and student need across the developing syllabus.

Strengths

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

The range and diversity of staff available to students on this course is a particular strength.

The possibility of using Erasmus+ to enable staff mobility will reinforce staff development and enable the exchange of best practice between the partners – for the February submission the EEC would suggest some specific targets for staff mobility to make sure that these opportunities are realised.

Several of the partners listed the names of visiting and Honorary alumni – these individuals are a considerable strength. Input from these senior colleagues might support the network as a whole.

Areas of improvement and recommendations

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

The EEC suggests creating a handbook for faculty staff with clear guidelines to ensure a homogeneous, common view of teaching practices across the different courses. The EEC welcomes the proposals for student handbooks and for handbooks on administrative practice across the partner sites.

As the course develops, the EEC recommends one central resource for administrative information across the network. We note that the partners use very different platforms for content delivery and management (Blackboard, Sakai, Canvas, Moodle, etc). This is entirely appropriate. There is little prospect of getting all partner HEIs to agree on a common platform. However, students across each HEI will need a single point of reference for some administrative information and if each node duplicates these details, then there is a possibility for confusions and inconsistency. A simple approach might be to link from each on-line environment to a single pdf handbook. This would still enable each site to maintain course specific information.

There are opportunities to link material on similar topics taught by different HEIs – so that students can see more than one perspective. It is unclear how this might be supported across the different learning environments. However, short podcasts or videos might be produced by different staff working on common topics to stimulate debate and motivate students beyond what is possible from any single HEI.

The EEC would welcome target information about Staff-Student-Ratios across the partners especially where the proposed courses are shared with other programmes not considered in this evaluation.

As noted in the previous sections, the EEC were provided with outline details about the way research will inform teaching, but further details would be welcome for instance to demonstrate that the research strengths of each partner are well aligned to the material they will be delivering to the students on each track.

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

Sub-area		<i>Non-compliant/ Partially Compliant/Compliant</i>
3.1	Teaching staff recruitment and development	Compliant
3.2	Teaching staff number and status	Compliant
3.3	Synergies of teaching and research	Compliant

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

Sub-areas

- 4.1 Student admission, processes and criteria
- 4.2 Student progression
- 4.3 Student recognition
- 4.4 Student certification

4.1 Student admission, processes and criteria

Standards

- *Pre-defined and published regulations regarding student admission are in place.*
- *Access policies, admission processes and criteria are implemented consistently and in a transparent manner.*

4.2 Student progression

Standards

- *Pre-defined and published regulations regarding student progression are in place.*
- *Processes and tools to collect, monitor and act on information on student progression, are in place.*

4.3 Student recognition

Standards

- *Pre-defined and published regulations regarding student recognition are in place.*
- *Fair recognition of higher education qualifications, periods of study and prior learning, including the recognition of non-formal and informal learning, are essential components for ensuring the students' progress in their studies, while promoting mobility.*
- *Appropriate recognition procedures are in place that rely on:*
 - *institutional practice for recognition being in line with the principles of the Lisbon Recognition Convention*
 - *cooperation with other institutions, quality assurance agencies and the national ENIC/NARIC centre with a view to ensuring coherent recognition across the country*

4.4 Student certification

Standards

- *Pre-defined and published regulations regarding student certification are in place.*

- *Students receive certification explaining the qualification gained, including achieved learning outcomes and the context, level, content and status of the studies that were pursued and successfully completed.*

You may also consider the following questions:

- *Are the admission requirements for the study programme appropriate? How is the students' prior preparation/education assessed (including the level of international students, for example)?*
- *How is the procedure of recognition for prior learning and work experience ensured, including recognition of study results acquired at foreign higher education institutions?*
- *Is the certification of the HEI accompanied by a diploma supplement, which is in line with European and international standards?*

Findings

A short description of the situation in the Higher Education Institution (HEI), based on elements from the application for external evaluation and on findings from the onsite visit.

The admissions processes are clear. They are intended to deliver a very high-quality cohort of students. The admissions processes consider academic performance, motivation, and experience. The proposals to encourage female applicants are appropriate although specific role models, mentors, and other means of addressing Equality, Diversity and Inclusion will also have to be considered once the recruitment materials are prepared.

It is likely that some tracks will appeal to some students more than others and the team have plans in place to balance demand across the HEIs.

A student handbook, as outlined in deliverable D1.10, details the rights, responsibilities, and expectations of students participating in the program. It includes provisions on academic requirements, mobility periods, financial matters, intellectual property, and code of conduct, ensuring clarity and fairness for all students across consortium institutions.

The HEIs have mechanisms in place to monitor student progression and performance. These mechanisms focus on inactive students with limited participation or incomplete activities, enabling the identification and support of students at risk. However, it remains unclear how teachers utilize this information to help their students and the daily benefits derived from it.

Given the range of teaching methods and of previous experiences in HEIs across Europe it will be critical to identify any common factors that might explain lower progression rates for some students on some courses. The EEC was pleased to learn of the detailed monitoring in place within each of the partner HEIs. However, there will have to be mechanisms to support the exchange of this information when, for example, a student might struggle in the transition between year 1 in one of the partners and year 2 in another country.

Strengths

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

The HEIs have established mechanisms to orient and provide counselling to international students upon their arrival in a different country, assisting them with accommodation, healthcare, and administrative and financial issues. The EEC believes that these common services offered by the universities, and the variety and

effectiveness of personalized support methods, are highly valuable, as is the proactive approach of the administrative staff in effectively assisting new students.

Student feedback is actively sought at each HEI through anonymous surveys, conducted at the end of course delivery. The EEC highlighted the high participation rate in collecting student feedback in other programs of the HEIs (exact figures were not provided). We also note that many of these proposals go beyond the minimum expected within the Joint-Mundus programme.

The value added through being part of an international programme is a key strength – Summer schools are a good example. Another example is the proposals for joint and co-supervision across the partners. Some of these ideas might be strengthened – for example, to help students find jobs in countries across all the nodes or to promote research opportunities and PhDs more widely to all partners.

Areas of improvement and recommendations

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

The EEC suggests that the student handbook should include common regulations on plagiarism and other forms of academic fraud, ensuring clear rules as students transition between different HEIs.

Plans to gather evidence of effectiveness of student monitoring and feedback were not demonstrated during the evaluation. Measures must assess the value of specific improvement measures and action plans taken by the HEIs. This particularly applies across the different tracks, contributing to a unified approach for the continuous improvement cycle of the joint program. It is important not simply to identify problems in progression but also for continuing to assess the effectiveness of any interventions or changes that might then be put in place to support the students going forward.

The EEC notes that the HEIs should agree on a common approach to supporting students socially, especially online. The students must adapt to a variety of online platforms. This reduces their opportunities for connections with others. A common online platform could be easily set up for all students in this Joint-Mundus program, providing basic support for communication and experience sharing. We also note that the development of a common social on-line community will promote self-help between students – where those in year 2 on a track can provide advice and support to the new year 1 cohort.

The EEC note that many of the activities and innovations are staff led. Once the course goes ‘live’ the EEC would encourage the development of student-led support initiatives. The partners described a range of existing activities within each site but there would also be more creative possibilities for student-led projects a cross borders – for instance, “capture the flag” exercises in which students from one partner attempts to compromise the defences created by another. ENISA and NATO both have examples of these exercises as a means of developing cyber skills.

The EEC would welcome some discussion as to whether the relationship with ENISA profiles will be sufficient to gain certification in each of the member states involved in this proposal; given that security is a national prerogative across Europe.

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

Sub-area	<p style="text-align: center;"><i>Non-compliant/ Partially Compliant/Compliant</i></p>
----------	--

4.1	Student admission, processes and criteria	Compliant
4.2	Student progression	Partially compliant
4.3	Student recognition	Compliant
4.4	Student certification	Partially compliant

5. Learning resources and student support (ESG 1.6)

Sub-areas

- 5.1 Teaching and Learning resources
- 5.2 Physical resources
- 5.3 Human support resources
- 5.4 Student support

5.1 Teaching and Learning resources

Standards

- *Adequate and readily accessible teaching and learning resources (teaching and learning environments, materials, aids and equipment) are provided to students and support the achievement of objectives in the study programme.*
- *Adequacy of resources is ensured for changing circumstances (change in student numbers, etc.).*
- *All resources are fit for purpose.*
- *Student-centred learning and flexible modes of learning and teaching, are taken into account when allocating, planning and providing the learning resources.*

5.2 Physical resources

Standards

- *Physical resources, i.e. premises, libraries, study facilities, IT infrastructure, are adequate to support the study programme.*
- *Adequacy of resources is ensured for changing circumstances (change in student numbers, etc.).*
- *All resources are fit for purpose and students are informed about the services available to them.*

5.3 Human support resources

Standards

- *Human support resources, i.e. tutors/mentors, counsellors, other advisers, qualified administrative staff, are adequate to support the study programme.*
- *Adequacy of resources is ensured for changing circumstances (change in student numbers, etc.).*
- *All resources are fit for purpose and students are informed about the services available to them.*

5.4 Student support

Standards

- *Student support is provided covering the needs of a diverse student population, such as mature, part-time, employed and international students and students with special needs.*
- *Students are informed about the services available to them - a special attention in the social aspect and information-sharing between the students (e.g. a joint introductory course, a discussion area on the web) the definition of the distinct quality of graduates*
- *Student-centred learning and flexible modes of learning and teaching, are taken into account when allocating, planning and providing student support.*
- *Students' mobility within and across higher education systems is encouraged and supported.*

You may also consider the following questions:

- *Evaluate the supply of teaching materials and equipment (including teaching labs, expendable materials, etc.), the condition of classrooms, adequacy of financial resources to conduct the study programme and achieve its objectives. What needs to be supplemented/ improved?*
- *What is the feedback from the teaching staff on the availability of teaching materials, classrooms, etc.?*
- *Are the resources in accordance with actual (changing) needs and contemporary requirements? How is the effectiveness of using resources ensured?*
- *What are the resource-related trends and future risks (risks arising from changing numbers of students, obsolescence of teaching equipment, etc.)? How are these trends taken into account and how are the risks mitigated?*
- *Evaluate student feedback on support services. Based on student feedback, which support services (including information flow, counselling) need further development?*
- *How is student learning within the standard period of study supported (student counselling, flexibility of the study programme, etc.)?*
- *How students' special needs are considered (different capabilities, different levels of academic preparation, special needs due to physical disabilities, etc.)?*
- *How is student mobility being supported?*

Findings

A short description of the situation in the Higher Education Institution (HEI), based on elements from the application for external evaluation and on findings from the onsite visit.

The programme exhibits strong infrastructure in terms of learning resources and student support across all participating HEIs. Each HEI supports its own e-learning platform, replete with course materials, discussion boards, messaging systems, collaboration sessions, and video conferencing capabilities. Additional support includes provision of email accounts with access to Microsoft 365 facilities.

In terms of physical resources, HEIs are well-equipped with libraries, study facilities, IT infrastructure, computer labs, and access to essential software. The fact that all HEIs already operate accredited cybersecurity programmes, ensures the availability of necessary resources.

Student support is comprehensive, including counsellor access for any queries or issues, orientation programmes for new students, and availability of psychologists and advisors. There is also an intent to establish clear procedures for informing students about programme contents.

Based on accredited courses and programs, the HEIs ensure that study materials, learning activities, and assessments adhere to international standards. The EEC recognizes the HEIs' efforts to enhance the teaching and learning experience.

The development of staff and student handbooks across the tracks creates an important means for increasing consistency and coordination across the partners when the details of individual courses may be different on each of the HEIs e-learning environments.

Strengths

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

The programme's need for e-learning platforms and physical resources like libraries, IT infrastructure, and labs is already established.

The proposed courses feature a complete syllabus and detailed student-centred study guides, including information such as learning objectives and outcomes, content, methodology, bibliography and assessment methods. The uniform presentation of these study guides is motivational for students. The EEC acknowledges this as a best practice, with recommendations for ongoing improvements.

Students on each track will have access to the facilities in at least two of the partner HEIs. This is important because it will provide direct experience of different network architectures and the associated security mechanisms.

There are also opportunities to use virtualisation to encourage the re-use of some common teaching materials across the partner institutions.

Areas of improvement and recommendations

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

Despite the availability of resources, a significant continuity problem exists when students transition between HEIs. They lose access to the previous HEI's facilities, including software licenses, data, assignments, and course content, creating inconvenience and potential disruption in their learning process. Ensuring this data portability and access across HEIs would be a significant enhancement to this joint experience. There is a

need to consider the continuing “digital identity” of the student both while they are studying and after graduation – providing continued access to material for alumni will enhance opportunities for student-led and self-help initiatives.

The EEC notes that some required readings consist of entire volumes, which may not be practical for students needing to study efficiently. Some of the HEIs use a curriculum builder that helps staff form reading lists in a more flexible manner. This is to be commended.

Where course reading is set as an entire book, the EEC recommend that staff provide clear guidance to students on the relevant sections of these volumes, along with the recommended study time. This will direct students and help them plan their study effectively.

This course will develop a cohort of students with advanced cybersecurity skills and there is, therefore, a need for all HEIs to regularly review the security of their systems. We encourage all HEIs to agree a ‘code of conduct’ that addresses topics such as ‘ethical hacking’ of the HEI systems. Plans should be put in place to address any compromise of the systems and networks used by this cohort of students. These plans should be exercised through drills that may also involve the students.

Just as the EEC would welcome clarity over the teaching staff-student ratios, the February proposal for Lot 1 funding might also benefit from details about the administrative and support staff-student ratios in each node.

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

Sub-area		<i>Non-compliant/ Partially Compliant/Compliant</i>
5.1	Teaching and Learning resources	Compliant
5.2	Physical resources	Compliant
5.3	Human support resources	Compliant
5.4	Student support	Compliant

6. Additional for doctoral programmes (ALL ESG)

Sub-areas

- 6.1 Selection criteria and requirements**
- 6.2 Proposal and dissertation**
- 6.3 Supervision and committees**

6.1 Selection criteria and requirements

Standards

- *Specific criteria that the potential students need to meet for admission in the programme, as well as how the selection procedures are made, are defined.*
- *The following requirements of the doctoral degree programme are analysed and published:*
 - *the stages of completion*
 - *the minimum and maximum time of completing the programme*
 - *the examinations*
 - *the procedures for supporting and accepting the student's proposal*
 - *the criteria for obtaining the Ph.D. degree*

6.2 Proposal and dissertation

Standards

- *Specific and clear guidelines for the writing of the proposal and the dissertation are set regarding:*
 - *the chapters that are contained*
 - *the system used for the presentation of each chapter, sub-chapters and bibliography*
 - *the minimum word limit*
 - *the binding, the cover page and the prologue pages, including the pages supporting the authenticity, originality and importance of the dissertation, as well as the reference to the committee for the final evaluation*
- *There is a plagiarism check system. Information is provided on the detection of plagiarism and the consequences in case of such misconduct.*
- *The process of submitting the dissertation to the university library is set.*

6.3 Supervision and committees

Standards

- *The composition, the procedure and the criteria for the formation of the advisory committee (to whom the doctoral student submits the research proposal) are determined.*
- *The composition, the procedure and the criteria for the formation of the examining committee (to whom the doctoral student defends his/her dissertation), are determined.*
- *The duties of the supervisor-chairperson and the other members of the advisory committee towards the student are determined and include:*
 - *regular meetings*
 - *reports per semester and feedback from supervisors*
 - *support for writing research papers*
 - *participation in conferences*
- *The number of doctoral students that each chairperson supervises at the same time are determined.*

You may also consider the following questions:

- *How is the scientific quality of the PhD thesis ensured?*
- *Is there a link between the doctoral programmes of study and the society? What is the value of the obtained degree outside academia and in the labour market?*
- *Can you please provide us with some dissertation samples?*

Findings

A short description of the situation in the Higher Education Institution (HEI), based on elements from the application for external evaluation and on findings from the onsite visit.

The focus of the HEIs is on the Joint-Mundus cooperation and does not specifically address the integration and development of a PhD programme – there would be considerable opportunities to develop this across the HEIs.

The proposals for MSc project supervision are strong and could be developed naturally into a joint PhD programme.

Strengths

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

The diversity of research strengths across the partners would create important opportunities for research growth and for mobility funding.

Areas of improvement and recommendations

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

The development of a PhD programme remains to be directly addressed by the HEIs.

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

Sub-area		<i>Non-compliant/ Partially Compliant/Compliant</i>
6.1	Selection criteria and requirements	Not applicable
6.2	Proposal and dissertation	Not applicable
6.3	Supervision and committees	Not applicable

7. Eligibility (ALL ESG)

Sub-areas

7.1 Legal framework and cooperation agreement

7.2 The joint programme

7.3 Added value of the joint programme

7.1 Legal framework and cooperation agreement

Standards

- *The joint programme is offered in accordance with legal frameworks of the relevant national higher education systems.*
- *The terms and conditions of the joint programme are laid down in a cooperation agreement. The agreement in particular covers the following issues:*
 - *Denomination of the degree(s) awarded in the programme*
 - *Coordination and responsibilities of the partners involved regarding management and financial organisation, including funding, sharing of costs and income, resources for mobility of staff and students*
 - *Admission and selection procedures for students*
 - *Mobility of students and teaching staff*
 - *Examination regulations, student assessment methods, recognition of credits and degree awarding procedures*
 - *Handling of different semester periods, if existent*

7.2 The joint programme

Standards

- *The partner universities apply joint internal quality assurance processes.*
- *The joint programme is offered jointly, involving all cooperating universities in the design, delivery and further development of the programme.*
- *Aims and learning outcomes are clearly stated, including a joint syllabus, language policy, as well as an account of the intended added value of the programme.*
- *Study counselling and mobility plans are efficient and take into account the needs of different kinds of students.*
- *The criteria for jointness: formal agreement between the participating institutions; mechanisms and responsibilities of cooperation spelled out and defined; support of managements; added value of programme; sustainable funding strategy; language policy; adequate resources (both infra and staff); mobility secured; students' rights secured also in other institutions; contacts between teachers across institutional/national boundaries; relevance and accessibility of information about programme to students and external stakeholders etc.*

7.3 Added value of the joint programme

Standards

The joint programme leads to the following added values:

- *Increases internationalisation at the institutions.*
- *Stimulates multinational collaboration on teaching at a high level and makes cooperation binding.*
- *Increases transparency between educational systems.*
- *Develops study and research alternatives in accordance with emerging needs.*
- *Improves educational and research collaboration.*
- *Offers students an expanded and innovative arena for learning.*
- *Increases highly educated candidates' employability and motivation for mobility in a global labour market.*
- *Increases European and non-European students' interest in the educational programme.*
- *Increases competence at partner institutions through cooperation and implementation of a best practice system.*
- *Increases the institution's ability to change in step with emerging needs.*
- *Contributes to tearing down cultural barriers, both personal and institutional.*

You may also consider the following questions:

- *Does the joint study programme conform to the requirements of a study programme offered at the specific level?*
- *Is there a system that assures the quality of joint provision and guarantees that the aims of the programme are met?*
- *Do the mechanisms for ensuring the quality of the joint study programme take into consideration the European Standards and Guidelines (ESG)? Are they adopted by all the universities involved?*
- *Is the division of responsibilities in ensuring quality clearly defined among the partner universities?*
- *Is relevant information about the programme, e.g. admission requirements and procedures, course catalogue, examination and assessment procedures, well documented and published by taking into account the specific needs of students?*
- *What is the added value of the programme of study?*
- *Is there a sustainable funding strategy among the partner universities? Explain.*

Findings

A short description of the situation in the Higher Education Institution (HEI), based on elements from the application for external evaluation and on findings from the onsite visit.

The partner institutions have agreed on the terms of collaboration, as detailed in deliverable D1.9. This comprehensive document outlines the consortium partners' terms, responsibilities, and obligations. It includes provisions on academic cooperation, resource sharing, student mobility, quality assurance, and decision-making processes, laying the groundwork for a strong and sustainable partnership. The EEC believes this agreement aims to ensure clear communication, mutual understanding, and a collaborative framework.

We have seen strong evidence that these agreements are matched by actions and a common purpose to work together for the benefit of staff and students across Europe.

Strengths

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

Some of the partners already run Erasmus+ and Joint-Mundus programmes. The agreement and the associated provisions have clearly benefitted from this experience.

The partners have put together a well-defined structure for managing quality assurance across the HEIs in a Degree Programme. They have four key committees (Steering, Joint Quality Assurance, Course development and sustainability and joint admissions committee). Each committee has defined roles and responsibilities, with a clear delineation of tasks among the partner institutions' representatives, ensuring a collaborative and systematic approach to quality assurance in the academic programme.

Areas of improvement and recommendations

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

The existing courses run across the HEIs are not in cyber security – nor does it seem many are in software or computer networks. Hence, there may be a need to consider in more detail the provision of electronic resources and “digital identity” that represent new opportunities for value added across the HEIs.

It is also crucial to align the programme's curriculum with industry demands and promote the development of cybersecurity skills that are in high demand.

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

Sub-area		<i>Non-compliant/ Partially Compliant/Compliant</i>
7.1	Legal framework and cooperation agreement	Compliant
7.2	The joint programme	Compliant



7.3	Added value of the joint programme	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 programme of study under review may be achieved, with emphasis on the correspondence with the EQF (Consider also the added value of the joint programme).

Overall, we find:

- that they have an open international mind-set (e.g. Erasmus exchange focused on cybersecurity);
- high quality and capable of satisfying demand for professionals with appropriate qualification in accordance with the development needs of modern western economies and the trends of the global education market;
- contributions to the individual student's personality growth and social development;
- a contemporary education approach that meets the demands of the cybersecurity market and promotes the transformation of the (national) economy by focusing on the development of cybersecurity competencies, skills and creativity needed.

Reviewing, assessing and appraising the course, we find they are in overall compliance and are to be recognized in the delivery of programmes demonstrating an efficient and effective approach to the core business and the continuous improvement thereof.

E. Signatures of the EEC

Name	Signature
Professor C.W. Johnson	
Professor <u>Kevin Curran</u>	
Professor <u>Santi Caballé Llobet</u>	
<u>Krinos A. Vasileiou</u>	

Date: 11/1/24