

Doc. 300.3.1

Date: 7/10/2020

# External Evaluation Report (Departmental)

- **Higher Education Institution:**  
University of Cyprus
- **Town:** Nicosia
- **School/Faculty:** Economics and Management
- **Department:** Department of Business and Public Administration
- **Programme(s) of study under evaluation**  
Name (Duration, ECTS, Cycle)

## Programme 1

**In Greek:**

Programme Name

**In English:**

Programme Name

## Programme 2

**In Greek:**

Programme Name

**In English:**

Programme Name

## Programme 3

**In Greek:**

Programme Name

**In English:**

Programme Name

- **Department's Status:** Choose status

**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].**

## A. Introduction

Due to COVID-19 travel restrictions, the evaluation of the Department of Business and Public Administration at University of Cyprus took place virtually via a Zoom meeting on October 5, 2020.

Prior to the meeting, we were submitted the document 200.3 that runs to 254 pages and includes analytical information about the Department, the Faculty, the infrastructure, the quality assurance mechanisms and the teaching and research procedures.

After a welcome discussion with the Vice Rector of the Academic Affairs and Internal QA Committee of the University, Professor Irene-Anna Diakidoy, the EEC had the opportunity to meet with Professor Andreas Soteriou, Chair of the Department, Assoc. Prof. Alexia Panayiotou, Vice-Chair of the Department, Mrs Demetra Demetri, QA Coordinator, Prof. Leonidas Leonidou, Coordinator of the Marketing Specialization, Prof. Hercules Vladimirov, Coordinator of the Operations Management Specialization, Prof. George Hadjinicolas, Ex-Vice Chair and Undergraduate Studies Committee member and Prof. Haridimos Tsoukas, Dean of the Graduate School, Member of the Departmental Postgraduate Committee. The EEC met also undergraduate students and Phd Students, as well as members of the administrative staff, such as Ms Elena Diomidi, Acting Library Director, Ms Nicoleta Pissarides, University officer, Mr Marios Kyriakou, University officer, Ms Myria Kourri, Administrative Assistant and Ms. Theodora Kalapoda, Administrative Assistant.

An analytical interactive discussion took place between the Accreditation Committee and the representatives of the University of Cyprus in relation to the academic program, the teaching staff, the administrative staff, the number of students and the facilities offered to the students.

Moreover, we have met and interviewed six students and one PhD student from different years of study, in the absence of faculty or administrative/managing members. Our committee interviewed members of the administrative personnel related to admissions, registration, library facilities, IT and other admin support again in the absence of faculty members. Then, we had a virtual visit of University of Cyprus facilities.

Finally, the 'Application' and associated documents, which were submitted by University of Cyprus and examined, were considered complete, very satisfactory and informative.

## B. External Evaluation Committee (EEC)

<i>Name</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>University</i>
<b>Aard Groen</b>	Professor (Chair)	University of Groningen
<b>Kevin Orr</b>	Professor (Member)	University of St Andrews
<b>Kyriaki Kosmidou</b>	Professor (Member)	Aristotle University of Thessaloniki
<b>Maria Averkiou</b>	Student (Member)	Cyprus University of Technology

## C. Guidelines on content and structure of the report

### 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
- 1.2 Connecting with society
- 1.3 Development processes

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

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

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).

**There is strong coherence and compatibility within and across the programmes of study offered by the Department. The programme objectives are clearly articulated and represent an excellent fit with the mission of the Department (including engagements with research and practice) and the research and applied expertise of the faculty. There is also good complementarity across the suite of provision, with opportunities for undergraduates to progress onto further study, or for MBA students to then pursue a PhD.**

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.	5
1.2.2	The Department provides sufficient information to the public about its activities and offered programmes of study.	5
1.2.3	The Department ensures that its operation and activities have a positive impact on society.	5
1.2.4	The Department has an effective communication mechanism with its graduates.	5

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

[Click to enter text.](#)

## 1. Department's academic profile and orientation

1.3 Development processes		1 - 5
1.3.1	Effective procedures and measures are in place to attract and select teaching staff to ensure that they possess the formal and substantive skills to teach, carry out research and effectively carry out their work.	5
1.3.2	Planning teaching staff recruitment and their professional development is in line with the Department's academic development plan.	4

1.3.3	The Department applies an effective strategy of attracting high-level students from Cyprus and abroad.	4
1.3.4	The funding processes for the operation of the Department and the continuous improvement of the quality of its programmes of study are adequate and transparent.	4

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

We are in general highly impressed with the work of the Department. The profile of staff is excellent and the Department benefits from a supportive culture, collegiate leadership and a clear mission. We did develop a sense that, in common with many such Schools and Departments, that local financial autonomy may be somewhat constrained in some respects. Whilst recognizing the benefits of being part of a wider institution, if departmental leadership teams are too limited in their ability to recruit, reward and retain staff, such policies can act as constraints on their ability to continue to flourish. The scores of '4' rather than '5' in some of the categories signal our slight concerns, and in doing so we mean to be supportive. We acknowledge that there are no easy solutions but suggest that such issues can be a legitimate part of ongoing dialogues with the wider University. The excellence of the work of the department and its strong fit with the mission of the University should put it in a good position to have constructive dialogues about these matters.

Additionally, write:

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

[Click to enter text.](#)

### Findings

We were impressed by our time with faculty, administered staff and students. It seems that morale is good, and the culture is mutually supportive. There was evident pride in the work of the department and a commitment to continuous improvement, excellence in research and teaching, and an enriching student experience. We looked in most depth at the BSc programme but have a good understanding of how this fits with wider provision. As peers, it was a pleasure to learn about the Department, and its future directions.

### Strengths

- Excellent academic profile of staff
- Strong support systems in place for students and faculty
- A collegiate and developmental departmental culture
- A nicely articulated mission appropriate to the specialisms and in line with the School and University, including its social mission and public engagement
- Programmes which are coherent and research-led, and which also engage with practice
- An ethic of care towards students
- A systematic approach to quality assurance

Areas of improvement and recommendations

- (i) To continue to find ways to maximize autonomy for decision making within the wider institutional structure.
- (ii) To consider formalizing mechanisms to ensure that administrative staff have a voice in strategic direction and decisions in the Department.

**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	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

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

2. Quality Assurance		
2.2 Quality assurance for the programmes of study		1 - 5
2.2.1	The responsibility for decision-making and monitoring the implementation of the programmes of study offered by the Department lies with the teaching staff.	5
2.2.2	The system and criteria for assessing students' performance in the subjects of the programmes of studies offered by the Department are clear, sufficient and known to the students.	5
2.2.3	The quality control system refers to specific indicators and is effective.	4
2.2.4	The results from student assessments are used to improve the programmes of study.	5
2.2.5	The policy dealing with plagiarism committed by students as well as mechanisms for identifying and preventing it are effective.	5
2.2.6	The established procedures for examining students' objections/ disagreements on issues of student evaluation or academic ethics are effective.	5
2.2.7	The Department publishes information related to the programmes of study, credit units, learning outcomes, methodology, student admission criteria, completion of studies, facilities, number of teaching staff and the expertise of teaching staff.	5
2.2.8	The Department has a clear and consistent policy on the admission criteria for students in the various programmes of studies offered.	5
2.2.9	The Department flexibly uses a variety of pedagogical methods.	5
2.2.10	The Department systematically collects data in relation to the academic performance of students, implements procedures for evaluating such data and has a relevant policy in place.	5
2.2.11	The Department analyses and publishes graduate employment information.	5
2.2.12	The Department ensures adequate and appropriate learning resources in line with European and international standards and/or international practices, particularly:	
2.2.12.1	Building facilities	5
2.2.12.2	Library	5
2.2.12.3	Rooms for theoretical, practical and laboratory lessons	5
2.2.12.4	Technological infrastructure	5
2.2.12.5	Academic support	5

2.2.13	There is a student welfare service that supports students in regard to academic, personal problems and difficulties.	5
2.2.14	The Department's mechanisms, processes and infrastructure consider the needs of a diverse student population such as mature, part-time, employed and international students as well as students with disabilities.	5
2.2.15	Mentoring of each student is provided and the number of students per each permanent teaching member is adequate.	5
2.2.16	The provision of quality doctoral studies is ensured through doctoral studies regulations, which are publicly available.	5
2.2.17	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.	4
2.2.18	The Department has mechanisms and funds to support writing and attending conferences of doctoral candidates.	4
2.2.19	There is a clear policy on authorship and intellectual property.	5

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

### Findings

We were shown the quality procedures and discussed with staff and management on the way these are upheld. We found an excellent culture of quality in a good working atmosphere. As is also shown in the process of getting Aacsb accreditation this department has a high standard. We heard in our discussion with the support staff ample evidence of a broadly carried positive attitude of service for students and staff. The connection with society is taken very seriously. The successful internship program gives evidence for good combination of research, teaching and societal relevance such as one would expect from an engaged scholarship (Van de Ven, 2007) oriented research university. We have met in our discussions with staff and students a high level of objectified criteria for admittance in the PhD program, for the Bsc program this is done via state exams. It appeared that the students on average score high on these exams, so the quality of input of student population is high. The facilities and technology available is of high standard and all relatively new. The adaptation to teaching online was administered in a very good way, as reported by staff and students. Using mentoring and more elaborate welfare and (mental) health services are available and well put to use in the pandemic period.

### Strengths

The systematic approach of the management enables the well structured approach to systematic quality management. We were pleasantly surprised by the processes of care for the students during this pandemic. Also for the part time students the well developed structure on the one hand as well as the flexibility build in was striking.

Areas of improvement and recommendations

We recommend to uphold the combination of clear structure and flexibility of process time in the PhD program. Furthermore, we applaud the effort to get Erasmus programs and the like to let the students have international experience. If this is not possible for a longer period such as the pandemic period you might consider to join programs of internationalisation from home in virtual class room programs such as in the were developed in several Erasmus programs (e.g. [www.Listoproject.eu](http://www.Listoproject.eu))

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	Compliant

### 3. Administration

(ESG 1.1, 1.3, 1.6)

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

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

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

[Click to enter text.](#)

### Findings

From students as well as from staff we got a clear picture of that the governance system is clear and used in a way which is compliant to open academic standards. We are as a committee pleased to see how procedures are clear without coming across as bureaucratic inside the department. We did signal some perhaps overly bureaucratic tendencies in how the school and university is managed by the state. Some more autonomy on budget, and rewards for the performance could further improve the situation of the department

### Strengths

The governance system is very clear. All layers of staff & students are finding there way to express opinions. Decision making follows procedures in a transparent way.

### Areas of improvement and recommendations

Above already mentioned is our appreciation of the management of the department and the clear governance structure, but it is hold on a relative short lease by the state. To allow the public university to prosper further in probably enhancing competition for the higher grade students and acquiring new very good staff, the reward system and budget for the department and higher autonomy to adapt to new circumstances seems to be necessary

**Please select what is appropriate for the following assessment area:**

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

#### 4. Learning and Teaching

(ESG 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.9)

##### Sub-areas

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

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

Quality indicators/criteria		
<b>4. Learning and Teaching</b>		
<b>4.1 Planning the programmes of study</b>		<b>1 - 5</b>
4.1.1	The Department provides an effective system for designing, approving, monitoring and periodically reviewing the programmes of study.	5
4.1.2	Students and other stakeholders, including employers, are actively involved on the programmes' review and development.	5
4.1.3	The content of the programmes of study, the assignments and the final exams correspond to the appropriate level as indicated by the European Qualifications Framework (EQF).	5
4.1.4	The programmes of study are in compliance with the existing legislation and meet the professional qualifications requirements in the professional courses, where applicable.	5
4.1.5	The Department ensures that its programmes of study integrate effectively theory and practice.	5
Justify the numerical scores provided for the quality indicators (criteria) by specifying (if any) the deficiencies.		
<a href="#">Click or tap here to enter text.</a>		
<b>4. Learning and Teaching</b>		
<b>4.2 Organisation of teaching</b>		<b>1 - 5</b>
4.2.1	The Department establishes student admission criteria for each programme, which are adhered to consistently.	5



4.2.2	Recognition of prior studies and credit transfer is regulated by procedures and regulations that are in line with European standards and/or international practices.	5
4.2.3	The number of students in the teaching rooms is suitable for theoretical, practical and laboratory lessons.	5
4.2.4	The teaching staff of the Department has regular and effective communication with their students, promoting mutual respect within the learner-teacher relationship.	5
4.2.5	Student-centred learning and teaching plays an important role in stimulating students' motivation, self-reflection and engagement in the learning process.	5
4.2.6	The teaching staff of the Department provides timely and effective feedback to their students.	5
4.2.7	The criteria and the method of assessment as well as the criteria for marking are published in advance.	5
4.2.8	The assessment allows students to demonstrate the extent to which the intended learning outcomes have been achieved.	5

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

[Click to enter text.](#)

### Findings

The Faculty has an ambitious plan for the department which is to turn it into a point of excellence in the area of studies in business and public administration.

### Strengths

There is experienced and professional teaching staff that can create interesting synergies and results in the academic process which may prove beneficial for the students.

The faculty aims very high in terms of academic excellence.

### Areas of improvement and recommendations

Although the workload of staff was reported to be not too high, we see a hard working culture in the group and thus the Accreditation Committee would encourage the assignment of more members of teaching staff.



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

Sub-area	<i>Non-compliant / Partially Compliant / Compliant</i>
4.1 Planning the programmes of study	Compliant
4.2 Organisation of teaching	Compliant

## 5. Teaching Staff (ESG 1.5)

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

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

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

[Click to enter text.](#)

Also, write the following:

- Number of teaching staff working full-time and having exclusive work
- Number of special teaching staff working full-time and having exclusive work
- Number of visiting Professors
- Number of special scientists on lease services

[Click to enter text.](#)

Findings

In overall, the current teaching staff is well-qualified and has adequate experience in the business world. This enables them to offer teaching, which is balanced between theory and practice which is very important for the students. Apart from the 13 members of teaching staff, there are visiting professors and scientific specialists.

### Strengths

- Interesting mix of teaching staff from academia and business.
- Enthusiastic about teaching.
- Seem to care for the need of students.

### Areas of improvement and recommendations

Although the workload of staff was reported to be not too high, we see a hard working culture in the group and thus the Accreditation Committee would encourage the assignment of more members of teaching staff.

Please ✓ what is appropriate for the following assessment area:

Assessment area	<i>Non-compliant / Partially Compliant / Compliant</i>
5. Teaching Staff	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

Quality indicators/criteria		1 - 5
<b>6. Research</b>		<b>1 - 5</b>
6.1	The Department has a research policy formulated in line with its mission.	5
6.2	The Department consistently applies internal regulations and procedures of research activity, which promote the set out research policy and ensure compliance with the regulations of research projects financing programmes.	5
6.3	The Department provides adequate facilities and equipment to cover the staff and students' research activities.	5
6.4	The Department has the appropriate mechanisms for the development of students' research skills.	5
6.5	The results of the teaching staff research activity are published to a satisfactory extent in international journals which work with critics, international conferences, conference proceedings, publications, etc. The Department also uses an open access policy for publications, which is consistent with the corresponding national and European policy.	5
6.6	The Department ensures that research results are integrated into teaching and, to the extent applicable, promotes and implements a policy of transferring know-how to society and the production sector.	5
6.7	The Department provides mechanisms which ensure compliance with international rules of research ethics, both in relation to research activity and the rights of researchers.	5
6.8	The external, non-governmental, funding of research activities of teaching staff is similar to other Departments in Cyprus and abroad.	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.		
Click to enter text.		

### Findings

The EEC finds that the department has a very good level in terms of research since most of the teaching staff publishes scientific papers to high quality international journals with impact factor or at least index by various journal indexing services or being published by widely respectable publishers, i.e. Elsevier, Springer, Emerald, etc.

### Strengths

The EEC finds that the facilities in terms of libraries, databases and equipment are satisfactory and helpful to the staff that wishes to engage in research.

### Areas of improvement and recommendations

Research is the main objective of the University of Cyprus and goals regarding research are included in the strategic planning of the department. We found no substantive problems but we encourage the department to keep on focusing on the quality and not in the quantity of the research work produced. The publication record of a future candidate faculty member must be heavily weighted in the final decision for employment. The university must provide grants -as much as this is possible- to academic staff to participate in quality international conferences. Nonetheless, it is important that the potential and willingness for research is present.

Please ✓ what is appropriate for the following assessment area:

Assessment area	<i>Non-compliant / Partially Compliant / Compliant</i>
6. Research	Compliant

## 7. Resources (ESG 1.6)

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

Quality indicators/criteria		
<b>7. Resources</b>		<b>1 - 5</b>
7.1	The Department has sufficient financial resources to support its functions, managed by the Institutional and Departmental bodies.	4
7.2	The Department follows sound and efficient management of the available financial resources in order to develop academically and research wise.	5
7.3	The Department's profits and donations are used for its development and for the benefit of the university community.	5
7.4	The Department's budget is appropriate for its mission and adequate for the implementation of strategic planning.	4
7.5	The Department carries out an assessment of the risks and sustainability of the programmes of study and adequately provides feedback on their operation.	5
7.6	The Department's external audit and the transparent management of its finances are ensured.	5
7.7	The fitness-for-purpose of support facilities and services is periodically reviewed.	5
Justify the numerical scores provided for the quality indicators (criteria) by specifying (if any) the deficiencies.  Click to enter text.		

### Findings

We did not have sight of detailed financial figures; rather we were briefed on student and staff numbers, the strategy of the Department, School and University and developments in provision. We saw evidence of a well run Department with excellent professional support staff and clear structures and processes governing the stewardship of resources. Alongside evidence of excellent support from the University, we heard some examples which suggested constraints on local autonomy over resources. We recognize that this is far from a unique tension for schools and departments seeking to flourish and at the same time contribute to wider institutional strategies.

### Strengths

Professional and experienced administrative staff

Excellent faculty leadership, benefiting from responsible office holders and collegiality  
A well developed departmental identity to guide the allocation of resources and activities

Areas of improvement and recommendations

Our comments here are closely aligned with our comments provided in Section 1 of this Report. We see excellent features of the Department and a strong fit with the wider goals of the School and University. It is also clear that the work of the Department, and the experience of students, benefits from the infrastructure of the University, including its investments in the world class library, the student health services, sports, as well as the University's reputation, and so on. We know too from our own institutions that resources and relationships with the center are often tricky issues. We see a Department with an excellent track record and high ambitions, in line with the University's aspirations and strategy, and therefore a strong case for appropriate enhancements to financial support and local autonomy.

Please ✓ what is appropriate for the following assessment area:

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

## D. Conclusions and final remarks

We appreciate the strengths of this department as described above. Although relatively small, the department is capable in delivering good programs and has an effective governance system. They show initiatives to keep at the level of international standards in research as well as in teaching and in creating societal value. Also the initiative to apply for AACSB accreditation is a proof of this overall strategy. Our concerns as expressed above are mainly with the amount of bureaucracy and lack of financial autonomy, and we advise the state to organize this more in line with the proven capabilities of the department.



## E. Signatures of the EEC

<i>Name</i>	<i>Signature</i>
Aard Groen	
Kevin Orr	
Kyriaki Kosmidou	
Maria Averkiou	

**Date:** 7/10/2020

