



Doc. 300.3.1

Date: Date

# External Evaluation Report (Departmental)

- **Higher Education Institution:**  
Cyprus University of Technology
- **Town:** Limassol
- **School/Faculty:** School/Faculty
- **Department:** Department of Multimedia and Graphic Arts
- **Department's Status:** Choose status
  
- **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



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

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

DEPARTMENT	PROGRAMMES OF STUDY
<p><b>Department of Multimedia and Graphic Arts</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Multimedia and Graphic Arts (4 years/240 ECTS/BA)</b></li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Multimedia and Graphic Arts (3 years/240 ECTS/PhD)</b></li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>MSc in Interaction Design</b> (Inter-university) Cyprus University of Technology (CUT) &amp; Tallinn University(TLU), Estonia</li> </ul>



## A. Introduction

*This part includes basic information regarding the onsite visit.*

- Due to the pandemic the evaluation to an online meeting via Zoom.
- Video material has been provided, however it was rather not appropriate to replace an on-site visit. The studios, classrooms and labs did not become very clear. A neutral documentation exploring the actual facilities would have been helpful.
- The meetings with the academic staff were well prepared, and the staff was organized. There has been sufficient time to ask questions, and the tutors have been supportive and helpful.

## B. External Evaluation Committee (EEC)

<i>Name</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>University</i>
<b>Walter Bergmoser</b>	Professor and Vice-Dean Academic Leader of the Campus Berlin	University of Europe for Applied Sciences Berlin
<b>Martin Lundell</b>	Professor and Head of Program Graphic Design and Illustration	Oslo National Academy of the Arts
<b>Alexander Tibus</b>	Professor and Head of Program Graphic Design and Visual Communication	Berlin International University of Applied Sciences
<b>Katerina Nicolaou</b>	Bachelor Student	University of Cyprus
Name	Position	University
Name	Position	University

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

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

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

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

### Findings

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

### **Strengths**

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

### **Areas of improvement and recommendations**

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

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

**1. Department's academic profile and orientation**  
(ESG 1.1, 1.2, 1.4, 1.5, 1.6, 1.7, 1.8, 1.9)

**Sub-areas**

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

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

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

Quality indicators/criteria		
<b>1. Department's academic profile and orientation</b>		
<b>1.1 Mission and strategic planning (including SWOT analysis)</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.	4
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.	4
1.1.4	The programmes of study offered by the Department reflect its academic profile and are aligned with the European and international practice.	4
1.1.5	The academic community is involved in shaping and monitoring the implementation of the Department's development strategies.	4
1.1.6	Stakeholders such as academics, students, graduates and other professional and scientific associations participate in the Department's development strategy.	4
1.1.7	The mechanism for collecting and analysing data and indicators needed to effectively design the Department's academic development is adequate and effective.	4
Justify the numerical scores provided for the quality indicators (criteria) by specifying (if any) the deficiencies.		

## The strategic planning

Students are well involved in the departmental development.

Additionally, provide information on the following:

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

The students can choose between the two pathways “Multimedia” and “Graphic Arts”. There is a number of joint courses, but only very few projects in which students of the two pathways would cooperate. A structure that allows the students to collaborate across the pathways would help them to interact and teamwork together. This was also expressed as a wish in the meeting with students and graduates.

Provide suggestions for changes in case of incompatibility.

Click to enter text.

### 1. Department’s academic profile and orientation

#### 1.2 Connecting with society

1 - 5

1.2.1	The Department has effective mechanisms to assess the needs and demands of society and takes them into account in its various activities.	4
1.2.2	The Department provides sufficient information to the public about its activities and offered programmes of study.	4
1.2.3	The Department ensures that its operation and activities have a positive impact on society.	4
1.2.4	The Department has an effective communication mechanism with its graduates.	4

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

1.2.1–1.2.4 The mechanisms behind could hardly be assessed in the format of the online site visit, however the interaction with and impact on society is convincing.

1.2.4 There is good communication and strong bonds between the graduates and the department’s academic staff. This seems to happen on an interpersonal level and intermediately.

### 1. Department’s academic profile and orientation

#### 1.3 Development processes

1 - 5

1.3.1	Effective procedures and measures are in place to attract and select teaching staff to ensure that they possess the formal and substantive skills to teach, carry out research and effectively carry out their work.	4
1.3.2	Planning teaching staff recruitment and their professional development is in line with the Department's academic development plan.	4
1.3.3	The Department applies an effective strategy of attracting high-level students from Cyprus and abroad.	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.

1.3.3 Regarding Cyprus-based students, strategies and procedures to attract high-level students are well developed on all levels: BA, MA and PhD. Those activities could be improved towards the recruitment of international students for the BA program.

1.3.4 The funding processes and budgets are clear and transparent.

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

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

The application papers have been detailed and informative. The quality of the teaching staff described in the application has been proven in the online meetings.

The mission, strategy planning and development process including SWOT analysis are transparent and well implemented.

### Strengths

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

Self-organization is well-structured, clear and transparent.

Offering studies from undergrad over postgrad to doctoral.

The "Makers Space" is a clear benefit for staff, students, research and social life in the department.

Different and extensive publications and awards have been achieved by staff and students.

Extensive sufficient extracurricular activities.

Students and graduates were enthusiastic towards the department, staff and the teaching.

Connections between students and tutors is close and personal.

The students get industry insights and contacts via their tutors and the projects offered.

The academic staff appeared very well informed, and form an effective team together.

Areas of improvement and recommendations

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

For multimedia and graphic arts, there should be MA program opportunities that bridge between the Bachelor and the doctoral studies.

More attention could be given to the recruitment on attracting international high-level students.

**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

### 3. Quality Assurance

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

**Sub-areas**

- 3.1 System and quality assurance strategy**
- 3.2 Quality assurance for the programmes of study**

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

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

Quality indicators/criteria		
<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.	4
2.1.3	The Department's policy for quality assurance supports guarding against intolerance of any kind or discrimination against students or staff.	N/A
2.1.4	The quality assurance system adequately covers all the functions and sectors of the Department's activities:	
2.1.4.1	Teaching and learning	4
2.1.4.2	Research	4
2.1.4.3	The connection with society	4
2.1.4.4	Management and support services	4
2.1.5	The quality assurance system promotes a culture of quality.	4
2.1.6	Students' evaluation and feedback	N/A

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

2.1.1–2.1.2 The department uses feedback and data coming from their industry partners to ensure the quality of learning and teaching. An exit survey is conducted with graduates. There are also alumni survey course evaluations. Further, the academic rely on the continuous feedback in all courses.

2.1.3 This point was hardly addressed, and there are only very few international students overall.

## 2. Quality Assurance

### 2.2 Quality assurance for the programmes of study

1 - 5

2.2.1	The responsibility for decision-making and monitoring the implementation of the programmes of study offered by the Department lies with the teaching staff.	4
2.2.2	The system and criteria for assessing students' performance in the subjects of the programmes of studies offered by the Department are clear, sufficient and known to the students.	4
2.2.3	The quality control system refers to specific indicators and is effective, which have been presented and discussed.	4
2.2.4	The results from student assessments are used to improve the programmes of study.	4
2.2.5	The policy dealing with plagiarism committed by students as well as mechanisms for identifying and preventing it are effective.	4
2.2.6	The established procedures for examining students' objections/ disagreements on issues of student evaluation or academic ethics are effective.	4
2.2.7	The Department publishes information related to the programmes of study, credit units, learning outcomes, methodology, student admission criteria, completion of studies, facilities, number of teaching staff and the expertise of teaching staff.	4
2.2.8	Names and position of the teaching staff of each programme are published and easily accessible.	4
2.2.9	The Department has a clear and consistent policy on the admission criteria for students in the various programmes of studies offered.	4
2.2.10	The Department flexibly uses a variety of teaching methods.	4

2.2.11	The Department systematically collects data in relation to the academic performance of students, implements procedures for evaluating such data and has a relevant policy in place.	4
2.2.12	The Department analyses and publishes graduate employment information.	4
2.2.13	The Department ensures adequate and appropriate learning resources in line with European and international standards and/or international practices, particularly:	
2.2.12.1	Building facilities	4
2.2.12.2	Library	4
2.2.12.3	Rooms for theoretical, practical and laboratory lessons	4
2.2.12.4	Technological infrastructure	3
2.2.12.5	Academic support	5
2.2.14	There is a student welfare service that supports students in regard to academic, personal problems and difficulties.	4
2.2.15	The Department's mechanisms, processes and infrastructure consider the needs of a diverse student population such as mature, part-time, employed and international students as well as students with disabilities.	N/A
2.2.16	Mentoring of each student is provided and the number of students per each permanent teaching member is adequate.	4
2.2.17	The provision of quality doctoral studies is ensured through doctoral studies regulations, which are publicly available.	4
2.2.18	The number of doctoral students, under the supervision of a member of the teaching staff, enables continuous and effective feedback to the students and it complies with the European and international standards.	4
2.2.19	The Department has mechanisms and funds to support writing and attending conferences of doctoral candidates.	4
2.2.20	There is a clear policy on authorship and intellectual property.	4

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

**2.2.13** The department ensures appropriate facilities within its opportunities. However, there are issues with the lack of a central campus and the facilities the department can use. It might be in the interest of the university to look into centralizing its facilities. The establishment of social meeting points, such as a cafeteria close to the Makers Space, would foster a center for student life. During the evaluation, students, graduates and staff have repeatedly addressed the issue, and suggested a cafeteria as a possible solution.

2.2.12.4 Some of the technical equipment meets high standards, however the computers (iMacs and PCs) as seen on the visual documentation and as pointed out by students are not anymore meeting current industry standards, and therefore should be renewed or updated.

### Findings

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

The overall impression is compliant.

### Strengths

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

Great staff engagement towards students and teaching.

A range of activities such as inviting relevant designers for talks and participating in international competitions.

Staff is committed to their subject areas and covers a great bandwidth of specializations.

Collaboration of different departments sharing labs and facilities.

Maker Space as an area of learning and teaching, research and experimentation in which students of all levels and staff interact with each other.

### Areas of improvement and recommendations

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

Installation of a social meeting point such as a cafeteria.

The establishment of a more cohesive and integrated campus in the future.

**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

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

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

3.11 Internalization of the Department and external collaborations. 4

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

Even if the overall impression of the administration is positive, the academic struggle with the heavy administrative workload. A better support through administrative staff who take away some of the working load would allow them to focus more on teaching, research and the departments' development.

Findings

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

The administration team was found efficient and functional.

Strengths

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

Areas of improvement and recommendations

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

More support for the academics through administrative staff. The academics' admin workload should be lowered to allow them to focus more on teaching, research and the departments' development.

Please select what is appropriate for the following assessment area:

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

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

##### Sub-areas

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

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

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

Quality indicators/criteria		
<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.	4
4.1.2	Students and other stakeholders, including employers, are actively involved on the programmes' review and development.	4
4.1.3	Intended learning outcomes, the content of the programmes of study, the assignments and the final exams correspond to the appropriate level as indicated by the European Qualifications Framework (EQF).	4
4.1.4	The programmes of study are in compliance with the existing legislation and meet the professional qualifications requirements in the professional courses, where applicable.	N/A
4.1.5	The Department ensures that its programmes of study integrate effectively theory and practice.	4
Justify the numerical scores provided for the quality indicators (criteria) by specifying (if any) the deficiencies.		
4.1.1.–4.1.2 There are different systems such as an exit survey with graduates, alumni survey course evaluations, and continuous feedback in all courses.		
4.1.4 The committee is not familiar with the Cyprus legislation.		
<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.	3
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.	N/A
4.2.3	The number of students in the teaching rooms is suitable for theoretical, practical and laboratory lessons.	4
4.2.4	The teaching staff of the Department has regular and effective communication with their students, promoting mutual respect within the learner-teacher relationship.	5
4.2.5	Student-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.	4
4.2.8	The assessment allows students to demonstrate the extent to which the intended learning outcomes have been achieved.	4

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

**4.2.1. There is no admission criteria system that ensures the applicants' subject-specific art and design qualification of applicants.**

### Findings

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

In the current procedure, the candidates' qualifications towards art and design are not assessed for the BA program before they enter their studies.

### Strengths

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

There is good communication and a respectful as well as close relationship between staff and students.

### Areas of improvement and recommendations

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



Introduce qualifying entry exams for art and design Bachelor candidates to ensure attracting the most qualified applicants in the subject area.

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

## 6. Teaching Staff (ESG 1.5)

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

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

Quality indicators/criteria		
<b>5. Teaching Staff</b>		<b>1 - 5</b>
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.	4
5.3	The visiting Professors' subject areas adequately support the Department's programmes of study.	4
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.	4
5.7	The ratio of the number of students to the total number of teaching staff is sufficient to support and ensure the quality of the programme of study.	4
5.8	Feedback processes for teaching staff in regard to the evaluation of their teaching work, by the students, are satisfactory.	4

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

[Click to enter text.](#)

Also, write the following:

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

[Click to enter text.](#)

**Findings**

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

The committee has gained a very positive overall impression of the department and the academic staff.

**Strengths**

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

The academics are often holding PhDs, while many of them evidence broad international academic and professional experience. A great number of technical staff members demonstrate to be highly qualified in their subject area, and are also holding higher academic degrees.

**Areas of improvement and recommendations**

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

Click to enter text.

Please ✓ what is appropriate for the following assessment area:

Assessment area	<i>Non-compliant / Partially Compliant / Compliant</i>
Teaching staff number, adequacy and suitability	Compliant
Teaching staff recruitment and development	Compliant
Synergies of teaching and research	Compliant

## 6. Research

(ESG 1.1, 1.3, 1.5, 1.6)

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

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

Quality indicators/criteria		
<b>6. Research</b>		<b>1 - 5</b>
6.1	The Department has a research policy formulated in line with its mission.	4
6.2	The Department consistently applies internal regulations and procedures of research activity, which promote the set out research policy and ensure compliance with the regulations of research projects financing programmes.	4
6.3	The Department provides adequate facilities and equipment to cover the staff and students' research activities.	4
6.4	The Department has the appropriate mechanisms for the development of students' research skills.	4
6.5	The results of the teaching staff research activity are published to a satisfactory extent in international journals which work with critics, international conferences, conference proceedings, publications, etc. The Department also uses an open access policy for publications, which is consistent with the corresponding national and European policy.	4
6.6	The Department ensures that research results are integrated into teaching and, to the extent applicable, promotes and implements a policy of transferring know-how to society and the production sector.	4
6.7	The Department provides mechanisms which ensure compliance with international rules of research ethics, both in relation to research activity and the rights of researchers.	N/A
6.8	The external, non-governmental, funding of research activities of teaching staff is similar to other Departments in Cyprus and abroad.	N/A
6.9	The policy, indirect or direct of internal funding of the research activities of the teaching staff is satisfactory, based on European and international practices.	4

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

6.8: The Evaluation Committee is not familiar on the standards of other departments in Cyprus, and therefore cannot compare.

Findings

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

The academic staff engages in research, and carries their findings into their teaching. Particularly on the PhD program, there are well established methods to equip students with research skills, include them into the staff's research, and foster research-driven student mobility.

Strengths

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

Specific staff members evidence strong research profiles.  
There is a strong research output by staff and PhD students.

Areas of improvement and recommendations

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

Click to enter text.

Please ✓ what is appropriate for the following assessment area:

Assessment area	<i>Non-compliant / Partially Compliant / Compliant</i>
Research mechanisms and regulations	Compliant
External and internal funding	Compliant
Motives for research	Compliant
Publications	Compliant

## 7. Resources (ESG 1.6)

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

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

Quality indicators/criteria		
<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.	4
7.3	The Department's profits and donations are used for its development and for the benefit of the university community.	N/A
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.	N/A
7.6	The Department's external audit and the transparent management of its finances are ensured.	N/A
7.7	The fitness-for-purpose of support facilities and services is periodically reviewed.	N/A
Justify the numerical scores provided for the quality indicators (criteria) by specifying (if any) the deficiencies. <a href="#">Click to enter text.</a>		

### Findings

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

The impression the Evaluation Committee could gain through the online visit is overall compliant and positive.

### Strengths

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



Click to enter text.

*Areas of improvement and recommendations*

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

Click to enter text.

Please ✓ what is appropriate for the following assessment area:

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

## B. Conclusions and final remarks

*Please provide constructive conclusions and final remarks, which may form the basis upon which improvements of the quality of the Department under review may be achieved.*

The committee agrees that the department is sufficiently equipped. The structures appear satisfying, the staff is qualified and committed.

The department ensures appropriate facilities within its opportunities. However, the spread-out campus without a central meeting place is partly demanding for students and staff. It might be in the interest of the university to look into centralizing its facilities, or establishing social meeting points to foster a centre for student life, such as a cafeteria close to the Makers Space. During the evaluation, it has been repeatedly addressed by students and graduates, who suggested a cafeteria as a possible solution.

The committee agrees the department is fully compliant.

## C. Signatures of the EEC

<i>Name</i>	<i>Signature</i>
<b>Walter Bergmoser</b>	
<b>Martin Lundell</b>	
<b>Alexander Tibus</b>	
<b>Katerina Nicolaou</b>	
FullName	
FullName	

**Date:** 30.3.2021

