

Doc. 300.3.1

Date: 17 November 2023

External Evaluation Report (Departmental)

- Higher Education Institution:
Cyprus University of Technology
- Town: Limassol
- School/Faculty: School of Management & Economics
- Department: Department of Shipping
- Department's Status: New
- Programme(s) of study under evaluation:

Programme 1

In Greek:

Πτυχίο στα Ναυτιλιακά

In English:

BSc in Shipping

Programme 2

In Greek:

Μεταπτυχιακό στα Ναυτιλιακά

In English:

MSc in Shipping

Programme 3

In Greek:

Διδακτορικό στα Ναυτιλιακά

In English:

PhD in Shipping



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].

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

DEPARTMENT	PROGRAMMES OF STUDY
Department of Shipping	BSc in Shipping
	MSc in Shipping
	PhD in Shipping
	BSc in Shipping & Finance (interdepartmental)
	MSc in Shipping & Finance (interdepartmental)

A. Introduction

This part includes basic information regarding the onsite visit.

The External Evaluation Committee (EEC) comprised of 3 members, George Theocharidis, Nikolaos Papapostolou, Andromachi Georgosouli and Neofyta Christoforou (student representative), was invited by the Cyprus Agency of Quality Assurance and Accreditation in Higher Education (CYQAA) to assess the Department of Shipping proposed by the Technical University of Cyprus (hereafter “University”), Limassol. The evaluation took place at the premises of the University in Limassol on the 15th of November 2023. The EEC met with the Rector, Prof. Panayiotis Zaphiris (via teleconference means), the Dean of the School, Assoc. Prof. Eleni Kalotychou, the Coordinator of the Department, Prof. Photis Panayides and others as below. In addition, the EEC had the opportunity to have constructive discussions with the members of teaching staff and administrative personnel, which supports the relevant Department, as well as with graduate and current students (undergraduate, MSc and PhD) from the conventional programmes. The EEC also had a physical tour in the University’s infrastructure and facilities. To facilitate the process of evaluation the University have provided the EEC with additional evidence upon request. In this evaluation report we present the findings of the EEC committee, the strengths of the Department of the University and areas that need further improvement. The EEC provides constructive feedback and makes several suggestions to the University for improvement. The EEC remains at the disposal of the CYQAA and University for providing clarifications regarding this report. Finally, the EEC would like to thank the CYQAA for the invitation to evaluate the Department, and the members of the University for their hospitality and cooperative spirit on the day of the evaluation.

B. External Evaluation Committee (EEC)

<i>Name</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>University</i>
George Theocharidis	Professor	WMU
Nikolaos Papapostolou	Reader	City University, London
Andromachi Georgosouli	Associate Professor	Queen Mary, London
Neta Chrisoforou	Student	University of Cyprus
Name	Position	University
Name	Position	University

C. Guidelines on content and structure of the report

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

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

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

Findings

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

Strengths

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

Areas of improvement and recommendations

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

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

1. Department's academic profile and orientation

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

Sub-areas

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

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

1 or 2: *Non-compliant*

3: *Partially compliant*

4 or 5: *Compliant*

Quality indicators/criteria		
1. Department's academic profile and orientation		
1.1 Mission and strategic planning (including SWOT analysis)		1 - 5
1.1.1	The Department has formally adopted a mission statement, which is available to the public and easily accessible.	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.		

Based on the submitted documents, the interviews held and the available website information the Department complies with all of the above

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 planned programmes are relevant among themselves and show coherence regarding the substance offered. We were also told that the students may elect subjects from other departments but no evidence was adduced.

Provide suggestions for changes in case of incompatibility.

N/A

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.

All evidence shows unassailably that the Department has achieved fully its aim to communicate its profile and goals to the society, which has responded accordingly in various ways (e.g. offer of requested accommodation in various buildings by the city of Limassol etc.)

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.	5
1.3.4	The funding processes for the operation of the Department and the continuous improvement of the quality of its programmes of study are adequate and transparent.	3

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

The Department submitted evidence and it was also raised during the discussions that there is a need for additional faculty members to support the delivery of the planned programmes. This proposition is supported by the comment made by the PhD research student that certain courses, preceding the composition of the doctoral thesis, are not offered yet.

Additionally, write:

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

According to data exposed from previous years, we do not see any reason for decrease. On the contrary, the new BSc in Shipping seems to have the impetus to increase the intake of students from Cyprus and Greece.

Findings

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

The offered programmes by the Department in Shipping are currently operating programmes, with the exception of the BSc in Shipping, and they are delivered physically (*in situ*) by the University. The EEC expects that all programmes will primarily attract interest from the Cypriot and Greek markets, however, the MSc and PhD, which are also currently delivered in Greek, if they would be offered in English, could potentially attract other nationalities too.

The EEC believes that the qualifications for the programmes to be awarded by the University meet the National Qualifications Framework for Higher Education.

Further, the EEC believes that the core content and structure of the programmes are similar to those offered in other EU countries and the UK. The programmes in their current format provide the necessary disciplinary knowledge and skills needed for professional development in the area of Shipping Business at undergraduate and postgraduate level. The EEC enquired about the programme's learning outcomes, teaching approaches, and assessment procedures. The programme coordinator (also Coordinator of the Department of Shipping) and teaching team provided sufficient evidence of such information. Employment information from a similar undergraduate programme was presented.

With regard to the structure and design of the programmes, the EEC commends the University and teaching staff for their efforts to develop programmes that are current and reflective of the recent shipping and business trends.

Important information about the programmes, their content and structure, admission criteria, fees etc. are publicly available on the University's website (except for the newly proposed BSc in Shipping and the PhD which appear to be under construction).

The EEC has observed that the University, as a whole, has several policies in place to ensure quality assurance, which were duly presented by Assoc. Prof. Nicos Souleles. Any new programmes or changes to existing programs have to go through an internal process and they are subject to approval. Good practice recommendations can then be tailored to the programme as per necessary. However, we were not provided with a specific policy regarding protocols for research and data collection management.

Based on the site-visit, the EEC also expresses positive comments on the infrastructure and facilities available for the students of the Department.

Strengths

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

When one looks at the structure of the programmes, it can safely be drawn that the deliverables provide a solid foundation for the future career of the students in the relevant industry.

All programmes of the Department appear to be based on a student strategy recruitment at all levels, which indicates a targeted approach by the Department.

The Department's teaching curriculum across all programmes offered indicates high relevance to the country's economy.

Information about the programmes of study is clear, accurate, and readily accessible for prospective students, albeit in the University's and not the Department's website.

The undergraduate programme will offer internships, as an elective, to various companies and organizations, which seems to be linked with future career opportunities and this is commended. The criterion of performance for the participation in the limited number of internship position seems solid.

Areas of improvement and recommendations

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

According to the submitted documents and the discussions that took place, it seems that the offered programmes are insufficiently supported by permanent academic staff, especially specialized in the field of shipping. However, the Department indicated that there is a pending process for recruitment as well as a request for special scientists, which will be engaged only in teaching.

The Department must ensure a specific and comprehensive policy, clearly also reflected in the handbooks, about the conduct of research according to protocols, especially the management and destruction of data collected after the completion of research. For that purpose, the establishment of a Research Ethics Committee is recommended, which will deal with the above matters, whether at departmental or at University level.

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

Sub-area	<i>Non-compliant / Partly 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

1 or 2: Non-compliant

3: Partially compliant

4 or 5: Compliant

Quality indicators/criteria		
2. Quality Assurance		
2.1 System and quality assurance strategy		1 - 5
2.1.1	The Department has a policy for quality assurance that is made public and forms part of the Institution's strategic management.	4
2.1.2	Internal stakeholders develop and implement a policy for quality assurance through appropriate structures and processes, while involving external stakeholders.	4
2.1.3	The Department's policy for quality assurance supports guarding against intolerance of any kind or discrimination against students or staff.	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.	4
2.1.6	Students' evaluation and feedback	3

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

While the Department in its application has included the guidelines for grievances and re-evaluation of exam papers, the EEC has not seen a comprehensive policy on appeals for feedback from the instructor and re-evaluation. More importantly the wording “...If the instructor does not agree to discuss with the student, then the student has the right to ask the Chair..” has to be amended according to a proper policy. These matters should be duly addressed, as they reflect on the quality of the programmes.

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.	3
2.2.3	The quality control system refers to specific indicators and is effective, which have been presented and discussed.	3
2.2.4	The results from student assessments are used to improve the programmes of study.	3
2.2.5	The policy dealing with plagiarism committed by students as well as mechanisms for identifying and preventing it are effective.	2
2.2.6	The established procedures for examining students' objections/ disagreements on issues of student evaluation or academic ethics are effective.	2
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	Names and position of the teaching staff of each programme are published and easily accessible.	5
2.2.9	The Department has a clear and consistent policy on the admission criteria for students in the various programmes of studies offered.	5
2.2.10	The Department flexibly uses a variety of teaching methods.	5

2.2.11	The Department systematically collects data in relation to the academic performance of students, implements procedures for evaluating such data and has a relevant policy in place.	4
2.2.12	The Department analyses and publishes graduate employment information.	5
2.2.13	The Department ensures adequate and appropriate learning resources in line with European and international standards and/or international practices, particularly:	
2.2.12.1	Building facilities	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	4
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.	5
2.2.15	The Department's mechanisms, processes and infrastructure consider the needs of a diverse student population such as mature, part-time, employed and international students as well as students with disabilities.	4
2.2.16	Mentoring of each student is provided and the number of students per each permanent teaching member is adequate.	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.	N/A
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.

The Department has not submitted evidence on the marking descriptors which apply in the grading of the assessment tasks. We have not been given any documents pertaining to a departmental quality system but only at University level.

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

As per above

Strengths

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

The Studies and Student Affairs Service, on the premise that it functions properly, is a commendable mechanism for the wellbeing of students, which reflects in their academic performance.

Areas of improvement and recommendations

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

As per above

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

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

3. Administration (ESG 1.1, 1.3, 1.6)

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

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

Quality indicators/criteria		
3. Administration		1 - 5
3.1	The administrative structure is in line with the legislation and the Department's mission.	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.	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.	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.	4

3.11	Internationalization of the Department and external collaborations.	5
------	---	---

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

The Department is in a formative period and the meetings held are informal. However the decisions are implemented to the extent that they require action by the academic faculty

Findings

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

As stated above, the Department is in a formative period, therefore, its functions and supporting policies are under the responsibility of the University

Strengths

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

Despite the fact that the administration allocated by the University for the support of the Department is limited in number, it seems that they are willing to carry out their mandate responsibly and in full

Areas of improvement and recommendations

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

As per above

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		
4. Learning and Teaching		
4.1 Planning the programmes of study		1 - 5
4.1.1	The Department provides an effective system for designing, approving, monitoring and periodically reviewing the programmes of study.	5
4.1.2	Students and other stakeholders, including employers, are actively involved on the programmes' review and development.	5
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).	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.		
The Department shows eagerness in ensuring quality in the planned programmes with an open eye to the industry's needs		
4. Learning and Teaching		
4.2 Organisation of teaching		1 - 5

4.2.1	The Department establishes student admission criteria for each programme, which are adhered to consistently.	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.	3
4.2.7	The criteria and the method of assessment as well as the criteria for marking are published in advance.	3
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

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

Regarding feedback on the assignments and the final exams, see our comments above.
The marking descriptors have not been drawn to the attention of EEC, as per our comment above.

Strengths

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

As above

Areas of improvement and recommendations

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

See comments above

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

Sub-area	<i>Non-compliant / Partly 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

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

Quality indicators/criteria		
5. Teaching Staff		1 - 5
5.1	The number of teaching staff - full-time and exclusive work - and the subject area of the staff sufficiently support the programmes of study.	3
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.	3
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.	N/A
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.

It has already been raised that the number of resident faculty cannot support the delivery of all planned programmes and new recruitments are required.

Teaching staff working full time is three

Special teaching staff working full time is one

Visiting Professors are five

Special scientists on lease services are five according to the application

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.

As per above

Strengths

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

The professional profile of some of the special staff promises high quality delivery

Areas of improvement and recommendations

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

As per above

Please ✓ what is appropriate for the following assessment area:

Assessment area	Non-compliant / Partly Compliant / Compliant
Teaching staff number, adequacy and suitability	Partially 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		
6. Research		1 - 5
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.	4
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.	5
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.	5
Justify the numerical scores provided for the quality indicators (criteria) by specifying (if any) the deficiencies.		

All evidence provided during the presentation amply support the above scoring

Findings

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

As per above

Strengths

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

Merit funding for research in conjunction with departmental funding provide a solid foundation for the research aspirations of the faculty.

The Coordinator of the Department stressed the paramount significance of research publications for the recruitment and promotion of faculty, which is commendable. This proposition is supported also by the submitted CVs of the existing faculty.

Areas of improvement and recommendations

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

As per above

Please ✓ what is appropriate for the following assessment area:

Assessment area	<i>Non-compliant / Partly 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		
7. Resources		1 - 5
7.1	The Department has sufficient financial resources to support its functions, managed by the Institutional and Departmental bodies.	5
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.	5
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.	N/A
7.7	The fitness-for-purpose of support facilities and services is periodically reviewed.	4
Justify the numerical scores provided for the quality indicators (criteria) by specifying (if any) the deficiencies.		
The above scoring is supported by the discussion and the presentations during the site-visit		

Findings

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

As per above

Strengths

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

The Department preserves a close connection with the industry and this link provides the ground for donations and extra funding (e.g. the new library room facilities dedicated to the use by the Department of Shipping)

Areas of improvement and recommendations

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

As per above

Please ✓ what is appropriate for the following assessment area:

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

D. Conclusions and final remarks

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

Based on the findings and the recommendations as reflected in the performance per section, we do not see the need to provide general remarks, subject to the conclusions below.

When one considers the structure of the programmes against the number of instructors involved in the delivery, it is easy to notice that there is an imbalance due to lack of sufficient number of faculty.

Matters relating to appeals for grades on academic grounds, including re-evaluation of exam papers should properly be addressed in a comprehensive policy.

Consequences from plagiarism (i.e. mark deduction etc.) should form part of a policy, which needs to be adopted by the Department.

The EEC would like to take this opportunity and thank again the CYQAA for the invitation and the coordinator of CYQAA, Mr. Georgios Aletraris, for managing the evaluation of the programmes of the Department both efficiently and effectively. Also, we, as EEC, would like to extend our thanks to all the colleagues at the University for the dedication, professionalism, and co-operation during the evaluation process.

The EEC report highlights the committee's key findings, the strengths of the programmes of the Department (existing and new), and recommendations for ensuring a high quality delivery by the University.

Overall, the EEC found the Department's offered and under construction programmes along the expected national standards. The nature of each programme is compatible with physical delivery and the methodology provided is appropriate for the particular programme of study, including some strong elements that reinforce the Department's teaching and learning model.

The EEC believes that once delivery is performed, revisions based on the feedback provided would strengthen and improve all programmes, especially fine tuning, which is invariably expected when new programmes are delivered.

University level administrative support is conducive to high standards of quality and performance and it is important that this is maintained in the long term. In case of failures, the matter should be addressed at the Department level accordingly.

We advise the faculty of the Department of Shipping to take into consideration our recommendations and address all the suggestions.

Once more we remain at the disposal of CYQAA for any clarification required.

E. Signatures of the EEC

<i>Name</i>	<i>Signature</i>
George Theocharidis	
Nikolaos Papapostolou	
Andromachi Georgosouli	
Neta Christoforou	
FullName	
FullName	

Date: 17 November 2023

