

Doc. 300.3.1

External Evaluation Report (Departmental)

Date: 2025-05-18

- **Higher Education Institution:**
European University Cyprus
- **Town:** Nicosia
- **School/Faculty:** School of Science
- **Department:** Computer Science and Engineering
- **Department's Status:** Currently Operating
- **Programme(s) of study under evaluation:**
Name (Duration, ECTS, Cycle)

Programme 1

In Greek:

Επιστήμη των Υπολογιστών (4 ακαδημαϊκά έτη, 240 ECTS, Πτυχίο(BSc))

In English:

Computer Science (4 academic years, 240 ECTS, Bachelor(BSc))

Programme 2

In Greek:

Επιστήμη των Υπολογιστών (18 μήνες, 90 ECTS, Μάστερ(MSc))

In English:

Computer Science (18 months, 90 ECTS, Master(MSc))

Programme 3

In Greek:

Επιστήμη των Υπολογιστών (3 ακαδημαϊκά έτη, 180 ECTS, Διδακτορικό(PhD))

In English:

Computer Science (3 academic years, 180 ECTS, Doctorate(PhD))

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
Computer Science and Engineering, European University Cyprus	BSc in Computer Science
	MSc in Computer Science
	PhD in Computer Science

A. Introduction

This part includes basic information regarding the onsite visit.

The onsite visit to the Department of Compute Science and Engineering (henceforth: “the Department”) at the European University Cyprus in Nicosia took place on May 15 and May 16, 2025, during which the External Evaluation Committee (EEC) was accompanied by Ms. Natasa Kazakeou from the Cyprus Agency of Quality Assurance and Accreditation.

During the site visit, the EEC met, and had a series of constructive discussions, with members of the governing board of the University, and with members of the teaching and administration staff who assisted in the presentation and delivery of the programs of studies.

In particular, from among university, school, and Department management, the EEC met with L Symeou (Vice Rector of Academic Affairs), M. Vryonides (Vice Rector of Research and External Affairs), P Papagiorgis (Dean of the school of sciences), L. Voniati (Internal Quality Assurance Committee), M. Appiou-Nikiforou (Acting chairperson of the Department), Y. Danidou (Vice-chairperson of the Department), A Grondoudis (Programme coordinator, BSc in Computer Science), V. Papadopoulou-Lesta (Programme Coordinator, MSc and PhD in Computer Science).

Additionally, the ECC also met with the following teaching staff from the Department: K. Papanikolaou, C. Dimopoulos, C. Iordanou, K. Katzis, D. Hadjiloucas, P. Leng-Cheng,

The ECC also met with E. Markantoni (Director, Office of Student Affairs), M. Georgiou-Mathaiou (Admissions coordinator, Office of Admissions), C. Kolatsi (International Student Advisor, Department of Enrolment), M. Georgiou (Network Operations Manager) and T. Tzitzimbourounis (Head Librarian).

From among the strong network of industrial partners of EUC, the ECC met with A. Loutsios (Vice-chairperson of the Cyprus Computer Science Society), Georg Malekkos (CEO and software innovation architect, PowerSoft Computer Solutions), and Constantinos Loizou (CEO & Founder, EMBIO Diagnostics Ltd.)

The EEC wishes to express its gratitude to these staff members and external stakeholders for having made themselves available, and for engaging in intense, deep, and constructive discussions and exchanges.

Finally, the EEC had the privilege to meet with a large set of students and graduates from the BSc, MSc, and PhD programmes — respectively. This provided us with — in addition to insights on the programme structure and “academic” attractiveness — valuable insights in the experience of being a student in a programme in the Department at EUC.

The EEC does not wish to bury the lead here: the students affirmed — and thus confirmed our initial impression — that the most valuable asset that the Department possesses is the teaching staff in the Department, whose energy, availability, and commitment to excellence in education was the overriding theme of the site visit.

With reference to the initially proposed agenda for the site-visit, the ECC requested the following changes be made:

- That the meeting with all teaching staff in the MSc and PhD programmes be restricted to a meeting with only current PhD advisors.*
- That a dedicated meeting be programmed with the “Quality Assurance Team” of the Department.*

The EEC wishes to express its gratitude to EUC for having accommodated these last-minute changes. In particular, the EEC wishes to thank the student representative in the Quality Assurance Team for making himself available at very short notice and in spite of his previous commitment.

Two days prior to the site visit, and by way of the Ms. Kazakiau from CYQAA, the EEC shared an extensive list of requested information and documents with the EUC. The EEC wishes to express its gratitude to:

- The presenters during the sessions of site-visit, who had made last-minute changes to their presentations, to provide us with the information requested*
- The entire “back-end” administrative staff — most of whom we likely didn’t get to meet and thank in person, but who worked tirelessly behind the scenes to extract data, and provide the documents and information that we requested in a timely manner to produce this report, as well as who ensured the logistics (and caffeine) of our on-site visit. A final request will be to convey our gratitude for their efforts to them.*

The EEC was granted access to all the information, and to all the people/stakeholders, that we requested, from EUC. All personnel — from university and school leadership, through to the administrative and technical personnel, and to the faculty members in the Department — were forthcoming, positive, and actively and constructively engaged with the ECC throughout the site visit. The students and graduates, from the programmes being assessed, were thoughtful, respectful, and — again, without burying the lead — evidence of the quality of education that the students in the Department receive.

The EEC wishes to thank both the officers from the CYQAA and the personnel from the Department for excellent organisational arrangements of the site visit.

B. External Evaluation Committee (EEC)

<i>Name</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>University</i>
Thomas Heide Clausen	Professor (Chair)	Ecole Polytechnique, FR
Nik Bessis	Professor (Member)	Edge Hill University, UK
Damal K. Arvind	Professor (Member)	University of Edinburgh, UK
Yiannis Zapitis	Professional Body Representative (Member)	Cyprus Scientific and Technical Chamber (ETEK)
Paraskevas Kyriacou	PhD Student (Student Member)	University of Cyprus
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. Mission and strategic planning (including SWOT analysis)
2. Connecting with society
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.	1
1.1.2	The Department has developed its strategic planning aiming at fulfilling its mission.	1
1.1.3	The Department's strategic planning includes short, medium-term and long-term goals and objectives, which are periodically revised and adapted.	1
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 EEC did not find any publicly available mission statement, or vision for the Department on the EUC website.

During the presentation of the Department, a “strategic plan” was presented in the slides, which comprised 5 points: (i) sustain student employability and engagement, (ii) increase student numbers, (iii) strengthen research, (iv) grow the Department, and (v) become more internationally visible. The 5-point strategy statement can be summarised as simply “do better”.

Whereas the EEC certainly agrees with the objective to “do better” — and the sincerity of the faculty members of the Department to want to “do better” is not at all in question — we observe that this is an “ambition” and not a “strategic plan”.

For a strategic plan, concrete actions with cost-estimates and benefit-targets are expected — as is a vision: what would a “better” Department look like for the different stakeholders, and what is the arbitration between these versions of “better”?

Likely (and, quite reasonably) for EUC management, a “better Department” would generate higher revenues (from tuition, from overhead on research contracts, from royalties) ; for faculty members, a “better Department” would likely (and, equally reasonably) include more time to do ground-breaking research and produce high-impact scientific papers, more support for repetitive tasks (such as “grading”), and greater scope for career development ; for students, a “better Department” would likely include better post-graduation opportunities ; for Cyprus (and, thus, Europe), a “better Department” would contribute more to her economic and societal development.

These versions of “better” from the different stakeholders are, in some areas, concordant: “more science” might imply “more research contracts” and thus more overhead revenue. However other areas are at odds: “more time to do science” would imply “less time to teach” thus be at odds with a goal of “admit more students for increased tuition revenue”.

Even within stakeholder groups, different visions may exist, and whichever prevails may lead to different mission statements emerging. For example, if the Department’s vision (for teaching AND research) is “cover all fields of computer science by full-time faculty members”, that could lead to a significant different “strategic recruitment and faculty development plan”, than would the vision for the same of “becoming among the regional (or world) leaders in a specific field”.

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 programmes offered by the Department are coherent and credible, and the Department is well positioned within the school to which it belongs. Internally, the Department is thematically divided into “Computer Science” and “Occupational Safety”.

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.	3
1.2.3	The Department ensures that its operation and activities have a positive impact on society.	4
1.2.4	The Department has an effective communication mechanism with its graduates.	4

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

The EEC observes that whereas the public information about the educational programs offered by the Department is readily available on the WWW and elsewhere, there is no public information available about the Department, its excellence-areas, its scientific profile and productivity, its vision (see comments under 1.1) available on the WWW side of EUC or elsewhere.

The EEC also observes, that similar comments were made by the previous EEC in its 2020 report.

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.	2
1.3.2	Planning teaching staff recruitment and their professional development is in line with the Department's academic development plan.	1
1.3.3	The Department applies an effective strategy of attracting high-level students from Cyprus and abroad.	1
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.	1

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

The EEC would first like to note that it was impressed by the energy, the commitment, and the dedication of the faculty members that it met during the site visit.

However, despite the unequivocal qualities of these faculty members, the EEC finds it unfortunate that in a Department of **Computer Science** and Engineering, there is not a single faculty with the rank and seniority of a **Computer Science professor**.

Discussions during the site visit revealed that new positions were opened exclusively at the Lecturer and Assistant Professor levels - and never (at least, within the Department) at higher levels of seniority. While this (with the assumption of normal seniority-based pay-scales) can be understood at the economic level, it is to the detriment of being able to complement the existing Departmental intellectual leadership with a fresh vision.

While the EUC has a “minimum bar to pass” for staff to advance through the ranks, the Department has no guidelines or policies for how to mentor / prepare / encourage its members through that process, or for informing the EUC about the particularities normal to a Computer Science Department (for example: while in Medicine, a “conference presentation” is based on a short and unreviewed abstract with little archival value, in Computer Science most credible conferences are peer reviewed with acceptance rates rivalling those of selective journals).

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 Department has existed, and has offered successful courses in Computer Science, since 2007
- The faculty members of the Department are energetic, dedicated, enthusiastic, and committed
- By being a small Department, decisions are collegial and consensual
- While the Department shares a goal of “doing better”, it has not formalised a vision, a mission statement, or a strategic plan for making their vision a reality
- Surprisingly for a **Computer Science** and Engineering Department, the Department has no faculty members in **Computer Science** with the rank and seniority of a “Professor”

Strengths

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

- The greatest strength of the Department is unequivocally its faculty members: their commendable ethos of engagement and willingness to be available to their students beyond their call of duty is inspiring (the EEC confirmed that this was the case during independent chat with the past and current students)
- A close second is the proximity and collegiality among the faculty members — who genuinely seem to appreciate working with each other, and who complement each other well.

- The Department entertains close, and fruitful relations with industrial partners, to the benefit of both their research (collaborations around doctoral students) and their students for their final year undergraduate, internships, and graduate employment and biannual contribution to the Industrial Advisory Board on the strategic direction of the Department.

Areas of improvement and recommendations

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

The EEC recognises that the development of a vision, a mission statement, and a strategic plan, does not happen overnight — but, rather, is an iterative process of refinement, requiring the time necessary for all senior faculty members to contribute to the emerging of a consensus. With that in mind, the EEC recommends that the Department engages defining and executing a process towards the development of an ambitions vision, formulating a mission statement, and presenting to the EUC leadership a strategic plan in order to ensure the necessary support for successful realisation of the plan.

With the above mentioned vision and strategic plan as a prerequisite, the EEC recommends that the Department also incorporates a strategic plan for faculty recruitment — with a particular eye to the sought scientific profile and required seniority.

In parallel, the EEC recommends commencing work on a staff development plan for faculty members already in the Department.

The EEC recommends that the Department also present its scientific, innovation, and service activities to the general public and potential students, in the style of international research intensive universities.

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	Partially compliant
1.2 Connecting with society	Compliant
1.3 Development processes	Partially compliant

2. Quality Assurance

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

Sub-areas

1. **System and quality assurance strategy**
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.	1
2.1.2	Internal stakeholders develop and implement a policy for quality assurance through appropriate structures and processes, while involving external stakeholders.	1
2.1.3	The Department's policy for quality assurance supports guarding against intolerance of any kind or discrimination against students or staff.	3
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	3
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.	3

2.1.6	Students' evaluation and feedback	4
Justify the numerical scores provided for the quality indicators (criteria) by specifying (if any) the deficiencies. Click to enter text.		

2. Quality Assurance		
2.2 Quality assurance for the programmes of study		1 - 5
2.2.1	The responsibility for decision-making and monitoring the implementation of the programmes of study offered by the Department lies with the teaching staff.	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, which have been presented and discussed.	5
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	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.	4
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.	5

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	5
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.	5
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.	2
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.

The doctoral studies regulations are not publicly available (at least, not on the university website). AS a matter of fact, a lot of URLs on the EUC and Departmental website that should point to "doctoral programme in CS", in actuality point to the BSc in CS.

Findings

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

- The EEC notes that the University itself has QA Committees and regulation

- The EEC found the specific QA policies of the Department to be fragmented and often not formalised.

Strengths

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

- The Department is sufficiently small to operate in a collegiate manner with QA practices known to the members without being formally codified.
- The QA committee meets twice a year with external stakeholders such as the Cyprus Computer Science Society and local employers.
- A student representative provides input to the QA Committee.
- The provision of ramps in all the buildings support students and staff in wheelchair.

Areas of improvement and recommendations

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

- Quality Assurance (QA) is based on practices and processes which are codified as a set of rules and regulations which govern all aspects of the operations of the Department in a transparent manner, ranging from admissions, conduct of examinations, promotions, support for disability, leave of absence, award of degrees, and dispute resolution. The EEC recommends that in addition to the central university QA Committees and regulations, the Department should ensure that its ad-hoc policies be formalised into internal QA regulations, documented to conform with University ones as well as being customised to its unique requirements. For example, the Departmental regulations for examinations in Medicine will be different from those of Computer Science.
- In the interest of staff, students and administrators, these QA regulations for the Department should be documented and available publicly on the internet. This will be viewed positively as an asset that the visibility of rules and regulations encourages transparency and their fair application to the overall benefit of the Department.
- Smaller departments, such as this Department, tend to have administrative practices which are held in the memory of long-standing members which are disseminated in emails and shared in online repositories only visible to a few. Such systems neither scale well as Departments expand, nor is this a fair way of running Departments. The EEC suggests that these administrative practices be captured by formalised and written QA regulations, and prominently displayed on the Departmental website. The EEC recommends that these administrative practices so formalised cover the entire gamut of operations in the Department ranging from examinations to promotions to dispute resolution.

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

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

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.	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.	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.	5
3.10	The Department has appropriate procedures for dealing with students' complaints.	5

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.

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 Department has a fairly flat structure with the Head of Department taking day-to-day administrative decisions.
- The Head interacts with the Dean of the School of Sciences and Vice-Rector for annual budgetary allocation and strategic decisions such as recruitment of staff.
- The Head is supported for the day-to-day running of teaching by a Programme Co-ordinator for the Computer Science undergraduate degree, and another for both the MSc and doctoral programmes.
- There is no division between planning and policy making for Teaching and Research, and the responsibility for overall administration of the Department, as both functions rest with the Head.
- There are separate units in the University, such as the Library, Student Welfare, IT infrastructure, and Marketing whose services are available to all the students and members of staff in the Department.

Strengths

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

- The Department is run in a consensual manner in regular Departmental meetings for discussion of policy and administrative matters which is possible thanks to its small size.
- There is a close and regular interaction between the Head of Department and the Dean of the School of Science and the Vice-Rector of the university.
- Mental health of students and staff is taken seriously with free consultation available with specialist staff.
- Overseas students with visa issues are helped for dealing with the Migration and Immigration office.

Areas of improvement and recommendations

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

- The management of any university Department should be structured for efficient management of its activities in order to avoid a single point of failure (such as personal emergency, illness, etc.) as most decisions currently rest with the Head of Department. To this end, the EEC, suggests:
 - Supporting the Head of Department with two new posts for Director of Teaching and Director of Research for policy and planning to complement the day-to-day administrative functions of Programme Co-ordinators of the BSc, MSc and PhD programmes.
 - That the Director of Teaching would include responsibilities for policy decisions on new courses to be offered in the next academic year; acting on the feedback provided by students

in the previous year to improve the taught courses; planning student recruitment; interacting with the marketing Department; ensuring resources are available for the courses planned for the next academic year.

- The Director of Research with responsibilities for policy decisions on planning new research areas of strategic interest to the Department in which to invest time and resources; plan proposals that members of Department should be involved; aggregate members with cognate interests into groups for productive interactions; plan for new PhD studentships to increase the cohort of doctoral students.
- The EEC strongly encourages the Department to invest time and resources in developing of a 5-year strategic plan going forward, which charts out its ambition to becoming the leading teaching and research centre in the Eastern Mediterranean.

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.	2
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.

While there are University procedures for periodic reviews of programs (PER), that does not translate into the programs and courses being kept up-to-date. For evidence: the recommendations from the previous EEC (with which this EEC concurs) have yet to be reflected in the programs offered.

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.	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.

Several students mentioned that the delays of getting feedback to their assignments, midterms, and exams was greater than the promised 2 weeks. This maximum delay should be enforced strictly

Findings

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

- The Head of Department and 9 teaching staff responsible for delivering the courses for the BSc, MSc and PhD programmes were present during the EEC onsite visit. Two of the teaching staff members were also Programme Co-ordinators of the BSc in Computer Science degree, and the MSc in Computer Science and doctoral degrees, respectively.

- The EEC also met current and graduates of the three programmes.

Strengths

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

- The students were complimentary of the dedication, accessibility and supervision of all the Faculty member.
- The University is investing in two new teaching staff appointments starting in September 2025.
- Two students had transferred from the public university in Nicosia to the BSc in Computer Science degree EUC thanks to the flexibility and resources provided by the programme.
- The teaching staff have the opportunity to teach courses in their area of research/expertise.
- The assessment criteria and weighting of marks between the final examination, coursework/assignments, attendance were clearly advertised in advance.
- Some of the students worked either full-time or part-time and were able to use the computer and library resources after work and had access to their teaching staff over the weekends in case of questions before the deadline.
- Students had the opportunity to be placed in industry to gain experience and there were joint projects with industry for their final undergraduate year and MSc individual projects.
- Students had online access to the books recommended for the courses and journals in Computer Science and Artificial Intelligence.

Areas of improvement and recommendations

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

- The Faculty members were spending 12 contact hours per week on teaching, which, although the norm in private universities in Cyprus, is nevertheless excessive compared to European University standards. This does not include hours devoted to marking assignments and returning feedback; setting and marking the final examination; and, demonstrating in the Lab. These excessive hours are counterproductive in developing the research potential of their staff.
- The Faculty members would benefit from support for marking, and demonstrating in the laboratory in the form of graduate Teaching Assistants.
- Given the small size of the Teaching Staff, many of them are teaching a diverse set of courses.
- The MSc course should make the individual project compulsory (currently it is an elective and student can take two other courses instead). The project is a major piece of independent work undertaken by the student which prepares them well for their future job.
- The structure of the PhD is a strange hybrid by superimposing the American system of qualifying examination onto an European model. The Department should rationalise its structure.
- The Department has a commendable ambition going forward of 10 PhD students per year resulting in a steady state of 30 students. The source of funding for these students is unclear. One option is to create Teaching Assistantships to support the delivery of the 3 teaching programmes, and also freeing the staff to concentrate on their research.
- The Teaching Staff should enforce strictly the policy of returning marks and feedback on assignments within 2 weeks of their submission date.
- The syllabus of the courses taught in the BSc and MSc in Computer Science course look dated and would benefit from being freshened with modern material and new courses to reflect significant recent progress in the field.

- The Department should plan for increasing their student numbers both of home (albeit in a competitive market) and overseas students. The EUC has a number of advantages: it is located in the Eastern Mediterranean within 2 – 3 hours flying distance from major population centres in Africa, Europe and the Middle East; Cyprus is a stable, English-speaking country blessed with good weather which attracts tourists from around the world. The Department should market itself and its courses more effectively to attract overseas students to increase its student numbers and its revenue.

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

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

5. Teaching Staff (ESG 1.5)

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

1 or 2: Non-compliant

3: Partially compliant

4 or 5: Compliant

Quality indicators/criteria		
5. Teaching Staff		1 - 5
5.1	The number of teaching staff - full-time and exclusive work - and the subject area of the staff sufficiently support the programmes of study.	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.	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.	4
5.5	The ratio of special teaching staff to the total number of teaching staff is satisfactory.	1
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.	2
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.

Given the low number of staff, and the number of topics to be taught, several staff members teach courses outside their subject-area. This limits the ability to develop and perfect the courses on offer. The ratio of 15 tenured full-time staff and the 52 part-time non-tenure seems beyond the acceptable threshold.

There are a total of 52 part-time scientific collaborators and special scientists, from among which 3 are non-tenured adjunct CS staff, and 4 CS are visiting Faculty. It is unclear whether all 52 scientific collaborators and special scientists contribute to teaching, to research, or both.

Findings

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

- There are currently 15 tenured academic staff in the Department, none of whom are at full Professor rank.
- Two new appointments have been sought for September 2025, one with a Data Science, and one with a general CS profile. Both of these appointments were reported to be at Assistant Professor, or Lecturer, levels.
- There are a total of 52 part-time scientific collaborators and special scientists, from among which 3 are non-tenured adjunct CS staff, and 4 CS are visiting Faculty. It is unclear whether all 52 scientific collaborators and special scientists contribute to teaching, to research, or both.
- Sir Timothy John Berners-Lee is an Honorary Faculty member.
- The titular Department chairperson, currently on sick-leave, was an Associate Professor with Programme Coordinator duties.
- The authoritative and leadership representation of the Department, and its strategic input, planning and decision-making at Faculty and University levels is currently facilitated by an Acting Chairperson having an Engineering background at the Assistant Professor level. The Acting chairperson has prior experience as a former Chairperson at the CSE (Computer Science and Engineering).
- The Departmental Student-Staff Ratio (SSR) is functional.
- There is a wide range of course subjects to be taught and the range of tenured staff expertise is limited, given that this is a small Department.
- In terms of teaching duties, the CVs of tenured staff demonstrate evidence of appointed academic staff having appropriate skills.
- Publication and research contract income generation activities vary from staff-to-staff, and sustainable growth at a Departmental level is not consistent. This is also reflected in the lack of staff promotion and progression for the past 4-5 years.
- Overall, staff CVs are relevant and consistent to the programmes of study and functional for the current state of the Department's goals.
- There are student feedback mechanisms in place, which are used as part of self-assessment processes. There are also teaching and observation peer review procedures. Annual performance reviews are taking place providing the opportunities for staff to negotiate a plan for their development.
- Teaching staff is highly commended from their students. For example, students expressed that:
 - The teaching staff all are very dedicated
 - expressed that they were very well taken care of, by all staff
 - Demonstrated an impressive availability of academic staff also outside normal hours, to service students with special needs (part-time students, for example).

Strengths

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

- The Department's reputation benefits from having Sir Timothy John Berners-Lee as an Honorary Faculty member
- Staff are committed to teaching, and are dedicated and student-focused
- Despite the high number of course subjects and the low number of tenured staff, the Department remains functional
- Staff CVs are relevant and consistent in relation to teaching duties

Areas of improvement and recommendations

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

- The lack of CS staff at a Professorial level is a result of a lack of investment, a lack of succession planning or a lack of appropriate staff development, which the EEC recommends be remediated, for the following reasons:
 - The lack of an authoritative subject specific leader is limiting the strategic thinking, the input and planning, the ownership, accountability and responsibility of the decision-making in relation to the future direction(s) of the CS unit.
 - The appropriateness of subject representation and its voicing at Faculty and University's levels is not optimal.
 - There are two areas requiring leadership. One is related to the strategic planning and execution for sustainable growth as a teaching provider and the other one is related to the strategic planning and execution for sustainable growth and staff development as a research organisation for knowledge and income generation.
These two roles can be undertaken by one or two staff members having the appropriate skillset. Given there is a Department's target for increasing the number of PhD students and for bettering the quantity and quality of staff publication, income and knowledge generation track records, additional staff is required.
- To this end, the EEC recommends:
 - One or more appointments in CS at professorial level — either as an external appointment or as an internal promotion — to provide strategic leadership on teaching and research matters.
 - Development of a Departmental vision that is based on sustainable growth of both teaching and research — linked to higher targets in terms of research students, knowledge and income generation accomplishments, additional staffing will be required
 - identifying and producing additional staff development opportunities and motives to support internal staff promotion and progression

Please ✓ what is appropriate for the following assessment area:

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



Synergies of teaching and research	Partially Compliant
------------------------------------	---------------------

6. Research

(ESG 1.1, 1.3, 1.5, 1.6)

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

1 or 2: Non-compliant

3: Partially compliant

4 or 5: Compliant

Quality indicators/criteria		
6. Research		1 - 5
6.1	The Department has a research policy formulated in line with its mission.	2
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.	2
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.	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.	N/A
-----	---	-----

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

The Department does not seem to have any research policy, outside “do more research” and “have PhD students”.

Findings

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

The following lists a number of policies and practices which are being made available from the University in which the Department would benefit from using them but our findings suggest otherwise

- There is a university-wide standard research policy and an ethics procedure.
- The university is a member of the Galileo network and the Sunrise alliance.
- The university and the Department have several industry collaborations.
- Staff has access to training, seminars and guidelines to improve their practices.
- The university also participates as an active member of the European Universities Association – Council for Doctoral Education actions.
- The university is a member of the Open Science, an open research initiative.
- The Department has no tailored research policy. This is particularly important since the Department is engaging in multi-disciplinary research.
- The faculty members in the Department do not take full advantage of publishing in open access outlets.
- The number of faculty members from the Department having a sustainable scientific production is low,
- The quality of publications produced by the faculty members is not consistent, and merits improvement - as does the selection of venues where the scientific production from the Department are published.
- There are good facilities and equipment to cover the needs of research students and active research staff.

Strengths

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

- There is a good range of facilities and equipment to cover the needs of research of staff and students

Areas of improvement and recommendations

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

- The EEC recommends that additional motivators for publication be established, to foster an increase, and more qualitative, scientific output, published in better venues — and, consequently, to foster staff development and career development opportunities.
- The EEC also recommends development of Departmental research policies, to complement those from the University, capturing the specificities of the field of Computer Science.

- Finally, the EEC strongly recommends identifying that the Department fully takes advantage of the ability to publish in Open Access venues.

Please ✓ what is appropriate for the following assessment area:

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

7. Resources (ESG 1.6)

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

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

Quality indicators/criteria		
7. Resources		1 - 5
7.1	The Department has sufficient financial resources to support its functions, managed by the Institutional and Departmental bodies.	4
7.2	The Department follows sound and efficient management of the available financial resources in order to develop academically and research wise.	4
7.3	The Department's profits and donations are used for its development and for the benefit of the university community.	N/A
7.4	The Department's budget is appropriate for its mission and adequate for the implementation of strategic planning.	1
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.	2
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.

While there is a SWOT analysis, there is no strategic planning for a growth in relation to staffing, and support for research, etc. Thus, while the Departmental budget is sufficient for the current state of the Department, it is not clear that it will be for the implementation of strategic planning.

Findings

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

- The University facilitates a student-centred approach to teaching.
- Academic counselling and tutoring are provided to students by both the Department and the University.
- The Student Services help students with accommodation, arrival and career matters.
- The Career & Employability Office provides students and alumni relevant career information.

- The Department provides an appropriate number of good size classrooms and laboratories with reasonable specification computers that are updated every five years.
- There is specialist equipment including lego Mindstorm, and other programmable robots and drones. T
- The Blackboard virtual learning environment provides full access to learning material.
- Students are having access to their University and Azure desktop remotely.
- The Library provides access to both printed and electronic subscription based resources and is open during the weekend.
- Both the IT Services and the Library have dedicated budget for the Faculty in addition to the budget of the Department.
- Generally speaking, the University financial resources are excellent to support the low-level requirements of the Department.
- The Departmental budget is sufficient for the current state of the Department.
- There is a SWOT analysis however, there is no strategic planning for a growth in relation to staffing and support for research.
- The Department is not producing an annual monitoring report that captures the progress made from earlier years on a comparable manner.
- The Department has been awarded some strong Marie-Curie Fellowship projects, which support the purchase of specialist equipment from which students can benefit.
- Provisions for financially supporting staff expenses to acquire equipment and attend conferences are in line with expectations

Strengths

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

- Both library and IT equipment are sufficient for the current function

Areas of improvement and recommendations

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

- Produce an annual monitoring report alongside financial requirements to support the vision for a sustainable growth both in teaching and research
- Provide more investment to support the implementation of the growth vision

Please ✓ what is appropriate for the following assessment area:

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

D. Conclusions and final remarks

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

The EEC recognises that the most valuable asset of the department is its faculty members, who demonstrated to the EEC, and were acclaimed by students and stakeholders, for their dedication, availability, and commitment to the department and its programmes. The EEC appreciated that the Department works in a collaborative and collegial manner on both research and in offering the Bachelors, Masters, and Doctoral programmes.

The EEC recognises the quality of the educational programmes on offer, as evidenced by both the student satisfaction, and by the documented employability of graduates.

Notwithstanding, the EEC has found that the three programmes offered by the Department — BSc in Computer Science, MSc in Computer Science, and PhD in Computer Science — will benefit from maintaining relevance and currency to reflect technological and scientific developments. The EEC has provided detailed examples of improvements in the separate report assessing these programmes.

The EEC recognises that the faculty members are committing considerable time to delivering the courses in these programmes — at the detriment of their ability to also conduct ground-breaking research, publish high-impact papers, and thus advancing their research careers. Towards this end, the EEC strongly recommends that efforts be made to enable individual professional development of the faculty members by increasing their time available to do research and write grant proposals. This can, for example, be accomplished through reducing the “outside-classroom-time” that each faculty member spent for a class-hour on ancillary activities (marking, lab demonstrations, etc.) by employment of PhD students as Teaching Assistants.

The Department presently is small — with an ambition for growth. To enable that this growth is viable and harmonious, the EEC recommends a codification of the current practices of the faculty members — and, notably, the establishment of a “Departmental Handbook” with QA procedures, faculty member development policies, etc.

The faculty members of the Department have legitimate ambitions for growth. Towards this end, the EEC strongly recommends that EUC supports the department by giving it the means (TAs, PhD fellowships, senior faculty recruitment, and career advancements) that it needs.

Concordant with the Departmental ambition for growth, the EEC learned from the industrial stakeholders that they would be able to easily hire considerably more graduates than are currently produced per year. Thus the EEC strongly recommends EUC to amplify the assistance that the marketing department gives to the Department, so as to increase the intake of both Cypriot and international students.

Overall the EEC finds that the Department and the faculty members are of high quality. However the EEC also finds that the time-pressure on the faculty members, from research and — in particular — from teaching duties, has implied that they haven’t had the head-space to plan effectively the future strategies for the Department and the programmes. Consequently, the recommendations in this report should be enable them to judiciously act upon them as appropriate.

E. Signatures of the EEC

Name	Signature
Thomas Heide Clausen	
Damal K. Arvind	
Nik Bessis	
Yiannis Zapitis	
Paraskevas Kyriacou	

Date: 2025-05-18

