

Doc. 300.3.1

Date: 7 October 2025

External Evaluation Report (Departmental)

- **Higher Education Institution:**
University of Nicosia
- **Town:** Nicosia
 - **School/Faculty:** Humanities and Social Sciences
 - **Department:** Design and Multimedia
- **Department's Status:** Currently Operating
- **Programme(s) of study under evaluation:**
Name (Duration, ECTS, Cycle)

Programme 1

In Greek:

Γραφιστική και Ψηφιακός Σχεδιασμός (4 έτη / 240 ECTS, Πτυχίο)

In English:

Graphic and Digital Design (4 years, 240 ECTS, Bachelor)

Programme 2

In Greek:

Διαδραστικά Μέσα και Κινούμενο Σχέδιο (4 έτη / 240 ECTS, Πτυχίο)

In English:

Interactive Media and Animation (4 years, 240 ECTS, Bachelor)



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
Design and Multimedia	Graphic and Digital Design (4 years, 240 ECTS, Bachelor)
	Interactive Media and Animation (4 years, 240 ECTS, Bachelor)



A. Introduction

This part includes basic information regarding the onsite visit.

The panel followed a schedule of presentations and Q&A sessions as defined by the agency. The program is attached herewith. Presentations were given by the Vice Rector, the Dean of the School, the heads of the two programs and the individual faculty members. We met with students, external stakeholders and administrators and underwent a tour of the facilities. Presentation materials were provided for us. We found the structure of the day adequate to complete our report when combined with their submissions. The day combined the assessment of the Department and the individual programs. The two programs share identical bureaucratic and management structures, adhere to the same policies and are supported by the same staff. As such in the below document our responses are mostly identical with any key differences marked as such.



B. External Evaluation Committee (EEC)

Name	Position	University
Martin Egge Lundell	(Chair) Professor	Oslo Academy of the Arts, Norway
Tom Schofield	(Member) Reader	Newcastle University, UK
Rasmus Spanggaard Troelsen	(Member) Associate Professor	Royal Danish Academy
Anastasia Papakosta	(Student Member)	University of Cyprus
Name	Position	University
Name	Position	University



ΦΟΡΕΑΣ ΔΙΑΣΦΑΛΙΣΗΣ ΚΑΙ ΠΙΣΤΟΠΟΙΗΣΗΣ ΤΗΣ ΠΟΙΟΤΗΤΑΣ ΤΗΣ ΑΝΩΤΕΡΗΣ ΕΚΠΑΙΔΕΥΣΗΣ
CYPRUS AGENCY OF QUALITY ASSURANCE AND ACCREDITATION IN HIGHER EDUCATION



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.	4
1.1.4	The programmes of study offered by the Department reflect its academic profile and are aligned with the European and international practice.	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.	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.	5
Justify the numerical scores provided for the quality indicators (criteria) by specifying (if any) the deficiencies.		

1.13 The short medium and long term objectives were implied by the mission statement but were not codified as such.

1.16 Stakeholders clearly influenced the department's developmental strategy but we observed no formal mechanism for this process and this might be usefully addressed.

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).

[Click to enter text.](#)

1. Students had a clear sense of the identity of their program of study but benefited strongly from the opportunity to sit courses across the three programmes of the department. We identify this as core strength of the programmes.
2. The committee finds little to comment on here. We were shown the structure of the schools and departments which seem clear and sensible.

Provide suggestions for changes in case of incompatibility.

We identify no such incompatibility

1. Department's academic profile and orientation

1.2 Connecting with society

1 - 5

1.2.1	The Department has effective mechanisms to assess the needs and demands of society and takes them into account in its various activities.	5
1.2.2	The Department provides sufficient information to the public about its activities and offered programmes of study.	5
1.2.3	The Department ensures that its operation and activities have a positive impact on society.	5
1.2.4	The Department has an effective communication mechanism with its graduates.	5

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

[Click to enter text.](#)

We observe the healthy exchange of ideas between alumni and students for instance in the Alumni Success Stories events. There are many public facing events, newsletters, a publication and societal impact is underpinned by University Social Responsibility (USR) campaigns. This is an outward looking department. Another strength.

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.	5
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.	4

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

There is no mention of Equality Diversity and Inclusion principles in the very detailed and otherwise excellent hiring policy. This should be addressed. Funding processes are described but it is not clear how they are communicated and thus transparent.

Additionally, write:

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

This info is provided in the accompanying document "EEC Visit Department of Design Students"

Findings

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

The department conforms to our expectations of a well-run, internationally-oriented Department of Design and Multimedia. External stakeholders, students and faculty appear to agree on the Unique Selling Points (USPs) of the department and this results in a coherent set of programs with apparently satisfied graduates.

Strengths

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

Interdisciplinary orientation of the faculty. There are many diverse specialisms and a sense of common purpose.

Staff are research active.

Areas of improvement and recommendations

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

As above, we recommend that a suitable EDI framework is institute for the hiring processes

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

Sub-area	<i>Non-compliant / Partially Compliant / Compliant</i>
1.1 Mission and strategic planning	Compliant
1.2 Connecting with society	Compliant
1.3 Development processes	Compliant

2. Quality Assurance

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

Sub-areas

- 2.1 System and quality assurance strategy
- 2.2 Quality assurance for the programmes of study

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

- 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.	5
2.1.2	Internal stakeholders develop and implement a policy for quality assurance through appropriate structures and processes, while involving external stakeholders.	5
2.1.3	The Department's policy for quality assurance supports guarding against intolerance of any kind or discrimination against students or staff.	5
2.1.4	The quality assurance system adequately covers all the functions and sectors of the Department's activities:	
2.1.4.1	Teaching and learning	5
2.1.4.2	Research	5
2.1.4.3	The connection with society	5
2.1.4.4	Management and support services	5
2.1.5	The quality assurance system promotes a culture of quality.	5
2.1.6	Students' evaluation and feedback	5

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

[Click to enter text.](#)

There are extremely robust QA internal and external process.

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.	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.	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.	5
2.2.17	The provision of quality doctoral studies is ensured through doctoral studies regulations, which are publicly available.	N/A
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.	N/A
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.	5

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

The above scores are supported by the evidence submitted in the department's application, their presentations on the day, data provided by the department and our conversations with staff.

Findings

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

There are extremely robust QA process at work in the department. Without providing cross references into the application for each individual section it is difficult to add much to the detailed questions above.

Strengths

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

Robust internal and external QA. Indeed this may be considered one of the strengths of the department.

Internal policies and mechanisms to support the above.

Areas of improvement and recommendations

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

Following the scores above, we consider this section to be extremely thoroughly covered and have no recommendations.

However, the panel observes that these QA processes, and this external one in particular are extremely time-demanding on staff to the degree that they may detract from the core missions of teaching and research. We would like to represent this view which was also expressed by faculty in this report and recommend that a lighter touch process is considered.

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

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

3. Administration (ESG 1.1, 1.3, 1.6)

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

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

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

3.11 Internationalization of the Department and external collaborations.

Choose
mark

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

Click to enter text.

The above scores are supported by the evidence submitted in the department's application, their presentations on the day, data provided by the department and our conversations with staff.

Findings

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

Administrative procedures are clearly defined and specified in the submitted documents

Strengths

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

Admin staff are appropriately allocated to match the activities of the department.

See above, procedures are clear and fair.

Areas of improvement and recommendations

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

none

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.	3
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
<p>Justify the numerical scores provided for the quality indicators (criteria) by specifying (if any) the deficiencies.</p> <p>The above scores are supported by the evidence submitted in the department's application, their presentations on the day, data provided by the department and our conversations with staff. 4.1.3 is addressed in the section below</p>		
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.	5
4.2.7	The criteria and the method of assessment as well as the criteria for marking are published in advance.	5
4.2.8	The assessment allows students to demonstrate the extent to which the intended learning outcomes have been achieved.	5
<p>Justify the numerical scores provided for the quality indicators (criteria) by specifying (if any) the deficiencies.</p> <p>The above scores are supported by the evidence submitted in the department's application, their presentations on the day, data provided by the department and our conversations with staff.</p>		

Findings

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

4.1.3

“Students and other stakeholders, including employers, are actively involved on the programmes’ review and development. “

We were not introduced to formal mechanisms by which students are able to influence the ongoing development of the program and could not find evidence of this in the submitted documents. In all other institutions we have observed there are student representatives, staff-student committees or other structures that support student involvement in the direction of the programme.

Strengths

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

Assessment criteria are clearly communicated as are learning outcomes for courses and the programmes.

Good integration of theory and practice

Areas of improvement and recommendations

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

If nonsuch exists we recommend the inauguration of staff-student committee and the appointment of student representatives.

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

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

5. Teaching Staff (ESG 1.5)

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

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

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

We have interpreted the phrase “special teaching staff” to intend specialist technicians with teaching responsibilities. Otherwise, the above scores are supported by the evidence submitted in the department’s application, their presentations on the day, data provided by the department and our conversations with staff.

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

We were not presented with this data. The department's submission mentions only one visiting professor per year in 2024 and 2025. The panel finds this to be a very low number.

Findings

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

A staff student ratio of 1:16 (as is the case here) is a healthy balance for a program of this sort. Students have good access to faculty and are well supported by technicians
Faculty are well-qualified, passionate about what they do, use a variety of appropriate teaching methods and are research active with many award-winning outputs.

Strengths

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

As above. Healthy ratios and good opportunities to access relevant staff.
Students noted that faculty are approachable and helpful.

Areas of improvement and recommendations

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

none

Please ✓ what is appropriate for the following assessment area:

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

6. Research

(ESG 1.1, 1.3, 1.5, 1.6)

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

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

Quality indicators/criteria		
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.	5
6.4	The Department has the appropriate mechanisms for the development of students' research skills.	5
6.5	The results of the teaching staff research activity are published to a satisfactory extent in international journals which work with critics, international conferences, conference proceedings, publications, etc. The Department also uses an open access policy for publications, which is consistent with the corresponding national and European policy.	5
6.6	The Department ensures that research results are integrated into teaching and, to the extent applicable, promotes and implements a policy of transferring know-how to society and the production sector.	5
6.7	The Department provides mechanisms which ensure compliance with international rules of research ethics, both in relation to research activity and the rights of researchers.	5
6.8	The external, non-governmental, funding of research activities of teaching staff is similar to other Departments in Cyprus and abroad.	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.

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.

Research is well-organised and in some ways well supported by the institution notwithstanding the below areas of improvement.

Strengths

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

Research is both international in scope but more importantly often responds to Cypriot contexts adding to the unique research offer of the department
 Faculty's own research influences the teaching delivered.

Areas of improvement and recommendations

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

As is unfortunately common, staff research in particular is negatively impacted by administrative tasks. Although the university policy specifies research leave for "members who engage in research, as defined in the University's Policy and Collective Agreement" this is not supported adequately on the ground. Ultimately this is bad for staff and bad for students and we recommend that this time is more robustly protected.

Please ✓ what is appropriate for the following assessment area:

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

7. Resources (ESG 1.6)

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

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

Quality indicators/criteria		
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.	3
7.4	The Department's budget is appropriate for its mission and adequate for the implementation of strategic planning.	4
7.5	The Department carries out an assessment of the risks and sustainability of the programmes of study and adequately provides feedback on their operation.	5
7.6	The Department's external audit and the transparent management of its finances are ensured.	5
7.7	The fitness-for-purpose of support facilities and services is periodically reviewed.	N/A

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

This section was difficult to assess with the information provided and it is difficult to suggest what data would be necessary to do so. We have followed the scoring provided by the department following their comments in section 7 of the applications

Findings

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

In our meeting with students, we noted that they were satisfied with their facilities indeed, had many positive comments regarding their access to equipment and infrastructure. This speaks at least partially to the competent management of available financial resources.

Strengths

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

Investment in facilities for these programs is having an obvious beneficial impact on student experience.

Areas of improvement and recommendations

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

We note with concern that the department feels that there is “room for improvement especially with reference to the work load, remuneration”. Adequate remuneration is essential for attracting and retaining high-quality staff in any organization and particularly so in academia where the international job market is so competitive. Investment in facilities should exist in a balance with investment in research and that means supporting and thus retaining faculty.

Please ✓ what is appropriate for the following assessment area:

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

D. Conclusions and final remarks

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

The committee agrees that the Department complies under the headings above. We recognize and commend the many areas of good practice already identified in the above. We hope that our comments will prove useful in the ongoing development of the department.

We have some minor comments regarding the process of the site visit:

1. We were not afforded the opportunity to observe a lesson (as specified in the schedule for the day) and this seems like a reasonably significant omission
2. We were grateful for the opportunity to tour the facilities but this was a little ad hoc and would have benefit from a more formal approach. We would have appreciated the opportunity to hear more from teaching staff rather than leadership because this would have given us more insight into the use and value of these spaces.



E. Signatures of the EEC

<i>Name</i>	<i>Signature</i>
(Chair) Professor Martin Egge Lundell (Vice Rector) Oslo Academy of the Arts, Norway	
(Member) Reader Tom Schofield, Newcastle University, UK	
(Member) Associate Professor Rasmus Spanggaard Troelsen, Royal Danish Academy	
(Student Member) Ms. Anastasia Papakosta, University of Cyprus	
FullName	
FullName	

Date: 7 October 2025

