

Doc. 300.1.2

Date: 30 December 2025

Higher Education Institution's Response

- **Higher Education Institution:**
University of Nicosia

- **Town:** Nicosia

- **Programme of study**
Name (Duration, ECTS, Cycle)

In Greek:

Αλυσίδα Συστοιχιών και Ψηφιακό Νόμισμα (1.5 έτος/
90 ECTS, Μάστερ)

In English:

- Blockchain and Digital Currency (1.5 years / 90 ECTS,
Master of Science)

- **Language(s) of instruction:** English

- **Programme's status:** Currently Operating

- **Concentrations (if any):**

In Greek: Concentrations

In English: Concentrations



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].

A. Guidelines on content and structure of the report

- *The Higher Education Institution (HEI) based on the External Evaluation Committee's (EEC's) evaluation report (Doc.300.1.1 or 300.1.1/1 or 300.1.1/2 or 300.1.1/3 or 300.1.1/4) must justify whether actions have been taken in improving the quality of the programme of study in each assessment area. The answers' documentation should be brief and accurate and supported by the relevant documentation. Referral to annexes should be made only when necessary.*
- *In particular, under each assessment area and by using the 2nd column of each table, the HEI must respond on the following:*
 - *the areas of improvement and recommendations of the EEC*
 - *the conclusions and final remarks noted by the EEC*
- *The institution should respond to the EEC comments, in the designated area next each comment. The comments of the EEC should be copied from the EEC report **without any interference** in the content.*
- *In case of annexes, those should be attached and sent on separate document(s). Each document should be in *.pdf format and named as annex1, annex2, etc.*



We would like to thank the External Evaluation Committee (EEC) for its professional and thorough evaluation of the MSc in Blockchain and Digital Currency programme. We also express our appreciation for the collegial and constructive approach with which the Committee conducted the evaluation. During the process, the EEC met with the academic and administrative staff supporting the programme and held separate meetings with students and alumni, as well as relevant external stakeholders, enabling a comprehensive and well-informed review of the programme's design, delivery, and outcomes.

More specifically, the EEC notes, among other positive observations:

- The University largely meets the required standards of academic quality, institutional governance, and student support, in line with the evaluation framework and the European Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ESG).
- The University sets and maintains high standards in delivering top-level education and demonstrates a clear commitment to continuous improvement and the development of programmes aligned with evolving societal and student needs.
- The MSc in Blockchain and Digital Currency is found to be compliant with the Agency's standards.
- The Committee valued the openness, collaboration, and constructive dialogue demonstrated by the University's leadership, faculty, administrative staff, students, and external stakeholders throughout the evaluation process.

We appreciate the Committee's recommendations for improvement, which we view as an opportunity to further strengthen the programme. We address these recommendations in the corresponding sections of this response, focusing on actions that enhance quality while remaining fully aligned with the requirements governing accredited programmes.

1. Study programme and study programme's design and development (ESG 1.1, 1.2, 1.7, 1.8, 1.9)

Areas of improvement and recommendations by EEC	Actions Taken by the Institution	For Official Use ONLY
<p>While the curriculum offers a diverse and rich selection of courses that thoroughly cover the technical and financial dimensions of blockchain and digital currencies, the social, ethical, and organizational implications of these technologies remain largely implicit. Addressing these aspects with explicit course offerings in the curriculum would foster interdisciplinary thinking and better prepare graduates to navigate complex real-world environments where technical and financial systems intersect with social structures and governance frameworks.</p>	<p>Thank you for this constructive observation. We note that these dimensions are already addressed explicitly within the current curriculum through required modules such as Law and Regulation in Blockchain (BLOC-513) and Blockchain and Entrepreneurship Management (BLOC-515), and through finance/economics modules that examine institutional, governance, and societal implications of digital currencies. In addition, the programme-level learning outcomes already include applying digital-currency solutions “to address problems in business, finance, or the society at large,” and analysing regulatory environments and their implications, which anchors these themes at the programme design level. We will further strengthen visibility by making the social/ethical/organisational threads explicit in course descriptions and weekly study guides.</p>	<p>Choose level of compliance:</p>
<p>Several technology-oriented courses could benefit from a more open and adaptive course design that accommodates ongoing innovation. Given the rapid pace of technological advancements in blockchain and related fields, it is essential for course content to remain up to date. While institutional procedures for modifying accredited curricula are understandably time-consuming, incorporating modular or open-ended course frameworks can help ensure that students are exposed to</p>	<p>Thank you for this recommendation. We agree with the underlying objective and note that curricular agility is already supported through our existing course design and annual review cycle, to the degree allowed by DIPAE regulations. We particularly support agility via modules that are explicitly intended to evolve with the field (e.g., Emerging Topics) and through regular updates to reading lists, case studies, lab exercises, and assessment briefs across the technology-oriented courses.</p>	<p>Choose level of compliance:</p>

<p>the latest industry developments without necessitating external approval of continuous realignments of the courses. A proactive approach to curricular agility would enhance both the program’s relevance and its appeal.</p>	<p>Without requiring formal re-accreditation for routine updates, we will further strengthen this approach by adopting a more modular structure within affected courses: clearly delineated “core/evergreen” components (stable conceptual foundations and skills) alongside “frontier modules” that can be refreshed each delivery (e.g., new protocol designs, tooling stacks, security incidents, and major ecosystem shifts). In the same spirit, we are developing additional applied learning content on crypto markets (market structure, liquidity, trading workflows, and risk considerations) that can initially be embedded through updated applied activities and, if pursued as a standalone module, will follow the relevant approval and accreditation procedures.</p>	
<p>The course descriptions currently lack a clear breakdown of the expected student workload to justify the allocation of 10 ECTS credits. In line with best practices in higher education, it is important to provide a transparent and structured accounting of the learning activities associated with each course, such as contact hours, self-study, group work, assessments, and practical assignments. This information would not only support accreditation and quality assurance processes but also help instructors and students align their expectations and better manage time and learning outcomes. Clarifying this breakdown would strengthen the pedagogical coherence of the programme and ensure the workload is commensurate with the credits awarded.</p>	<p>Thank you for this point. We agree that a transparent, structured workload breakdown strengthens both quality assurance and student planning. In practice, workload expectations are already operationalised through the weekly structure of the study guides, scheduled learning activities, and assessment briefs. In line with the Cyprus quality assurance framework, where substantive changes to an accredited programme must follow the appropriate external procedures, we will address this recommendation through documentation and transparency enhancements within the existing approved programme structure.</p>	<p>Choose level of compliance:</p>

<p>The programme’s responsiveness to labor market demands could be improved through more systematic and structured stakeholder engagement. While the programme has strong ties to industry, there appears to be room for formalizing these relationships into a structured feedback mechanism. This might include an advisory board for the programme or structured consultations with alumni to continuously refine course content and programme focus. A more deliberate integration of external input would not only ensure alignment with market trends and professional standards but also enhance the programme’s employability outcomes and practical relevance.</p>	<p>This is a brilliant recommendation. We agree that a more systematic mechanism for capturing external input can strengthen labour-market alignment. The programme already benefits from strong industry-connected teaching staff, guest contributions, and ongoing informal feedback from employers and alumni; however, we recognise the value of formalising this into a structured, documented process. We will implement a sustainable approach that does not require curriculum redesign: (i) establish a programme advisory group with defined terms of reference and an annual meeting cadence focused on skills needs, emerging topics, and employability signals; and (ii) continue to run structured alumni consultations (e.g., short surveys and targeted focus groups) on graduate outcomes and curriculum relevance. We are also scoping the development of an additional practice-oriented course focused on hands-on understanding of crypto market structure and operations, to further strengthen employability and applied competence, subject to the University’s and DIPAE’s processes for introducing curriculum updates.</p>	<p>Choose level of compliance:</p>
<p>Retention and completion rates appear to be within acceptable norms, but there is clear potential for improvement through strategic interventions. Fine-tuning the admission criteria to ensure stronger alignment between student profiles and programme demands, particularly in relation to prior academic background and motivation, could help reduce early dropouts. In addition, enhancing student support mechanisms, including academic advising, mentoring, and early-warning</p>	<p>We note that our retention and completion outcomes are within acceptable norms, and we of course agree that further improvement is both possible and desirable. We also recognise the challenges of a global, interdisciplinary cohort, where prior preparation can vary across technical, quantitative, and legal/business domains. Within the boundaries of the accredited programme, we will prioritise targeted, operational interventions: first, we are refining admissions alignment by strengthening pre-</p>	<p>Choose level of compliance:</p>



<p>systems, would likely contribute to improved retention and timely completion. Proactive monitoring and continuous guidance throughout the study period can play a crucial role in ensuring students remain engaged, successful, and on track.</p>	<p>admission guidance on expected background and workload, and by introducing structured readiness checks at entry (covering key foundational areas) to inform personalised study plans and, where needed, recommended preparatory resources. Second, we are enhancing student support through more proactive academic advising and mentoring, supported by an early-warning approach that uses learning analytics and assessment signals to trigger timely outreach.</p>	
--	---	--

2. Student – centred learning, teaching and assessment (ESG 1.3)

Areas of improvement and recommendations by EEC	Actions Taken by the Institution	For Official Use ONLY
<p>Workload intensity and time constraints: The programme’s structure, which includes formative assessments, interactive learning activities, and multiple learning modalities, fosters deep engagement and sustained academic rigor. However, this intensity may inadvertently place considerable pressure on students, particularly on working professionals balancing employment and study commitments. The cumulative demands of frequent assignments, collaborative projects, and research-based tasks can challenge time management and lead to student fatigue if not carefully calibrated. Consideration could be given to introducing more flexible pacing options, differentiated deadlines, or alternative learning pathways to better support part-time and professionally active learners.</p>	<p>Thank you for this observation. We agree that balancing academic rigour with the realities of working-professional time constraints is essential. Our current design intentionally combines formative assessment, interactive activities, and applied tasks to support sustained engagement and learning. We note that we must adhere with DIPAE regulations on each of the assessment modalities. We will strengthen flexibility through delivery-level adjustments: clearer time-on-task guidance in weekly study plans, better calibration and coordination of assessment deadlines across modules, and the use of defined flexibility windows (e.g., differentiated submission windows, structured extensions, and rebalanced sequencing of tasks within the semester).</p>	<p>Choose level of compliance:</p>
<p>Variation in student preparedness due to interdisciplinary intake: The programme’s appeal to students from diverse academic and professional backgrounds, including finance, law, computer science, and business, enriches the learning environment and fosters interdisciplinary dialogue. However, this diversity also presents pedagogical challenges in maintaining a balanced teaching pace and ensuring equitable learning outcomes. Disparities in foundational knowledge can result in uneven student experiences, particularly in technical or domain-specific courses. To address this, the programme might consider offering</p>	<p>This has been a concern of us since the beginning. To address it, we have introduced deliberate scaffolding to ensure that students with different starting points can progress equitably, particularly in more technical or specialised modules. We mitigate this through the introductory course (BLOC511) as well as structured study guides, formative checkpoints, and instructor support.</p>	<p>Choose level of compliance:</p>



preparatory modules, bridging resources, or differentiated learning support that help align baseline competencies and ensure that all students are equally empowered to succeed across the curriculum.		
--	--	--

3. Teaching staff (ESG 1.5)

Areas of improvement and recommendations by EEC	Actions Taken by the Institution	For Official Use ONLY
<p>Dependence on senior academics: The programme currently relies heavily on a small core group of senior faculty members, whose expertise and leadership are clearly instrumental to its success. However, this concentration of institutional knowledge and teaching responsibilities within a limited number of individuals poses a structural vulnerability. Should one or more of these key professors retire, take leave, or transition out of the institution, the programme may face challenges in maintaining continuity, academic quality, and leadership capacity. The limited pool of junior academic staff highlights the need for succession planning through targeted recruitment, faculty mentoring, and strategic hiring to mitigate long-term risks.</p>	<p>This is an important point. We agree that sustaining continuity and academic quality requires reducing concentration risk around a small number of senior academics, particularly in a specialised and fast-evolving field. While the current core team provides strong leadership and coherence, we recognise the value of strengthening succession planning and expanding the pipeline of academics who can assume module leadership over time. At the Department level, we have addressed this primarily through staffing and governance measures. Specifically, we have designed a structured succession plan that formalises module leadership documentation (syllabus rationale, assessment design, marking guides, and updated teaching resources) to reduce single-person dependency. We have also increased co-teaching arrangements so junior staff and high-performing adjuncts can progressively take on greater responsibilities under senior supervision. Finally, we have prioritised targeted recruitment to expand the junior full-time academic base in key areas, supported by a mentoring plan.</p>	<p>Choose level of compliance:</p>
<p>Balance between full-time and adjunct staff: The inclusion of adjunct faculty, particularly those with current industry roles, adds valuable real-world perspective and enhances the practical relevance of the curriculum. However, a high dependency on part-time instructors may impact the long-</p>	<p>We agree that adjunct participation is valuable for practice-oriented relevance, but that programme cohesion, consistent student support, and institutional continuity depend on maintaining a strong core of full-time academics and clear coordination mechanisms. Our current model already assigns</p>	<p>Choose level of compliance:</p>

<p>term pedagogical stability of the program. Adjuncts typically have limited availability for student consultation, advising, or involvement in curricular development. Overreliance on external lecturers may also affect the consistency of student support and limit opportunities for integrated, cross-course coordination. Maintaining an appropriate balance between core academic staff and adjunct contributions is essential for ensuring institutional memory, programme cohesion, and the overall student experience.</p>	<p>academic oversight to the programme leadership and module leaders to ensure consistency across delivery. We have reinforced programme cohesion through ensuring every adjunct-taught module has a designated full-time academic lead responsible for alignment of learning outcomes, assessment standards, and student support expectations, as well as strengthening onboarding and teaching support for adjuncts (templates, rubrics, marking calibration, and clear response-time expectations for student queries). We have also introduced scheduled termly module-lead meetings to deconflict deadlines and maintain coherence across the student journey.</p>	
<p>Faculty workload and role strain: Faculty involved in the programme are actively engaged in research, funded projects, external collaborations, and teaching, which reflects their professional vitality and the programme's strong academic reputation. However, this multifaceted engagement may contribute to workload pressures that constrain the time available for course innovation, curriculum renewal, and student mentoring. High workloads can also affect responsiveness to emerging pedagogical trends and evolving student needs. To safeguard sustainability and promote innovation, the university may consider reviewing workload distribution, providing teaching relief where appropriate, and investing in additional academic support capacity.</p>	<p>Thank you for this point. We agree that maintaining the programme's quality and continued innovation requires protecting time for course renewal, pedagogical improvement, and student mentoring, particularly given the high level of research and external engagement of the faculty involved. UNIC already uses institutional processes for workload allocation and support, which our program follows closely.</p>	<p>Choose level of compliance:</p>
<p>Student feedback utilisation and transparency: The program collects student feedback systematically through semester-based course</p>	<p>We may have not made this totally clear in the application. Student evaluations are already systematically collected and</p>	<p>Choose level of compliance:</p>

<p>evaluations. While this represents a positive commitment to quality assurance, the extent to which such feedback informs faculty development, recognition, and promotion processes remains unclear. Greater transparency in how student evaluations are analysed, reported, and acted upon would strengthen the feedback loop and reinforce a culture of responsiveness and continuous improvement.</p>	<p>reviewed both at module and programme level, with follow-up actions discussed within the internal quality assurance cycle, as we discussed during the evaluation meeting. Within existing institutional processes, we have enhanced transparency by standardising how evaluation results are analysed and documented as part of our AACSB accreditation requirements for the UNIC Business School.</p>	
--	---	--

4. Student admission, progression, recognition and certification (ESG 1.4)

Areas of improvement and recommendations by EEC	Actions Taken by the Institution	For Official Use ONLY
<p>Broad disciplinary intake and student preparedness: While the programme’s openness to applicants from a wide range of academic and professional backgrounds promotes inclusivity and interdisciplinary learning, it also introduces significant variation in baseline competencies. Students entering from unrelated fields, such as humanities, arts, or non-technical disciplines, may lack foundational knowledge in areas such as finance, computer science, or blockchain principles. This disparity can affect the pace and depth of instruction, placing additional strain on teaching staff and potentially impacting the overall learning experience. To mitigate these challenges, the programme may need to develop targeted academic support, such as bridging courses, foundational modules, or differentiated instructional tracks tailored to students’ prior knowledge levels.</p>	<p>Thank you for this observation. We agree, and as noted under Section 2 regarding interdisciplinary intake, we will address baseline variation through targeted, optional bridging resources and readiness diagnostics within the existing accredited programme framework (without introducing differentiated tracks or substantive curriculum changes). We will reinforce this through clearer pre-admission guidance on expected background, structured onboarding, and proactive advising in the first weeks of study to ensure students who need additional support are identified early and guided to the appropriate preparatory materials.</p>	<p>Choose level of compliance:</p>
<p>Recognition of prior learning and administrative complexity: The programme’s commitment to recognising diverse forms of prior learning is commendable and aligns with international best practices in lifelong learning. However, implementing this recognition framework introduces a non-trivial administrative burden, particularly in cases involving complex or non-standard qualifications. Assessing equivalency, validating experiential learning, and ensuring consistency in credit allocation requires significant institutional resources, staff training, and clear procedural guidelines. Without robust support</p>	<p>We agree that recognising prior learning is important, but that it requires clear procedures, consistency, and adequate administrative support to avoid delays or uneven decisions. Our recognition of prior learning already follows institutional processes designed to ensure fairness and transparency. Due to the size and complexity of our operations, we have set up a dedicated team for admissions management only for this programme of study.</p>	<p>Choose level of compliance:</p>



<p>and infrastructure, there is a risk of delays, inconsistency, or lack of transparency in the recognition process, which could impact student satisfaction and operational efficiency.</p>		
--	--	--

5. Learning resources and student support (ESG 1.6)

Areas of improvement and recommendations by EEC	Actions Taken by the Institution	For Official Use ONLY
<p>Incorporating AI into the curriculum: While the programme is already technologically forward-looking in its focus on blockchain and digital currencies, there remains untapped potential in the deeper integration of AI-driven tools and frameworks within the pedagogy of the course design. Embedding AI not merely as a supplementary topic but as a core design element across relevant courses would provide students with a more holistic view of the evolving digital landscape. Such integration would enhance both the technical relevance and interdisciplinary strength of the programme.</p>	<p>We agree that AI is increasingly relevant to the broader digital asset ecosystem and to modern professional practice. We also note that our programme already engages with adjacent developments through current content on emerging technologies, automation, security, and digital finance; however, we recognise the opportunity to make the AI dimension more explicit and pedagogically integrated. Within the constraints of the accredited programme (and without introducing substantive curriculum redesign), we will strengthen AI integration primarily through learning activities, tools, and applied casework inside existing modules, especially BLOC511 (dedicated session on the integration of blockchain with AI) and BLOC514 (AI-aware assignments).</p>	<p>Choose level of compliance:</p>
<p>Learning management system and digital delivery infrastructure: The continued use of Blackboard as the primary learning management system is understandable, particularly in facilitating a smooth migration from legacy systems such as Module. Blackboard offers a stable and widely recognized platform for asynchronous learning, content delivery, and assessments. However, in light of emerging pedagogical trends and the increasing importance of seamless, user-friendly digital learning environments, a strategic transition to a next-generation learning management system such as Canvas may better support the</p>	<p>Thank you for this forward-looking recommendation, which is related to the e-learning programme. We note that the LMS is a university-wide decision, which we must adhere to. We must ensure platform choices are sustainable, institutionally supported, and compliant with our quality assurance obligations, including stability, security, data protection, and operational continuity. Our current Blackboard-based environment provides a stable and well-supported foundation, and it is central to our ongoing standardisation and quality assurance processes. Rather than initiating a programme-level system</p>	<p>Choose level of compliance:</p>

<p>program’s long-term development. Canvas offers more intuitive navigation, deeper integration with third-party tools (including AI-enhanced platforms), mobile responsiveness, and stronger support for collaborative and adaptive learning. Leapfrogging to Canvas could position the program to more effectively deliver interactive, scalable, and future-ready learning experiences, particularly for its globally distributed, digitally savvy student cohort.</p>	<p>shift, we will treat this as an institution-level strategic consideration. Specifically, we will feed the committee’s recommendation into the university’s digital learning roadmap and undertake a structured evaluation of next-generation LMS options (including Canvas) against criteria such as pedagogical capabilities, integrations, mobile experience, analytics, accessibility, data protection, and total cost of ownership.</p>	
---	--	--



6. Additional for doctoral programmes

Not applicable.



7. Eligibility (Joint programme)

Not applicable.

B. Conclusions and final remarks

Conclusions and final remarks by EEC	Actions Taken by the Institution	For Official Use ONLY
<p>The EEC affirms that the University of Nicosia largely meets the required standards of academic quality, institutional governance, and student support, as outlined in the evaluation framework and the European Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ESG).</p> <p>The EEC is satisfied that the University sets and maintains high standards in delivering top-level education to its students. It is regarded as one of the leading institutions in Cyprus and demonstrates a clear commitment to continuous improvement and the development of new programmes aligned with the evolving needs of society and students. Overall, the EEC finds that the MSc in Blockchain and Digital Currency program is compliant with the Agency's standards.</p> <p>The EEC wishes to extend its sincere appreciation to the leadership, faculty, administrative staff, students, and external stakeholders of the University for their openness, collaboration, and active engagement throughout the evaluation process. The EEC particularly values the constructive dialogue, transparent exchange of ideas, and forward-looking orientation that characterised all meetings and discussions. These interactions provided valuable insights into the institution's operational strengths, educational philosophy, and strategic ambitions.</p>	<p>We thank the EEC for confirming that the University of Nicosia and the MSc in Blockchain and Digital Currency are compliant with the Agency's standards and aligned with the ESG. We also appreciate the constructive dialogue and the recommendations offered for further enhancement.</p> <p>Building on the programme's established strengths, and within the boundaries of the approved accredited framework (with any substantive changes to be handled through the appropriate external procedures), we have translated the EEC's recommendations into a focused improvement plan centred on clearer signposting of the programme's social, ethical, organisational and governance dimensions within existing modules and study guides; increased curricular agility in technology-oriented courses via updated reading lists, labs, case studies, and assessment briefs; transparent ECTS-aligned workload breakdowns for each 10-ECTS module within official module descriptions and study guides; a more structured stakeholder feedback loop through a programme advisory group and systematic alumni consultations; strengthened student success mechanisms, including readiness guidance and diagnostics, optional bridging resources, proactive advising, and early-warning monitoring; calibrated pacing and assessment scheduling to support working professionals without compromising academic standards; staffing resilience through</p>	<p>Choose level of compliance:</p>

<p>At the same time, the EEC would like to offer the following recommendations for further improvement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • While the curriculum provides strong technical and financial coverage of blockchain and digital currencies, it would benefit from explicitly addressing their social, ethical, and organizational dimensions to foster further interdisciplinary thinking and real-world readiness. • To keep pace with rapid innovation in blockchain and related fields, several technology-focused courses would benefit from a more modular and adaptive design that allows timely updates without requiring full curricular reapproval. • To justify the 10 ECTS credit allocation, course descriptions should include a transparent breakdown of student workload—covering contact hours, self-study, group work, assessments, and practical assignments—in line with best practices in higher education. • The programme's heavy reliance on a small group of senior faculty poses a structural risk, underscoring the need for succession planning through targeted recruitment, mentoring, and the strategic hiring of junior faculty as permanent staff to ensure continuity and long-term resilience. 	<p>succession planning, co-teaching, and strengthened oversight and onboarding for adjunct delivery; clearer documentation and communication of how student feedback is analysed and acted upon; and deeper, responsible integration of AI-enabled tools into learning activities within existing modules, alongside continued enhancement of the learner experience on the institutionally supported LMS and structured evaluation of future platform options. Finally, as part of continuous improvement and responsiveness to industry needs, we are preparing a new applied, hands-on course concept focused on crypto markets, to be progressed in line with the University's governance and DIPAE requirements.</p>	
---	---	--

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • While adjunct faculty bring valuable industry perspectives, overreliance on part-time instructors can undermine program cohesion, student support, and long-term pedagogical stability, underscoring the need for a balanced mix of core academic and adjunct staff. • While the programme is already technologically forward-looking, integrating AI tools and frameworks more deeply into course design—as core pedagogical elements rather than supplementary topics—would enhance its technical relevance and interdisciplinary strength. • While the PhD program’s inclusive admissions policy broadens access, the lack of explicit academic thresholds—such as GPA or Master’s thesis grades—risks admitting underprepared candidates, highlighting the need to introduce minimum performance criteria alongside case-by-case flexibility to ensure academic rigor and transparency. • While the three-supervisor model ensures strong support, it may overburden faculty, and a two-supervisor structure with an advisory third could offer a more sustainable alternative. 		
--	--	--

<ul style="list-style-type: none">• While the three-supervisor model ensures strong support for PhD students, it may overburden faculty and risk delivering conflicting guidance, whereas a two-supervisor structure with an optional advisory third could offer a more sustainable and coherent alternative. <p>As for doctoral thesis assessment, while the current model of one internal and one external examiner provides basic oversight, a three-member committee—including two external experts with strong academic credentials—would significantly enhance the credibility, impartiality, and international recognition of the evaluation process.</p>		
--	--	--



C. Higher Education Institution academic representatives

<i>Name</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>Signature</i>
Prof. Angelika Kokkinaki	Dean, School of Business	
Prof. Soulla Louca	Head of Department of Digital Innovation	
George Giaglis	MSc Program Coordinator	

Date: 30 December 2025

