Doc. 300.1.1

Date: Date.

External Evaluation Report

(Conventional-face-to-face programme of study)

- **Higher Education Institution:**
  American College
- **Town:** Nicosia
- **School/Faculty (if applicable):** School/Faculty
- **Department/ Sector:** Science and Engineering
- **Programme of study- Name (Duration, ECTS, Cycle)**
  In Greek:
  Πληροφορική (2 έτη / 120 ECTS, Δίπλωμα)
  In English:
  Computer Science (2 years / 120 ECTS, Diploma)
- **Language(s) of instruction:** English/Greek
- **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. Introduction

This part includes basic information regarding the onsite visit.

The External Evaluation Committee (EEC) held a preliminary remote meeting on 5 June 2026 to discuss the programme evaluation process. On 12 June 2026, the EEC visited American College and met with faculty members, staff, students, graduates, and relevant industry stakeholders as part of its evaluation of the two-year, 120 ECTS Diploma Programme in Computer Science. The visit was arranged and facilitated by Natasa Kazakaiou, representing the Agency of Quality Assurance and Accreditation in Higher Education.

Prior to the visit, the EEC members were provided with relevant programme documentation and a video for review. During the visit, the EEC was presented with detailed information about the College and the Diploma Programme. The Committee also requested and received additional material, including statistical data, sample examinations, minutes from committee meetings, and institutional policies.

As part of the site visit, the EEC met with College leadership, academic staff, instructors, administrative personnel, current students, graduates of the programme, and relevant industry representatives. Based on its review of the accreditation materials and the findings from the site visit, the EEC concludes that the programme under evaluation is fully compliant with most standards and partially compliant with a number of standards.

This assessment report describes and justifies the above evaluation and provides recommendations and suggestions for the further improvement of the programme under evaluation.

B. External Evaluation Committee (EEC)

Name	*Position*	*University*
Michail Giannakos	Professor, Department of Computer Science	Norwegian University of Science and Technology, Norway
Steven Bradley	Professor, Department of Computer Science	Durham University, UK
Fabio Crestani	Professor, Faculty of Informatics	Università della Svizzera Italiana (USI), Switzerland
Miltiades Hadjioannou	Student	European University Cyprus, Cyprus
Name	Position	University
Name	Position	University

C. Guidelines on content and structure of the report

- *The external evaluation report follows the structure of assessment areas.*
- *At the beginning of each assessment area there is a box presenting:*
  (a) *sub-areas*
  (b) *standards which are relevant to the European Standards and Guidelines (ESG)*
  (c) *some questions that EEC may find useful.*
- *The questions aim at facilitating the understanding of each assessment area and at illustrating the range of topics covered by the standards.*
- *Under each assessment area, it is important to provide information regarding the compliance with the requirements of each sub-area. In particular, the following must be included:*

Findings

A short description of the situation in the Higher Education Institution (HEI), based on elements from the application for external evaluation and on findings from the onsite 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 to be dealt with, 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. It is pointed out that, in the case of standards that cannot be applied due to the status of the HEI and/or of the programme of study, N/A (= Not Applicable) should be noted.*
- *The EEC should state the conclusions and final remarks regarding the programme of study as a whole.*
- ***The report may also address other issues which the EEC finds relevant.***

1. Study programme and study programme's design and development

(ESG 1.1, 1.2, 1.7, 1.8, 1.9)

Sub-areas

1.1 Policy for quality assurance
1.2 Design, approval, on-going monitoring and review
1.3 Public information
1.4 Information management

1.1 Policy for quality assurance

Standards

- *Policy for quality assurance of the programme of study:*
  - *is a part of the strategic management of the program.*
  - *focuses on the achievement of special goals related to the quality assurance of the study program.*
  - *has a formal status and is publicly available*
  - *supports the organisation of the quality assurance system through appropriate structures, regulations and processes*
  - *supports teaching, administrative staff and students to take on their responsibilities in quality assurance*
  - *ensures academic integrity and freedom and is vigilant against academic fraud*
  - *guards against intolerance of any kind or discrimination against the students or staff*
  - *supports the involvement of external stakeholders*
    - *is developed with input from industry leaders and other stakeholders (i.e. industry leaders, professional bodies/associations, social partners, NGO's, governmental agencies) to align with professional standards.*
    - *integrates employer surveys to adapt to evolving workplace demands.*
    - *regularly utilizes alumni feedback for long-term effectiveness assessment.*
    - *is published and implemented by all stakeholders.*

1.2 Design, approval, on-going monitoring and review

Standards

- *The programme of study:*

- *is designed with overall programme objectives that are in line with the institutional strategy and have explicit intended learning outcomes*
- *Aligns course learning outcomes with student assessments using rubrics to ensure objectives are met.*
- *Connects each course's aims and objectives with the programme's overall aims and objectives through mapping, aligning with the institutional strategy.*
- *is designed by involving students and other stakeholders*
- *benefits from external expertise*
- *reflects the four purposes of higher education of the Council of Europe (preparation for sustainable employment, personal development, preparation for life as active citizens in democratic societies, the development and maintenance, through teaching, learning and research, of a broad, advanced knowledge base)*
- *is designed so that it enables smooth student progression*
- *is designed so that the exams' and assignments' content corresponds to the level of the programme and the number of ECTS*
- *defines the expected student workload in ECTS*
- *includes well-structured placement opportunities where appropriate*
- *is subject to a formal institutional approval process*
- *results in a qualification that is clearly specified and communicated, and refers to the correct level of the National Qualifications Framework for Higher Education and, consequently, to the Framework for Qualifications of the European Higher Education Area*
- *is regularly monitored in the light of the latest research in the given discipline, thus ensuring that the programme is up-to-date*
- *is periodically reviewed so that it takes into account the changing needs of society, the students' workload, progression and completion, the effectiveness of procedures for assessment of students, student expectations, needs and satisfaction in relation to the programme*
- *is reviewed and revised regularly involving students and other stakeholders*
    - collaborates with industry experts for curriculum development.
    - conducts joint reviews with external academic specialists to maintain academic rigor.
    - performs periodic assessments with external stakeholders to ensure continuous alignment with market needs.
    - establishes collaboration with international educational institutions or/& other relevant international bodies for a global perspective.
    - conducts regular feedback sessions with local community leaders for societal relevance.

1.3 Public information

Standards

- *Regarding the programme of study, clear, accurate, up-to date and readily accessible information is published about:*
  - *selection criteria*
  - *intended learning outcomes*
  - *qualification awarded*
  - *teaching, learning and assessment procedures*
  - *pass rates*
  - *learning opportunities available to the students*
  - *graduate employment information*

  In addition, the programmehas established mechanisms of transparency & communication to ensure that
  - Professional bodies validate programmedescriptions and outcomes.
  - Community leaders actively participate in ensuring that the program's public information is relevant and resonates with the local and societal context.
  - External auditors review public information for accuracy & consistency vis-à-vis the actual implementation of the program.
  - Industry-specific & societal information is regularly updated with expert inputs.
  - Alumni testimonials are included for a realistic portrayal of programmeoutcomes.

1.4 Information management

Standards

- *Information for the effective management of the programme of study is collected, monitored and analysed using specific indicators and data i.e:*
  - *key performance indicators*
  - *profile of the student population*
  - *student progression, success and drop-out rates*
  - *students' satisfaction with their programmes*
  - *learning resources and student support available*
  - *career paths of graduates*
  - *industry trend analysis.*
  - *feedback mechanisms from external partners/stakeholders*
  - *data exchanges with professional networks*
  - *employer insights concerning career readiness*

- *Students and staff are involved in providing and analysing information and planning follow-up activities.*

You may also consider the following questions:

- *What is the procedure for quality assurance of the programme and who is involved?*
- *Who is involved in the study programme's design and development (launching, changing, internal evaluation) and what is taken into account (strategies, the needs of society, etc.)?*
- *How/to what extent are students themselves involved in the development of the content of their studies?*
- *Please evaluate a) whether the study programme remains current and consistent with developments in society (labour market, digital technologies, etc.), and b) whether the content and objectives of the study programme are in accordance with each other?*
- *Do the content and the delivery of the programme correspond to the European Qualifications Framework (EQF)?*
- *How is coherence of the study programme ensured, i.e., logical sequence and coherence of courses? How are substantial overlaps between courses avoided? How is it ensured that the teaching staff is aware of the content and outputs of their colleagues' work within the same study programme?*
- *How does the study programme support development of the learners' general competencies (including digital literacy, foreign language skills, entrepreneurship, communication and teamwork skills)?*
- *What are the scope and objectives of the foundation courses in the study programme (where appropriate)? What are the pass rates?*
- *How long does it take a student on average to graduate? Is the graduation rate for the study programme analogous to other European programmes with similar content? What is the pass rate per course/semester?*
- ***How is it ensured that the actual student workload is in accordance with the workload expressed by ECTS?***
- *What are the opportunities for international students to participate in the study programme (courses/modules taught in a foreign language)?*
- *Is information related to the programme of study publicly available?*
- *How is the HEI evaluating the success of its graduates in the labor market? What is the feedback from graduates of the study programme on their employment and/or continuation of studies?*
- *Have the results of student feedback been analysed and taken into account, and how (e.g., when planning in-service training for the teaching staff)?*
- *What are the reasons for dropping out (voluntary withdrawal)? What has been done to reduce the number of such students?*

- *How and to what extent are external stakeholders involved in the quality assurance process of the program?*
- *How is external stakeholder feedback gathered, analyzed and implemented,?*
- *In what ways do external stakeholders assist in making programmeinformation publicly available?*
- *How do external stakeholders contribute to evaluating graduate success in the labor market and obtaining feedback on employment outcomes?*

Findings

A short description of the situation in the Higher Education Institution (HEI), based on elements from the application for external evaluation and on findings from the onsite visit.

The quality assurance process for the programme is governed by the college's quality assurance procedures, as described in the submission, which include monitoring and evaluation by individual faculty members and oversight by the Quality Assurance Committee, which is supposed to review programmes every two years. Also, in preparation for re-accreditation by CYQAA an "ad hoc" committee is commissioned by the Academic Committee to prepare and review documentation for submission. On request were provided with a copy of a review report for the programme, which appropriately examined statistics on admissions, progress, graduate outcomes and student satisfaction and provided an overall critical evaluation of the programme. While this review was not completed within two years as required by the policy, it does follow the correct form. We were also provided, on request, with copies of two stakeholder reports on the curriculum, its alignment with market needs and the industry employability. These were corroborated by our meeting with external stakeholders during the visit. In meetings with the faculty during the visit we were given examples of how they monitor and critically reflect on the courses that they teach. When we asked the students., none of them were able to comment on engagement with quality assurance processes, although they did give examples of how teaching staff had responded well to questions and suggestions. We asked for copies of Quality Assurance Committee minutes, to see if there was any engagement with students, but instead were provided with copies of minutes from the Academic Committee referring to the formation of the "ad hoc" committee for re-accreditation, which did show student attendance. We noted that one of the actions reported by the institution as part of the response to the previous re-accreditation report was "To ensure the students' involvement in the work of the Quality Assurance Committee a clause was added that at least one student must be present in the meetings of the Committee." Because the minutes were not available, we were not able to confirm that this action had been completed.

Details of the approved courses within the programme of study were provided, including learning outcomes, prerequisites, ECTS credits, assessment methods, workload and content were provided. The documentation was of a good standard and, along with the provided list of compulsory and elective courses, evidenced a well-designed curriculum with a clear structure of progression and some student choice. Placement opportunities are provided within the curriculum through the internship course. Some students did report completing such an internship, however there was little support provided by the college in identifying companies that might host placements. In meetings, both students and staff reported that the workload for courses was in line with expectations from the course descriptions and associated ECTS credits.

From a curriculum content perspective, the sequence Python I → Python II/OOP → Data Structures → Java → Mobile → Web/Django is coherent. However, some topics appear repeatedly, while other modern software-development practices are less visible, e.g., Git/GitHub, testing frameworks, APIs, containers, cloud deployment, collaborative workflows, documentation, and code review.

AI/data science is too light for the current landscape. AI appears mainly as an introductory topic in Fundamentals of IT, and statistics is included, which is positive. But there is no clear applied data science, machine learning, data analytics, or responsible AI component. For employability, even a short applied module on Python data analysis, notebooks, visualization, ML basics, and ethical AI would strengthen the diploma. Staff explained how they had begun to introduce generative AI to students within programming classes, which is good, but efforts should be made

to include this within the approved curriculum as it is likely to be central to professional practice of software developers in most industrial settings.

There may be too many non-CS/general education courses for a 2-year diploma. English, Greek, history, sociology, psychology, economics, and mathematics all have value. But for a short diploma, the balance matters. If the programme is meant to be highly employability-oriented, care should be taken to ensure enough time remains for hands-on computing depth, especially practical software development and systems skills. The course list includes many general education courses alongside the CS core. Overall the diploma has a good foundation and breadth, but it needs modernization and a more practice-oriented assessment strategy. The biggest concerns are dated technologies/resources, and limited contemporary AI/data/cloud/software-tooling content.

Appropriate information is provided publicly on the college website, including curriculum structure and content, admission requirements, staffing, and student testimonials.

Summaries provided within the review reports show that good data is collected on progression and graduation, student satisfaction, and graduate outcomes. In meetings with senior staff we were told that data on student gender are collected and reported to the relevant ministry, but that there was no internal reporting or consideration of gender balance. Given the poor representation of women within computing (not just in this programme), and actions relating to gender balance agreed by the institution after the previous re-accreditation, this is something that needs to be addressed - and monitoring gender balance is an essential first step.

Strengths

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

The curriculum is clearly described and well structured, giving students clear progression. Teaching staff do a very good job, are responsive to students and update their delivery and content in line with trends, in particular with some good efforts to include the use of generative AI. There is good data collection and reporting in general (see comments on gender below) and quality assurance procedures are in place, and generally followed

Areas of improvement and recommendations

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

Because of the fast-paced development of the field, particularly in the area of generative AI, the curriculum needs to be updated. In some cases this only needs to reflect practice that is already happening in the classroom, but this needs to be reflected upon and consideration given to where and how generative AI is discussed, either in a dedicated course and/or across multiple courses where appropriate. Other areas that should be considered for updating in the curriculum are data science, cloud computing, and software-tooling content

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

Sub-area		***Non-compliant/ Partially Compliant/Compliant***
1.1	Policy for quality assurance	Compliant
1.2	Design, approval, on-going monitoring and review	Partially Compliant
1.3	Public information	Compliant
1.4	Information management	Partially Compliant

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

Sub-areas

2.2 Process of teaching and learning and student-centred teaching methodology
2.3 Practical training
2.4 Student assessment

2.1 Process of teaching and learning and student-centred teaching methodology

Standards

- *The process of teaching and learning supports students' individual and social development.*
- *The process of teaching and learning is flexible, considers different modes of delivery, where appropriate, uses a variety of pedagogical methods and facilitates the achievement of planned learning outcomes.*
- *Students are encouraged to take an active role in creating the learning process.*
- *The implementation of student-centered learning and teaching encourages a sense of autonomy in the learner, while ensuring adequate guidance and support from the teacher.*
- *Teaching methods, tools and material used in teaching are modern, effective, support the use of modern educational technologies and are regularly updated.*
- *Mutual respect within the learner-teacher relationship is promoted.*
- *The implementation of student-centred learning and teaching respects and attends to the diversity of students and their needs, enabling flexible learning paths.*
- *Appropriate procedures for dealing with students' complaints regarding the process of teaching and learning are set.*
- *Detailed schedules in course materials are included, explicitly stating the expected hours for lectures, self-study, and group projects, ensuring transparency in time allocation.*
- *A system is integrated where each learning activity is assigned a weight proportional to its importance and time requirement, aiding in balanced curriculum design.*

2.2 Practical training

Standards

- *Practical and theoretical studies are interconnected.*
- *The organisation and the content of practical training, if applicable, support achievement of planned learning outcomes and meet the needs of the stakeholders.*

- *The expected hours for different components of practical training, such as lab work, fieldwork, and internships are clearly documented in the training manuals*
- *A weighting system is applied to various practical training elements, reflecting their significance in the overall learning outcomes and student workload.*

2.3 Student assessment

Standards

- *Assessment is consistent, fairly applied to all students and carried out in accordance with the stated procedures.*
- *Assessment is appropriate, transparent, objective and supports the development of the learner.*
- *The criteria for the method of assessment, as well as criteria for marking, are published in advance.*
- *Assessment allows students to demonstrate the extent to which the intended learning outcomes have been achieved. Students are given feedback, which, if necessary, is linked to advice on the learning process.*
- *Assessment, where possible, is carried out by more than one examiner.*
- *A formal procedure for student appeals is in place.*
- *Assessors are familiar with existing testing and examination methods and receive support in developing their own skills in this field.*
- *The regulations for assessment take into account mitigating circumstances.*
  - *The time allocation for each assessment task is explicitly stated in course outlines, ensuring students are aware of the expected workload.*
  - *A balanced assessment weighting strategy is implemented, considering the complexity and learning objectives of each task, to ensure fair evaluation of student performance.*

You may also consider the following questions:

- *How is it monitored that the teaching staff base their teaching and assessment methods on objectives and intended learning outcomes? Provide samples of examination papers (if available).*

- *How are students' different abilities, learning needs and learning opportunities taken into consideration when conducting educational activities?*
- *How is the development of students' general competencies (including digital skills) supported in educational activities?*
- *How is it ensured that innovative teaching methods, learning environments and learning aids that support learning are diverse and used in educational activities?*
- *Is the teaching staff using new technology in order to make the teaching process more effective?*
- *How is it ensured that theory and practice are interconnected in teaching and learning?*
- *How is practical training organised (finding practical training positions, guidelines for practical training, supervision, reporting, feedback, etc.)? What role does practical training have in achieving the objectives of the study programme? What is student feedback on the content and arrangement of practical training?*
- ***Are students actively involved in research? How is student involvement in research set up?***
- *How is supervision of student research papers (seminar papers, projects, theses, etc.) organised?*
- ***Do students' assessments correspond to the European Qualifications Framework (EQF)?***
- *How are the assessment methods chosen and to what extent do students get supportive feedback on their academic progress during their studies?*
- *How is the objectivity and relevance of student assessment ensured (assessment of the degree of achievement of the intended learning outcomes)?*

Findings

A short description of the situation in the Higher Education Institution (HEI), based on elements from the application for external evaluation and on findings from the onsite visit.

The programme is delivered entirely through face-to-face instruction, with no online teaching component. Teaching and assessment activities are designed to promote students' independent understanding of Computer Science concepts while fostering the analytical and problem-solving skills required for lifelong learning. The organization, content, and assessment methods of individual courses are generally aligned with the intended learning outcomes and meet the expected standards in terms of quality, academic rigor, and workload.

The panel particularly appreciated the assessment structure adopted across many courses, which combines mid-term examinations, assignments, and final examinations. This approach provides students with multiple opportunities to demonstrate their knowledge and progress throughout the semester while supporting continuous engagement with the course material. More broadly, the programme exhibits a strong integration of theoretical foundations and practical application, ensuring that students can connect conceptual knowledge with hands-on experience. Assessment criteria and grading procedures are clearly defined and communicated in advance, and the

relevant regulations appropriately take mitigating circumstances into account. They adhere to the European Qualifications Framework (EQF).

The panel observed that the programme shows awareness of different learning needs and delivery approaches. However, limited evidence was provided regarding the systematic use of a diverse range of pedagogical methods or the explicit implementation of student-centered learning practices. Further development in this area could contribute to increased student engagement and enhance the learning experience. Nevertheless, feedback obtained during the meeting with students was overwhelmingly positive. Students expressed a high degree of satisfaction with their educational experience and consistently highlighted the accessibility and commitment of the academic staff. Professors were described as approachable, responsive, and genuinely interested in supporting students both academically and personally. Students appreciated the willingness of faculty members to listen to their concerns, provide guidance, and accommodate individual needs when appropriate.

The relatively small class sizes were identified as a major strength of the program. Students valued the close interaction with professors and the opportunity to participate actively in class discussions. The learning environment benefits from a strong sense of community and facilitates meaningful engagement between students and academic staff. These aspects contribute significantly to student satisfaction and help create a supportive and effective learning atmosphere.

The panel also notes that a substantial proportion of the student population consists of international students. This international composition enriches the educational environment by bringing together diverse cultural, linguistic, and educational backgrounds, thereby enhancing classroom discussions and broadening students' perspectives.

Finally, assessment procedures are transparent and consistently applied. Students demonstrated a clear understanding of both the assessment and reassessment processes and generally regarded the system as fair. Assessment methods, criteria, and regulations are well documented and communicated in advance, contributing to transparency, consistency, and confidence in the evaluation process.

Strengths

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

The programme is characterized by a clear, coherent, and well-structured design. Its organization and progression are easy for students to understand, providing a transparent framework that supports the achievement of the intended learning outcomes. The curriculum appears well defined, with a logical sequence of courses and clearly articulated expectations.

The panel's discussion with students was particularly positive. Students expressed a high level of satisfaction with their overall learning experience and highlighted the benefits of studying in relatively small classes. They considered the limited class size to be one of the program's key strengths, as it fosters active participation, encourages interaction, and creates a supportive learning environment. Students reported that the small-class setting enables them to engage more effectively with course material and facilitates meaningful exchanges with both their peers and academic staff.

A recurring theme during the interviews was the accessibility and commitment of the teaching staff. Students consistently described professors as approachable, supportive, and willing to engage with them beyond formal teaching activities. They reported that academic staff are readily available to answer questions, provide guidance, and discuss academic matters, contributing to a positive and collaborative educational environment. This close interaction between students and faculty is particularly valued by the student body and appears to strengthen both academic engagement and student satisfaction.

Assessment procedures are perceived by students as fair, transparent, and consistently applied. Assessment criteria are clearly communicated, and students demonstrated a good understanding of both the evaluation process and the opportunities available for reassessment. The panel found evidence that students are well informed about assessment requirements and that the procedures in place support fairness and transparency throughout the evaluation process.

Areas of improvement and recommendations

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

The panel observed that the programme benefits from a highly international student population, which enriches the learning environment through a diversity of cultural, linguistic, and educational backgrounds. This diversity, however, also requires continued attention to ensuring that teaching, learning, and student support mechanisms adequately address the needs of an internationally mobile student body. In this context, the panel remains concerned about the low representation of female students. Although this challenge is common across many Computer Science programs, additional efforts should be made to improve gender balance and promote inclusivity. The panel also notes that a previous review recommended the establishment of an Equality, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI) Committee; however, limited evidence of its activities or impact was available during the current review.

The panel believes that the curriculum would benefit from a more explicit and systematic treatment of Artificial Intelligence, particularly in relation to large language models, generative AI, prompt engineering, and the ethical implications of their use. Students themselves highlighted the importance of these topics and their growing relevance in the labour market. While students indicated that they are learning these topics by themselves, we believe the university should take an active role in this. The panel therefore encourages the programme to integrate such competencies across appropriate courses in a coherent and consistent manner. Similarly, greater exposure to Linux-based operating systems would strengthen students' practical preparation for a wide range of professional roles.

While students expressed a high level of satisfaction with the program, some indicated that the balance between theoretical instruction and practical activities could be improved. The panel therefore encourages the introduction of additional hands-on learning opportunities where appropriate. Particular attention should also be paid to timetabling. Given that many students combine their studies with employment, scheduling classes predominantly in the late afternoon or evening could help reduce pressure and improve the overall learning experience.

Finally, although the small class sizes are greatly appreciated by students and contribute to the close interaction between students and academic staff, the panel encourages the institution to continue monitoring enrolment and student engagement levels and their implications for the long-term sustainability and dynamism of the program.

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

Sub-area		***Non-compliant/ Partially Compliant/Compliant***
2.1	Process of teaching and learning and student-centred teaching methodology	Compliant
2.2	Practical training	Partially Compliant
2.3	Student assessment	Compliant

3. Teaching staff *(ESG 1.5)*

Sub-areas

3.1 Teaching staff recruitment and development
3.2 Teaching staff number and status
3.3 Synergies of teaching and research

3.1 Teaching staff recruitment and development

Standards

- *Institutions ensure the competence of their teaching staff.*
- *Fair, transparent and clear processes for the recruitment and development of the teaching staff are set up.*
- *Teaching staff qualifications are adequate to achieve the objectives and planned learning outcomes of the study programme, and to ensure quality and sustainability of the teaching and learning.*
- *The teaching staff is regularly engaged in professional and teaching-skills training and development.*
- *Promotion of the teaching staff takes into account the quality of their teaching, their research activity, the development of their teaching skills and their mobility.*
- *Innovation in teaching methods and the use of new technologies is encouraged.*
- *Conditions of employment that recognise the importance of teaching are followed.*
- *Recognised visiting teaching staff participates in teaching the study programme.*

3.2 Teaching staff number and status

Standards

- *The number of the teaching staff is adequate to support the programme of study.*
- *The teaching staff status (rank, full/part time) is appropriate to offer a quality programme of study.*
- *Visiting staff number does not exceed the number of the permanent staff.*

3.3 Synergies of teaching and research

Standards

- *The teaching staff collaborate in the fields of teaching and research within the HEI and with partners outside (practitioners in their fields, employers, and staff members at other HEIs in Cyprus or abroad).*
- *Scholarly activity to strengthen the link between education and research is encouraged.*
- *The teaching staff publications are within the discipline.*
- *Teaching staff studies and publications are closely related to the programme's courses.*
- *The allocation of teaching hours compared to the time for research activity is appropriate.*

You may also consider the following questions:

- *How are the members of the teaching staff supported with regard to the development of their teaching skills? How is feedback given to members of the teaching staff regarding their teaching results and teaching skills?*
- *How is the teaching performance assessed? How does their teaching performance affect their remuneration, evaluation and/or selection?*
- *Is teaching connected with research?*
- *Does the HEI involve visiting teaching staff from other HEIs in Cyprus and abroad?*
- *What is the number, workload, qualifications and status of the teaching staff (rank, full/part timers)?*
- *Is student evaluation conducted on the teaching staff? If yes, have the results of student feedback been analysed and taken into account, and how (e.g., when planning in-service training for the teaching staff)?*

Findings

A short description of the situation in the Higher Education Institution (HEI), based on elements from the application for external evaluation and on findings from the onsite visit.

The College ensures that all teaching staff meet the minimum requirements with regard to their educational qualifications and that they have expertise in areas closely related to the subjects they teach. Procedures for promotion take into account both the quality of teaching and the research activity of staff members.

A considerable proportion of teaching is delivered by staff employed on part-time contracts. In total, six full-time and six part-time teaching staff contribute to the delivery of the program. The 12 teaching staff responsible for the various courses of the study programme are not assigned exclusively to this program. All teaching staff hold a relevant Master's degree, while some also hold a relevant PhD. According to the data provided, three of the six full-time teaching staff dedicate 50% of their time to this study program, while the remaining teaching staff dedicate a smaller proportion of their time.

Based on the information provided to the Committee, the number of teaching staff is adequate to support the programme of study. The academic rank and qualifications of the teaching staff are appropriate for the delivery of a quality program. Staff recruitment is carried out through appropriate procedures.

Students evaluate the educational work of the program, and instructors receive feedback through various mechanisms, including formal surveys as well as daily interaction and communication with students. While not all staff members are actively engaged in research, this is not a formal requirement for teaching staff in a two-year diploma program.

Strengths

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

The College has adopted good practices for the recruitment of new academic staff members with strong potential. It is particularly encouraging that some staff members are actively engaged in research. The College also maintains its own academic journal, the *Cyprus Journal of Sciences*, and has procedures in place for teaching-load relief to support research activity.

It is also commendable that the core Computer Science teaching staff are engaged in research and publish in reputable venues. The College appears willing to invest further in Computer Science-related study programs. Although the number of core teaching staff remains relatively limited, the existence of related study programmes is encouraging, as it helps create the critical mass of academic expertise needed to support future development in this area.

Areas of improvement and recommendations

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

The teaching staff are adequate to deliver the programme under evaluation. The professional development activities offered to teaching staff focus on teaching and learning skills and contribute to the further enhancement of their pedagogical competence.

With regard to the study programme under evaluation, the core Computer Science teaching staff are sufficiently qualified and capable of delivering the relevant courses. However, there appear to be no staff members dedicated exclusively to this program, nor staff whose workload is predominantly allocated to it (50% was the maximum allocation).

Although research time is formally provided, it was unclear how many staff members make use of this opportunity and to what extent they are involved in research proposals. While there was discussion about integrating research into teaching, the examples provided appeared to relate mainly to initiatives undertaken by teaching staff employed on a part-time basis, whose research activity is primarily conducted at another institution.

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

Sub-area		***Non-compliant/ Partially Compliant/Compliant***
3.1	Teaching staff recruitment and development	Compliant
3.2	Teaching staff number and status	Compliant
3.3	Synergies of teaching and research	Partly Compliant

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

Sub-areas

4.1 **Student admission, processes and criteria**
4.2 **Student progression**
4.3 **Student recognition**
4.4 **Student certification**

4.1 Student admission, processes and criteria

Standards

- *Pre-defined and published regulations regarding student admission are in place.*
- *Access policies, admission processes and criteria are implemented consistently and in a transparent manner.*

4.2 Student progression

Standards

- *Pre-defined and published regulations regarding student progression are in place.*
- *Processes and tools to collect, monitor and act on information on student progression, are in place.*

4.3 Student recognition

Standards

- *Pre-defined and published regulations regarding student recognition are in place.*
- *Fair recognition of higher education qualifications, periods of study and prior learning, including the recognition of non-formal and informal learning, are essential components for ensuring the students' progress in their studies, while promoting mobility.*
- *Appropriate recognition procedures are in place that rely on:*
    - *institutional practice for recognition being in line with the principles of the Lisbon Recognition Convention*

- *cooperation with other institutions, quality assurance agencies and the national ENIC/NARIC centre with a view to ensuring coherent recognition across the country*

4.4 Student certification

Standards

- *Pre-defined and published regulations regarding student certification are in place.*
- *Students receive certification explaining the qualification gained, including achieved learning outcomes and the context, level, content and status of the studies that were pursued and successfully completed.*

You may also consider the following questions:

- *Are the admission requirements for the study programme appropriate? How is the students' prior preparation/education assessed (including the level of international students, for example)?*
- *How is the procedure of recognition for prior learning and work experience ensured, including recognition of study results acquired at foreign higher education institutions?*
- *Is the certification of the HEI accompanied by a diploma supplement, which is in line with European and international standards?*

Findings

A short description of the situation in the Higher Education Institution (HEI), based on elements from the application for external evaluation and on findings from the onsite visit.

The admission requirements are clearly defined. Applicants are required to hold a Secondary (High) School Leaving Certificate or an equivalent qualification, as well as provide evidence of English language proficiency. Accepted evidence includes an average score of at least 5.0 in the IELTS examination, a score of at least 71 in the TOEFL Internet-Based Test (TOEFL iBT), or a grade of at least D in the IGCSE English Language examination.

Academic advisors and tutors are available to support students throughout their studies. The grading and degree classification systems are comparable to those used by other national and international higher education institutions and are aligned with the ECTS framework. The Panel observed that student progression from year to year is appropriately monitored and supported through examinations and other forms of assessment, enabling students to progress effectively in their studies.

There are predefined regulations governing the selection and intake of students. The number of students admitted to the programme is determined; however, there appears to be scope for the program's intake to grow further.

While the current number of students may allow teaching staff to focus more closely on individual student needs, it may also limit opportunities for collaborative and social learning among students.

The study programme plays a central role in ensuring students' academic progress. It clearly defines the number of courses, their workload, and their distribution across the four semesters. The diploma is accompanied by a Diploma Supplement, and both the diploma and the supplement follow European and international standards.

Strengths

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

The infrastructure is good, with sufficient computers available in the laboratories to meet the needs of all students. The College has several laboratories, reflecting the existence of multiple Computer Science-related study programmes. The facilities also support students with disabilities.

The low student-to-teacher ratio contributes to a good level of student support and trust, enables focused teaching, and allows space for dialogue and individual guidance. In previous years, approximately 73% of students completed the programme. Some graduates continued to further studies, while a significant proportion of the remaining graduates proceeded to employment in industry.

The relevant procedures are clearly described, supporting transparency and effective planning in relation to course management and resource allocation. Students provided extremely positive feedback on the study programme and the quality of teaching. However, the pathway from the programme to relevant career opportunities is not always clearly defined or easily identifiable.

Areas of improvement and recommendations

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

Based on student feedback gathered during the evaluation process, the Panel has obtained a clear picture of the students' level of satisfaction with the programme.

To attract larger numbers of students, it may also be useful to review the curriculum to ensure that course content remains highly relevant to current Computer Science labour market needs. The College could also more actively promote and advertise the positive value and strong potential of the programme to prospective students and relevant stakeholders. For example, Artificial Intelligence components could be integrated into existing courses or introduced as a dedicated course.

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

Sub-area	***Non-compliant/ Partially Compliant/Compliant***

4.1	Student admission, processes and criteria	Compliant
4.2	Student progression	Compliant
4.3	Student recognition	Compliant
4.4	Student certification	Compliant

5. Learning resources and student support *(ESG 1.6)*

Sub-areas

5.1 **Teaching and Learning resources**
5.2 **Physical resources**
5.3 **Human support resources**
5.4 **Student support**

5.1 Teaching and Learning resources

Standards

- *Adequate and readily accessible teaching and learning resources (teaching and learning environments, materials, aids and equipment) are provided to students and support the achievement of objectives in the study programme.*
- *Adequacy of resources is ensured for changing circumstances (change in student numbers, etc.).*
- *All resources are fit for purpose.*
- *Student-centred learning and flexible modes of learning and teaching, are taken into account when allocating, planning and providing the learning resources.*

5.2 Physical resources

Standards

- *Physical resources, i.e. premises, libraries, study facilities, IT infrastructure, are adequate to support the study programme.*
- *Adequacy of resources is ensured for changing circumstances (change in student numbers, etc.).*
- *All resources are fit for purpose and students are informed about the services available to them.*

5.3 Human support resources

Standards

- *Human support resources, i.e. tutors/mentors, counsellors, other advisers, qualified administrative staff, are adequate to support the study programme.*
- *Adequacy of resources is ensured for changing circumstances (change in student numbers, etc.).*
- *All resources are fit for purpose and students are informed about the services available to them.*

5.4 Student support

Standards

- *Student support is provided covering the needs of a diverse student population, such as mature, part-time, employed and international students and students with special needs.*
- *Students are informed about the services available to them.*
- *Student-centred learning and flexible modes of learning and teaching, are taken into account when allocating, planning and providing student support.*
- *Students' mobility within and across higher education systems is encouraged and supported.*
- *Students receive support in research-led teaching through engagement in research projects, mentorship from research-active faculty, and access to resources that enhance their research skills and critical engagement with current studies.*

You may also consider the following questions:

- *Evaluate the supply of teaching materials and equipment (including teaching labs, expendable materials, etc.), the condition of classrooms, adequacy of financial resources to conduct the study programme and achieve its objectives. What needs to be supplemented/ improved?*
- *What is the feedback from the teaching staff on the availability of teaching materials, classrooms, etc.?*
- *Are the resources in accordance with actual (changing) needs and contemporary requirements? How is the effectiveness of using resources ensured?*
- *What are the resource-related trends and future risks (risks arising from changing numbers of students, obsolescence of teaching equipment, etc.)? How are these trends taken into account and how are the risks mitigated?*
- *Evaluate student feedback on support services. Based on student feedback, which support services (including information flow, counselling) need further development?*

- *How is student learning within the standard period of study supported (student counselling, flexibility of the study programme, etc.)?*
- *How students' special needs are considered (different capabilities, different levels of academic preparation, special needs due to physical disabilities, etc.)?*
- *How is student mobility being supported?*

Findings

A short description of the situation in the Higher Education Institution (HEI), based on elements from the application for external evaluation and on findings from the onsite visit.

Students confirmed that they have access to the software required for their coursework. Teaching staff also indicated that the available equipment is sufficient to support the practical components of their courses, and that the laboratory facilities are well equipped for the practical needs of the programme.

The College premises seem to be accessible to students with disabilities, including wheelchair users (administrative staff confirmed that as well). The College supports a diverse student population, and instructors accommodate students with disabilities or learning differences in practice. Teaching staff reported that they are informed of relevant cases and provide tailored support where needed, including additional examination time and alternative formats for students with visual impairments. They also indicated that, when necessary, they clarify topics or questions during examinations.

Students reported that the small cohort size enables close and personal relationships with their lecturers. They communicate easily with teaching staff by email or mobile phone and feel supported when facing challenges during their studies. Flexibility is also shown towards students balancing their studies with other commitments; for example, teaching staff demonstrate understanding when employed students occasionally require additional time to submit assignments.

Student mobility is supported through the Erasmus+ programme. Outbound participation requires a minimum GPA above 3.5. Inbound mobility appears to be more active, although incoming students are mainly attracted to other programmes rather than to Computer Science. There were no outbound students from the programme. Students also reported that they do not typically experience IT-related problems requiring formal escalation.

Overall, students appear satisfied with the programme, the teaching staff, and their interactions with staff members. The relevant regulations and mechanisms supporting student progress and the monitoring of student satisfaction are in place. Overall, the teaching and learning resources, as well as the physical and human resources, are adequate to support the current needs of the College's study programme.

Strengths

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

Student welfare mechanisms for monitoring the adequacy of student support are in place. The Panel found that the review of laboratory resources is appropriately planned and supports the provision and maintenance of the available hardware.

The College premises are physically accessible to students with disabilities, including wheelchair users. The small cohort size supports close, accessible student–instructor relationships. Students communicate readily with their lecturers, often by email, and report feeling supported when facing difficulties during their studies.

Teaching staff actively accommodate students with disabilities or learning differences in practice. Such provisions include additional examination time and alternative examination and reading-material formats for students with special needs. Teaching staff are also willing to provide further clarification on a topic or a specific examination question when a student requires it during an examination.

The College and its instructors demonstrate flexibility towards students who balance their studies with other commitments, including employed students who may occasionally require additional time to submit assignments. The laboratory facilities are appropriately equipped to support the practical components of the programme. The College also operates an Erasmus+ programme, with active inbound mobility into the institution.

Areas of improvement and recommendations

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

Students are provided with a departmental email account; however, it appears that many students use their private email accounts instead. The College could consider encouraging more systematic use of institutional email accounts to support consistent communication and ensure that official information reaches students through appropriate channels.

Students reported that they do not typically experience IT issues requiring formal reporting, which is a positive indication. Nevertheless, a clearly documented support channel would be valuable for cases where issues do arise. The College could establish a dedicated IT support email channel, publish it prominently on the LMS landing page, and communicate it explicitly to students during the orientation programme at the start of each semester. The panel also believes that the visibility of mental health support services could be further strengthened, even if demand for such services has so far been limited.

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

Sub-area		***Non-compliant/ Partially Compliant/Compliant***
5.1	Teaching and Learning resources	Compliant
5.2	Physical resources	Compliant
5.3	Human support resources	Compliant
5.4	Student support	Compliant

6. Additional for doctoral programmes *(ALL ESG)*

Sub-areas

6.1 **Selection criteria and requirements**
6.2 **Proposal and dissertation**
6.3 **Supervision and committees**

6.1 Selection criteria and requirements

Standards

- *Specific criteria that the potential students need to meet for admission in the programme, as well as how the selection procedures are made, are defined.*
- *The following requirements of the doctoral degree programme are analysed and published:*
  - *the stages of completion*
  - *the minimum and maximum time of completing the programme*
  - *the examinations*
  - *the procedures for supporting and accepting the student's proposal*
  - *the criteria for obtaining the Ph.D. degree*

6.2 Proposal and dissertation

Standards

- *Specific and clear guidelines for the writing of the proposal and the dissertation are set regarding:*
  - *the chapters that are contained*
  - *the system used for the presentation of each chapter, sub-chapters and bibliography*
  - *the minimum word limit*
  - *the binding, the cover page and the prologue pages, including the pages supporting the authenticity, originality and importance of the dissertation, as well as the reference to the committee for the final evaluation*
- *There is a plagiarism check system. Information is provided on the detection of plagiarism and the consequences in case of such misconduct.*
- *The process of submitting the dissertation to the university library is set.*

6.3 Supervision and committees

Standards

- *The composition, the procedure and the criteria for the formation of the advisory committee (to whom the doctoral student submits the research proposal) are determined.*

- *The composition, the procedure and the criteria for the formation of the examining committee (to whom the doctoral student defends his/her dissertation), are determined.*
- *The duties of the supervisor-chairperson and the other members of the advisory committee towards the student are determined and include:*
  - *regular meetings*
  - *reports per semester and feedback from supervisors*
  - *support for writing research papers*
  - *participation in conferences*
- *The number of doctoral students that each chairperson supervises at the same time are determined.*

You may also consider the following questions:

- *How is the scientific quality of the PhD thesis ensured?*
- *Is there a link between the doctoral programmes of study and the society? What is the value of the obtained degree outside academia and in the labour market?*
- *Are the criteria reflected in dissertation samples?*

Findings

A short description of the situation in the Higher Education Institution (HEI), based on elements from the application for external evaluation and on findings from the onsite visit.

N/A

Strengths

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

N/A.

Areas of improvement and recommendations

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

N/A.

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

Sub-area		***Non-compliant/ Partially Compliant/Compliant***
6.1	Selection criteria and requirements	
6.2	Proposal and dissertation	Choose answer
6.3	Supervision and committees	Choose answer

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 programme of study under review may be achieved, with emphasis on the correspondence with the EQF.

The EEC reviewed and examined the materials provided by the College in relation to its Diploma Programme in Computer Science. The one-day site visit took place on 12 June 2026. During the visit, the EEC was presented with detailed information about the programme and met with College leadership, academic staff, instructors, administrative staff, external stakeholders, and students.

Based on its examination and evaluation of the accreditation materials and the findings from the site visit, the EEC concludes that most of the standards are met, while a small number are partially met.

The EEC identified the following key strengths:

- The programme has an adequate number of teaching staff to support the courses and teaching activities.
- Students are very satisfied with the programme and with the support they receive.
- Student dropout rates are relatively low, and progression to further education is high.
- The expertise of the core Computer Science staff is consistent with the programme of study.
- The programme offers a good range of courses, covering most of the topics expected in a Diploma Programme in Computer Science.
- The College provides good human support and resources to students.
- Some of the teaching staff involved in the programme are engaged in research and are supported in this activity by the College.

The EEC also identified a number of areas for improvement and makes the following recommendations:

- The EEC recommends minor updates to the curriculum to ensure that courses align more closely with recent developments in the field, particularly in relation to Artificial Intelligence.
- The EEC recommends that external stakeholders be further engaged in the programme, including through the development of a list of potential companies for internships and the maintenance of active links with this network.
- The EEC recommends that student representation be ensured at all meetings of the internal quality assurance committee.

E. Signatures of the EEC

Name	*Signature*
Michail Giannakos	
Steven Bradley	
Fabio Crestani	
Miltiades Hadjioannou	
Click to enter Name	
Click to enter Name	

Date: 13 June 2026