

Course descriptions — EUT_150 Challenge Studio and EUT_107 Venture Block

Cyprus University of Technology • Prepared 10 September 2026 for internal registration and for sending institutions (Learning Agreement component mapping). Written in the course-description table used in CUT's CYQAA (ΔΙΠΑΕ) programme files (Doc. 200.1), following the CUT Quality Assurance Manual for Teaching and Learning and the EUT+ Pedagogical Framework (Zenodo, DOI 10.5281/zenodo.17228345).

Format note: the field set and order reproduce the course-description table of CUT's previous accreditation file (sample: ABF 200). The ΔΙΠΑΕ Doc. 200.1 template and the Doc. 200.1.4 course-alignment template could not be downloaded from dipae.ac.cy from this working environment; the alignment table that follows each description is built in the spirit of Doc. 200.1.4 (learning outcome ↔ teaching method ↔ assessment) and should be transferred into the official file when it is opened.

EUT_150 — Challenge Studio

Course Title	Challenge Studio (Interdisciplinary Challenge Semester; 2027 edition: Living Heritage Studio)				
Course Code	EUT_150				
Course Type	Mixed — studio-based project work, fieldwork and laboratory work (no lectures)				
Level	Undergraduate (3rd and 4th year, EQF 6) and Postgraduate (Master's, EQF 7)				
Year / Semester	3rd or 4th year of Bachelor's, or Master's — Spring semester (18 January – 26 May 2027)				
Teacher's Name	Dr Athos Agapiou, Assistant Professor, Department of Civil Engineering and Geomatics (course coordinator and studio lead); course owners from the contributing departments and studio mentors (to be listed on registration)				
ECTS	15	Studio sessions / week	2 × 4 hr protected studio blocks	Field / lab work	Field school weeks 3–5 (full days); studio laboratories on demand
Course Purpose and Objectives	The Challenge Studio is the core of the Interdisciplinary Challenge Semester. Its purpose is to give students a full semester of authentic, team-based work on one real brief, written with the people who use and care for a living heritage site — in 2027, the Omeriye complex in the walled city of Nicosia, in collaboration with the Technical Committee on Cultural Heritage. Students from engineering, design, media, humanities and business form interdisciplinary teams that document the site, build its digital assets and develop one workable proposal for its next hundred years. The course operationalises the EUT+ Pedagogical Framework: Studio-Based Learning (Learning Path #4) is its spine; Academia–Industry Collaboration (Learning Path #1) shapes partner mentoring and handover; Interdisciplinary Collaboration (Learning Path #2) governs team formation and the embedded mobility. Its objectives are (a) to develop the transversal competences the framework names — creative problem-solving, iterative design, project management, critical evaluation and professional communication — through work that has consequences for a real place; (b) to teach students to combine methods from at least three disciplines into one coherent response; and (c) to produce datasets, assets and proposals that the site's stakeholders can adopt. The course contributes to SDG 11.4 (safeguarding cultural				

	and natural heritage).		
Learning Outcomes	Upon the successful completion of the course students are expected to be able to: • Plan and execute the documentation of a heritage asset with discipline-appropriate methods to a professional standard, within the agreed data, ethics and safety protocol. • Combine evidence and methods from at least three disciplines into one coherent response to an open-ended brief. • Design and improve a solution through successive prototypes, using feedback from mentors, peers and stakeholders. • Evaluate their own and others' work against published criteria and justify design decisions. • Organise and manage a team project within time, resource and site constraints while exercising a defined professional role. • Defend a proposal before a jury of academics, practitioners and the people who use and care for the site, and communicate it to a public audience. • Analyse and document their own process in a journal and portfolio, mapping artefacts to learning outcomes. • Prepare and deposit datasets and digital assets as documented, reusable resources under the agreed licences.		
Prerequisites	Completion of at least four semesters of a relevant Bachelor's programme, or enrolment in a Master's programme; English at CEFR B2 or higher. No disciplinary prerequisite: the brief is written so that every contributing discipline finds authentic work in it.	Required	Compulsory within the Interdisciplinary Challenge Semester; elective for CUT degree programmes under their Package Agreements
Course Content	Week 1 — On-site briefing at the monument with the partners; formation of interdisciplinary teams; team charter and professional roles; the brief as a curriculum document; studio rules, data and safety protocol. Week 2 — Strategic gate: each team presents its reading of the brief and intended direction; research plan; knowledge burst on site history and conservation ethics. Week 3 — Field school I: geodetic control and capture planning; condition survey walk; daily debriefs. Week 4 — Field school II: photogrammetric and remote-sensing capture; interviews and observation with site users; knowledge burst on data standards. Week 5 — Field school III: data processing, first models and maps; dataset package v0 deposited; retrospective. Week 6 — Data infrastructure and first concepts; cross-team pin-up; knowledge burst on interpretation and audiences; fortnightly practitioner mentoring begins. Week 7 — Midterm jury (functional gate): what the solution does, evidenced; structured critique; peer assessment 1; roles rotate; scope reassessed. Week 8 — Development sprint; study mission to an EUT+ partner laboratory; remote mentor session; process-journal check. Week 9 — Development sprint; study mission to an industry environment; follow-up memo per team; fabrication and media production begin. Week 10 — Valorisation sprint I (with EUT_107): stakeholder validation of the solution; knowledge burst on access and inclusive design. Week 11 — Valorisation sprint II: technical layer consolidated; exhibition and handover planning; monthly cross-team review.		

	Week 12 — Technical gate rehearsal: complete solution walk-through with mentors; dataset package v1; written feedback within the week. Week 13 — Finalisation; peer assessment 2; portfolio and process journal submitted; rehearsal of the public defence. Examination period (6–26 May) — Final public jury, exhibition and handover to the site's stakeholders; individual viva on the portfolio.
Teaching Methodology	• Studio-based project work in interdisciplinary teams (two protected half-day blocks per week) • Fieldwork and field school (on-site documentation campaign, weeks 3–5) • Critiques: weekly pin-ups, monthly cross-team reviews, midterm and final juries • Knowledge bursts: 60–90 minute masterclasses by faculty and invited specialists, on demand, recorded • Mentoring: weekly academic mentor, fortnightly practitioner mentor, monthly EUt+ partner mentor • Study missions to an EUt+ partner laboratory and an industry environment • Learning through research; problem- and challenge-based learning; reflective process journal
Bibliography	1. The Challenge Brief v1.0 (co-signed edition document, October 2026) — primary text. 2. Cyprus University of Technology – EUt+ Coordination Center (2025). The EUt+ Pedagogical Framework, Version 2. Zenodo. DOI 10.5281/zenodo.17228345. 3. Butterworth, C. et al. (2013). A Handbook for Live Projects. Sheffield School of Architecture, University of Sheffield. 4. Sara, R. et al. (2020). Live Projects: A Guide to Good Practice. University of the West of England. 5. ICOMOS (2008). Charter for the Interpretation and Presentation of Cultural Heritage Sites. 6. Denard, H. (ed.) (2009). The London Charter for the Computer-based Visualisation of Cultural Heritage, v2.1. 7. Historic England (2015). Metric Survey Specifications for Cultural Heritage, 3rd ed. 8. Site-specific readings supplied by the partner (Technical Committee on Cultural Heritage) — see brief, Section 4.
Assessment	20 points — Midterm jury (week 7): team presentation and functional-gate artefacts, scored against the published rubric; written feedback within one week. Team mark, moderated by calibrated peer assessment. 40 points — Final public jury (examination period): the solution, dataset package, exhibition and handover memo, defended before a jury of academics, practitioners, an EUt+ mentor and a community representative. Team mark, moderated by peer assessment. 40 points — Individual portfolio and process journal with a 15-minute viva (submission week 13; viva in the examination period). Individual mark. Total: 100 points. Grades on the 0–10 scale, pass mark 5. An individual grade is never simply the team mark: the two team components are multiplied by the student's calibrated peer-assessment factor (0.8–1.2, moderated by the academic mentor). Every assessment point has at least two examiners. Criteria and rubrics are published in the brief before week 1. Use of AI tools follows the CUT Policy for AI use: permitted for planning, transcription, translation and language checking, prohibited as submitted work, and declared with every submission.

Language	English
----------	---------

Alignment table — EUT_150 (learning outcome ↔ teaching method ↔ assessment ↔ RTU BM1159 outcome)

The last column maps each outcome to the numbered learning outcomes of RTU's BM1159 "TEDS Thematic Challenge" (15 ECTS), the sister course in the EUT+ TEDS initiative, so that the two courses are mutually recognisable. BM1159 outcomes: 1 frame the challenge; 2 develop and justify concepts; 3 apply methods to analyse, design, model, test; 4 collaborate in an interdisciplinary international team; 5 evaluate the solution against the brief, feasibility, risk, sustainability, society; 6 communicate in written, visual and oral form; 7 reflect on professional responsibility (ethics, inclusiveness, safety, environment).

#	Learning outcome (short)	Bloom level	Teaching methods	Assessment	BM1159
1	Plan and execute documentation of a heritage asset to professional standard within the protocol	Applying · Creating	Field school; knowledge bursts (capture, data standards); mentoring	Midterm jury; final jury (dataset package)	1, 3
2	Combine evidence and methods from ≥3 disciplines into one response	Creating	Interdisciplinary teams; studio work; cross-team reviews	Midterm jury; final jury	2, 3
3	Design and improve a solution through successive prototypes using feedback	Creating · Evaluating	Studio iteration; pin-ups; maturity gates; missions	Midterm jury; final jury; portfolio	2, 3
4	Evaluate own and others' work against published criteria; justify decisions	Evaluating	Critiques; peer assessment; rubric-based feedback	Portfolio and viva	5
5	Organise and manage a team project within constraints in a defined role	Applying	Team charter; rotating roles; mentor hours; debriefs	Midterm jury; portfolio (peer factor)	4
6	Defend a proposal before a stakeholder jury and communicate it publicly	Evaluating	Jury rehearsals; exhibition; handover memo	Final jury	6
7	Analyse and document own process; map artefacts to outcomes	Analysing · Evaluating	Weekly journal prompts; mentor feedback in the journal	Portfolio and viva	7
8	Prepare and deposit datasets and assets as reusable, licensed resources	Applying	Data protocol; repository practice; open-science burst	Final jury (dataset package)	3, 7

Workload: 15 ECTS × 25–30 hours = 375–450 hours, of which approximately 160 hours are contact time (studio blocks, field school, juries, bursts, mentoring) and the remainder independent and team work — the same proportion as BM1159 (160 contact / 230 independent).

EUT_107 — Venture Block

Course Title	Venture Block: Valorisation and Heritage Entrepreneurship (Interdisciplinary Challenge Semester; 2027 edition: Living Heritage Studio)				
Course Code	EUT_107				
Course Type	Mixed — workshops, sprint and team project (co-delivered with EUT_150)				
Level	Undergraduate (3rd and 4th year, EQF 6) and Postgraduate (Master's, EQF 7)				
Year / Semester	3rd or 4th year of Bachelor's, or Master's — Spring semester (18 January – 26 May 2027); intensive weeks 10–12				
Teacher's Name	Dr Athos Agapiou (course coordinator); instructor from the EUT+ Entrepreneurship School (WP6) and mentors from heritage, tourism and finance practice (to be listed on registration)				
ECTS	5	Studio sessions / week	1 × 2 hr workshop in weeks 2, 6, 8, 9, 13	Field / lab work	Valorisation sprint, weeks 10–12 (full days, with BIP participants)
Course Purpose and Objectives	A living monument survives only if someone can pay for its second century. The Venture Block asks students to answer that question for the site their studio team is working on. The course introduces how heritage creates value for the people who use it, for its custodians and for a local economy; how museums, sites and heritage enterprises are funded in Europe — public schemes, EU programmes, sponsorship, concessions, earned income; and how to test whether a proposal can sustain itself. It is the entrepreneurship strand of the Interdisciplinary Challenge Semester, delivered with the EUT+ Entrepreneurship School (WP6) and framed by EntreComp, the European Entrepreneurship Competence Framework. Objectives: (a) to develop the EntreComp competences most relevant to heritage valorisation — spotting opportunities, valuing ideas, ethical and sustainable thinking, mobilising resources, financial and economic literacy, planning and management, working with others; (b) to give every studio solution a tested value proposition, operating model and funding mix; and (c) to have students defend the numbers and the ethics of their case before practitioners and site custodians. The course contributes to SDG 8.9 (sustainable tourism that promotes local culture) and SDG 11.4.				
Learning Outcomes	Upon the successful completion of the course students are expected to be able to: • Analyse the value a heritage site creates for its users, custodians and local economy, and identify who can pay for its continued care. • Formulate and test a value proposition and operating model for the team's solution with real stakeholders. • Compare funding instruments available to heritage sites (public schemes, EU programmes, sponsorship, concessions, earned income) and select a viable mix. • Estimate costs, revenues and risks in a simple financial plan and justify its assumptions. • Compose and deliver a pitch to a panel of practitioners, funders and site custodians. • Assess the ethical, community and sustainability implications of valorising a living, in-use heritage site.				

Prerequisites	Co-registration in EUT_150 Challenge Studio (the venture case is built on the team's studio solution); English at CEFR B2 or higher. No prior business or economics course is required.	Required	Compulsory within the Interdisciplinary Challenge Semester; elective for CUT degree programmes under their Package Agreements
Course Content	Week 2 — "Who pays for the second century?": heritage economics in one workshop; the site's current cost base and custodians, with the partner. Week 4 — During the field school: stakeholder and value mapping on site; interviews with users and custodians; the ethics of asking. Week 6 — The European funding landscape for heritage: national schemes, Creative Europe, ERDF, EEA grants, sponsorship, concessions; case comparisons. Week 7 — At the midterm jury: the viability question put to every team by a practitioner juror; feedback logged in the journal. Week 8 — Value proposition and operating model canvas v1 for each team's solution; pricing and access trade-offs. Week 9 — Financial plan v1: costs, revenues, risks, assumptions; cultural-tourism demand and seasonality. Week 10 — Valorisation sprint I (with EUT+ Entrepreneurship School students and mentors): market and stakeholder validation round. Week 11 — Valorisation sprint II: funding mix decided; financial plan v2; pitch training; ethics and community-benefit review. Week 12 — Valorisation sprint III: interim canvas and plan submitted; dry-run pitches to mentors. Week 13 — Individual venture memo drafted; pitch rehearsal integrated into the studio's public-defence rehearsal. Examination period — Pitch at the final public jury before the venture panel; team valorisation case and individual memo submitted.		
Teaching Methodology	• Workshops and knowledge bursts by faculty and invited practitioners • Team project work in the studio team (co-delivered with EUT_150) • Experiential learning in the three-week valorisation sprint with real stakeholders • Critiques: mentor dry-runs and jury pitch • Problem-based learning; guest speakers from funding bodies, tourism and heritage enterprises • Independent study for the individual memo and EntreComp self-assessment		
Bibliography	1. Bacigalupo, M., Kampylis, P., Punie, Y. & Van den Brande, G. (2016). EntreComp: The Entrepreneurship Competence Framework. Publications Office of the EU (JRC). 2. McCallum, E., Weicht, R., McMullan, L. & Price, A. (2018). EntreComp into Action: Get Inspired, Make it Happen. Publications Office of the EU (JRC). 3. Council of Europe (2005). Framework Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society (Faro Convention). 4. CHCfE Consortium (2015). Cultural Heritage Counts for Europe. International Cultural Centre, Krakow. 5. Osterwalder, A. & Pigneur, Y. (2010). Business Model Generation. Wiley. 6. Throsby, D. (2010). The Economics of Cultural Policy. Cambridge University Press. 7. The Challenge Brief v1.0, Section 1 (the partner's statement of need) and Section 9 (rules of engagement).		

Assessment	50 points — Team valorisation case (value proposition and operating model canvas, funding mix, financial plan, community-benefit statement) and the pitch at the final public jury before the venture panel. Team mark, moderated by the same peer-assessment factor as EUT_150. 30 points — Individual venture memo (about 1,500 words) defending the assumptions and the ethics of the case, with an EntreComp self-assessment annexed (week 13). Individual mark. 20 points — Sprint interim canvas and financial plan, with participation in the stakeholder validation round (week 12). Team mark. Total: 100 points. Grades on the 0–10 scale, pass mark 5; at least two examiners at every point; criteria published in advance; AI-use rule as in EUT_150.
Language	English

Alignment table — EUT_107 (learning outcome ↔ EntreComp ↔ teaching method ↔ assessment)

#	Learning outcome (short)	Bloom level	EntreComp area · competence	Teaching methods	Assessment
1	Analyse the value a site creates and who can pay for its care	Analysing	Ideas & opportunities · Spotting opportunities; Valuing ideas	Workshop wk 2; field mapping wk 4	Team case; individual memo
2	Formulate and test a value proposition and operating model with stakeholders	Creating · Evaluating	Ideas & opportunities · Creativity; Vision	Canvas wk 8; sprint validation wk 10	Sprint interim; team case
3	Compare funding instruments and select a viable mix	Evaluating	Resources · Mobilising resources	Funding landscape wk 6; sprint wk 11	Sprint interim; team case
4	Estimate costs, revenues and risks; justify assumptions	Evaluating	Resources · Financial & economic literacy	Financial plan wk 9, 11	Team case; individual memo
5	Compose and deliver a pitch to practitioners, funders and custodians	Creating	Into action · Taking the initiative; Working with others	Pitch training wk 11; dry-runs wk 12; rehearsal wk 13	Team case (pitch)
6	Assess the ethical, community and sustainability implications of valorisation	Evaluating	Ideas & opportunities · Ethical & sustainable thinking	Ethics review wk 11; midterm viability question wk 7	Individual memo

Workload: 5 ECTS × 25–30 hours = 125–150 hours, of which approximately 45 hours are contact time (five workshops, three sprint days per week for three weeks shared with EUT_150, pitch and jury) and the remainder independent and team work.

Registration notes

- Both codes are owned by the Interdisciplinary Challenge Semester and coordinated by Dr Athos Agapiou; the courses are offered every spring, with the edition theme and site changing while the codes, outcomes and assessment structure remain.
- Level: one course description serves both EQF 6 (3rd/4th year) and EQF 7 (Master's) students; if the student records system requires separate level registration, the same description is registered twice with the level field changed.

- ECTS grade distribution: not yet available (first edition, 2027). To be published after the first cohort.
- Incoming Erasmus+ students take EUT_150 and EUT_107 together with 10 ECTS of English-taught CUT modules; CUT students take them under their department's Package Agreement.