ΕΛΛΗΝΙΚΗ ΔΗΜΟΚΡΑΤΙΑ
HELLENIC REPUBLIC

Accreditation Report
for the Undergraduate Study Programme of:

History, Archaeology and Social Anthropology
Institution: University of Thessaly
Date: 4 July 2020

Report of the Panel appointed by the HAHE to undertake the review of the Undergraduate Study Programme of **History, Archaeology and Social Anthropology** of the **University of Thessaly** for the purposes of granting accreditation

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART A: BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT OF THE REVIEW

I. The External Evaluation & Accreditation Panel

The Panel responsible for the Accreditation Review of the Undergraduate Study Programme of **History, Archaeology and Social Anthropology** of the **University of Thessaly** comprised the following four (4) members, drawn from the HAHE Register, in accordance with Laws 4009/2011 & 4653/2020:

1. **Professor Timothy Duff** (Chair), University of Reading (UK)

2. **Associate Professor Anastassios Anastassiadis,** McGill University (Canada)

3. **Associate Professor Maria Antoniou,** Pace University (USA)

4. **Professor Maria Koundoura,** Emerson College (USA)

II.   Review Procedure and Documentation

The Accreditation Panel attended an online briefing (via Zoom) by the HAHE on Thursday 26 June 2020 and considered the following **documents prior to the online site visit**:

▪ The HAHE Guidelines for the Members of the External Evaluation & Accreditation Panel, and Standards for Quality Accreditation of Undergraduate Programmes.

▪ The Template for the Accreditation Report and a mapping grid.

▪ The Proposal for the Accreditation of the Undergraduate Study Programme of History, Archaeology and Social Anthropology of the University of Thessaly, dated 19 April 2019.

▪ A statement of the Quality Assurance Policy of the Department of History, Archaeology and Social Anthropology, University of Thessaly.

▪ The Guide to Undergraduate Studies (Οδηγός Σπουδών) of the Department, 2019-20.

▪ The Regulations for Undergraduate Studies (Κανονισμός προπτυχιακών σπουδών) of the Department, current from 2017-18 onwards.

▪ A complete set of module descriptions (Περιγράμματα μαθημάτων) for 2019-20.

▪ A table of Quality Aims (Στοχοθεσία Ποιότητας), with timeline for their completion.

▪ A set of three questionnaire templates used for the evaluation by students of the Department's modules, with an explanation of the changes made in their design.

▪ The statement of the University's Quality Assurance Unit (ΜΟΔΙΠ) on 16.04.2019 approving the Department's Accreditation Proposal.

▪ Quality indicators for the academic years 2015-2016, 2016-2017 and 2017-18.

▪ The report of the External Evaluation of the Department conducted in 2010.

▪ The Department's summary of the results and recommendations of the 2010 External Evaluation report.

During the site visit, **additional documents** were made available to the Panel, including:

▪ Proposals by the undergraduate Study Programme Committee (Επιτροπή Προγράμματος Σπουδών) to the Department's General Assembly for changes to the study programme commencing academic years 2017-18 and 2020-21.

▪ A list of modules for 2018-19 showing for each module the number of students registered, the number of students examined (that is, who took the final exam and/or submitted all coursework) and the numbers of passes and fails.

▪ The results of student questionnaires for a representative sample of modules for 2018-19.

The Panel was also, during the course of the site visit, given limited access to eClass, the University of Thessaly's Virtual Learning Environment.

The site visit, conducted via Zoom, took place on Monday 29 and Tuesday 30 June 2020. The Department provided technical support which enabled the visit to proceed without problem and for which the Panel was most grateful. During the site visit, the following online teleconference meetings were held:

▪ Teleconference with Ioanna Laliotou, Vice-Rector of the University and President of the University's Quality Assurance Unit (ΜΟΔΙΠ) and with Dimitris Paleothodoros, Head of the Department. This included a short overview of the Undergraduate Programme.

▪ Teleconference with the Head of Department and the Department's Internal Evaluation

Team (OMEA).

- Teleconference with 8 members of teaching staff (ΔΕΠ).
- Teleconference with students: 7 current undergraduate students (1 first year, 2 second years, 2 third years, 2 fourth years), and 3 former undergraduate students, now PhD candidates in the Department.
- An online tour of the Department's facilities provided through a short video made specially for the purpose, and a teleconference with 7 members of teaching staff (ΔΕΠ και ΕΔΙΠ) to discuss facilities and learning resources, especially the three laboratories (of History, Archaeology and Social Anthropology).
- Teleconference with 8 recent graduates to discuss their experience of studying at the Department and their subsequent career path.
- Teleconference with social partners, to discuss relations of the Department with external stakeholders from the public sector.
- A final meeting with the Head of Department and the Department's Internal Evaluation Team The purpose of this meeting was to discuss points or findings which needed further clarification, though in fact the Panel had already been supplied with all the information that it needed.
- The Panel gave an informal presentation of its findings to the Vice-Rector of the University and President of the University's Quality Assurance Unit, the Head of Department and the Department's Internal Evaluation Team.

The documentation provided to the Panel both before and during the site visit was complete, detailed and clearly organised, and the Panel were grateful to the Department for facilitating their task in this way.

The Panel wishes to thank the Department for arranging and hosting the online meetings and for the exceptional spirit of openness and collaboration with which it responded to the queries of the Panel over the course of the two days of the site visit.

III. Study Programme Profile

The Undergraduate Programme in History, Archaeology and Social Anthropology at the University of Thessaly has been in operation since 2002, when it replaced the Programme in History, Archaeology and Folklore, which had operated since 1998. The programme is taught by the Department of History, Archaeology and Social Anthropology (Τμήμα Ιστορίας, Αρχαιολογίας και Κοινωνικής Ανθρωπολογίας or IAKA), which is part of the School of Humanities and Social Sciences. In common with the rest of the School the Department is housed in the University of Thessaly's Volos campus, in a prominent seafront location (Papastratos building).

The Department aligns itself with the aims of the University of Thessaly, "to create a learning environment that promotes critical thinking, innovation, freedom of expression and the cultivation of faith in democratic ideals".

The Department aims to teach its three main subjects not as separate entities but as a single multi-dimensional, methodological and thematic combination of all three. It places particular emphasis on education in the latest digital methods and in its interdisciplinary outlook. It aims to equip its graduates to work in secondary education, in the Archaeological Service and museums, in cultural organisations, in the media and educational publishing, and in organisations involved in historical documentation or in the recording of archaeological or ethnographic data. It also aims to enable them to continue their studies at the postgraduate level.

The duration of the Undergraduate Programme is 4 years (8 semesters). From semester 5 onwards, students choose one of the three pathways: History, Archaeology or Social Anthropology. Students need to pass 48 modules of 5 ECTS each to graduate (total 240 ECTS). In the first two years, modules are largely core modules: 3 compulsory modules, plus other core modules (καταστατικά μαθήματα) chosen from a larger list. In the third and fourth year, students are able to choose specialist modules, which are often developed out of the current research of teaching staff, as well as 6 further optional modules, which may include modules from other Departments. Students also take 4 modern language modules, 1 module in computer technology and 4 tutorial (φροντιστηριακά) modules. Students may replace 3 modules with an undergraduate dissertation (πτυχιακή εργασία) (15 ECTS) and may also choose to do a placement or practical exercise (πρακτική άσκηση), which consists of a month's work during the summer vacation at a partner organisation or employer related to the pathway in which the student is specialising.

In the academic year 2019-20, the Department had 20 permanent members of teaching and research staff (ΔΕΠ), 4 technical teaching staff (ΕΔΙΠ), 8 contract teaching staff, 4 postdoctoral fellows and 3 administrative staff.

PART B: COMPLIANCE WITH THE PRINCIPLES

Principle 1: Academic Unit Policy for Quality Assurance

INSTITUTIONS SHOULD APPLY A QUALITY ASSURANCE POLICY AS PART OF THEIR STRATEGIC MANAGEMENT. THIS POLICY SHOULD EXPAND AND BE AIMED (WITH THE COLLABORATION OF EXTERNAL STAKEHOLDERS) AT ALL INSTITUTION'S AREAS OF ACTIVITY, AND PARTICULARLY AT THE FULFILMENT OF QUALITY REQUIREMENTS OF UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMMES. THIS POLICY SHOULD BE PUBLISHED AND IMPLEMENTED BY ALL STAKEHOLDERS.

> *The quality assurance policy of the academic unit is in line with the Institutional policy on quality, and is included in a published statement that is implemented by all stakeholders. It focuses on the achievement of special objectives related to the quality assurance of study programmes offered by the academic unit.*
>
> *The quality policy statement of the academic unit includes its commitment to implement a quality policy that will promote the academic profile and orientation of the programme, its purpose and field of study; it will realise the programme's strategic goals and it will determine the means and ways for attaining them; it will implement the appropriate quality procedures, aiming at the programme's continuous improvement.*
>
> *In particular, in order to carry out this policy, the academic unit commits itself to put into practice quality procedures that will demonstrate:*
>
> a) *the suitability of the structure and organization of the curriculum;*
> b) *the pursuit of learning outcomes and qualifications in accordance with the European and the National Qualifications Framework for Higher Education;*
> c) *the promotion of the quality and effectiveness of teaching;*
> d) *the appropriateness of the qualifications of the teaching staff;*
> e) *the enhancement of the quality and quantity of the research output among faculty members of the academic unit;*
> f) *ways for linking teaching and research;*
> g) *the level of demand for qualifications acquired by graduates, in the labour market;*
> h) *the quality of support services such as the administrative services, the Library, and the student welfare office;*
> i) *the conduct of an annual review and an internal audit of the quality assurance system of the undergraduate programme(s) offered, as well as the collaboration of the Internal Evaluation Group (IEG) with the Institution's Quality Assurance Unit (QAU).*

Study Programme Compliance

The University of Thessaly's Quality Assurance Unit (ΜΟΔΙΠ) is responsible for overseeing the continuous improvement of its study programmes, as well as the efficient operation of its academic services, in accordance with international practices and the guidelines required by the HAHE.

The Department of History, Archaeology and Social Anthropology has a clearly articulated quality assurance policy, which is aligned with the quality assurance policy of the University of Thessaly as a whole and takes into account European and international standards. It aims at continual evaluation and improvement of the programme of studies and of the capabilities of its graduates.

Final responsibility for the undergraduate programme rests with the Department's General Assembly, which discusses annually it at its Spring Semester meeting. It evaluates the programme to ensure that it meets appropriate learning outcomes in accordance with the European Qualifications Framework and the Hellenic Qualifications Framework for Higher Education. Changes to the programme are approved by the Academic Affairs division of the University and finally by Senate.

The Department has in place a robust and clear procedure for the quality assurance of its undergraduate programme, devised in close cooperation with the University's Quality Assurance Unit. The three-member Study Programme Committee (Επιτροπή Προγράμματος Σπουδών), which includes student representative, reviews the structure and effectiveness of the undergraduate programme annually. The Department's Internal Evaluation Team (OMEA), which includes the members of the Study Programme Committee, oversees each semester the evaluation by students of each module through student questionnaires, and reports the results these evaluations to the General Assembly, which consists of all teaching staff and two student representatives.

Panel Judgement

Principle 1: Institution Policy for Quality Assurance	
Fully compliant	X
Substantially compliant	
Partially compliant	
Non-compliant	

Panel Recommendations

None

Principle 2: Design and Approval of Programmes

INSTITUTIONS SHOULD DEVELOP THEIR UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMMES FOLLOWING A DEFINED WRITTEN PROCESS WHICH WILL INVOLVE THE PARTICIPANTS, INFORMATION SOURCES AND THE APPROVAL COMMITTEES FOR THE PROGRAMME. THE OBJECTIVES, THE EXPECTED LEARNING OUTCOMES, THE INTENDED PROFESSIONAL QUALIFICATIONS AND THE WAYS TO ACHIEVE THEM ARE SET OUT IN THE PROGRAMME DESIGN. THE ABOVE DETAILS AS WELL AS INFORMATION ON THE PROGRAMME'S STRUCTURE ARE PUBLISHED IN THE STUDENT GUIDE.

Academic units develop their programmes following a well-defined procedure. The academic profile and orientation of the programme, the objectives, the subject areas, the structure and organisation, the expected learning outcomes and the intended professional qualifications according to the National Qualifications Framework for Higher Education are described at this stage. The approval or revision process for programmes includes a check of compliance with the basic requirements described in the Standards, on behalf of the Institution's Quality Assurance Unit (QAU).

Furthermore, the programme design should take into consideration the following:

- *the Institutional strategy*
- *the active participation of students*
- *the experience of external stakeholders from the labour market*
- *the smooth progression of students throughout the stages of the programme*
- *the anticipated student workload according to the European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System*
- *the option to provide work experience to the students*
- *the linking of teaching and research*
- *the relevant regulatory framework and the official procedure for the approval of the programme by the Institution*

Study Programme Compliance

The study programme has been designed based on appropriate standards and according to a well-defined procedure. The content of the programme is reviewed regularly to ensure that it is up-to-date both in terms of content and of pedagogical methods, the last reviews having taken place in 2011-12 and 2015-16, both of which took into account international developments and the recommendations of the External Evaluation Report of 2010.

As mentioned in section 1, the design, oversight and development of the Undergraduate Programme of Studies is the responsibility of the Study Programme Committee (Επιτροπή Προγράμματος Σπουδών). Any changes must be approved by the Department's General Assembly, which discusses revisions of the programme once a year. Proposals for change are then passed for approval by the Academic Affairs division of the University and finally by Senate. All members of academic staff in the Department are involved in the process, especially the Academic Advisors drawn from each of the Department's subject areas, as are also student representatives who attend the General Assembly.

The Department's Proposal for Accreditation provides essential information on the programme's objectives, intended professional qualifications, learning outcomes and structure. All are fully consistent with national and international norms. The programme is distinctive, in comparison to other similar programmes nationally and internationally, in its inclusion of Social Anthropology alongside History and Archaeology and in its interdisciplinary focus.

The structure provides students with a smooth progression as they move from the more introductory and foundational modules which predominate in the first two years of study, to the more specialised and research-led modules in the final two years. The optional modules and dissertation further distinguish the second half of the programme from the first. In addition, the Practical Exercise, done during a month in the summer vacation, gives students the opportunity to undertake work experience in archives, museums and other external stakeholder organisations. This structure allows students a considerable degree of autonomy in plotting their own course. It also equips all students with skills in a foreign language and in digital technology.

The Department pursues, as far as appropriate, research-led teaching, especially in specialist modules, and aims to inculcate in all students an attitude of enquiry and intellectual curiosity, Research skills are particularly encouraged in the dissertation and practical exercise. Students also have the opportunity to participate in the Department's archaeological projects.

Panel Judgement

Principle 2: Design and Approval of Programmes	
Fully compliant	X
Substantially compliant	
Partially compliant	
Non-compliant	

Panel Recommendations

Consideration might be given to the feasibility of allowing the Practical Exercise to be taken part-time over a semester or year rather than as a single month in the summer vacation.

The Department might consider further ways of soliciting student views and involvement in the design of the programme through e.g. a staff-student committee, or an online student newsletter.

Principle 3: Student-centred Learning, Teaching and Assessment

INSTITUTIONS SHOULD ENSURE THAT THE UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMMES ARE DELIVERED IN A WAY THAT ENCOURAGES STUDENTS TO TAKE AN ACTIVE ROLE IN CREATING THE LEARNING PROCESS. THE ASSESSMENT METHODS SHOULD REFLECT THIS APPROACH.

Student-centred learning and teaching plays an important role in stimulating students' motivation, self-reflection and engagement in the learning process. The above entail continuous consideration of the programme's delivery and the assessment of the related outcomes.

The student-centred learning and teaching process

- *respects and attends to the diversity of students and their needs, enabling flexible learning paths;*
- *considers and uses different modes of delivery, where appropriate;*
- *flexibly uses a variety of pedagogical methods;*
- *regularly evaluates and adjusts the modes of delivery and pedagogical methods aiming at improvement;*
- *regularly evaluates the quality and effectiveness of teaching, as documented especially through student surveys;*
- *reinforces the student's sense of autonomy, while ensuring adequate guidance and support from the teaching staff;*
- *promotes mutual respect in the student - teacher relationship;*
- *applies appropriate procedures for dealing with students' complaints.*

  In addition :
- *the academic staff are familiar with the existing examination system and methods and are supported in developing their own skills in this field;*
- *the assessment criteria and methods are published in advance;*
- *the 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;*
- *student assessment is conducted by more than one examiner, where possible;*
- *the regulations for assessment take into account mitigating circumstances;*
- *assessment is consistent, fairly applied to all students and carried out in accordance with the stated procedures;*
- *a formal procedure for student appeals is in place.*

Study Programme compliance

The Department uses a range of modes of delivery of its teaching and a range of pedagogical methods, especially in the specialised classes, including group discussions, presentations by individual students and in groups, visits to archaeological sites and museums (though this is constrained by financial limitations), and practical excavation work. There is a sense of progression in terms of pedagogical methods and student involvement, as specialist classes tend to have fewer students and allow for more student involvement.

The Department boasts three highly active research labs where students can familiarize themselves with hands-on approaches. There is extensive use of multi-media facilities in most

modules. The provision of a Practical Exercise which affords work placement opportunities for students in the local community (e.g. libraries, museums, archives) is highly successful and constitutes an instance of good practice. There is also good practice in the provision and use of eClass and in the supervision and assessment of dissertations, including the use of the tool Turnitin to detect plagiarism.

The Department has instituted a small number of methodological modules taught in a tutorial format (φροντιστηριακά) which all students must attend and which help prepare incoming students for University level work. This Departmental effort should be commended and the Department should be encouraged to consider giving more of these courses.

Much teaching is still lecture-based and most is taught in three-hour blocks, as at most Greek universities. Staff break up this time into different activities, and the Panel encourages them to continue to find ways of including elements of student-centred learning within such long blocks of time, such as group work or discussions. Some consideration might also be given to whether the three-hour session might be split. Consideration might also be given to whether there is scope to introducing more seminar-style teaching into some modules. The dissertation module might also include more workshops for all students taking the dissertation and perhaps more intermediate milestones such as presentations.

Students have some autonomy in plotting their own course and following their own interests, especially in the second half of the course when they choose one of three pathways and select from a range of specialist modules. They are also free to choose the optional dissertation and Practical Exercise.

Evaluation of progress is predominantly based on written final exams in core modules; in specialist modules assessment is often by coursework or a combination of coursework and written exam, and sometimes an oral exam. The Department might consider introducing coursework into more core modules; this would provide valuable training in research skills and in independent learning, would ensure students receive early formative feedback, and might encourage more students to opt to take the dissertation module.

As is normal in most Greek universities, marking is done by a single examiner in both written and oral examinations, with the exception of the undergraduate dissertation, where two examiners are required. Consideration might be given to the introduction of a form of internal "moderation", where staff peer-review each other's marking. It was notable from the figures we saw, that there is a high degree of variation in the pass rate of different modules: in some almost all students pass, while in others less than half do, which might suggest that examiners are not marking to equivalent standards. The Department may wish to monitor and reflect collectively on grading practices. At any rate, the cause of this variation ought to be investigated.

The Panel was not aware of a procedure for mitigating circumstances or for student appeals.

The Department applies regular evaluation of teaching through questionnaires, though student participation is rather low. The Department is aware of this and has been actively seeking to improve student participation through provision of new types of questionnaire. They might consider the timing and format in which questionnaires are distributed, and the possibility of forming a staff-student committee.

Panel Judgement

Principle 3: Student- centred Learning, Teaching an Assessment	
Fully compliant	
Substantially compliant	**X**
Partially compliant	
Non-compliant	

Panel Recommendations

The Panel recommends that the Department continue to consider the possibilities of increasing interactional modes of content delivery and assessment and of integrating PhD students as teaching assistants.

The Panel also recommends that the Department consider introducing, where possible, more laboratories, fieldwork and tutorials as complementary to lectures, especially for the introductory level.

If not already in place, processes for dealing with student appeals and complaints, and with mitigating circumstances such as illness, should be introduced and communicated to students.

Principle 4: Student Admission, Progression, Recognition and Certification

INSTITUTIONS SHOULD DEVELOP AND APPLY PUBLISHED REGULATIONS COVERING ALL ASPECTS AND PHASES OF STUDIES (ADMISSION, PROGRESSION, RECOGNITION AND CERTIFICATION).

Institutions and academic units need to put in place both processes and tools to collect, manage and act on information regarding student progression.

Procedures concerning the award and recognition of higher education degrees, the duration of studies, rules ensuring students progression, terms and conditions for student mobility should be based on the institutional study regulations. Appropriate recognition procedures rely on institutional practice for recognition of credits among various European academic departments and Institutions, in line with the principles of the Lisbon Recognition Convention.

Graduation represents the culmination of the students´ study period. Students need to receive documentation explaining the qualification gained, including achieved learning outcomes and the context, level, content and status of the studies that were pursued and successfully completed (Diploma Supplement).

Study Programme compliance

Application and admission procedures are largely controlled by centralised national agencies. The Department has noted a shift towards more students from the local region or adjacent areas coming to study on its programme.

The Department publishes its academic regulations and expectations in its Regulations for Undergraduate Studies (Κανονισμός προπτυχιακών σπουδών). It also publishes and updates annually its full Guide to Undergraduate Studies (Οδηγός Σπουδών) and module descriptions (Περιγράμματα μαθημάτων). Information on the procedure for students with mitigating circumstances might be added here.

The Department collects data on progression and graduation rates. In common with many Departments in Greek universities, the Department has a relative high but decreasing number of inactive ("stagnant") students (27% in 2017-2018 compared to 30% in 2015-2016), and a low number of students who finish within 4 years of study. This results in many more students enrolled on modules than attend classes or attempt the assessment. The Department has itself identified these issues as causing concern.

In large part these issues can be explained by factors independent of the Department's power, such as the state-regulated mode of admission to Greek universities; the state-mandated number of admitted students; the state-imposed measure of maintaining inactive students and allowing for a student to take a course and an examination numerous times; and the general social context in Greece over the last ten years which requires many students to take on paid work.

However, the rather heavy workload (6 courses and 18 hours of course-time per week for students who complete all modules in 4 years), as attested by students, and already signaled by the evaluation committee in 2010, may be an inhibiting factor for student attendance and

performance. Such a large number of contact hours may also make it more difficult for students to reflect on the material they are studying and to develop as independent learners. Future revision of the study programme could be an opportunity to consider whether increasing the number of ECTS per module or reducing contact hours, as well as diversifying modes of examination, might assist students to complete more quickly. Finding a way of reducing the number of students who are registered on courses would also have a beneficial effect on staff workloads.

The Department participates in the Erasmus programme, though numbers of both incoming and outgoing students are low. The Department's website (as well as the staff) informs students of Erasmus opportunities and requirements. The Department could explore other ways in which to publicize its strong mobility programme and encourage students to take up the available opportunities.

The Department offers a small number of modules in English.

The ECTS system is applied across the curriculum and the University provides students with a Diploma Supplement issued upon graduation.

Panel Judgement

Principle 4: Student Admission, Progression, Recognition and Certification	
Fully compliant	**X**
Substantially compliant	
Partially compliant	
Non-compliant	

Panel Recommendations

The Department should continue to monitor data on student progression and graduation and consider ways to increase the number of students completing in four years.

Principle 5: Teaching Staff

INSTITUTIONS SHOULD ASSURE THEMSELVES OF THE QUALIFICATIONS AND COMPETENCE OF THE TEACHING STAFF. THEY SHOULD APPLY FAIR AND TRANSPARENT PROCESSES FOR THE RECRUITMENT AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE TEACHING STAFF.

The Institutions and their academic units have a major responsibility as to the standard of their teaching staff providing them with a supportive environment that promotes the advancement of their scientific work. In particular, the academic unit should:

- *set up and follow clear, transparent and fair processes for the recruitment of properly qualified staff and offer them conditions of employment that recognize the importance of teaching and research;*
- *offer opportunities and promote the professional development of the teaching staff;*
- *encourage scholarly activity to strengthen the link between education and research;*
- *encourage innovation in teaching methods and the use of new technologies;*
- *promote the increase of the volume and quality of the research output within the academic unit;*
- *follow quality assurance processes for all staff members (with respect to attendance requirements, performance, self-assessment, training etc.);*
- *develop policies to attract highly qualified academic staff.*

Study Programme Compliance

The Department follows national legislation governing the appointment of staff; appointment committees include members from other universities both in Greece and abroad. There are few internal appointments (candidates who are former students of the Department). While many staff completed their PhDs abroad, few, if any, non-Greek citizens are appointed.

Teaching staff are fully qualified to teach at University level, in accordance with Greek law. All members of teaching staff in any capacity have PhDs and are actively involved in research; all teaching staff on permanent contracts have research publications.

All staff are encouraged to be research active, and the Department has a very good record of research publication. Active engagement in research is a pre-requisite for promotion. The research of members of teaching and research staff (ΔΕΠ) is supported with regular research leave, which applies to staff at all levels: one semester every three years or one year after six years of teaching (in accordance with current law). Arrangements are often made to allow staff to accept invitations to participate in research seminars in Greece and abroad. The research culture of the Department is fostered by the three specialist research Laboratories, by a programme of weekly research lectures often given by invited speakers from Greece and abroad, and by the frequent conferences and workshops held under the auspices of the Department, sometimes in collaboration with local stakeholders (e.g. museums, Ephorates of Antiquities, etc.). The Department has hosted an impressive number of funded research projects with funding provided from Greek and international sources and runs several archaeological projects.

Workload is high. The number of modules taught (2 per staff member per semester) and

number of contact hours (6 per staff member per semester) are determined by the Ministry of Education and are comparable to those at other institutions internationally in the humanities. In addition, staff supervise undergraduate, Master's, and Doctoral dissertations, carry heavy administrative burdens, and devote a large amount of time to research. Many staff are members of university boards, editorial boards, and research groups, and contribute expert advice to various community and scholarly organizations both locally and internationally.

Teaching is evaluated through student questionnaires using the process determined by the University's Quality Assurance Unit (ΜΟΔΙΠ) through its internal quality assurance system. The results of the questionnaires are analyzed by the Internal Evaluation Team (OMEA). It was not clear to the Panel whether there is any other formal system for the review of the activities of teaching staff, though they saw no evidence that any is needed.

Teaching mobility is possible through the Department's many Erasmus exchanges, and through other less formal arrangements.

Panel Judgement

Principle 5: Teaching Staff	
Fully compliant	X
Substantially compliant	
Partially compliant	
Non-compliant	

Panel Recommendations

The Panel recommends that consideration be given to the introduction of a system of peer observation of teaching, with a view to increasing the already strong climate of collaboration, assisting in mentoring junior staff, and spreading innovation and best practice.

Principle 6: Learning Resources and Student Support

INSTITUTIONS SHOULD HAVE ADEQUATE FUNDING TO COVER TEACHING AND LEARNING NEEDS. THEY SHOULD –ON THE ONE HAND– PROVIDE SATISFACTORY INFRASTRUCTURE AND SERVICES FOR LEARNING AND STUDENT SUPPORT AND –ON THE OTHER HAND– FACILITATE DIRECT ACCESS TO THEM BY ESTABLISHING INTERNAL RULES TO THIS END (E.G. LECTURE ROOMS, LABORATORIES, LIBRARIES, NETWORKS, BOARDING, CAREER AND SOCIAL POLICY SERVICES ETC.).

Institutions and their academic units must have sufficient funding and means to support learning and academic activity in general, so that they can offer to students the best possible level of studies. The above means could include facilities such as libraries, study rooms, educational and scientific equipment, information and communications services, support or counselling services.

When allocating the available resources, the needs of all students must be taken into consideration (e.g. whether they are full-time or part-time students, employed or international students, students with disabilities) and the shift towards student-centred learning and the adoption of flexible modes of learning and teaching. Support activities and facilities may be organised in various ways, depending on the institutional context. However, the internal quality assurance ensures that all resources are appropriate, adequate, and accessible, and that students are informed about the services available to them.

In delivering support services the role of support and administrative staff is crucial and therefore they need to be qualified and have opportunities to develop their competences.

Study Programme Compliance

The Department has access to three lecture halls, which it shares with the other Departments of the School. The Department also has two seminar rooms, three specialist laboratories (of History, Archaeology and Social Anthropology), a computer laboratory, and an archaeological collection developed specially for use in teaching. The Department also has access to the University Library and the University's Conference and Cultural Centre.

The Department is to be commended for managing its full programme with only limited teaching space; however, more teaching rooms would improve further its operations and the student experience.

The same can be said of funding: The Department offers a very high-quality education with limited means. More funding, and greater control over its own funding, would allow it, for example, to have more seminar-style teaching, perhaps with PhD students as instructors.

The structure of the programme is clearly set out and communicated to students in the Guide to Undergraduate Studies (Οδηγός Σπουδών). In addition, 9 members of teaching staff, 3 from each of the Department's three branches, act as Academic Advisors, who are available to advise students on their choice of modules. The students whom the Panel met were aware of the existence and role of Academic Advisors and described the Department as friendly and supportive. They were satisfied with the clarity of information and advice with which they are

provided and reported that staff are easily accessible and respond regularly and promptly to email communications.

The eClass electronic platform is well-designed and generally well used. All members of teaching staffs should be encouraged to make available on their module sites the syllabus for the term, reading lists, information about assessment etc.

The administrative staff of the Department, consisting of the secretary and two other colleagues, provides invaluable support; the Panel were informed that administrative staff were accommodating and competent.

The University Library is underfunded, and this makes the task of the Department's teaching staff more challenging than it would otherwise be. The Panel was shocked to learn that, for complex financial and legal reasons, staff and students have not had access to JSTOR since summer 2016. They were also concerned at the delays in funding the Department's activities and urge that both matters be addressed.

The Department benefits from the following support services of the University: Placement Office, Office of Educational Exchange and Public Relations (including Erasmus+), IT Service, 'Access' (Πρόσβαση) – the support service for students with disabilities or special educational needs – the Employment and Careers Service, eClass, and the Counselling Service.

Several induction events are organised to make new students aware of the range of services available to them. The Department's Academic Advisors act in cooperation with these services in advising students, and especially in responding to those students who need particular support. The Practical Exercise gives students the option of working with the resources of local museums, archives, etc.

Panel Judgement

Principle 6: Learning Resources and Student Support	
Fully compliant	
Substantially compliant	X
Partially compliant	
Non-compliant	

Panel Recommendations

The Panel recommends that the University address the underfunding of the Library as a matter of urgency, and in particular that it ensures adequate provision of electronic access to journals and databases.

Principle 7: Information Management

INSTITUTIONS BEAR FULL RESPONSIBILITY FOR COLLECTING, ANALYSING AND USING INFORMATION, AIMED AT THE EFFICIENT MANAGEMENT OF UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMMES OF STUDY AND RELATED ACTIVITIES, IN AN INTEGRATED, EFFECTIVE AND EASILY ACCESSIBLE WAY.

Institutions are expected to establish and operate an information system for the management and monitoring of data concerning students, teaching staff, course structure and organisation, teaching and provision of services to students as well as to the academic community.

Reliable data is essential for accurate information and for decision making, as well as for identifying areas of smooth operation and areas for improvement. Effective procedures for collecting and analysing information on study programmes and other activities feed data into the internal system of quality assurance.

The information gathered depends, to some extent, on the type and mission of the Institution. The following are of interest:

- *key performance indicators*
- *student population profile*
- *student progression, success and drop-out rates*
- *student satisfaction with their programme(s)*
- *availability of learning resources and student support*
- *career paths of graduates*

A number of methods may be used for collecting information. It is important that students and staff are involved in providing and analyzing information and planning follow-up activities.

Study Programme Compliance

StudentsWeb and ClassWeb allow students and staff immediate access to important information and services.

The University and the Department have a very good system in place for gathering and updating information regarding key performance indicators, such as student progression, success and drop-out rates, the number of years taken to complete the programme, the number of students registered on modules, the number of students examined and the numbers of passes and fails. The Internal Evaluation Team analyses such data and reports to the Department's General Assembly.

Information on student satisfaction is gathered through module evaluations and analysed by the Internal Evaluation Team. The number of students who participate is quite low, and the Department is already considering how it might to increase participation rates. It is not clear how the results of evaluations and any action taken is fed back to students.

The Department went to great lengths to collect information on its alumni in 2018-19, which revealed useful information on their career paths.

Panel Judgement

Principle 7: Information Management	
Fully compliant	
Substantially compliant	X
Partially compliant	
Non-compliant	

Panel Recommendations

The Panel recommends that the Department continue to consider ways of increasing student participation in module evaluation and develop a system for informing students of any action taken as a result.

The Panel recommends to the University that it considers procedures for the monitoring of the employability and career path of graduates/alumni and strengthening ties with them.

Principle 8: Public Information

INSTITUTIONS SHOULD PUBLISH INFORMATION ABOUT THEIR TEACHING AND ACADEMIC ACTIVITIES WHICH IS CLEAR, ACCURATE, OBJECTIVE, UP-TO-DATE AND READILY ACCESSIBLE.

Information on Institution's activities is useful for prospective and current students, graduates, other stakeholders and the public.

Therefore, institutions and their academic units provide information about their activities, including the programmes they offer, the intended learning outcomes, the qualifications awarded, the teaching, learning and assessment procedures used, the pass rates and the learning opportunities available to their students, as well as graduate employment information.

Study Programme Compliance

The Department makes available key information on its website, which is well-designed, up-to-date, clear and accessible. Current and prospective students, and the wider public, can find detailed information about all aspects of undergraduate studies (including regulations, modules offered, examinations, pedagogical certification, etc.) and postgraduate studies (Study Guide, scholarships, examinations). The website also includes general information about the Department; a list giving the memberships of committees and key officeholders; and an administrative section, including important forms for downloading. The Policy for Quality Assurance and the last External Evaluation Report can also be found here.

The website successfully reflects the Department's research activities. It contains information about its three laboratories, its programme of weekly research lectures, its research projects, its excavations, and the conferences and workshops it organises. It also includes the CVs and publications of its staff members, their research interests, and the modules they teach. Other sections of the Department's website include information on the Department's student and alumni societies and the Erasmus programme, and links to other important University sites such as eClass, the University Library, the Careers Service and e.g. the policy on harassment.

The Open Doors (Ανοιχτές Θύρες) initiative provides an opportunity for high school students in the local area to gain an understanding of the Department, its research activities, its resources (laboratories, libraries, etc.), and its undergraduate study programme.

Panel Judgement

Principle 8: Public Information	
Fully compliant	**X**
Substantially compliant	
Partially compliant	
Non-compliant	

Panel Recommendations

Principle 9: On-going Monitoring and Periodic Internal Review of Programmes

INSTITUTIONS SHOULD HAVE IN PLACE AN INTERNAL QUALITY ASSURANCE SYSTEM FOR THE AUDIT AND ANNUAL INTERNAL REVIEW OF THEIR PROGRAMMES, SO AS TO ACHIEVE THE OBJECTIVES SET FOR THEM, THROUGH MONITORING AND AMENDMENTS, WITH A VIEW TO CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT. ANY ACTIONS TAKEN IN THE ABOVE CONTEXT SHOULD BE COMMUNICATED TO ALL PARTIES CONCERNED.

Regular monitoring, review and revision of study programmes aim to maintain the level of educational provision and to create a supportive and effective learning environment for students.

The above comprise the evaluation of:
- *the content of the programme in the light of the latest research in the given discipline, thus ensuring that the programme is up to date;*
- *the changing needs of society;*
- *the students' workload, progression and completion;*
- *the effectiveness of the procedures for the assessment of students;*
- *the students' expectations, needs and satisfaction in relation to the programme;*
- *the learning environment, support services and their fitness for purpose for the programme*

Programmes are reviewed and revised regularly involving students and other stakeholders. The information collected is analysed and the programme is adapted to ensure that it is up-to-date. Revised programme specifications are published.

Study Programme Compliance

The Department's Internal Quality Assurance system is robust and follows best practice. The Department's Internal Evaluation Team works in close collaboration with the University's Quality Assurance Unit (ΜΟΔΙΠ).

There is a well-defined process for curricular review (see above under 2). The programme was substantially revised in 2017, for implementation in 2017-18. This involved a lowering of number of modules needed to complete the degree and aimed to raise the proportion of students graduating within 4 years and lower the proportion of inactive students.

The Internal Evaluation Team collects data from student evaluations, a tool that is under constant, iterative revision. The current form is made up of both quantitative and qualitative questions and is filled-in anonymously by students. As noted earlier, the evaluation response rate is not high. Student representatives are invited to attend the Study Programme Committee and General Assembly but do not always do so. The Internal Evaluation Team also works informally with staff in gathering information and feedback on their experience of the modules they teach.

Panel Judgement

Principle 9: On-going Monitoring and Periodic Internal Review of Programmes	
Fully compliant	X
Substantially compliant	
Partially compliant	
Non-compliant	

Panel Recommendations

None

Principle 10: Regular External Evaluation of Undergraduate Programmes

PROGRAMMES SHOULD REGULARLY UNDERGO EVALUATION BY COMMITTEES OF EXTERNAL EXPERTS SET BY HAHE, AIMING AT ACCREDITATION. THE TERM OF VALIDITY OF THE ACCREDITATION IS DETERMINED BY HAHE.

HAHE is responsible for administrating the programme accreditation process which is realised as an external evaluation procedure, and implemented by a committee of independent experts. HAHE grants accreditation of programmes, with a specific term of validity, following to which revision is required. The accreditation of the quality of the programmes acts as a means of verification of the compliance of the programme with the template's requirements, and as a catalyst for improvement, while opening new perspectives towards the international standing of the awarded degrees.

Both academic units and institutions participate in the regular external quality assurance process, while respecting the requirements of the legislative framework in which they operate.

The quality assurance, in this case the accreditation, is an on-going process that does not end with the external feedback, or report or its follow-up process within the Institution. Therefore, Institutions and their academic units ensure that the progress made since the last external quality assurance activity is taken into consideration when preparing for the next one.

Study Programme Compliance

The Department has clearly worked to implement the recommendations of the 2010 external review, though some factors remain outside of its control.

In particular, it has responded to that review by increasing the element of progression by providing a more common grounding for all students in the first part of their studies followed by specialisation in the latter part. The appointment of Academic Advisors has increased students' access to guidance as to their choice of pathway and modules. They have also given considerable thought to increasing student participation in module questionnaires, an issue raised in that review.

Progress on integration of PhD students into teaching has been more difficult to achieve, largely owing to budgetary and legal constraints.

The previous report recommended an increase in funding for the University Library by the institution. There appears still to be a funding shortfall here, though this is beyond the Department's control.

Panel Judgement

Principle 10: Regular External Evaluation of Undergraduate Programmes	
Fully compliant	X
Substantially compliant	
Partially compliant	
Non-compliant	

Panel Recommendations

None

PART C: CONCLUSIONS

I.   Features of Good Practice

- Excellent working relationship between the University's Quality Assurance Unit and the Department's Internal Evaluation Team.
- Excellent facilities, site, learning resources and support.
- Quality and breadth of curriculum, and its interdisciplinary nature.
- Constant monitoring of the effectiveness of the programme and willingness to adapt and restructure it.
- The range of teaching methods.
- Strong links with local community and non-academic stakeholders.
- Opportunities for students to learn and put into effect practical research skills, and gain work experience through the Practical Exercise and archaeological projects.
- Accessibility of teaching staff to students, and the availability of Academic Advisors.
- The Open Doors initiative.

II.   Areas of Weakness

- Library funding.
- Student participation in evaluations is rather low and follow up mechanisms to inform students of decisions taken as a result could be formalized.
- Number of non-active students.

III.   Recommendations for Follow-up Actions

Recommendations to the University:

- To introduce, if not already in place, processes for dealing with student appeals and complaints, and with mitigating circumstances such as illness, and to communicate these to students.
- To address the underfunding of the Library as a matter of urgency, and in particular to ensure adequate provision of electronic access to journals and databases.
- To consider procedures for the monitoring of the employability and career path of graduates/alumni and strengthening ties with them.

Recommendations to the Department:

- To consider the feasibility of allowing the Practical Exercise to be taken part-time over a semester or year rather than as a single month in the summer vacation.
- To consider further ways of soliciting student views and involvement in the design of the programme through e.g. a staff-student committee, or an online student newsletter.
- To continue to consider the possibilities of increasing interactional modes of content delivery and assessment and of integrating PhD students as teaching assistants.
- To consider introducing, where possible, more laboratories, fieldwork and tutorials as complementary to lectures, especially for the introductory level.

- To continue to monitor data on student progression and graduation and consider ways to increase the number of students completing in four years.
- To continue to consider ways of increasing student participation in module evaluation and to develop a system for informing students of any action taken as a result.
- To consider introducing a system of peer observation of teaching, with a view to increasing the already strong climate of collaboration, assisting in mentoring junior staff, and spreading innovation and best practice.

IV.   Summary & Overall Assessment

The Principles where full compliance has been achieved are:

- Principle 1: Academic Unit Policy for Quality Assurance
- Principle 2: Design and Approval of Programmes
- Principle 4: Student Admission, Progression, Recognition and Certification.
- Principle 5: Teaching Staff
- Principle 8: Public Information
- Principle 9: On-going Monitoring and Periodic Internal Review of Programmes
- Principle 10: Regular External Evaluation of Undergraduate Programmes

The Principles where substantial compliance has been achieved are:

- Principle 3: Student- centred Learning, Teaching and Assessment
- Principle 6: Learning Resources and Student Support
- Principle 7: Information Management

The Principles where partial compliance has been achieved are:

The Principles where failure of compliance was identified are:

Overall Judgement	
Fully compliant	**X**
Substantially compliant	
Partially compliant	
Non-compliant	

The members of the External Evaluation & Accreditation Panel

Name and Surname	Signature
1. Professor Timothy Duff , University of Reading (UK)	*Tim Duff*
2. Associate Professor Anastassios Anastassiadis, McGill University (Canada)	
3. Associate Professor Maria Antoniou, Pace University (USA)	*Maria Antoniou*
4. Professor Maria Koundoura, Emerson College (USA)	