



ΕΛΛΗΝΙΚΗ ΔΗΜΟΚΡΑΤΙΑ
HELLENIC REPUBLIC



**Εθνική Αρχή
Ανώτατης Εκπαίδευσης**
Hellenic Authority
for Higher Education

Αριστείδου 1 & Ευριπίδου 2 • 10559 Αθήνα | 1 Aristidou str. & 2 Evripidou str. • 10559 Athens, Greece
T. +30 210 9220 944 • E. secretariat@ethaae.gr • www.ethaae.gr

Accreditation Report for the Undergraduate Study Programme of:

Computer Science and Telecommunications

Institution: University of Thessaly

Date: 11 July 2020



Επιχειρησιακό Πρόγραμμα
Ανάπτυξη Ανθρώπινου Δυναμικού,
Εκπαίδευση και Διά Βίου Μάθηση
Με τη συγχρηματοδότηση της Ελλάδας και της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης



Report of the Panel appointed by the HAHE to undertake the review of the
Undergraduate Study Programme of **Computer Science and
Telecommunications** of the **University of Thessaly** for the purposes of
granting accreditation

Table of Contents

PART A: BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT OF THE REVIEW	4
I. The External Evaluation & Accreditation Panel	4
II. Review Procedure and Documentation	5
III. Study Programme Profile	7
PART B: COMPLIANCE WITH THE PRINCIPLES	8
Principle 1: Academic Unit Policy for Quality Assurance	8
Principle 2: Design and Approval of Programmes	11
Principle 3: Student-centred Learning, Teaching and Assessment	13
Principle 4: Student Admission, Progression, Recognition and Certification	17
Principle 5: Teaching Staff	19
Principle 6: Learning Resources and Student Support	22
Principle 7: Information Management	24
Principle 8: Public Information	26
Principle 9: On-going Monitoring and Periodic Internal Review of Programmes	28
Principle 10: Regular External Evaluation of Undergraduate Programmes	30
PART C: CONCLUSIONS	32
I. Features of Good Practice	32
II. Areas of Weakness	32
III. Recommendations for Follow-up Actions	33
IV. Summary & Overall Assessment	35

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 **Computer Science and Telecommunications** of the **University of Thessaly** comprised the following five (5) members, drawn from the HAHE Register, in accordance with Laws 4009/2011 & 4653/2020:

1. **Prof. Sotirios Skevoulis** (Chair), Pace University, New York City, New York, USA
2. **Prof. Constandinos Mavromoustakis**, University of Nicosia, Nicosia, Cyprus
3. **Prof. Christos Politis**, Kingston University, Kingston Upon Thames, United Kingdom
4. **Prof. Angelos Stefanidis**, Bournemouth University, Poole, United Kingdom
5. **Dr. Paraskevas Dalianis**, UniSystems S.M.S.A., Athens, Greece

II. Review Procedure and Documentation

The External Evaluation & Accreditation Panel (EEAP) for the accreditation of the Computer Science & Telecommunications Program of the University of Thessaly was formed in June 2020.

The EEAP members attended a virtual (via zoom) meeting from the HAHE premises in Athens on Tuesday June 30th, 2020, at which the General Director of HAHE explained the Accreditation Procedure, and the role and tasks of the EEAP members. The EEAP members met online privately afterwards to discuss their initial impressions of the Department and divide the work prior to the meetings with the department.

The site visit to the Department of Computer Science & Telecommunications of the University of Thessaly (UTH) at Lamia took place virtually utilizing Zoom meetings and video facilities on Monday July 6th. The first day of meetings lasted from 15.00 to 17.00.

At the welcome meeting, the EEAP met the Vice-Rector and President of MODIP, Prof. Yiannis Theodorakis, and the Head of Department, Associate Prof. George Furlas. Due to some early connectivity problems that caused delays in the start of the meeting, the Vice-Rector welcomed the Panel and invited the Department Head, Prof. Furlas to present a broad overview of the history and current situation of the department and inform the EEAP about the Quality Assurance Procedures. He indicated that the Department participated fully in the university's evaluation processes. Immediately after the first meeting EEAP met with the OMEA (Associate Prof. George Furlas, Assistant Prof. Maria Koziri, and Assistant Prof. George Dimitriou) as well as the MODIP representative Prof. Theodoros Karakasidis to discuss the degree of compliance of the UTH to the Quality Standards for Accreditation, review of student assignments, theses, exam papers & examination materials. After the end of this meeting, the EEAP members met in a separate zoom meeting to discuss and reflect on their first impressions and prepare for the next day.

The following day, July 7th, at 15:00 the Panel had a teleconference with the teaching staff members. The following were present for this meeting: Prof. Anagnostou Kostas, Assistant Prof. Dadaliaris Antonis, Assistant Prof. Nikolaos Zygouris, Assistant Prof. Karras George, Assistant Prof. Spyrou Evangellos, Assistant Prof. Kolomvatsos Konstantinos, Assistant Prof. Tziritas Nikolaos, Assistant Prof. Konstantinou Ioannis, Assistant Prof. Baziana Peristera. EEAP had the opportunity to discuss professional development opportunities, mobility, workload, student evaluations; competence and adequacy of the teaching staff to ensure learning outcomes; link between teaching and research; teaching staff's involvement in applied research, projects and research activities directly related to the programme as well as possible areas of weakness.

At 16:00 the EEAP met with several undergraduate students to review their perception about the program, their satisfaction from the study experience and Department/Institution facilities; their input in quality assurance; and any priority issues concerning student life and welfare.

Following that meeting EEAP had the opportunity to watch a video prepared by the department with the main university facilities, classrooms, office, dining hall, labs and library. At 17:15 EEAP met with administrative staff (Ms. Patrikou Malamo, Ms. Makri Efrosini, Ms. Karanika Athanasia), laboratory teaching staff (Dr. Karageorgos Athanasios) and the members of the Special Technical Staff (Mr. Aleksopoulos Dimitrios and Ms. Latou Chara). They were all immensely helpful in assisting the EEAP to evaluate facilities and learning resources to ascertain that the learning materials, equipment and facilities are adequate for a successful provision of the programme.

At 17:30 EEAP met with the external stakeholders and social partners (President of Lamia Municipal Council, Mr. George Kirodimos, Chamber of Fthiotida, Mr. George Zardas, Former Regional Director of Primary and Secondary Education of Fthiotida, Mr. Elias Palialexis, Region of Central Greece - Information Systems Department, Mr. Grigorios Kalisiakis, CEO in Agricultural Collaboration STEVIA HELLAS, Mr. Christos Stamatis.

The last meeting of the day was at 18:15 with the Programme graduates: Ms. Kalogianni Eleni, Mr. Lignos Ioannis, Mr. Tsamadias Gregory, Ms. Kallitsopoulou Styliani, Mr. Argyriou Ioannis.

The following day, July 8th, EEAP had its last follow-up meeting with the OMEA and MODIP representatives during which additional comments and clarifications were brought up, all of which related to Quality Policy and the undergraduate Program of Studies. The Vice Rector and the Department Chair joined from the beginning of the meeting. The EEAP gave a short preliminary verbal report about their impressions and findings of the virtual visit. The EEAP thanked everyone for their participation, cooperation, and virtual hospitality.

III. Study Programme Profile

The Department of Computer Science and Telecommunications is located in the city of Lamia and is part of the University of Thessaly. The Department was originally established in 2013 (Government Gazette ΦΕΚ 131/5-6-2013) and started accepting students in 2013-2014 as Department of Informatics by renaming the University's Department of Mathematics and Computer Science that already existed in the city of Larissa which was initially established in 1993 (Π.Δ. 177/1993). In 2019 the department was named into its current name: Department of Computer Science & Telecommunications.

The Department offers bachelor, postgraduate (masters), and doctoral degrees. Its bachelor's degree requires at least four years of studies and provides its graduates the skills necessary to work in the general fields of computer science, telecommunications, or both. The professional rights of the graduates of the Department are equivalent to the rights of the graduates of the relevant Greek University departments.

The Department had only 2 faculty members up until last year and currently went up to 12 faculty (10 assistant professors, 1 associate professor, and 1 full professor), and a number of laboratory instruction staff (EDIP), along with the appropriate number of administrative personnel. The Department's facilities span two different buildings that are about one kilometer away from each other. Currently there are about 787 undergraduate students and a number of post graduate and Ph.D. students studying at the department.

Ever since its inception, the department has set as its main goal to advance the scientific knowledge in the areas of Computer Science and Telecommunications, the preparations of its graduates for the very demanding and ever-changing working environment of technology.

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 EAAP has concluded that the Department's curriculum, its learning and teaching methods, the quality assurance provision, and the expanding monitoring and enhancement mechanisms, meet partly the expected national and international standards of educational provision in the area of Computer Science and Telecommunications. It is the opinion of the EAAP that the

Department is on a positive trajectory of developmental growth, and it is expected to continue to improve in the future, following the recent growth of its staff base.

Extensive discussions with the students, academic and administrative staff, and various external stakeholders, but also the careful review of the policies and procedures of the Department, have shown that the Department is gradually beginning to establish its academic and research identity, and is becoming more confident as a national academic entity in the field of computer science and telecommunications.

The EAAP recognises the tremendous efforts which a very small number of staff have made for the first few years of operation and recognises their significant contributions. However, the embryonic size of the Department has meant that many of the prevailing academic and research standards found in comparable departments are only beginning to become an established practice in this case. Hence, the quality assurance processes concerning the monitoring, feedback and academic attainment, the reflection on teaching methods, the embedding of research into teaching, the development of tangible links with external stakeholders to enhance student employability prospects, and the general collaborative links with the wider national and international community, are only gradually becoming established at this point.

The EAAP recognises the strong teaching and research ethos which underpins the growing academic team of the Department. It also recognises the emerging research agenda promoted by the different research centers and the plans to enhance the level of co-creation of research outputs with undergraduate students. There are also emerging plans for cross-disciplinary research work which are a positive development.

The annual review of the programme whose purpose is to collate feedback from all the relevant stakeholders is viewed by the EAAP as in need of further enhancement. The process followed thus far, has not been sufficiently reflective or pluralistic enough as a result of not engaging sufficiently with external stakeholders. There is a need to establish clear performance indicators which will be monitored carefully. Similarly, student feedback from questionnaires but also other indirect means, teaching and research related observations, and reflections from academic teaching staff, should also become more prominent in the annual cycle of performance and attainment evaluations.

In line with the earlier observations, the Department's OMEA has done a great deal of work under the auspices of the University's MODIP. The EAAP hopes that the recent additions to the staff complement and the broader engagement with external and internal stakeholders will make the collective responsibility for overseeing the quality assurance processes less reliant on a very small number of staff. As such, one of the primary quality assurance practices of direct student feedback acquisition through the administration of questionnaires would become more robust and measurable.

Panel Judgement

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

Panel Recommendations

- The Department should continue to enhance the use of the student feedback questionnaires to supplement the existing informal mechanisms of gathering indirect feedback from the students.
- It is recommended that the Department reassess its academic and research identity to reflect the profile of the newly appointed academic staff and how they can be best interfaced with the existing teaching committees and research centers (ways of linking teaching with research).
- Ensure that the departmental targets and KPIs incorporate the relevant views of external stakeholders, specifically those which relate to employability and graduate prospects.

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 Department's degree programme was initially developed in 2013-2014. The programme requires the completion of 240 ECTS units, which may be obtained following the successful completion of the 27 required core courses that all students need to take, a thesis, an optional practical training, as well as, the successful completion of at least 13 optional courses from a list of about 47 elective courses offered. At its current status, the programme does not have any discrete tracks or specializations related to any partial set of these elective courses.

The programme offers a great variety of courses covering a broad aspect of the Computer Science and Telecommunications field. The faculty has done an outstanding job within the study programme guide in articulating the set of learning objectives that its students are expected to meet at time of graduation. The guide is currently provided only in the Greek language, which eliminates the possibilities for foreign students to consider the Department as a probable destination during their participation in the student exchange ERASMUS+ program.

Panel Judgement

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

Panel Recommendations

- The Department should implement its plans for ongoing degree programme updates.
- A formal and efficient process has to be defined and implemented assuring the consultation of stakeholders, students, graduates, external experts, etc., in the curriculum revision.
- The Department should prepare an English version of its Student Guide providing sufficient information for foreign students who might potentially consider it as their destination via the ERASMUS student exchange program.
- The Department needs to precisely specify how the stated learning objectives of its degree programme are satisfied by the courses that it offers and how they are assessed.
- Course description within the student guide should be enhanced towards their clear association with the posed learning programme's objectives.

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

There is significant effort for a student-centered learning approach to be adopted and applied by the Department but there is always room for improvement. This improvement may include novel techniques for having students in the loop of learning for which the Department is encouraged to take-up and commence the steps forward for ensuring the actual participation of students in the decision-making bodies of the program. It is noteworthy that there is no annual assessment

presented so that the continuous evolution of the programme of study, the structure and content of its courses can be monitored.

Students are encouraged to develop their skills through individual and group assignments and projects. There is sufficient evidence that students are given some opportunities to participate in research-oriented projects in their final years whereas some of them continue further with applied research projects. However, this should be organized and arranged systematically, and social partners should be engaged solidly and actively. It is important to mention that students can easily reach the industry sector of their discipline but unfortunately not through the pathway of the social partners or any career hub of the University.

It is clear that students have no idea and/or communication of/by the career office and never asked to be guided towards this direction (i.e. workshop day with the social partners/meet industry key persons). This is also clearly indicated by the social partners who mentioned that the Department has no solid relations with them particularly for innovation and applied research and development projects. All students are required to work on a thesis during the last year of their studies.

Based on the feedback provided, students feel that they are provided a sufficient set of skills towards the market needs. Selective courses available on the study guide appear to align with the students' demands and are consistently offered to the students. Emphasis is being given to applications although some basic theory courses are provided as well. However, students unanimously expressed that some cutting-edge innovating courses are never offered (i.e. Mobile programming and cross platforms' programming) mentioning that they need to revise the offered courses to enable more modern and cutting-edge topics to be included.

The Department encourages an open-door environment approach making students comfortable to meet with their instructors for any request. The Department has just established the role of Academic Advisor (only new students were aware of this role), that must be implemented for all students. Detailed process and sufficient rules have not yet been specified and documented towards the whole process.

In terms of assessment and continuous improvement, the Department maintains an effective way to collect feedback from the students. The response rates in the student evaluation questionnaires may, however, be further enhanced.

The Panel appreciates the fact that the Department is committed to stimulating a student-centered learning environment and promoting mutual respect, promoting the continuous evaluation and enhancement of its structure and processes towards this direction. Additionally, the Panel acknowledges the significant support and infrastructure that exists for students with physical or learning disabilities or disorders.

The Department’s provisions for allowing access, both physically and electronically, in various forms and capacities, is commendable. In general, the committee observed that the Department is committed to fostering a student-centered learning environment and promoting mutual respect and has taken several steps towards this direction. Finally, the committee has noted that the services of the Department’s secretariat are excellent addressing the needs of numerous students on a daily basis and ensuring the regular operation of the Department.

Panel Judgement

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

Panel Recommendations

- There is a lack of well-established policies that govern several parts of the student learning, teaching and assessment:
 - The advance dissemination of course outlines to students (e.g. beginning of the semester/first week of classes), and their enforcement to be aware of the courses’ requirements.
 - A formal procedure for student appeals.
 - A policy for the “acceptable time” of posting grades.
- The Department’s commitment to fostering a student-centered learning environment should continue by further working to increase the interest of the students for the offered courses by adding new cutting edge topics to the courses as well as encourage continuous assessment and monitoring of students. The periodic reviews of the program should be formalized, well documented, and embraced by all.
- The Department needs to consider the broader dissemination of the above and existing policies related to students’ rights and responsibilities (appeals, academic integrity, etc.). This could be done in various ways, e.g., during orientation week, the student handbook, the web site, etc.
- It would be desirable for the department to expand its existing courses to cover more courses (in cutting edge fields) across the programme, in an effort to align even further the theoretical with the practical aspects of the Computer Science discipline. EEAP feels that this would be a good approach to enhance learning and teaching and strengthen the programme and its Learning Outcomes.
- The participation of undergraduate students is limited to conducting thesis related to the research topics of the projects that the Department granted. Considering the latter, the

limited or inexistence of the social partners alleviate this problem limiting at the same time the number of internships or scholarships.

- The Department needs to develop effective ways to collect measurable and actionable feedback from students and increase the response rate. Development of diverse quality processes for monitoring, evaluation and enhancement of students' progression is required.
- As job and career counselling services are not currently offered in an organized way (through a career office-does not really exist) on individual or group level, this should be initiated within a very short period of time so that students have a view of the market and a gate to access it. The latter should be linked with the social partners as these ties are essential for the Department.

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

Key information which underpins the orientation of new students during their first few weeks at the University of Thessaly (UTH), is available on the university's website. Students commented on how useful and accessible the provided information is, and how it helped them gain a useful insight into their study programme, the Department, and the support services of the institution.

As part of their studies, students have to undertake a Senior Thesis (Διπλωματική Εργασία) with the support of an academic advisor. There are no measures currently in ensuring fairness of process and ability to be seen by a second examiner. Furthermore, it appears that there is no thesis handbook provided to the students.

The Department is proactive in trying to promote funding opportunities, such as ERASMUS+ programmes and dedicates reasonable resources in that respect. However, all the information provided is in Greek.

Students also have the option of a paid internship in industry (or other participating institutions) during the summer months of the last two academic years. Furthermore, students are able to participate in the ERASMUS+ programme by spending one or two semesters at an overseas institution. Though, it appears that this scheme is not overly utilized neither by outgoing nor incoming students. For the latter, it is even more difficult as the information provided on the department's website is not in English.

Part of the department's effort to increase the support to students throughout their studies, is based on the role of the Academic Advisor. It appears that there are no guidelines provided to the students on this academic role. Furthermore, it became apparent to the External Evaluation & Accreditation Panel (EEAP) during the discussion with the students that they are not aware of

this offering. It is therefore strongly recommended that the effort should be intensified in order to promote this opportunity to a wide community of students.

There is a Diploma Supplement made available to the students.

Finally, it is recommended that all the above academic offerings are supported and further enhanced with the creation of an external advisory board. This can be manned with experts from the local industry, who appear very enthusiastic for their involvement with the Institution.

Panel Judgement

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

Panel Recommendations

- Senior thesis processes should be enhanced to allow for fairness and ability to moderate the final mark.
- The academic advisor role should be widely advertised and promoted as students appear not to be using this offered benefit.
- The establishment of an External (Industrial) Advisory Board is recommended and should be used as a significant step forward.

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 has teaching staff (faculty, special teaching staff (ΕΔΙΠ), temporal teaching staff) of high quality and committed to their teaching, research responsibilities and administrative duties. This is particularly important as the department is young (6 years in existence), started under its current name with two faculty members in 2017-2018 and only recently begun hiring a substantial number of new faculty members at the level of Assistant Professor. The selection of the teaching staff of the Department follows the well-established procedures mandated by Greek law and observed by all universities in Greece (N. 4009/2011, article 19, as it was modified by v. 4386/2016, v.4405/2016, v.4485/2017 και v.4521/2018) without any deviations and with absolute transparency (system APELLA - ΑΠΕΛΛΑ). These rather complex rules are common to all Greek Universities. The department has set up and follows transparent processes for the recruitment of qualified staff. Special emphasis is given in highlighting the importance of teaching and research.

The teaching workload of the teaching staff follows existing applicable laws and regulations. The EEAP deems the overall load distribution among the members of the Department appropriate in a way that allows them to perform research and devote a considerable amount of time to it. The EEAP observed a significant effort of the teaching faculty to bring quality research into the undergraduate classrooms. Undergraduate students are participating in research projects as part of their thesis work.

The Department has extremely limited means for assuring professional development opportunities and mobility for its faculty members. Consequently, the existing efforts are rather limited and inadequate to ensure the participation of all faculty members and in a more frequent manner. This is by no means the exclusive responsibility of the Department and it is associated with the overall financial situation in the country and the University of the Thessaly.

The evaluation of the teaching staff of the Department is an area of concern. There are established processes of evaluating the teaching staff every semester by asking the students to fill electronic questionnaires/surveys through the electronic system of MODIP. This is a highly commendable and private process. However, the problem lies with the student turnout which is extremely low making the results of the process mostly unusable and the teaching evaluation impractical. EEAP recognizes that this situation is difficult to remedy but the Department should intensify the efforts to convince and incentivize the students to participate in the process, since this is directly linked with the evaluation of the faculty members and their professional advancement. The EEAP is concerned about the absence of other assessment methods in place like for example peer evaluations by other staff members via a mechanism such as individual Faculty Activity Reports. Additionally, there is a lack of peer mentoring especially by more experienced staff members to newly appointed ones. The peer mentoring could be extended beyond teaching to other staff activities like grant proposal writing, etc. EEAP strongly feels that it is the right time for the Department, as it has grown the size of its faculty members, to consider these ideas.

Additionally, the Department needs to work harder and more consistently into providing a more complete and comprehensive research strategy. While this process has started with the establishment of Labs (Εργαστήρια), EEAP would recommend the formation of an internal Strategic Research Committee. Due to the limited external funding, the Department needs to go beyond just compiling ideas of the existing research labs that provide some information on the strengths of the Department in various research areas. There is a need to formulate and communicate a research strategy, describe it in concrete terms and design and implement measures to support it. The Department in its Proposal for Accreditation (Principle 5, page 17) acknowledges that there is limited funding for professional development opportunities and teaching staff mobility.

Panel Judgement

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

Panel Recommendations

- Establish a seed funding mechanism to the extent possible to support internally the research and professional development and mobility of its members, especially the newer ones.
- Establish peer review processes among its members both for teaching and research evaluations and combine those with the ones by the students.
- Establish mentoring processes for junior faculty to support their first steps towards teaching at high level and successful grant proposal writing.
- Establish a comprehensive research strategy and various criteria in order to evaluate the implementation of this strategy by the faculty members.
- Establish frequent (at least once every two years or annually) self-assessment procedures for its faculty. This could be facilitated by the creation of a self-report (**Faculty Activity Report**) for all faculty where they will be asked to report their teaching/research/service achievements/participation in the current academic year. This will help the faculty to prepare their tenure and/or promotion dossiers as well as provide them and any external/internal evaluation committee to glance over their achievements on a particular year or set of years.

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

Whereas normally the EAAP would have the opportunity to visit in person the facilities of the Department, the evaluation of learning resources supporting both the teaching and research on this occasion, was carried out using feedback offered by the students, the meeting with admin staff, feedback from the academic team, and the various aspects of the documentary evidence provided.

Overall, the EAAP has concluded that the general provision of facilities is broadly satisfactory. This judgement has taken into account the current and future expansion plans of the institution, with the growth plans of the estate of the University and the construction of new specialist buildings being key for the future growth of the Department.

The students were predominantly positive about the quality of the teaching facilities, with some concerns expressed about the size and level of provision of the main food canteen. Additional concerns were also expressed about the size of the existing library, which was described as not being large enough to accommodate the increasing student numbers. However, it was noted that additional space was becoming available, which should alleviate this problem going forward.

The Department has a growing number of research centers, each of which features its own dedicated space. This space has been designed to accommodate the academic and research staff

who work in each area, along with the standard and specialist equipment which is needed for each lab.

The University does not provide any dormitories or sport facilities for its Departments located in Lamia.

An overall positive outlook was noted at the end of the meeting with the administrative staff of the Department expressing their general satisfaction with the support they receive to carry out their duties well. Equally positive comments were made by the students who expressed their appreciation for the easy access to administrative services and staff.

Panel Judgement

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

Panel Recommendations

- The improving student to staff ratio of the Department is seen as a very positive development, however, a plan capturing the deployment of new staff in relation to their responsibilities and the way in which they will support future Departmental plans, would be useful.
- The additional resources which are gradually becoming available, such as the new library and new research labs, should have a positive impact on the overall student experience and the research capability of the Department but it would be useful to establish how these improvements will be realized in the soft and long term future.

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

The EEAP recognises that availability of digital resources, information and associated mechanisms, as well as student support, are significantly impacted by the financial constraints imposed on the entire higher education sector in Greece. The EEAP also wishes to note that the Library and its digital resources were not inspected due to the virtual environment. The learning and teaching environment is appropriate and of high quality with all supporting equipment in the premises, while the provision for disabled access to both Libraries (Lamia and Volos) is highly commendable.

The MODIP of University of Thessaly (UTH) is responsible for overseeing the continuous improvement of its academic provision and research outputs, as well as the efficient operation of its academic services, in accordance with international practices and the guidelines stipulated by Hellenic Authority for Higher Education (HAHE). For this purpose, University of Thessaly has established a set of principles for the collection of data regarding students, teaching staff, course structures, annual monitoring, assessments, etc.

Efficiency measurements include quantitative and qualitative indicators which provide valuable and reliable information, the collection of datasets encompassing the number and categories of indicators per quality objective, and their analysis and reporting for the purpose of supporting higher level decision-making.

Panel Judgement

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

Panel Recommendations

The EEAP recommends that the Department prioritizes the opportunities that will be derived from having social partners and market stakeholders as partners. This can be achieved if the Department:

- Establishes regulations and processes for engaging social partners in the learning process as well as establishing formal job and career counselling services in an organised way (students were totally unaware of these) on individual or group level by organizing Open Days.
- Establishes formal and systematic processes for eliciting input from stakeholders, industrial partners and alumni. The Department should also establish processes of evaluating this input and proposing specific actions based on it.
- Performs dedicated surveys involving students, alumni and the industry regularly and establishes procedures to incorporate the results in the assessment process.
- Tracks the alumni of the Department as currently there are no evident established mechanisms that alumni are monitored and contacted in an organised way.
- Prioritizes the hiring of new faculty members (finalizing their hiring procedures) in order to ensure that the overall KPIs are adopted.
- Prioritizes -by establishing internal regulations and mechanisms- the minimization of the number of students that are leaving (re-admission) for other Universities. The latter should be achieved by providing incentives to students and employing them further in academic processes.
- Take steps at Departmental, institutional, and state level for ensuring the actual participation of students in the decision-making bodies of the program.
- Perform a staff satisfaction survey to have a measurable approach to obtain feedback from staff.

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 Departmental website provides the main channel of communication for both students and staff of the Department, as well as the outside world. The website is reasonably structured, though in places is quite crude, e.g. some of the research laboratories lack a website describing their activities and research outputs. The content is mainly provided in the Greek language. The equivalent English website is completed to a lesser extent with most of its sections without content or with pages which are redirected back to the Greek site.

The content of the website is broken down into a number of sections which cover educational, administrative, and social matters, with most key information being present. The navigation between the different parts of the site is easy; basic web usability principles are adhered to. The content appears to be updated regularly. It is understood during the interviews with the students that the teaching material is available on the signed-in part of UTH's website, which hosts the e-class virtual learning tool.

The pass rates and the graduate employment information are not available on the departmental website. It appeared during the meetings with the academic staff that this information was only available to the staff and not the students.

Panel Judgement

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

Panel Recommendations

- The website could feature more pertinent information for incoming ERASMUS+ students. For instance, it should be easy to find courses offered in English per semester. It is also apparent that there is no information for non-Greek speaking students.

- The PDF version of the Study Guide is comprehensive, but its contents should also be available as a 'hypertext' to allow selective access. It should be offered in English too for non-Greek speaking students.
- The pass rates and the graduate employment information should be made widely available to the students on the Departmental website.

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 study program has been designed and is periodically reviewed by the Department's committee. The programme, in general, follows the international standards and provides courses covering a number of different and diverse topics of the Computer Science and Telecommunications area. However, due to the fact that until this year, the faculty was limited to the number of 4 professors, the periodic review and monitoring process was arranged around their availability. This means that it was not self-assessed on an annual basis until recently and the outcome of such processes was not sufficiently recorded. To that end, the Department has to consider the quality guidelines posed by HQA and the University's Quality Assurance Unit (MODIP) and reorganize its processes and committees involving all staff and fulfilling all related expectations.

The Department and staff have fully declared their commitment to complete and realize detailed action plans currently under development, in order to assure the regular monitoring, review and revision of the study programme.

Due to the above-mentioned staff limitations, there was no sufficient evaluation of the society's needs. Although the students which participated in the meetings expressed their satisfaction regarding the programme's workload, they appeared to have limited information on the review

processes. Besides, as was declared, till now there was no student representative assigned to participate in any of the Department's committees.

There is no evidence of a widespread sharing of the results among the other members of the Department (students, non-teaching staff) and neither a formal process of collectively evaluating the results of the self-assessment.

In the EEAP meetings with faculty, staff, students and graduates, there was strong evidence of the existence of a friendly and mutually respectful relationship among them. To that end, there were very positive comments regarding the availability, assistance and support that the students enjoy during their studies. This positive relationship has to be reflected in the programme's review and monitoring processes.

Panel Judgement

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

Panel Recommendations

- Introduce clear, measurable action plans and set up and fully document processes to assure the periodic and annual evaluation and improvement of the study programme.
- Clearly communicate the appropriate actions to all stakeholders.
- Involve external stakeholders in the form of an External Advisory Committee in a periodic monitoring and review process of the study programme.
- Set up and realize formal procedures for eliciting and effectively using input from all stakeholders (faculty, staff, students, external stakeholders).

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 administering 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

To the best of EEAP's knowledge the department and its program has not gone through any external evaluation exercise before, neither as Computer Science & Telecommunications department nor as previously named and merged departments. It is the first time the Department's study programme is going through an evaluation or accreditation review led by HAHE. The Department acknowledges this limitation and lack of experience in its Proposal for Accreditation (Principle 10, page 31).

Based on the information gathered during the online Zoom visit, it appears that the faculty, lab personnel, and administrative staff are aware of the importance of the external review process and its contribution to improvement. All available stakeholders of the programme were actively engaged in the external review, although we noticed that there were not many representatives of some categories – like relevant external/social partners – available. It is expected that all stakeholders will be actively engaged to the appropriate extent to the follow-up actions upon their implementation, as the Department committed towards that.

Panel Judgement

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

Panel Recommendations

- The Department should make the best out of the final accreditation report and share the results, its recommendations and collaborate on its outcomes with every internal and external stakeholder as well as devise an action plan for the department to assess and ensure the implementation of the appropriate external evaluation suggestions and recommendations.
- The Department is advised to come up with follow-up yearly reports that would allow external entities (e.g. the University, the HAHE, etc.) to follow up on the implementation of the recommendations included in this report.
- The Department should identify and implement further actions to achieve better awareness of the quality assurance process among all stakeholders, enhancing their involvement in all aspects of the required activities.
- The department should employ innovative and efficient procedures for collecting meaningful and actionable feedback from the students and external stakeholders. All their actions and committee meetings should formally be recorded in minutes so that actions/responsibilities can formally be assigned to internal stakeholders.

PART C: CONCLUSIONS

I. Features of Good Practice

- There is significant effort for a student-centered learning approach to be adopted and applied by the Department but there is always room for improvement. This improvement may include novel techniques for having students in the loop of learning for which the Department is encouraged to take-up and commence the steps forward for ensuring the actual participation of students in the decision-making bodies of the program.
- The EEAP appreciates the fact that despite its limited -till recently- staff, the Department supports the existence of a final year Diploma Thesis as a requirement for graduation.
- The EEAP appreciates the fact that the Department is committed to stimulating a student-oriented learning environment and promoting mutual respect, promoting the continuous evaluation and enhancement of its structure and processes towards this direction.
- Additionally, the EEAP acknowledges the significant support and infrastructure that exists for students with physical or learning disabilities or disorders.
- Based on the feedback provided, students feel that they are provided a sufficient set of skills towards the market needs. Selective courses available on the study guide appear to align with the students' demands and are regularly offered to the students.
- The Department encourages an open-door environment approach making students comfortable to meet with their instructors for any request. The Department has just established the role of Academic Advisor (only new students were aware of this role), however a lot of room for improvement, towards the appropriate utilization of this role, exists.

II. Areas of Weakness

- The Department's commitment to fostering a student-centered learning environment should continue by further working to increase the interest of the students for the offered courses by adding new cutting-edge topics to the courses as well as encourage continuous assessment and monitoring of students. The periodic reviews of the program should be formalized, well documented, and embraced by all.
- The Department needs to consider the broader dissemination of the above and existing policies related to students' rights and responsibilities (appeals, academic integrity, etc.). This could be done in various ways, e.g., during orientation week, the student handbook, the web site, etc.
- It would be desirable for the department to expand its existing courses to cover more courses (in cutting edge fields) across the programme, in an effort to align even further the theoretical with the practical aspects of the Computer Science discipline. EEAP feels

that this would be a good approach to enhance learning and teaching and strengthen the programme and its Learning Outcomes.

- The participation of undergraduate students is limited to conducting a thesis related to the research topics of the projects that the Department granted. Considering the latter, the limited participation or inexistence of the social partners exacerbate this problem, limiting at the same time the number of internships or scholarships.
- The EEAP recognizes the lack of student dormitories as well as the lack of sports facilities.
- As job and career counselling services are not currently offered in an organised way (through a career office - does not really exist) on individual or group level, this should be initiated within a very short period of time so that students have a view of the market and a gate to access it. The latter should be linked with the social partners as these ties are essential for the Department.
- Take steps at Departmental, institutional, and state level for ensuring the actual participation of students in the decision-making bodies of the program.
- Perform a staff satisfaction survey to have a measurable approach to obtain feedback from staff.

III. Recommendations for Follow-up Actions

- The Department should continue to enhance the use of the student feedback questionnaires to supplement the existing informal mechanisms of gathering direct feedback from the students.
- It is recommended that the Department reassess its academic and research identity to reflect the profile of the newly appointed academic staff and how they can be best interfaced with the existing teaching committees and research centers (ways of linking teaching with research).
- Ensure departmental targets and KPIs incorporate the relevant views of external stakeholders, specifically those which relate to employability and graduate prospects.
- The Department should implement its plans for ongoing degree programme updates.
- A formal and efficient process has to be defined and implemented assuring the consultation of stakeholders, students, graduates, external experts, etc., in the curriculum revision.
- The Department should prepare an English version of its Student Guide providing sufficient information for foreign students who might potentially consider it as their destination via the ERASMUS student exchange program.
- The Department needs to precisely specify how the stated learning objectives of its degree programme are satisfied by the courses that it offers and how they are assessed.
- The Department's commitment to fostering a student-centered learning environment should continue by further working to increase the interest of the students for the offered

courses by adding new cutting edge topics to the courses as well as encourage continuous assessment and monitoring of students. The periodic reviews of the program should be formalized, well documented, and embraced by all.

- The Department needs to consider the broader dissemination of the above and existing policies related to students' rights and responsibilities (appeals, academic integrity, etc.). This could be done in various ways, e.g., during orientation week, the student handbook, the website, etc.
- As job and career counselling services are not currently offered in an organised way (through a career office-does not really exist) on individual or group level, this should be initiated within a very short period of time so that students have a view of the market and a gate to access it. The latter should be linked with the social partners as these ties are essential for the Department.
- The establishment of an External (Industrial) Advisory Board is recommended as well as the set-up of formal procedures for eliciting and effectively using input from all stakeholders (faculty, staff, students, social partners, external stakeholders).
- Establish a seed funding mechanism to the extent possible to support internally the research and professional development and mobility of its members, especially the newer ones.
- Establish peer review processes among its members both for teaching and research evaluations and combine those with the ones by the students.
- Establish frequent (at least once every two years or annually) self-assessment procedures for its faculty. This could be facilitated by the creation of a self-report (Faculty Activity Report) for all faculty where they will be asked to report their teaching/ research/ service achievements/ participation in the current academic year. This will help the faculty to prepare their tenure and/or promotion dossiers as well as provide them and any external/internal evaluation committee to glance over their achievements on a particular year or set of years.
- Establish regulations and processes for engaging social partners in the learning process as well as establishing formal job and career counselling services in an organised way (students were totally unaware of these) on individual or group level by organizing Open Days.
- The website could feature more pertinent information for incoming ERASMUS+ students. For instance, it should be easy to find courses offered in English per semester. It is also apparent that there is no information for non-Greek speaking students.
- The Department is strongly advised to come up with follow-up yearly reports that would allow external entities (e.g. the University, the HAHE, etc.) to follow up on the implementation of the recommendations included in this report.

IV. Summary & Overall Assessment

The Principles where full compliance has been achieved are:

NONE

The Principles where substantial compliance has been achieved are:

Principles: 2, 5, 6, 7

The Principles where partial compliance has been achieved are:

Principles: 1, 3, 4, 8, 9, 10

The Principles where failure of compliance was identified are:

NONE

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

The members of the External Evaluation & Accreditation Panel

Name and Surname

Signature

1. **Prof. Sotirios Skevoulis** (Chair), Pace University,
New York City, New York, USA
2. **Prof. Constandinos Mavromoustakis**, University
of Nicosia, Nicosia, Cyprus
3. **Prof. Christos Politis**, Kingston University,
Kingston Upon Thames, United Kingdom
4. **Prof. Angelos Stefanidis**, Bournemouth
University, Poole, United Kingdom
5. **Dr. Paraskevas Dalianis**, UniSystems S.M.S.A.,
Athens, Greece