



**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 • **F.** +30 210 9220 143 • **E.** secretariat@ethaae.gr • [www.ethaae.gr](http://www.ethaae.gr)

# Accreditation Report for the Internal Quality Assurance System (IQAS)

**Institution Name: Technical University of Crete**

**Date: 11 September 2021**

Report of the Panel appointed by the HAHE to undertake the review of the  
Internal Quality Assurance System (IQAS) of the **Technical University of  
Crete** for the purposes of granting accreditation

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>Part A: Background and Context of the Review</b> .....	<b>4</b>
I.    The External Evaluation & Accreditation Panel.....	4
II.   Review Procedure and Documentation .....	5
III.  Institution Profile.....	7
<b>Part B: Compliance with the Principles</b> .....	<b>8</b>
Principle 1: Institution Policy for Quality Assurance.....	8
Principle 2: Provision and Management of the Necessary Resources .....	10
Principle 3: Establishing Goals for Quality Assurance.....	16
Principle 4: Structure, Organisation and Operation of the IQAS .....	18
Principle 5: Self-Assessment .....	21
Principle 6: Collection of Quality Data: Measuring, Analysis and Improvement.....	24
Principle 7: Public Information .....	27
Principle 8: External Evaluation and Accreditation of the IQAS .....	29
<b>Part C: Conclusions</b> .....	<b>31</b>
I.    Features of Good Practice .....	31
II.   Areas of Weakness .....	31
III.  Recommendations for Follow-up Actions .....	32
IV.  Summary & Overall Assessment .....	33

## **PART A: BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT OF THE REVIEW**

### **I. The External Evaluation & Accreditation Panel**

The Panel responsible for the Accreditation Review of the Internal Quality Assurance System (IQAS) of the **Technical University of Crete** comprised the following five (5) members, drawn from the HAHE Register, in accordance with Laws 4009/2011 & 4653/2020:

- 1. Professor Konstantinos Kontis (Chair)**  
University of Glasgow, Glasgow, UK
- 2. Dr Fivos Andritsos**  
European Commission, Joint Research Centre, Ispra, Italy
- 3. Professor Emeritus Spyros Economides**  
California State University, East Bay, Berkeley, California, USA
- 4. Professor Costas Iliopoulos**  
King's College London, London, UK
- 5. Professor Nicholas Vonortas**  
The George Washington University, Washington, D.C., USA

## II. Review Procedure and Documentation

The EEAP reviewed the material provided by HAHE (Hellenic Authority of Higher Education) in advance of the evaluation week including documentation regarding the HAHE mission, standards and guidelines of IQAS (Internal Quality Assurance System) accreditation process, and national framework of Higher Education Institutes (HEIs) including the Quality Measure Metrics. On 6<sup>th</sup> September 2021, the EEAP met in private to discuss the accreditation report for IQAS, allocate tasks and list of issues for the virtual visit. The EEAP started the virtual visit at the Technical University of Crete (TUC) on 07/09/2021. The first meeting was with the Rector and the Vice-Rectors for a short overview regarding its history, vision, mission, Key Performance Indicators (KPIs), and academic profile. Further presentations provided useful information about TUC current status, strengths and possible areas of concern. In the virtual meeting with the Quality Assurance Unit (QUA/MODIP) – Vice-Rector of Administrative, Academic and Student Affairs and MODIP members – the EEAP investigated the degree of compliance of the Internal Quality Assurance System with the Standards for Quality Accreditation. The EEAP received further documentation and supporting material related to the presentations given by QUA/MODIP to facilitate their decision for TUC Quality Accreditation. In the evening, the EEAP met in private to reflect on the discussions and prepare for the second day of the visit.

On 08/09/2021, the program consisted of meetings involving Deans of the Schools, Internal Evaluation Groups (IEGs/OMEA) representatives, students and chief administration officers:

- Meeting with the Deans of the Schools, and Internal Evaluation Groups (IEGs/OMEA) representatives. This facilitated the understanding of the internal evaluation review process, adequacy of resources and possible areas of weaknesses. In addition, discussions took place about the formulation of relationships among the IEGs/OMEA with QUA/MODIP. The EEAP received additional information and supporting material about the Schools.
- Meeting with the Undergraduate (UGT) and Postgraduate (PGT and PGR) students and Postdoc researchers to gain an insight of their study experience and campus facilities, and their input in quality control and decision making; discuss their priority issues concerning student life, welfare, grants, mobility, research and career opportunities, and their views on recruitment, learning, progression, assessment.
- Meeting with the TUC Chief Administration officers to discuss the role of Institutional strategic documents (strategic plan, QA manual etc.) in the development of the Institution, and special issues arising from the internal evaluation process.

In the evening, the EEAP met in private to reflect on the discussions and prepare for the third day of the visit. On 09/09/2021, the program consisted of the following activities involving stakeholders and bodies associated with TUC QUA:

- Meeting with the Graduates and Alumni to discuss their learning experiences at TUC and their career paths.
- Meeting with the external stakeholders to better understand their relations with the Institution.

- On-line tour: overview of TUC, MODIP and other facilities, and discussion about the facilities presented in the videos produced for this purpose. This was an opportunity to evaluate facilities and equipment, to ascertain that the Institution maintains all the necessary resources to ensure its smooth and proper functioning. Links to access the videos were also provided.
- Meeting with the Quality Assurance Unit (QUA/MODIP) members to review several points and findings. The EEAP received further clarifications.
- A final meeting with the Rector and Vice-Rector of Administrative, Academic and Student Affairs of the TUC took place where the EEAP briefly presented their key findings.

The EEAP started the preparation of the report of the Internal Quality Assurance System (IQAS) of TUC following the procedures provided by HAHE.

### **III. Institution Profile**

The Technical University of Crete (TUC) is a state university under the supervision of the Greek Ministry of Education and was founded in 1977 in Chania, Crete. The first students were admitted in 1984. The purpose of the institution is to conduct research, to provide undergraduate and graduate educational programs in modern engineering fields as well as to develop links with the Greek industry. The Technical University of Crete is well placed among the Greek technical universities in terms of research productivity, research funding, scientific publications and citation per faculty member.

It has 323 members of staff, 112 engaging with research/teaching, 80 facilitating laboratory activities and 131 for administrative duties. It also has 6302 undergraduate students, 398 postgraduate students, 243 PhD candidates and 249 fixed-contract researchers. TUC is located on a panoramic site in the peninsula of Akrotiri and covers an area of 750 acres (3.0 km<sup>2</sup>), 7 km northeast of Chania and 1 km from Kounoupidiana. Teaching classrooms, laboratories, workshops, construction units, library, IT & Communications Centre, cafeterias, sports facilities, and students' dormitories are located on campus.

TUC comprises 5 Engineering Schools offering 5 undergraduate programmes and more than 15 postgraduate programmes. Several of the latter programmes are joint and four are taught in English. The administration consists of the Rector, 3 Vice-Rectors, the Senate, the Deans of the Schools and the Heads of Administrative Directorates. It supports knowledge and research, provides highly-qualified education & research activities and facilitates the development of new tools and methodologies. It aspires to strengthen the dialogue with society through the dissemination of achievements and good practices.

TUC maintains permanent partnerships with other domestic and foreign educational and research institutions, with the aim of continually improving the level of study. In addition, it is involved in various European Union Programs aiming for international collaborations, development of innovation and dissemination of knowledge.

## PART B: COMPLIANCE WITH THE PRINCIPLES

### Principle 1: Institution Policy for Quality Assurance

**INSTITUTIONS SHOULD APPLY A QUALITY ASSURANCE POLICY AS PART OF THEIR STRATEGIC MANAGEMENT. THIS POLICY SHOULD BE DEVELOPED AND ADJUSTED ACCORDING TO THE INSTITUTIONS' AREAS OF ACTIVITY. IT SHOULD ALSO BE MADE PUBLIC AND IMPLEMENTED BY ALL PARTIES INVOLVED.**

*The quality assurance policy is the guiding document which sets the operating principles of the Internal Quality Assurance System (IQAS), the principles for the continuous improvement of the Institution, as well as the Institution's obligation for public accountability. It supports the development of quality culture, according to which, all internal stakeholders assume responsibility for quality and engage in quality assurance. This policy has a formal status and is publicly available.*

*The policy for quality is implemented through:*

- *the commitment for compliance with the laws and regulations that govern the Institution;*
- *the establishment, review, redesign and redefinition of quality assurance objectives, that are fully in line with the institutional strategy.*

*This policy mainly supports:*

- *the organisation of the internal quality assurance system;*
- *the Institution's leadership, departments and other organisational units, individual staff members and students to take on their responsibilities in quality assurance;*
- *the integrity of academic principles and ethics, guarding against discriminations, and encouragement of external stakeholders to be involved in quality assurance;*
- *the continuous improvement of learning and teaching, research and innovation;*
- *the quality assurance of the programmes and their alignment with the relevant HAHE Standards;*
- *the effective organisation of services and the development and maintenance of infrastructure;*
- *the allocation and effective management of the necessary resources for the operation of the Institution;*
- *the development and rational allocation of human resources.*

*The way in which this policy is designed, approved, implemented, monitored and revised constitutes one of the processes of the internal quality assurance system.*

### Institution compliance

The Quality Assurance (QA) policy of TUC aims to achieve the goals set by the strategic plan for the period 2020-2022. The achievement of the above goals requires the active participation and contribution of all internal stakeholders to the development and implementation of the QA policy. TUC has demonstrated its commitment in cultivating a culture that focuses on strengthening the quality assurance of all academic, research, administrative and infrastructure at all levels; undergraduate teaching (UGT), postgraduate teaching (PGT), and postgraduate research (PGR). TUC has created and is currently implementing an Internal Quality Assurance System (IQAS) according to the pertinent guidelines and policies.

IQAS complies with the laws and regulations that govern the university. The QA objectives are in line with the institutional strategy and aligned with the standards of IQAS manual. The institution has defined an information system supporting the IQAS processes available for the different groups and the public. The QA policy and the procedures are communicated to all parties. The MODIP (QAU) is responsible for the development, operation and improvement of



the IQAS (it is worth noting that the MODIP activated in the last quarter of 2020). Specific actions are proposed for each Key Performance Indicator (KPI) in order to achieve the desired improvement and corresponding target, which are posted on the TUC’s website openly available to all members of the community.

The future update of the courses is ensured through the internal quality procedural steps that aim to update all existing TUC courses on annual basis, to implement any required modifications. However, how the required modifications are identified by a QA process is not clear. An IQAS procedure of engaging the students, local authorities and industry as well as academic research, which considers all timely feasible approaches and constraints on resources (academic, estates, finances, and policy) is required. In this framework, a closed loop review needs to be established starting with the students’ questionnaire at each individual school OMEAs, communicated to MODIP and discussed at the general assembly. This will present a structured way for continuous improvement of QA processes. The TUC has a quality policy manual that describes the IQAS processes. Information on membership for each process (QA committees) should be published in MODIP’s web pages allowing for their efficient and timely update (when it is required). The established IQAS needs to incorporate procedures and processes relative to the integration of students and staff in the local community and industry.

The policy supports, considering the financial constraints, the organization of TUC services and infrastructure as well as the allocation of necessary resources for the successful operation of the IQAS. The TUC leadership, schools, and organisational units (MODIP, OMEAs), as well as, individual staff members and students, from all years and courses, have expressed their commitment to their responsibilities in the IQAS to align with the relevant HAHE Standards and achieve the continuous improvement of learning and teaching, research and innovation.

### Panel Judgement

<b>Principle 1: Institution Policy for Quality Assurance</b>	
Fully compliant	<b>X</b>
Substantially compliant	
Partially compliant	
Non-compliant	

### Panel Recommendations

- R 1.1 Incorporate a procedure in IQAS with respect to engaging the students, local authorities and industry as well as academic research.
- R 1.2 Information on membership of the QA committees needs to be included in MODIP’s web pages.

## Principle 2: Provision and Management of the Necessary Resources

**INSTITUTIONS SHOULD ENSURE APPROPRIATE FUNDING FOR LEARNING AND TEACHING ACTIVITIES, RESEARCH, AND ACADEMIC ACTIVITIES IN GENERAL. RELEVANT REGULATIONS SHOULD BE IN PLACE TO ASSURE THAT ADEQUATE INFRASTRUCTURE AND SERVICES FOR TEACHING AND RESEARCH ARE AVAILABLE AND READILY ACCESSIBLE (E.G. CLASSROOMS, LABORATORIES, LIBRARIES, IT INFRASTRUCTURE, PROVISION OF FREE MEALS, DORMITORIES, CAREER GUIDANCE AND SOCIAL WELFARE SERVICES, ETC.).**

### Funding

*The Institution ensures adequate funding to cover not only the overhead and operational costs (regular budget and public investment budget) but also costs related to research, innovation and development (Special Account for Research Funds, Property Development and Management Company). The financial planning and the operation of an effective financial management system constitute necessary tools for the full exploitation of the resources.*

### Infrastructure

*Based on the requirements and needs arising during its operation, the Institution has determined ways to define, allocate and maintain all the necessary resources to ensure its smooth and proper functioning, i.e. teaching, research and auxiliary facilities, equipment and software, support facilities (cleaning, transportation, communication) etc. The scope of the IQAS should include a suitable managing and monitoring system to safeguard the infrastructure. Compliance to the internal regulations is also necessary.*

### Working environment

*The Institution ensures -as far as possible- that the working environment has a positive effect on the performance of all members of the academic community (students and staff). Factors that are taken into consideration towards the creation of such a favorable environment are, among others, the sanitary facilities, the lighting/heating/ventilation system, the cleanliness and the overall appearance of the premises, etc. The scope of the IQAS should include an appropriate managing and monitoring system to promote a favorable working environment and to ensure compliance with the existing provisions.*

### Human resources

*The Institution and the academic units are responsible for the human resources development.*

*The subject areas, as well as the competences and tasks of the staff members are defined by the corresponding job descriptions that are established within the operation scope of each academic or administrative unit. These posts are filled following the requirements set by the law, on the basis of transparent, fair and published processes. The continuous training and evaluation of the staff is considered necessary for the enhancement of the performance, which is recorded and monitored as provided in the context of the IQAS.*

*The Institution should acknowledge and provide the necessary resources for the implementation of the IQAS, its enhancement and the provision of services that assist the satisfaction of the quality assurance requirements. Moreover, the Institution (Quality Assurance Unit-QAU) should properly organise the administrative structure and staffing of the IQAS, with a clear allocation of competences and tasks to its staff members.*

## **Institution compliance**

It must be noted that the fact that the accreditation procedure was remote and as such it did not permit a thorough evaluation of Principle 2, more in particular of the sections on the infrastructure and the working environment. The EEAP advises HAHE to proceed with the on-site procedures as soon as the COVID-19 pandemic allows for it.

## **Funding**

The substantial reduction of the state allocation budget for TUC, as well as the rest of the Higher Educational Establishments (AEI), as signalled also in the last External Evaluation Report (EER2015), continued throughout the last decade, resulting to a drop from 4.5 M€/yr of 2010 down to 1.2 M€/yr of 2020. Additionally, from 2018 onwards, TUC has been deprived of several hundred k€ of the ΤΣΜΕΔΕ funds. TUC administration has taken some commendable steps to fill this gap and further finance the Institution's development policy with an investment of 25 M€. However, the overall spending per student remains low, compared both to the EU and the US average.

TUC has an effective and transparent system of allocation of its funds that come from the Government, the Public Investment Funds, the EU, the Industry, the Special Accounts for Research (EAKΕ), as well as from the Property Development and Management Company (ΕΑΔΙΠ) of the University. The distribution and management of these funds is quite effective and is supported adequately by the IT unit. Cooperation among the Rectorate, the Academic Units and the Administration officials of the University ensures the development of a realistic annual operating budget.

EAKΕ supports efficiently the research and development policy of the University. EAKΕ funds are also used for other activities, filling the gap of the diminished public funding, such as the procurement of laboratory equipment, the dissemination and exploitation of the research results, scholarships, participation in scientific conferences, exhibitions, workshops, publications and public relations.

TUC participation in competitive research projects has been steadily increasing, in number of projects, employed researchers and overall budget. In 2020, the bulk of active project budget concerns various services (17 M€), followed by Horizon 2020 programme (13 M€) and ΕΣΠΑ (11 M€).

## **Infrastructure**

From 2013 onwards, TUC is located exclusively at the Akrotiri campus, extended over a TUC-owned area of 2.9 km<sup>2</sup> NE of the town of Chania. All TUC departments are in suitable modern buildings while the student dormitories, located at the same campus, when fully completed will house 300 students in individual fully furnished and equipped rooms. A 250-seat restaurant (students' club) functions within the TUC campus, serving more than 1,600 students who have a right to free meals.

Most departments have their own buildings which are of sufficiently good quality. The only important issue regards the School of Architecture, which does not yet have its own building. However, this issue has been dealt by TUC and a new, dedicated building will be available in the near future. Some students claimed that the common spaces (like the library) could be larger and that many labs do not have sufficiently modern equipment.

The completion and further expansion of the infrastructure is done according to a multi-annual strategic development plan. TUC has already proposed, in the frame of the program "Hellenic Universities II" a new Data Centre and a new building that will host all the TUC administrative services, which are currently located in many buildings.

A centralised technical service is responsible for the maintenance and good functioning of the campus buildings and other infrastructure, assisted by the digital platform helpdesk.tuc.gr.

Another centralised service is responsible for IT infrastructures and services across the whole campus.

The bulk of the TUC students live in the town of Chania, which is expensive but offers a much more attractive environment than the campus. Many students lamented for the scarce and expensive connection between the town of Chania and the TUC campus. Also, there have been some interesting comments on the use of the TUC property in Chania, which could serve better as an TUC antenna downtown, including the organisation of congresses etc.

### **Working Environment**

TUC places particular emphasis on clean, healthy and pleasant environment for the students and staff. It is assisted by the well located and recently constructed campus. Environment and energy are of particular concern for the Administration, which under the umbrella of the “Green University” has taken a number of steps, most of which are still ongoing and have yet to produce results, like the substitution of the TUC car park with electric vehicles, the use of photovoltaics and the passive heating and cooling of the buildings (bioclimatic design).

A protected natural park for the preservation of the flora and fauna spans over a surface of 0.3 km<sup>2</sup> adjacent to the campus functions as a site of ecology studies, helps the students building ecological consciousness and further enhances the TUC’s links with the city of Chania.

Besides the dormitories and the students’ restaurant, mentioned in the infrastructure section above, TUC provides its student and/or staff with a comprehensive list of complementary services. In particular:

A modern Library & Information Centre that supports the TUC’s educational and research activities and, most importantly, provides a pleasant, open workspace for students.

An IT Support Centre (Μηχανογραφικό Κέντρο) provides Hardware and Software (Windows and Linux based) support as well as 5 dedicated rooms with 150+ workplaces. It also provides remote access through VDI services, providing 120+ remote workplaces.

An Interconnection and Career Office (ΓΔΣ) links TUC with the local industry and enterprises and helps students to find employment after their graduation, according to their specialization and personal aspirations. The EEAP stresses the importance of ΓΔΣ, which should serve as an important source of quality feedback from the TUC’s alumni and stakeholders. ΓΔΣ should build on the existing commendable TUC alumni web platform and further expand both in what regards its functionality and the number of connected alumni. Most importantly, ΓΔΣ should be linked with IQAS with the function of providing input from the TUC’s alumni and external stakeholders.

A Public and International Relations Office supports the relation of TUC with the rest of the world at a local, national and international level. It also supports cultural and other students’ activities including 20+ cultural or thematic activity groups.

The Practical Training service is dedicated to further expanding the practical training within TUC and assist students finding the proper practical training placement. Finally, a dedicated ERASMUS+ office supports the international mobility of TUC students in the frame of the ERASMUS mobility programs.

The Counselling and Psychological Support Office is dedicated to the support of the students in all kinds of problems they encounter during their student life. In addition, the Campus is equipped with equipment and facilities dedicated to persons with special needs.

The TUC Innovation house encourages students and staff towards modern entrepreneurship and assists them in protecting novel product or service ideas.

While all the above commendable services are well documented in the TUC's Accreditation Proposal, the explicit link with the IQAS procedures is missing.

## **Human resources**

TUC staffing, at all levels, is ensured by transparent procedures in accordance with the relevant state legal framework. It is backed by the ΑΠΕΛΛΑ IT system. The same holds true for the academic advancement of staff from one academic level to another. The continuous improvement/education of staff, in Greece or abroad, is encouraged through various mechanisms, always within the existing national legal framework. The major concerns regarding the TUC's human resources have been already pointed out at the EER2015 and have not been addressed since. More in particular:

- Inadequate National strategic plan for higher education within which the Institution is called to orientate itself.
- Reduced autonomy of the Institution through a voluminous, complicated, difficult to follow and ever changing legal regulatory framework within which the Institution is called to operate.
- Lack of autonomy as to the number and the quality of student intake and the number of faculty and staff.
- Low compensation/salary of faculty compared to European and International standards that drive faculty abroad.

However, these factors are common across all Greek AEI and are, to a large extent, independent from TUC.

In terms of academic staff, deficiencies have been reported and especially in the School for Mineral Resources, resulting to a significant over-burden. TUC laments the fact that there have been no new positions for Technical / Support Staff (ΕΕΠ, ΕΔΙΠ, ΕΤΕΠ) despite the fact that a number of such staff have left. This results to the understaffing of many academic units, labs and services.

The EEAP was informed that both academic and administrative staff have opportunities for development and training. The University has in place appropriate processes for monitoring these opportunities for various training workshops in Greece and abroad, mainly through the Erasmus+ staff training programs. However, the small number and the resulting over-burden of the Technical / Support staff significantly limits these opportunities.

MODIP' administrative staff should coordinate well all processes that contribute to the IQAS and alleviate the IQAS academic staff from the substantial bureaucratic burden required for the effective compliance with the HAHE requisites. MODIP has been re-activated only recently (late last year) and is currently staffed with just one administrative employee. The EEAP is not satisfied from the explanations provided on the matter.

From the other side, the EEAP commends the initiative towards an integrated IT tool for the automatic collection of the IQAS required data across the Institution. Experience has shown that

such a tool is feasible only if the corresponding ‘manual’ procedures are in place and not vice versa. It is therefore advised that TUC proceeds with the maximum urgency to the adequate staffing of MODIP so as to implement all the necessary functions in parallel to the development of the IT tool in question.

### Panel judgement

<b>Principle 2: Provision &amp; Management of the Necessary Resources</b>	
<b>2.1 Funding</b>	
Fully compliant	<b>X</b>
Substantially compliant	
Partially compliant	
Non-compliant	
<b>2.2 Infrastructure</b>	
Fully compliant	<b>X</b>
Substantially compliant	
Partially compliant	
Non-compliant	
<b>2.3 Working Environment</b>	
Fully compliant	<b>X</b>
Substantially compliant	
Partially compliant	
Non-compliant	
<b>2.4 Human Resources</b>	
Fully compliant	
Substantially compliant	<b>X</b>
Partially compliant	
Non-compliant	

<b>Principle 2: Provision &amp; Management of the Necessary Resources (overall)</b>	
Fully compliant	<b>X</b>
Substantially compliant	
Partially compliant	
Non-compliant	

## **Panel Recommendations**

- R 2.1 Proceed with the maximum urgency to the adequate administrative staffing of MODIP so as to implement all the necessary IQAS functions.
- R 2.2 Proceed with the implementation of a data management system in support of IQAS.
- R 2.3 The role of ΓΔΣ must be enhanced; it must become an important source of quality feedback from the TUC's alumni and stakeholders, building on the existing TUC alumni web platform. Most importantly, ΓΔΣ should be linked with IQAS.
- R 2.4 Fill-in all the technical / support staff posts and, if necessary, create more for the flawless functioning of all TUC services.

### Principle 3: Establishing Goals for Quality Assurance

**INSTITUTIONS SHOULD HAVE CLEAR AND EXPLICIT GOALS REGARDING THE ASSURANCE AND CONTINUOUS UPGRADE OF THE QUALITY OF THE OFFERED PROGRAMMES, THE RESEARCH AND INNOVATION ACTIVITIES, AS WELL AS THE SCIENTIFIC AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES. THESE GOALS MAY BE QUALITATIVE OR QUANTITATIVE AND REFLECT THE INSTITUTIONAL STRATEGY.**

*The Institution's strategy on quality assurance should be translated into time-specific, qualitative and quantitative goals which are regularly monitored, measured and reviewed in the context of the IQAS operation, and following an appropriate procedure.*

*Examples of quality goals:*

- *rise of the average annual graduation rate of the Institution's Undergraduate Programmes to x%;*
- *upgrade of the learning environment through the introduction of digital applications on .....*;
- *improvement of the ratio of scientific publications to teaching staff members to .....*;
- *rise of the total research funding to y%*

*The goals are accompanied by a specific action plan for their achievement, and entail the participation of all stakeholders.*

#### **Institution compliance**

The EER2015 had judged the TUC mission statement and goals as overly broad and difficult to achieve and suggested that TUC should reassess them towards being more specific, achievable, and usable for the TUC performance assessment in future evaluations.

The mission statement of TUC is still rather generic (in fact it could easily be the mission of any university), but it has been broken down in strategic goals in a smart manner, adding several KPIs to the HAHE recommended ones. The QA goals are as expected, at the short term, but long-term planning is missing. The KPIs concerning the administration and the resources could be more extensive. Not all the issues signalled in Principle 2 above can be mapped and monitored with the set of KPIs provided.

The monitoring of the KPIs and, in general, the process to achieve the set goals is not detailed enough. In fact, there are no relevant IQAS procedures in place either for the monitoring or eventual corrective actions to be taken. These facts, as well as other minor flaws and deficiencies, can be explained by the fact that there was no MODIP prior to 2020 and that all these set of goals and plans were setup in a very brief period of time.

The EEAP acknowledges this fact, commends the effort of the academic and support staff involved in preparing a high-quality set of goals and urges MODIP to extend it at mid and long term. It also recommends that MODIP should include in the planning a KPI monitoring system coupled with periodic reviews and procedures for eventual re-adjustment and/or corrective measures.



## Panel judgement

<b>Principle 3: Establishing Goals for Quality Assurance</b>	
<b>3.1 Study Programmes/ education activities</b>	
Fully compliant	
Substantially compliant	<b>X</b>
Partially compliant	
Non-compliant	
<b>3.2 Research &amp; Innovation</b>	
Fully compliant	<b>X</b>
Substantially compliant	
Partially compliant	
Non-compliant	
<b>3.3 Administration (funding, human resources, infrastructure management)</b>	
Fully compliant	
Substantially compliant	<b>X</b>
Partially compliant	
Non-compliant	
<b>3.4 Resources (funding, human resources, infrastructure)</b>	
Fully compliant	
Substantially compliant	<b>X</b>
Partially compliant	
Non-compliant	

<b>Principle 3: Establishing Goals for Quality Assurance (overall)</b>	
Fully compliant	
Substantially compliant	<b>X</b>
Partially compliant	
Non-compliant	

## Panel Recommendations

- R 3.1 Along with short-term goals, there should also be included mid- and long-term goals, and the short-term goals should derive from these mid- and long-term goals.
- R 3.2 MODIP should include in the planning a KPI monitoring system coupled with periodic reviews and procedures for eventual re-adjustment and/or corrective measures.
- R 3.3 The goal-sets / KPIs for the administration and the resources should be more extensive and specific.

## Principle 4: Structure, Organisation and Operation of the IQAS

**INSTITUTIONS SET UP AND ESTABLISH AN INTERNAL QUALITY ASSURANCE SYSTEM, WHICH INCLUDES PROCESSES AND PROCEDURES COVERING ALL AREAS OF ACADEMIC ACTIVITIES AND FUNCTIONS. SPECIAL FOCUS IS GIVEN ON THE QUALITY OF TEACHING AND LEARNING, INCLUDING THE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT, RESEARCH, INNOVATION AND GOVERNANCE.**

*The key goal of the internal quality assurance system (IQAS) is the development, effective operation and continuous improvement of the whole range of the Institution's activities, and particularly, of teaching, research, innovation, governance and relevant services, according to the international practices - especially those of the European Higher Education Area - and the HAHE principles and guidelines described in these Standards.*

### Structure and organisation

*In each Institution, the Quality Assurance Unit (QAU) holds the responsibility for the administration and management of the IQAS. The QAU is set up according to the existing legislative framework and is responsible for:*

- *the development of specialised policy, strategy and relevant processes towards the continuous improvement of the quality of the Institution's work and provisions;*
- *the organisation, operation and continuous improvement of the Institution's internal quality assurance system;*
- *the coordination and support of the evaluation process of the Institution's academic units and other services, and;*
- *the support of the external evaluation and accreditation process of the Institution's programmes and internal quality assurance system in the context of the HAHE principles and guidelines.*

*The Institution's IQAS and its implementation processes are determined by the decisions of the competent bodies, as provided by the law, and are published in the Government Gazette, as well as on the Institution's website. The above are reviewed every six years, at the latest.*

*To achieve the above goals, the QAU collaborates with HAHE, develops and maintains a management information system to store the evaluation data, which are periodically submitted to HAHE, according to the latter's instructions. The QAU is responsible for the systematic monitoring of the evaluation process and for the publication of evaluation-related procedures and their results on the Institution's website.*

*The QAU structure has been approved by the Institution's competent bodies, as provided by the law, while all competences and tasks accruing from this structure are clearly defined.*

### Operation

*The Institution takes action for the design, establishment, implementation, audit and maintenance of the Internal Quality Assurance System (IQAS), taking into account the Standards' requirements, while making any necessary amendments to ensure fitness to achieve its aims.*

*The above actions include:*

- *provision of all necessary processes and procedures for the successful operation of the IQAS, as well as implementation of the above processes and procedures on all of the Institution's parties involved ;the Institution's areas of activity can constitute the IQAS processes, e.g. teaching, research and innovation, governance, services etc. An IQAS process is an area of activity including data input, data processing and outputs. A procedure defines the way an action is implemented and includes a course of stages or steps, e.g. the curriculum design procedure;*
- *determination of how the IQAS procedures / processes are audited, measured and assessed, and how they interact;*
- *provision of all necessary resources to enable the IQAS function.*

### Documentation

*The IQAS documentation includes, among other things, a series of key documents demonstrating its structure and organisation, such as the Quality Manual, which describes how the Standards' requirements are met.*

*The Annexes of the Quality Manual include:*

- *the Quality Policy and the Quality Assurance Objectives;*
- *the necessary written Procedures, along with the entailed forms;*
- *the necessary Guides, External Documents (e.g. pertinent legislation), as well as any other supporting data;*
- *the standing organisational structure of the QAU, with a detailed description of the competences, the required qualifications and the goals for each post. The organisational chart is structured in a manner that ensures that the IQAS organisational requirements are fully and properly met.*

### **Institution compliance**

TUC has recently established the process for quality evaluation and assurance; this is achieved via MODIP at the University level, OMEA at the school level. MODIP was activated in December 2020. The evaluation and assurance processes were established by the Ministry of Education, outlining the structure, the procedures and targets for TUC. The MODIP members are: 5 Professors, one from each of the 5 schools, the Vice-Rector, administrative and support staff representatives, an appointed administrator plus two student representatives; the student and support staff representatives have not taken their posts in the committee as of today, although an open call for participation has been widely published. Data and input collection is in its infancy and in need to gather pace; the faculty and students need to become accustomed to the process and participate actively to the processes.

TUC seems to need time to adjust the procedures and they are in the progress of adapting to them. At the moment, when an issue arises, it is addressed in an ad-hoc manner, firstly by the School Deans, and then by the Rectorate. TUC has taken some initial steps to create a culture of compliance and continuous improvement but needs to update and enforce the processes and data collections. There is a need for unification of the processes as the various school procedures differ. For example, some schools have hand-written evaluations, some automated, the student records are kept by expensive commercial software in need of adaptation to local requirements. The IQAS will only be fully compliant as soon as the system is set up properly, checked and validated.

Research and PhD studies monitoring is in its infancy. The research monitoring system was developed locally, based on the "Annual Activity Report." This needs to be integrated to a more comprehensive system. At present, available data is minimal and it is too early to give meaningful indices. EEAP feels however that, TUC, in order to be on the right track, needs to speed up the development of monitoring processes.

The web pages of MODIP are minimal. An English version is a work in progress.

## Panel judgement

<b>Principle 4: Structure, Organization and Operation of the IQAS</b>	
Fully compliant	
Substantially compliant	
Partially compliant	<b>X</b>
Non-compliant	

## Panel Recommendations

- R 4.1 MODIP needs to implement the requirements of the IQAS as required by HAHE.
- R 4.2 MODIP is in need of additional IT and Admin support for processing and analysing the data.
- R 4.3 MODIP web pages should be developed, implemented, and expanded as a matter of urgency.
- R 4.4 MODIP should further work towards developing a uniform IQAS approach across the five schools.

## Principle 5: Self-Assessment

**THE INTERNAL QUALITY ASSURANCE SYSTEM COMPRISES PROCEDURES PROVIDING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE ANNUAL SELF-ASSESSMENT OF THE INSTITUTION'S ACADEMIC AND ADMINISTRATIVE UNITS, ADDRESSING AREAS OF OVERSIGHTS OR SHORTCOMINGS, AND DEFINING REMEDIAL ACTIONS TOWARDS THE ACHIEVEMENT OF THE SET GOALS, AND EVENTUAL IMPROVEMENT.**

*The QAU conducts, on an annual basis, a self-assessment of the IQAS, following the written procedure provided for each area of activity, which is implemented by a certain academic or administrative unit, as appropriate. The procedure determines the timing, the participants, the data under consideration, and the expected outcomes. The self-assessment aims at a final estimation of the suitability of the IQAS in force, as well as at basing decisions concerning the necessary remedial or precautionary actions for improvement.*

*The data considered in the context of the self-assessment of a programme may, for example, include:*

- *students performance;*
- *feedback from students / teaching staff;*
- *assessment of learning outcomes;*
- *graduation rates;*
- *feedback from the evaluation of the facilities / learning environment;*
- *report of any remedial or precautionary actions undertaken;*
- *suggestions for improvement.*

*The outcomes of the self-assessment are recorded in internal reports drawn up by the QAU. The reports identify any areas of deviation or non-compliance with the Standards, and are communicated to the interested parties (if appropriate). The Institution's resolutions concerning any modification, compliance, or enhancement of the IQAS operation might include actions related to:*

- *the upgrade of the IQAS and the pertinent processes;*
- *the upgrade of the services offered to the students;*
- *the reallocation of resources;*
- *the introduction of new quality goals, etc.*

*The outcomes of the self-assessment are recorded and, along with the source data, are archived as quality files.*

*A special procedure is followed for the compliance check of newly launched programmes (of all three cycles), or programmes that are to be reviewed shortly, prior to the institutional approval of the programme.*

### **Institution compliance**

The Internal Quality Assurance framework (IQAS/ΕΣΔΠ) of an institution such as TUC, calls for an annual Self-Assessment process to review and assess the status of key operational and strategic planning issues and monitor the progress toward the achievement of the associated goals. The institutional areas of endeavour subject to the Self-Assessment process are the Programs of Study, Research Activity, Administrative Services, Physical Infrastructure and Human Resources. The Self-Assessment will examine deviations from goals, identify existing or potential operational or planning deficiencies, as well as significant accomplishments, properly document the findings that will be shared throughout the institution. As a result, action plans are established, communicated, and eventually implemented, especially as they relate to the

achievement of pre-set goals. This process should be extensively outlined and discussed in the institutional Quality Manual.

To assess the degree of compliance to the requirements of IQAS/ΕΣΔΠ by TUC, the EEAP examined the submitted file folders: A1. Proposal for Accreditation (Πρόταση Πιστοποίησης), A3. Quality Manual (Εγχειρίδιο Ποιότητας ΕΣΔΠ), A6. Quality Assurance Goals (Στοχοθεσία Ποιότητας) and A7. Strategic Planning (Στρατηγικός Σχεδιασμός).

The Proposal for Accreditation document suggested that MODIP consulted the Quality Manual since a portion of the Self-Assessment (Principle 5) discussion was a reiteration of the requirements and procedural steps as suggested by the manual. Beyond that, the discussion provided no substantial and relevant information for the EEAP to assess the compliance to Principle 5. For example, there was not a single document included, from among the several documents suggested by the manual, to indicate any Self-Assessment findings, positive or negative, and as a result no remedial actions, associated action plans for adjustments and implementation to be shared and communicated to the relevant institutional units was presented.

The Strategic Planning document enumerated a set of reasonable and appropriate strategic goals, four of which are directly associated with key areas of concern included in the IQAS/ΕΣΔΠ. However, no information of substance or any kind of quantitative assessment was provided other than the description of the requirements and expectations set for the implementation of these goals in the future.

The EEAP resorted to the Quality Assurance Goals document (A6. Στοχοθεσία Ποιότητας) in search for evidence, documentation, or quantitative material to assess the TUC compliance with Principle 5, as it is called for by the IQAS/ΕΣΔΠ. Indeed, this tabular document was properly constructed incorporating KPIs some of which could be related to the performance of processes and goals associated with the operational areas and strategic planning goals that were only verbally discussed in the Strategic Goals document (A7. Στρατηγικός Σχεδιασμός).

During the ensuing discussions with MODIP it was noted that the apparent deficiencies in the preparation and presentation of the Self-Assessment process were due to inadequate funding and staffing for the effort required by MODIP. The EEAP fully agrees and sympathizes with that situation. On the other hand, the EEAP does not understand why, since the conclusion of the External Committee evaluation of TUC in 2015, and knowing that the accreditation phase was to follow, no Self-Assessment process has been conducted and reported and why the MODIP unit has just been formed within the last year.

## Panel judgement

Principle 5: Self-Assessment	
Fully compliant	
Substantially compliant	
Partially compliant	<b>X</b>
Non-compliant	

## Panel Recommendations

- R 5.1 MODIP should pursue the task of the annual Self-Assessment process according to the procedural guidelines of the Quality Manual, thus satisfying compliance with the requirements of the IQAS/ΕΣΔΠ.
- R 5.2 MODIP should draft a document with procedural, data gathering and processing requirements and specifications relating to the unit's tasks, responsibilities, and deliverables.
- R 5.3 The IT department, based on the document mentioned in R.5.2, should implement a dedicated yet integrated, computerized processing module that would automate to a great extent many of the MODIP's manual tasks.

## Principle 6: Collection of Quality Data: Measuring, Analysis and Improvement

**INSTITUTIONS ARE FULLY RESPONSIBLE FOR THE COLLECTION, ANALYSIS AND USE OF INFORMATION IN AN INTEGRATED, FUNCTIONAL AND READILY ACCESSIBLE MANNER, AIMING AT THE EFFECTIVE MANAGEMENT OF THE QUALITY DATA RELATED TO TEACHING, RESEARCH AND OTHER ACADEMIC ACTIVITIES, AS WELL AS OF THOSE RELATED TO THE ADMINISTRATION.**

*The QAU should establish and operate an information system to manage the data required for the implementation of the Internal Quality Assurance System.*

*The QAU measures and monitors the performance of the various activities of the Institution, through appropriate procedures established in the context of the IQAS structure, and assesses their level of effectiveness. The measuring and monitoring is conducted on a basis of indices and data provided by HAHE in the pertinent guidelines and forms, which are part of the National Information System for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (NISQA). These measurements may concern: the size of the student body, the size of the teaching and administrative staff, the infrastructure, the structural components of the curricula, students' performance, research activity performance, financial data, feedback on student and faculty satisfaction surveys, data related to the teaching and research activity, services, infrastructure, etc.*

*The QAU makes use of the figures and presents the results for consideration using statistical analysis. Outcomes are displayed through histograms and charts. This sort of information is used by the Institution for decision making, at all levels, pursuing improvement, as well as for setting, monitoring, assessing and reviewing the Institution's strategic and operational goals.*

### Institution compliance

As stressed in other parts of this report, there were long delays in forming MODIP. MODIP took its present form and started working systematically just a few months ago, apparently under time pressure to produce the University's first ever IQAS accreditation proposal (A1). As a result, the product has had significant omissions in terms of evidence, and this despite the heroic efforts of the MODIP serving faculty members.

This EEAP looked at the first ever consolidated data for the whole university. Previously each OMEA run its own system of School-level quality control – with varying standards. The current MODIP used those numbers to produce the “base value” of its indicators.

The automated information system for data management across the university is under development but not yet operational. This obliges MODIP to search for data from a host of sources across Schools that certainly do not provide uniform information in terms of variable definition and aggregation.

Nevertheless, MODIP did manage to approve a set of indicators by the senate and did provide a clearly structured Document A6 [Στοχοθεσία Ποιότητας]. The document is structured in terms of the four HAHE thematic orientations including education, research & innovation, administration, and human resources. This KPI Table contains both indicators required by HAHE, and a good number of “new” indicators added by MODIP, including Education (4 + 3); Research & Innovation (5 + 3); Infrastructure & Administration (1 + 9); Human resources (1 + 5). While the above effort is commendable, the collection of indicators in Document A6 can improve significantly in three ways:

- (i) The quality of measurement and explanation of several of the extant “new” indicators which are difficult to interpret and of debatable measurement accuracy (NΔ1.01, NΔ1.03, NΔ2.01, NΔ2.02);



- (ii) The addition of, or substitution with, other indicators which may better capture important aspects of the quality of TUC. For instance, glaring omissions for “εξωστρέφεια” in the case of an engineering institution of higher education these days is the lack of explicit reference to start-ups and various types of technology transfer (patents are not a substitute). As for quality education, there are no indicators of graduates “destination” in terms of work and geography;
- (iii) A re-examination of a few indicators whose targets seem quite ambitious with the existing resources and within the short time period indicated such as Δ1.4.34, ΝΔ2.01, Δ1.045.

In contrast, the ambitious effort to create detailed Annual Activity Reports (AAR) for faculty members that will be aggregated across Schools and be made publicly available is probably a first for Greece and should be commented.

MODIP has made a genuine effort to collect and validate data but in this effort, it has been hampered by the lack of an integrated IT system across the five Schools, disparate data sources, non-standardized data, under-staffing and short time period.

### Panel judgement

<b>Principle 6: Collection of Data: Measuring, Analysis &amp; Improvement</b>	
<b>6.1 Study Programmes / education activities</b>	
Fully compliant	
Substantially compliant	<b>X</b>
Partially compliant	
Non-compliant	
<b>6.2 Research &amp; Innovation</b>	
Fully compliant	
Substantially compliant	<b>X</b>
Partially compliant	
Non-compliant	
<b>6.3 Activities related to the administration (funding, human resources, infrastructure management)</b>	
Fully compliant	<b>X</b>
Substantially compliant	
Partially compliant	
Non-compliant	
<b>6.4 Human Resources</b>	
Fully compliant	
Substantially compliant	<b>X</b>
Partially compliant	
Non-compliant	

<b>Principle 6: Collection of Data: Measuring, Analysis &amp; Improvement (overall)</b>	
Fully compliant	
Substantially compliant	<b>X</b>
Partially compliant	
Non-compliant	

### **Panel Recommendations**

- R 6.1 Devise an automated information system for collection of data across the university.
- R 6.2 Refine and standardize the collection and reporting of KPIs across all Schools of TUC.
- R 6.3 Increase the support staff for MODIP. Consider flexible ways of addressing the seasonality of demands for data collection, classification, and core analysis, and reporting.

## Principle 7: Public Information

**INSTITUTIONS SHOULD PUBLISH INFORMATION ABOUT THEIR TEACHING AND ACADEMIC ACTIVITIES IN A DIRECT AND ACCESSIBLE MANNER. ALL PERTINENT INFORMATION SHOULD BE UP-TO-DATE, CLEAR AND OBJECTIVE.**

*The QAU publishes data related to IQAS structure, organisation and operation. Furthermore, the QAU publishes data pertinent to the institutional quality policy and objectives, as well as information and data relevant to the Institution's internal and external evaluation. In the context of the self-assessment process, the QAU verifies that adequate information regarding the teaching activities and, particularly, the programmes' profile and the overall institutional activity is publicly available. QAU makes recommendations for improvement, where appropriate.*

### Institution compliance

The information publicly available on the website of TUC is rather moderate and basic, covering the structure of the MODIP, its purpose, QA policies, and other aspects of its operations. Further, detailed information on internal quality assurance is provided in the QA manual produced by the TUC. However, only very few activities are covered in this section, with the vast majority missing (no informative meetings of MODIP with the various School's OMEA, their participation in meetings with HAHE, no minutes of any meeting).

Similarly, on the TUC's website one can find up-to-date information on teaching, research, administration, recent news, and upcoming events as they relate to the Institution and its stakeholders. The information found in TUC's Greek webpages is covering most queries that one may have; the English language website is far simpler not covering all the activities of the institution. The English version is essential in answering questions from foreign prospective students, but it is minimal in comparison with the Greek version. MODIP section is available only in Greek.

Prospective students will seek details of the programmes of study offered, but they will also seek information on the quality of the faculty, their research and other achievements. The website is rather Spartan, although it addresses and covers essential information, its depth is rather narrow. Furthermore, by looking at the websites of the several schools of TUC, one can notice a lack of integration. TUC must specify and implement a well-structured and harmonised website, based on a University-wide website template following related standards and methodologies. Currently, it is very dry at places, with links to rather lengthy PDF files. The volume of information is not presented in a harmonised manner, making navigation and identification of the information challenging in many circumstances.

Overall. TUC's webpages provide regular updates on various events such as seminars and lectures that aim to bring together the academic community and outside stakeholders, in accordance with its strategic goals of outward orientation, linking studies with the job market and entrepreneurship, internationalisation, and institutional social responsibility.

## Panel judgement

<b>Principle 7: Public Information</b>	
Fully compliant	
Substantially compliant	<b>X</b>
Partially compliant	
Non-compliant	

## Panel Recommendations

The TUC must specify and implement a well-structured and harmonised website, following relevant standards and methodologies:

- R 7.1      Populate the English language website to include similar information as that available on the Greek website.
- R 7.2      Integrate the websites of the schools following a standardized template or a common Web management system.
- R 7.3      Highlight faculty research and similar activities.
- R 7.4      Expand significantly the MODIP section of the website.

## Principle 8: External Evaluation and Accreditation of the IQAS

**INSTITUTIONS SHOULD BE PERIODICALLY EVALUATED BY COMMITTEES OF EXTERNAL EXPERTS SET BY HAHE, FOR THE PURPOSE OF ACCREDITATION OF THEIR INTERNAL QUALITY ASSURANCE SYSTEMS (IQAS). THE PERIODICITY OF THE EXTERNAL EVALUATION IS DETERMINED BY HAHE.**

*External quality assurance, in the case in point external evaluation aiming at accreditation, may act as a means of verification of the effectiveness of the Institution's internal quality assurance, and as a catalyst for improvement, while opening new perspectives. Additionally, it can provide information with a view to public acknowledgement of the positive course of the Institution's activities.*

*The Higher Education Institutions engage in periodic external quality assurance which is conducted taking into consideration any special requirements set by the legislation governing the operation of the Institutions and their academic units.*

*Quality assurance, in this case 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 ensure that the progress made since the last external quality assurance activity is taken into consideration when preparing for the next one.*

### Institution compliance

It is typically believed that Principle 8 and the associated documentation comprise an on-going self-assessment incorporating the External Evaluation and Accreditation EEAP's suggestions and recommendations for improvement which should be implemented within the IQAS/ΕΣΔΠ. As appropriately mentioned in the Proposal for Accreditation, the content of this document should also be incorporated and become an integral part of the institution's QA goals, thus contributing to the effectiveness of the Self-Assessment and serving as a catalyst for improvement. Additionally, the External Evaluation suggestions and recommendations should be gathered, monitored and assessed in a separate, dedicated document, a "Progress Report", accompanied by an action plan for their implementation.

The typical Progress Report should preferably be in a dual tabular form, similar in format to that of Goal Setting for Quality. Table 1, to display the Implementation Plan, and Table 2, to display the Follow up of Implementation Results, each one having relevant field entries of information, descriptive and/or numeric, such as:

#### Table 1 field entries:

- The Specific Suggestion / Recommendation
- Anticipated Results
- Required Actions
- Assigned Responsibilities
- Implementation Time Frame
- Resources Required

#### Table 2 field entries:

- The Specific Suggestion / Recommendation
- Results Achieved
- Percent Result Achieved
- Implementation Actions

The submitted Proposal for Accreditation did not include any document of this kind. Instead, a brief document summarizing a subset of the conclusions and recommendations of the External

Evaluation report was submitted including positive and negative aspects. A couple of suggestions for improvement mentioned by the External Evaluation Committee were also included.

The EEAP found this document to be inadequate to serve the purpose and intent of Principle 8 of the IQAS/ESDP. Additionally, the EEAP noticed significant suggestions and comments made by the members of the External Evaluation Committee worthy to be labelled and considered as recommendations for potential implementation. Some examples, among others, are:

- The institution’s official mission statement and goals are too broad and too numerous and must be refocused.
- More aggressive action by TUC is needed to capture the potential sources of income offered by the institution’s real estate holdings.
- Enforce course prerequisites where appropriate in four of the five schools.
- Implement financial incentives for faculty teaching the postgraduate programs taught in English.
- Consider adding unique undergraduate engineering programs currently not offered by other Greek institutions.
- Ensure that ECTS units for each course reflect appropriately all components of course load.

Admittedly, some of these issues were brought up in the discussions with MODIP and along with others have been labelled as goals and incorporated in the Quality Goals document, (A6. Στοχοθεσία Ποιότητας). Nevertheless, they should have been identified and included in a Progress Report document as discussed above.

### Panel judgement

<b>Principle 8: External Evaluation &amp; Accreditation of the IQAS</b>	
Fully compliant	
Substantially compliant	<b>X</b>
Partially compliant	
Non-compliant	

### Panel Recommendations

R 8.1 The EEAP recommends that a Progress Report document is created in the format suggested above including External Evaluation suggestions and recommendations which could also be adopted as goals to pursue, as appropriate, and be included in the Goal Setting for QA document.

## **PART C: CONCLUSIONS**

### **I. Features of Good Practice**

- The very recently organized MODIP has used the enthusiasm of its faculty members in achieving the appropriate participatory organization (representing all five Schools) and systematic operation of the committee during the past few months while coordinating the operation of the Schools' OMEA.
- The new MODIP has managed to institutionalize a number of important steppingstones of IQAS through TUC's faculty senate including new progressive evaluation structures across the Institution such as the "Στοχοθεσία Ποιότητας" and Annual Research Report (ARR) (publicly available) Annual Faculty Research Reports.
- Production of indicators that address the four thematic orientations of HAHE. Selected indicators include those suggested by HAHE plus a good number of additional ones.
- The faculty has created a congenial environment of learning and proximity with the student population. Selected stakeholders in Greece and abroad – including research partners, customers of the university research, employers of the university graduates – referred to the work of the university with the best accolades. Same with selected very successful graduates from the various Schools.
- TUC has been entrepreneurial in seeking resources to substitute for the dramatically declining funding from the Ministry, including competitive funding through the Public Investment Programme (ΠΔΕ), ΕΛΚΕ, and ΕΑΔΙΠ.
- TUC has initiated, through a dedicated web platform, the tracking of its Alumni, with whom it tries to maintain relations and feedback through workshops, summer schools and other similar activities.

### **II. Areas of Weakness**

- Lack of documented evidence in addressing the EER2015 recommendations.
- Long delays in forming MODIP – this EEAP looked at the first ever consolidated data for the whole university. Consequently, the application for accreditation focuses on "what will be done" (aspirations) with little evidence (if at all) of what has been achieved.
- Understaffed MODIP making the work of faculty members quite burdensome. There has been just one administrative support staff member over the past 12 months or so.
- Lack of IT system for the collection of data across the university, which obliges MODIP to search for data across a host of sources and schools that apparently do not provide standardized information.
- Unsystematic and non-uniform student class evaluation processes across the Schools.
- Operation of the OMEA has not been centrally coordinated, implying significant differences across Schools in the appraisal and utilization of statistical information.
- The commendable practice of maintaining links and getting feedback from alumni and stakeholders has not been mapped to specific IQAS procedures or linked to specific goals and KPIs.

### III. Recommendations for Follow-up Actions

TUC is an excellent Higher Education Establishment in both teaching and research. It is well equipped, in a good campus and, with few exceptions, is well staffed, especially in what regards its professors. It is extrovert and tries maintaining links with its alumni, its stakeholders and the local community.

TUC has a good QA, without which all the above could not have been achieved; however, this system is ad-hoc, based on the commitment of some excellent staff and the part of the student and alumni bodies committed to excellence. What is missing is not the QA as such but its implementation through a formal, well-planned and well-documented set of procedures in the frame of the HAHE guidelines. It appears that the new administration is conscious of this fact and, most importantly, is willing to also ameliorate the formal part of the QA.

The EEAP regrets that these formal deficiencies did not permit a better assessment, which would better reflect the excellence of TUC. In that context, the EEAP recommends the following follow-up actions:

- Continue developing an automated IT system for collection of data across the university.
- Refine and standardize the collection and reporting of KPIs across all Schools of the University.
- MODIP should draft the appropriate documents with procedural, data gathering and processing requirements and specifications relating to the unit's tasks, responsibilities, and deliverables in order to institutionalize itself in the University apparatus.
- OMEAs should develop formal documentation of all significant departmental functions and procedures, preferably in the form of a flow chart. All such documents should be gathered in a Standard Procedures Reference Manual.
- Integrate the websites of the schools following a standardized template or a common Web management system and expand significantly the MODIP section of the website.
- Create a Progress Report including External Evaluation suggestions and recommendations which could also be adopted as goals.
- Establish an Advisory Board comprised from External Stakeholders, Alumni, and prominent members of the community to interact on a regular basis with TUC to formally discuss and exchange ideas on issues of mutual interest and benefit.
- Devise creative ways, beyond the student evaluation process, to engage students in the pursuit and engagement of Quality Assurance since they are the main beneficiaries of institutional quality.
- The role of ΓΔΣ must be enhanced; it must become an important source of quality feedback from the TUC's alumni and stakeholders, building on the existing TUC alumni web platform. Most importantly, ΓΔΣ should be linked with IQAS.



#### IV. Summary & Overall Assessment

The Principles where full compliance has been achieved are: **1 and 2.**

The Principles where substantial compliance has been achieved are: **3, 6, 7, and 8.**

The Principles where partial compliance has been achieved are: **4 and 5.**

The Principles where failure of compliance was identified are: **None.**

Overall Judgement	
Fully compliant	
Substantially compliant	<b>X</b>
Partially compliant	
Non-compliant	

## The members of the External Evaluation & Accreditation Panel

- 1. Professor Konstantinos Kontis (Chair)**  
University of Glasgow, Glasgow, UK
- 2. Dr Fivos Andritsos**  
European Commission, Joint Research Centre, Ispra, Italy
- 3. Professor Emeritus Spyros Economides**  
California State University, East Bay, Berkeley, California, USA
- 4. Professor Costas Iliopoulos**  
King's College London, London, UK
- 5. Professor Nicholas Vonortas**  
The George Washington University, Washington, D.C., USA