



ΕΛΛΗΝΙΚΗ ΔΗΜΟΚΡΑΤΙΑ
Α . Δ Ι . Π .
ΑΡΧΗ ΔΙΑΣΦΑΛΙΣΗΣ ΚΑΙ
ΠΙΣΤΟΠΟΙΗΣΗΣ ΤΗΣ ΠΟΙΟΤΗΤΑΣ
ΣΤΗΝ ΑΝΩΤΑΤΗ ΕΚΠΑΙΔΕΥΣΗ

HELLENIC REPUBLIC
H . Q . A .
HELLENIC QUALITY ASSURANCE
AND ACCREDITATION AGENCY

EXTERNAL EVALUATION REPORT

UNIVERSITY OF PATRAS

TABLE OF CONTENTS		pages
<i>1. EXTERNAL EVALUATION COMMITTEE</i>		4
<i>2. INTRODUCTION</i>		5
<i>2.1 The External Evaluation Procedure</i>		5
<i>2.2 The Self-Evaluation Procedure</i>		18
<i>3. PROFILE OF THE INSTITUTION UNDER EVALUATION</i>		19
<i>3.1 Institutional Governance, Leadership & Strategy</i>		19
3.1.1 Vision, mission and goals of the Institution		19
3.1.2 Organizational Development Strategy		21
3.1.3 Academic Development Strategy		22
3.1.4 Research Strategy		23
3.1.5 Financial Strategy		25
3.1.6 Buildings and Grounds Infrastructure		26
3.1.7 Environmental Strategy		27
3.1.8 Social Strategy		28
3.1.9 Internationalization Strategy		29
3.1.10 Student Welfare Strategy		30
<i>3.2 Strategy for Study Programmes</i>		32
3.2.1 Programmes of Undergraduate Studies (first cycle)		32
3.2.2 Programmes of Postgraduate Studies (second cycle)		34
3.2.3 Programmes of Doctoral Studies (third cycle)		37
<i>3.3 Profile of The Institution under evaluation – Conclusions and recommendations</i>		38
<i>4. INTERNAL SYSTEM OF QUALITY ASSURANCE</i>		40
<i>4.1 Quality Assurance (QA) Policy and Strategy</i>		40
<i>4.2 Design, approval, monitoring and evaluation of study programmes and degrees awarded</i>		41

<i>4.3 Teaching and learning - Assessment by students</i>	42
<i>4.4 Admission of students, progression and recognition of studies</i>	44
<i>4.5 Quality Assurance as regards the teaching staff</i>	45
<i>4.6 Learning resources and student support</i>	46
<i>4.7 Information Systems for Recording and Analysing Data and Indicators</i>	47
<i>4.8 Dissemination of information to stakeholders</i>	49
<i>4.9 Continuous monitoring and periodic review of the study programmes</i>	50
<i>4.10 Periodic external evaluation</i>	51
<i>4.11 Internal System of Quality Assurance - Conclusions and recommendations</i>	52
5. OPERATION OF THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATION OF THE INSTITUTION	53
<i>5.1 Central Administration Services of the Institution</i>	53
<i>5.2 Operation of the Central Administration of the Institution – Conclusions and recommendations</i>	54
6. FINAL CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS	55
<i>6.1 Final decision of the EEC</i>	56

1. EXTERNAL EVALUATION COMMITTEE

The Committee responsible for the External Evaluation of the University named: University of Patras comprised the following five (5) expert evaluators drawn from the Registry kept by the HQA in accordance with Law 3374/2005 and the Law 4009/2011:

1. Prof. Em. Constantine Memos (Chairman)
ex Member of HQA Council,
National Technical University of Athens, Greece

2. Prof. Dimitrios Assimakopoulos
Grenoble Ecole de Management, France

3. Prof. Nikitas Dimopoulos
University of Victoria, Canada

4. Prof. Konstadinos Goulias
University of California at Santa Barbara, USA

5. Prof. David Holton,
University of Cambridge, United Kingdom

N.B. The length of text in each box is free. Questions included in each box are not exclusive nor should they always be answered separately; the Committee's reply to those questions is meant to provide a general outline of issues that need to be addressed.

2. INTRODUCTION

2.1 The External Evaluation Procedure

- Dates and brief account of the site visit
- Whom did the Committee meet?
- List of Reports, documents, other data examined by the EEC
- Groups of teaching and administrative staff and students interviewed
- Facilities visited by the EEC

The External Evaluation Procedure was conducted in such a way that the External Experts Committee (EEC) acquired a fairly accurate impression of the status of the Institution. During the afternoon of the second day the proceedings were disrupted by a group of about 100 students protesting against the Evaluation. Thus part of the EEC's activities took place outside the university campus. The encounter with that group gave, on the other hand, the opportunity to the EEC to hear more voices of students with different value systems and form a more inclusive picture. Meetings or documents asked for by the EEC in addition to the initial schedule were promptly arranged for or provided by the University of Patras (UP) to the committee's complete satisfaction. The actual work plan with information on dates, meetings implemented, their agenda, participants, etc. is provided below.

Final Programme of the EEC Site Visit
University of Patras

Monday, 7 December 2015 Persons Involved		
9:00 - 10:00	Orientation meeting EEC (4 members) & representative member of the HQA (HQA offices, 44 Syngrou Ave.)	Briefing of HQA mission, standards and guidelines of QA institutional evaluation, national framework of HEIs in Greece
11.00-13:30	Transportation of EEC members to Patras	
15:00 – 16:15	Meeting with the Rector & the Vice Rectors of the University of Patras (UP) EEC and	Welcome, make acquaintance
	1 Kyriazopoulou Venetsana , Rector, Professor	Discuss key issues for evaluation from both EEC and the Institution's perspectives
	2 Karamanos K. Nikolaos , Vice Rector Academic and International Affairs, Professor	
	3 Bouras Christos , Vice Rector Economics, Planning and Project Implementation, Professor	
	4 Polyzos Demosthenes , Vice Rector Research & Development, Professor	
	5 Panagiotakopoulos Chris , Vice Rector Information Systems and Networks, Associate Professor	
	6 Angelopoulos George , Vice Rector Student Care, Infrastructure and Sustainability, Professor	
	7 Korfiati Marina , Secretary General of the University of Patras	

16:30 - 17:45	Meeting with the Quality Assurance Unit (QAU) of UP EEC and		Discuss the Institution's structure, quality management and strategic management; national higher education and research policies; student issues. Understand self-evaluation process and extent of institutional involvement. How useful was the self-evaluation for the Institution (emerging issues, function in strategic planning processes)? Are self-evaluation data still up to date?
	1	Karamanos K. Nikolaos , Vice Rector Academic and International Affairs, President of QAU	
	2	Vergidis Dimitrios , Professor, Department of Primary Education	
	3	Berberides Konstantinos , Professor, Department of Computer Engineering and Informatics	
	4	Papaioannou Dionysios , Professor, Department of Chemistry	
	5	Stathopoulos Constantinos , Professor, Department of Medicine	
	6	Karalis Athanasios , Associate Professor, Department of Educational Sciences and Early Childhood Education	
18:00 - 18:45	Meeting / Teleconference with the President and members of the UP Council EEC and		Discuss relationship of Council with rectoral team regarding strategic and quality management
	1	Haralambos Gavras , MD Professor of Medicine, Boston University School of Medicine USA, President, UP Council	
	2	Charalambos Gogos , Professor of Medicine Department of Medicine University of Patras, Vice President, UP Council	
	3	John Kallitsis , Professor, Department of Chemistry, University of Patras Member, UP Council	
	4	Angeliki Ralli , Professor, Department of Philology, University of Patras Member, UP Council	
	5	Athanasios Triantafillou , Professor Department of Civil Engineering, University of Patras Member, UP Council	
	6	Antony Tzes , Professor, Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, University of Patras Member, UP Council	
	7	Theodore Christopoulos , Professor, Department of Chemistry, University of Patras Member, UP Council	

18:45 - 19:30	Meeting with Research Committee of the UP EEC and		Discuss research development and quality management issues.
	1	Polyzos Demosthenes , Vice Rector, Research & Development, President, Research Committee	
	2	Bouras Christos , Vice Rector Economics, Planning and Project Implementation Member, Research Committee	
	3	Lygerou Zoi , Professor, Department of Medicine Member, Research Committee	
	4	Boutsinas Basilis , Professor, Department of Business Administration Member, Research Committee	
	5	Anastassopoulos Vassilis , Professor, Department of Physics Member, Research Committee	
	6	Mavroeidi Eirini , Deputy Director, Member, Research Committee	
20:30	Transfer of EEC members to the hotel		

Tuesday, 8 December 2015																													
09:00 - 10:00	<p>Meet with faculties (part A – group A: C. Memos, N. Dimopoulos) School of Health Sciences EEC and</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td> <td>Kardamakis Dimitrios, Dean, School of Health Sciences Professor, Department of Medicine</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">2</td> <td>Goumenos Dimitrios, Professor, Chair, Department of Medicine</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">3</td> <td>Spyroulias Georgios, Professor, Chair, Department of Pharmacy</td> </tr> </table>	1	Kardamakis Dimitrios , Dean, School of Health Sciences Professor, Department of Medicine	2	Goumenos Dimitrios , Professor, Chair, Department of Medicine	3	Spyroulias Georgios , Professor, Chair, Department of Pharmacy	<p>Meet with faculties (part A – group B: D. Assimakopoulos, K. Goulias, D. Holton) School of Humanities and Social Sciences & School of Business Administration EEC and</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td> <td>Komis Vassilios, Professor, Chair, Department of Educational Sciences and Early Childhood Education</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">2</td> <td>Kostiou Aikaterini, Professor, Chair, Department of Philology</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">3</td> <td>Julia-Athena Spinthourakis, Associate Professor, Chair, Department of Primary Education</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">4</td> <td>Paroussis Michael, Associate Professor, Department of Philosophy</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">5</td> <td>Martin Kreeb, Associate Professor, Department of Theatre Studies</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">6</td> <td>Skouras Dimitrios, Dean of the School of Business Administration, Professor, Department of Economics</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">7</td> <td>Demoussis Michael, Professor, Department of Economics</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">8</td> <td>Giannikos Ioannis, Associate Professor, Department of Business Administration</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">9</td> <td>Chela Dimitra, Associate Professor, Department of Business Administration of Food and Agricultural Enterprises</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">10</td> <td>Monioudi-Gavala Theodora, Associate Professor, Department of Cultural Heritage Management and New Technologies</td> </tr> </table>	1	Komis Vassilios , Professor, Chair, Department of Educational Sciences and Early Childhood Education	2	Kostiou Aikaterini , Professor, Chair, Department of Philology	3	Julia-Athena Spinthourakis , Associate Professor, Chair, Department of Primary Education	4	Paroussis Michael , Associate Professor, Department of Philosophy	5	Martin Kreeb , Associate Professor, Department of Theatre Studies	6	Skouras Dimitrios , Dean of the School of Business Administration, Professor, Department of Economics	7	Demoussis Michael , Professor, Department of Economics	8	Giannikos Ioannis , Associate Professor, Department of Business Administration	9	Chela Dimitra , Associate Professor, Department of Business Administration of Food and Agricultural Enterprises	10	Monioudi-Gavala Theodora , Associate Professor, Department of Cultural Heritage Management and New Technologies	<p>Introduction to the faculty: structure, quality management and strategic management; discuss relationships of faculties with the central level; input in self-evaluation; role of quality control activities in faculty</p>
1	Kardamakis Dimitrios , Dean, School of Health Sciences Professor, Department of Medicine																												
2	Goumenos Dimitrios , Professor, Chair, Department of Medicine																												
3	Spyroulias Georgios , Professor, Chair, Department of Pharmacy																												
1	Komis Vassilios , Professor, Chair, Department of Educational Sciences and Early Childhood Education																												
2	Kostiou Aikaterini , Professor, Chair, Department of Philology																												
3	Julia-Athena Spinthourakis , Associate Professor, Chair, Department of Primary Education																												
4	Paroussis Michael , Associate Professor, Department of Philosophy																												
5	Martin Kreeb , Associate Professor, Department of Theatre Studies																												
6	Skouras Dimitrios , Dean of the School of Business Administration, Professor, Department of Economics																												
7	Demoussis Michael , Professor, Department of Economics																												
8	Giannikos Ioannis , Associate Professor, Department of Business Administration																												
9	Chela Dimitra , Associate Professor, Department of Business Administration of Food and Agricultural Enterprises																												
10	Monioudi-Gavala Theodora , Associate Professor, Department of Cultural Heritage Management and New Technologies																												

10:15 - 10:45	Meet with faculties (part A – group A: C. Memos, N. Dimopoulos) EEC and Coordinators of the Internal Evaluation Units (OMEA) of the School of Health Sciences	Meet with faculties (part A – group B: D. Assimakopoulos, K. Goulias, D. Holton) EEC and Coordinators of the Internal Evaluation Units (OMEA) of the School of Humanities and Social Sciences and the School of Business Administration	Discuss the faculty's structure, quality management and strategic management; national higher education and research policies; student issues. Understand self-evaluation process. How useful was the self-evaluation for the departments and the faculty (emerging issues, function in strategic planning processes)?
	1 Stathopoulos Constantinos, Professor, Department of Medicine	1 Kamarianos John Assistant Professor, Department of Primary Education	
2 Antimisiaris Sophia, Professor, Department of Pharmacy	2 Ravanis Konstantinos, Professor, Department of Educational Sciences and Early Childhood Education		
	3 Kyriakos Konstantinos Associate Professor, Department of Theatre Studies		
	4 Kontos Pavlos, Associate Professor, Department of Philosophy		
	5 Xydopoulos George, Associate Professor, Department of Philology		
	6 Monioudi-Gavala Theodora, Associate Professor, Department of Cultural Heritage Management and New Technologies		
	7 Stamatiou Ioannis, Associate Professor, Department of Business Administration		
	8 Tsampra Maria, Assistant Professor, Department of Business Administration of Food and Agricultural Enterprises		
	9 Zervogianni Athina, Associate Professor, Department of Economics		

11:00 - 11:30	Meet with faculties (part A – group A: C. Memos, N. Dimopoulos) EEC and academic staff members of the School of Health Sciences		Meet with faculties (part A – group B: D. Assimakopoulos, K. Goulias, D. Holton) EEC and academic staff members of the School of Humanities and Social Sciences and the School of Business Administration		Discuss relationships of faculties with the central level; input in self-evaluation; role of quality control activities in faculty; recruitment of new staff; staff development; motivation policies. Deans, vice deans and chairmen were not present at this meeting; it was reserved for “regular” academic staff only.
	1	Lygerou Zoi , Professor, Department of Medicine	1	Daouli-Demousi Ioanna , Professor, Department of Economics	
	2	Anthrakopoulos Michael , Professor, Department of Medicine	2	Georgopoulos Antonios , Professor, Department of Business Administration	
	3	Taraviras Stavros , Associate Professor, Department of Medicine	3	Damaskos Dimitrios , Associate Professor, Department of Cultural Heritage Management and New Technologies	
	4	Papachristou Dionysios , Associate Professor, Department of Medicine	4	Papadimitriou Dimitra , Assistant Professor, Department of Business Administration	
	5	Skroubis George , Assistant Professor, Department of Medicine	5	Kosmopoulos Dimitrios , Assistant Professor, Department of Cultural Heritage Management and New Technologies	
	6	Solomou-Liosi Elena , Assistant Professor, Department of Medicine	6	Bouranta Athanasia , Lecturer, Department of Business Administration of Food and Agricultural Enterprises	
	7	Nika Konstantina , Lecturer, Department of Medicine	7	Katsillis John , Professor, Department of Primary Education	
	8	Papadimitriou Evangelia , Professor, Department of Pharmacy	8	Dimakos Ioannis , Assistant Professor, Department of Primary Education	
	9	Nikolaropoulos Sotirios , Associate Professor, Department of Pharmacy	9	Stavrianeas Stasinios , Lecturer, Department of Philosophy	
10	Klepetsanis Pavlos , Assistant Professor, Department of Pharmacy	10	Kounaki-Fillipidi Ekaterini , Lecturer, Department of Theatre Studies		
		11	Koliopoulos Dimitris , Professor, Department of Educational Sciences and Early Childhood Education		
		12	Papazachariou Dimitris , Associate Professor, Department of Philology		

11:45 - 12:45	Meet with faculties (part A – group A: C. Memos, N. Dimopoulos) EEC and 10 students from of the School of Health Sciences	Meet with faculties (part A – group B: K. Goulias, D. Holton, D. Assimakopoulos) EEC and 9 students from the School of Humanities and Social Sciences and the School of Business Administration	Students' views and experience [e.g., teaching and learning, student input in quality control and (strategic) decision making]
12:45 - 14:00	Lunch break		Reflect upon impressions of first meetings and complete information as necessary
14:00 - 15:00	Visit to central facilities/Tour of the campus (Part A Group A N. Dimopoulos, K. Goulias) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • University Hospital Administration • University Hospital • Experimental Animal Facility 	Visit to central facilities/Tour of the campus (Part A Group B C. Memos, D. Holton) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Library • Athletic Facilities • Restaurant • Printing Shop 	Visit to central facilities/Tour of the campus (Part A Group C D. Assimakopoulos) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ITYE
15:30 - 16:30	Meeting with Student Organizations/groups Small Amphitheater UP Conference Center		On the students' request to present their position on the evaluation visit.

17:00 – 18:15	Meet with faculties (part B – group A: C. Memos, N. Dimopoulos, K. Goulias) School of Engineering EEC and	Meet with faculties (part B – group B: D. Assimakopoulos, D. Holton) School of Natural Sciences EEC and	Introduction to the faculty: structure, quality management and strategic management; discuss relationships of faculties with the central level; input in self-evaluation; role of quality control activities in faculty
	1 Koufopavlou Odysseas, Dean School of Engineering, Professor, Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering	1 Koutsicopoulos Constantin, Dean, School of Natural Sciences, Professor, Department of Biology	
	2 Panetsos Georgios, Professor, Department of Architecture	2 Iatrou Grigorios, Professor, Department of Biology	
	3 Koubias Stavros, Professor, Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering	3 Papatheodorou George, Professor, Department of Geology	
	4 Garofalakis John, Professor, Department of Computer Engineering and Informatics	4 Alevizos Philippos, Associate Professor, Department of Mathematics	
	5 Papadopoulos Chris, Professor, Department of Mechanical Engineering & Aeronautics	5 Terzis Andreas, Professor, Department of Physics	
	6 Demetracopoulos Alexander, Professor, Department of Civil Engineering	6 Tsegenidis Theodore, Professor, Department of Chemistry	
	7 Mataras Dimitrios, Professor, Department of Chemical Engineering	7 Baskoutas Sotirios, Associate Professor, Department of Materials Science	
	8 Dimopoulos Panayotis, Professor, Department of Environmental and Natural Resources Management		

16:30-17:00	Meet with faculties (part B – group A: C. Memos, N. Dimopoulos, K. Goulias)	Meet with faculties (part B – group B: D. Assimakopoulos, D. Holton)	Discuss the faculty's structure, quality management and strategic management; national higher education and research policies; student issues. Understand self-evaluation process. How useful was the self-evaluation for the departments and the faculty (emerging issues, function in strategic planning processes)?
	EEC and Coordinators of the Internal Evaluation Units (OMEA) of the School of Engineering	EEC and Coordinators of the Internal Evaluation Units (OMEA) of the School of Natural Sciences	
	1 Petridou Vassiliki , Professor, Department of Architecture	1 Mintzas Anastassios , Professor, Department of Biology	
	2 Dimopoulos Panayotis , Professor, Department of Environmental and Natural Resources Management	2 Papatheodorou George , Professor, Department of Geology	
	3 Avouris Nikolaos , Professor, Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering	3 Vainos Nikolaos , Professor, Department of Materials Science	
	4 Kaklamanis Christos , Professor, Department of Computer Engineering and Informatics	4 Tzermias Pavlos , Professor, Department of Mathematics	
	5 Labeas Georgios , Associate Professor, Department of Mechanical and Aeronautical Engineering	5 Economou Georgios , Professor, Department of Physics	
6 Dritsos Stefanos , Professor, Department of Civil Engineering	6 Kordulis Christos , Professor, Department of Chemistry		
7 Boghosian Soghomon , Professor, Department of Chemical Engineering			

17:15 - 19:30	Meet with faculties (part B – group A C. Memos, N. Dimopoulos, K. Goulias) EEC and academic staff members of the School of Engineering	Meet with faculties (part B – group B D. Assimakopoulos, D. Holton) EEC and academic staff members of the School of Natural Sciences	Discuss relationships of faculties with the central level; input in self-evaluation; role of quality control activities in faculty; recruitment of new staff; staff development; motivation policies. Deans, vice deans and chairmen were not present at this meeting; it was reserved for regular” academic staff only.
	1 Aesopos Yannis , Professor, Department of Architecture	1 Sabataskis Nikolaos , Professor, Department of Geology	
	2 Grivas Konstantinos , Assistant Professor, Department of Architecture	2 Psychalinos Costas , Professor, Department of Physics	
	3 Papadakis Vagelis , Associate Professor, Department of Environmental and Natural Resources Management	3 Vynios Demitrios , Professor, Department of Chemistry	
	4 Vassilis Paliouras , Assistant Professor, Department of Electrical & Computer Engineering	4 Margariti Marigoula , Associate Professor, Department of Biology	
	5 Galopoulos Efstratios , Professor, Department of Computer Engineering and Informatics	5 Galanakis Iosif , Associate Professor, Department of Materials Science	
	6 Voulgaris Spyros , Lecturer, Department of Computer Engineering and Informatics	6 Karazeris Panagis , Associate Professor, Department of Civil Engineering	
	7 Dentsoras Argyris , Professor, Department of Mechanical Engineering & Aeronautics	7 Sinos Giokas , Assistant Professor, Department of Biology	
	8 Anifantis Nick , Professor, Department of Mechanical Engineering & Aeronautics	8 Iliopoulos Ioannis , Assistant Professor, Department of Geology	
	9 Fardis Michael , Professor, Department of Civil Engineering	9 Georgakilas Vasileios , Assistant Professor, Department of Materials Science	
	10 Chassiakos Athanasios , Associate Professor, Department of Civil Engineering	10 Kavadias Dimitrios , Assistant Professor, Department of Mathematics	
	11 Vayenas Konstantinos , Professor, Department of Chemical Engineering	11 Spiliopoulos Nikos , Lecturer, Department of Physics	
12 Dimakopoulos Yannis , Assistant Professor, Department of Chemical Engineering	12 Deimede Chrysovalanto , Lecturer, Department of Chemistry		

19:30 - 20:45	Meet with faculties (part B – EEC as a whole) EEC and 12 students from the School of Engineering EEC and 12 students from the School of Natural Sciences	Students' views and experience [e.g., teaching and learning, student input in quality control and (strategic) decision making]
----------------------	--	--

Wednesday, 9 December 2015		
09:00-10:30	Meeting with the chief administration officers EEC and Secretary General of the UP (Ms Marina Korfiati) and administration officers <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Education & Research Affairs (S. Assimakopoulos) – International Affairs, Public Relations and Publications (A. Chrysafi) – Students Care (K. Altanopoulos) – Administrative Affairs (O. Boussiou) – Economic Affairs (E. Apostolakis) – Technical Support (A. Hantzopoulos) 	Discuss role of Institutional strategic documents (development plans, etc.) in development of Institution; special issues arising from self-evaluation report and/or from talk with rector
10:45-11:30	Meeting with postgraduate students EEC with 14 MSc and PhD students and Postdocs	Students' views and experience [e.g., teaching and learning, student input in quality control and (strategic) decision making]

11:45-12:30	<p>Meeting with graduates EEC and graduates (Alumni)</p> <p>Using Skype</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dr. Christos Vlahos • Dr. Dionysios Hartoumbekis • Dr. Andreas Roussidis • Dr. Anastasios Kabolis <p>In person</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mr. Koumaniotis • Mr. Sotiriou • Mr. Konstantinopoulos • Three persons whose names were not recorded. 	<p>Discuss their experience of the Institution</p>
12:45-13:30	<p>Meeting with external partners EEC and Representatives of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Regional authority of Western Greece – Hellenic Federation of Enterprises – Chamber of Commerce of Patras 	<p>Discuss relations of the Institution with external partners of the private and public sectors</p>

<i>Please decide in respect to the specific evaluation area (§2.1):</i>	Tick
Worthy of merit	
Positive evaluation	X
Partially positive evaluation	
Negative evaluation	

Justify your rating (optional):

Exemplary preparation of material and response to requests. However, the schedule of the visit was regrettably disrupted.

General Note for Scoring Panels

The EEC evaluated and scored according to our estimate of where UoP stands in relation to our understanding of an international norm of excellence; although we are conscious of the severe constraints imposed by the Greek State, we have not used them as an excuse for not identifying areas of improvement.

2.2 The Self-Evaluation Procedure

Please comment on:

- Appropriateness of sources and documentation used
- Quality and completeness of evidence provided and reviewed
- The extent to which the objectives of the internal evaluation procedure have been met by the Institution
- Description and Analysis of the Self-Evaluation Procedure in the Institution
- Analysis of the positive elements and difficulties which arose during the self-evaluation procedure
- Whether the self-evaluation procedure was comprehensive and interactive

The self-evaluation procedure provided voluminous documentation that was appropriate for the external evaluation. The EEC was not in a position to check in detail all this documentation. However, minor inconsistencies in quantitative information or qualitative assessments did not prevent the EEC from gaining an objective view of UP's current status.

Please decide in respect to the specific evaluation area (§2.2):

	Tick
Worthy of merit	X
Positive evaluation	
Partially positive evaluation	
Negative evaluation	

Justify your rating (optional): Please refer to "General Note" on page 17.

3. PROFILE OF THE INSTITUTION UNDER EVALUATION

3.1 Institutional Governance, Leadership & Strategy

Please comment on:

3.1.1 Vision, mission and goals of the Institution

- What are the Institution's mission and goals?

The mission statement and goals of UP as articulated in the Internal Evaluation Report are overly broad and difficult to address realistically. The vision and mission of the University are presented in ten bullet points of general content, while its goals are listed in a further eleven. The process, through which the mission and goals were established, was not stated. The EEC suggests that UP reassess its published mission statement and goals so that they are more specific, achievable, and usable to assess the performance of UP in future evaluations. Additionally, the EEC suggests that UP sets up a process through which the strategic plan of the University is established so that it is widely adopted by the constituents (i.e. faculty, staff, students, community). Such a framework will form the foundation of the quality assurance (QA) internal system and should be conveyed to the Schools, which should align their individual mission statements and goals with those of the Institution.

In section §B.3.1 of the Internal Evaluation Report, it is stated that priority of UP is to benefit society through excellence in teaching and research. This was reaffirmed by the University's faculty and staff during their presentations to EEC. For the remainder of this report, it is assumed that the goal of UP is to achieve excellence in teaching and research and our findings will be addressed in this context.

- Priorities set by goals

To pursue excellence in teaching, the priorities set refer to regular review and revision of the undergraduate programmes of study, in order to meet current and future market and societal needs and to create relevant postgraduate degree programmes (some of which are multi-institutional), including some taught in English, which will attract foreign students and thus internationalize the student body. A few such programmes have been recently implemented at the MSc level. To pursue excellence in research, the priorities are to increase research activity and also external funding for research by establishing partnerships with national and international institutions and other relevant entities. Explicit prioritization of the (eleven) goals was not provided, inhibiting thus implementation.

- How are the goals achieved?

The goals are achieved by actively pursuing the priorities described in the previous paragraph. More information is provided in subsequent sections. The lack of a guiding plan with roadmap is, however, apparent. This evidently hinders and delays the attainment of the strategic goals.

- Procedures established by the Institution to monitor the achievement of goals

UP has established data collecting procedures through which progress in research funding or quality of teaching can be monitored. However, there is no institution-wide written procedural manual which would document and describe well-defined procedures and metrics to be used to evaluate progress made towards achieving goals. In addition, UP needs to develop a set of specific target values for the metrics and contingency plans when the targets are not met. The EEC believes that such a document is needed for the Institution to set benchmarks and successfully assess progress.

- What is your assessment of the Institution's ability to improve?

The UP is populated by highly skilled and motivated faculty, staff, and students who have the potential, will, and ability to excel. In fact, the University overall and many of its individual faculty members are held in high esteem by their peers. Under normal circumstances, one would expect that UP would be on a rising trajectory and in due course assume a position of high prominence at both national and international scale. At the time of this evaluation, however, circumstances were not normal. The Institution has been continuously confronted with an extensive

and inflexible regulatory framework that has led during the last few years to major budget cuts, a dramatic increase of student numbers, and accelerating loss of faculty members.

These conditions have the potential to severely affect the quality of teaching and research programmes. Unless the national government commits, at the very minimum, to maintaining faculty, staff, and student intake at broadly acceptable numbers, the quality of the teaching and research programmes at UP may be in peril and the Institution's ability to improve limited. On the other hand, the economic crisis is apparently pushing UP towards exploiting ways to stretch its limited budget.

The size of the Institution is appropriate for a contemporary University and the range of disciplines covered ensures a significant potential for intramural synergies that should be fostered towards attaining research and teaching excellence. Further forward, UP should be urged to develop synergies with the various applied research and development entities outside the Institution as well as with those of direct relevance to the regional economy. In the same context, an effort towards closer collaboration between UP Schools should also be undertaken. The Agrinio Departments should be relocated in the University's main campus to enhance academic interaction and student life on a common campus. Alternatively, the existing infrastructure in Agrinio could possibly support a university School endowed with enough resources to ensure its academic excellence or establish an entity offering continuing education or similar.

In addition to all the financial obstacles, UP is also faced with a set of national laws and decrees governing the operation of the University which are constantly changing and increasing in volume, irregular implementation and suspension of rules by the Ministry of Education, as well as lack of responsiveness on the part of the Ministry to submitted documents and initiatives; this is the case with the document submitted to the Ministry, as required by the law, concerning UP's organizational structure and operating procedures, where no action has yet been taken by the Ministry. In such an environment it is difficult to implement creative and innovative initiatives which may lead to measurable improvements in quality.

The EEC was satisfied with how well the Institution was functioning under these adverse conditions. UP's administrative team, faculty, and staff should be commended for these efforts.

Please decide in respect to the specific evaluation area (§3.1.1):

	Tick
Worthy of merit	
Positive evaluation	
Partially positive evaluation	X
Negative evaluation	

Justify your rating (optional):

UP's Institutional Council and the University Administration (i.e. the Rector and deputy rectors) share a vision and associated goals as to where they want to lead the Institution. They articulate their vision and goals and are expending great efforts to achieve them. However, the Institution's official mission statement and goals are too broad and too numerous and must be refocused. The Schools must align their mission and goals with those of the Institution. Simplified and unified official mission statements and goals are needed at all levels of the Institution.

Please refer to "General Note" on page 17.

3.1.2 Organizational Development Strategy

- Effectiveness of administrative officials

The EEC met with the UP administrative team (the Rector and deputy rectors) on several occasions. The administrative team provided EEC with information on the current condition of UP as well as their strategy and goals for the future. Their strategy and goals for academic and research programmes were discussed at various levels, but some clarification and consistency are needed in the use of the terms mission, strategy, goals, and objectives.

The administrative team is dynamic and committed to solving both short- and long-term problems facing the Institution. It also appears to have good working relationships with the support staff, the faculty, and the Schools.

- Existence of effective operation regulations

As reported earlier, UP has submitted its organizational structure and operating procedures, as required by law 4009/2011, to the Ministry of Education. These have as yet not been approved by the Ministry. As a result, UP operates using a blend of operating procedures some of which are prescribed by the 4009/2011 law and some of which are prescribed by the corresponding 1997 law. Under these confusing circumstances, the administrative team appears to be carrying out the difficult task of managing the Institution effectively.

- Specific goals and timetables

The administrative team's strategic goals and timetable are described in section 3.1.1 Vision, mission and goals of the Institution.

A recent study by the Ministry of Education determined that the current level of faculty and students should be supported by more than 650 staff. At present staff members cover 57% of this number with several retirements on the horizon. This group of staff manages to keep the University functioning, but further losses will result in loss of operational capabilities. Consequently, a major goal of the administrative team is refilling staff positions as they become vacant. A higher than current level of competence should also be sought for.

The Management of the University Assets Office have bright ideas on potential fund-raising. They should, however, develop as a matter of priority a strategic plan for all tangible and non-tangible property of the Institution. A professional administrator (preferably a UP alumnus) needs to be engaged to develop and implement the strategic plan of the University Assets Office.

- Measures taken to reach goals

- These are described in detail in sections “§3.1.3 Academic Development Strategy” and “§3.1.4 Research Strategy”.

<i>Please decide in respect to the specific evaluation area (§3.1.2):</i>	Tick
Worthy of merit	
Positive evaluation	X
Partially positive evaluation	
Negative evaluation	

Justify your rating (optional):

The administrative team is doing everything within its means to effectively govern the Institution. Actions of the national government are factors seriously inhibiting this effort. The administrative team could be much more effective if the legal framework under which it operates was clarified and kept stable for a period of several years by the national government.

Please refer to “General Note” on page 17.

3.1.3 Academic Development Strategy

- Response of the Institution to Faculties and Departments

The UP is organized into five Schools (Faculties) with each School offering undergraduate degrees equal in number to the Departments of the School, at least one postgraduate (Master's) degree, and one PhD degree. At this time there are seven interdisciplinary postgraduate degrees (i.e. offered jointly by two or more Departments). Undergraduate degrees consist of the equivalent of 8, 10 (engineering & pharmacy), or 12 (medicine) semesters, depending on the discipline.

The Institution has a goal of pursuing excellence in teaching, with priorities to regularly review and revise the undergraduate programmes of study and to create relevant single-institution and multi-institution postgraduate degrees, including some taught in English, which will attract foreign students and internationalize the student body. The Institution defers to the Schools to act on their own priorities and provides support to implement actions initiated by the Schools. There appears to be regular interactions between the Deans of the Schools and the Institution's administration (Rector and Deputy Rectors). The Institution also responds to the Schools' needs in a variety of appropriate ways.

The EEC urges a more direct communication between MODIP (the Quality Assurance Unit of the University) and the Deans in matters of academic quality assurance and enhancement. Furthermore, the Departmental Quality Assurance Teams (OMEA) should undertake a more proactive role in evaluating the collected data, developing metrics, and discussing procedures and issues with MODIP and their corresponding Department Heads.

- Goals and timetables

UP faculty, in conjunction with the administration, are discussing developing new interdisciplinary MSc degrees which will be taught in English. These new degrees may follow the model of charging fees to non-EU students who enrol in the programme. Such fees could become a substantial source of income for the Institution. The EEC suggests that any new campus-based postgraduate programmes be closely aligned with existing or proposed clusters of excellence discussed in "§3.1.4 Research Strategy". Revenue from the tuition fees paid by non-EU students should be used firstly to provide the University with some relief for its operational expenses.

The Departments should check the correct integration of the ECTS units and learning outcomes in their curricula. They should also re-examine their attitude toward introducing some prerequisites in student academic advancement. In a few instances the curricula do not give students the opportunity for elective courses. These cases should be reconsidered by the relevant Departments.

Differences in output and achievements among various Departments are quite discernible in several cases. Interdepartmental interaction should be developed further, especially in coordinating postgraduate studies in a variety of ways, the final goal being a separate entity/School of Postgraduate Studies to undertake this task.

The increasing influx of students should be seriously considered, since it could become **the** major challenge of the University. Ways to counteract its negative impact upon the quality of studies should be sought, although the EEC recognises the difficulties involved. This increase may lead in some cases to a reduction in the use of the "laboratory" as a teaching component or in the execution of diploma theses. This is something to be avoided at all costs.

A major goal of the Engineering School is to co-ordinate the academic operation of two of its Departments (Electrical & Computer Engineering and Computer Engineering and Informatics). The EEC suggests acceleration of the process, towards (a) avoiding duplication of the requisite resources and (b) the exploitation of synergies.

- Measures taken to reach goals

Many of the above initiatives have made their way through an initial stage of deliberations at various levels of faculty and administrative governance at UP. However, institutionalization of such moves may require authorization by the Ministry of Education, where they can languish for a long time. This inaction is highly detrimental to the success of higher education in Greece. Perhaps the Ministry of Education would accelerate and facilitate academic excellence by devolving many of the decisions and approvals directly to the universities.

Please decide in respect to the specific evaluation area (§3.1.3):

	Tick
Worthy of merit	
Positive evaluation	X
Partially positive evaluation	
Negative evaluation	

Justify your rating (optional):

UP has many worthy academic development goals. Some have been implemented while others are in their initial phases of development. Many others are stymied by inaction from the Ministry of Education. Overall, UP is forward-looking in refining its academic offerings.

Please refer to “General Note” on page 17.

3.1.4 Research Strategy

- Key points in research strategy

UP administration’s research strategy for the future is to enhance research activity over the near future by increasing extramural funding for research, establishing partnerships with national and international institutions, and providing administrative support for submitting proposals and operating grants. In terms of research publications, UP is one of the most productive research institutions in Greece and compares favourably with peer institutions in Europe and North America. This can be further enhanced through interdepartmental initiatives developing research links between UP’s departments; a practice already applied to Engineering and to a lesser extent to Medicine, but not yet diffused in all departments. Nevertheless, in some disciplines, such as Pharmacy, the teaching load is so extensive that there is no time for faculty to devote to research. This issue should be faced. UP administration clearly understands that productivity is directly related to external funding and is making significant progress to support faculty in their effort to secure funding.

The EEC considers that in each School a key person at the Dean level (Associate Dean for Research) should be responsible for implementing the University’s research policy, having a direct communication link with the Deputy Rector for Research. This person should also co-ordinate the research activities of the School.

Extramural research funding

Extramural research funding is at a level of 25-30 million Euro of new grant funds per year (since 2011) and ELKE’s yearly revenue fluctuates around a few million Euros. The number of grant-funded projects whose budgets are managed by ELKE stands close to 600. The annual grant-funded research budget is close (80%) to the annual faculty salaries budget; this is an excellent indicator of strong research activity at UP. All these data indicate the potential of UP’s faculty to combat the economic crisis by pursuing more extramural funding. This is a vital strategy for ensuring the Institution’s survival and the EEC suggests that this route cannot be ignored but should rather be strengthened and further developed.

Clusters of Excellence

The idea of Clusters of Excellence has been pursued on an individual basis and thus has not yet impacted the University as a whole. Although the achievements of such clusters are commendable, the EEC would like to suggest a more systematic approach to this issue that guarantees academic excellence and other advantages to the Institution, especially when properly orchestrated with extramural research activities. The Clusters of Excellence should intend to contribute towards solving societal challenges and take advantage of UP’s research strengths. Establishing Clusters of Excellence will make the University more competitive and increase its profile in the national and international research communities. However, the Clusters must be grounded in reality and truly reflect the

Institution's capabilities and aspirations for growth. Furthermore, they would be most beneficial if they also address local, regional, and national needs.

Partnerships

A limited number of formal partnerships with other entities were noted, especially with institutions for the purpose of running joint postgraduate programmes. The issue of partnerships should be further exploited in the framework of outward-looking policy of the University, as a matter of urgency. Such a policy should include societal outreach as a high priority.

Administrative support for submitting and managing grants

UP's administrative team has an explicit goal of assisting faculty with the preparation, submission, and management of grants. For example, the relevant office (ELKE) assists faculty with budget preparation if requested. Once grants are approved for funding, the ELKE office will advance funds to the responsible faculty member so that the research project can be carried out in accordance with the research timetable. According to several faculty members with whom the EEC spoke, the ELKE office expedites purchases and other expenditures to the extent possible within the confines of the applicable laws. These types of actions provide both motivation and confidence for faculty to prepare and submit grant proposals.

- Research strategy objectives and timetables for achieving them

The initiatives mentioned above in §3.1.4 need to be implemented in a manner that takes into account the existing regulatory framework. Thus despite the Institution's efforts –which are commendable– effectiveness relies heavily on this framework. Some co-ordination of the research activities is required though, as noted above in §3.1.4 (e.g. enhancing interdisciplinary research, strengthening research policy making within the Institution, etc.). Current and future research needs at the national or regional level should be examined and steps taken if necessary (e.g. in the sector of the food industry).

- Laboratory research support

Problems have been created in the laboratories with the increasing number of students. The current teaching laboratories were designed for a smaller number of students. However, most laboratories are of a mixed nature, thus inevitably a part of the said pressure is also transferred to the research activity.

- Research excellence network

Please see comments about Clusters of Excellence and partners earlier in this section. Innovation needs to be promoted considerably. In this direction the necessary outward-looking strategy should encompass a dedicated line of action.

- Existence of research assistance mechanisms (for preparing proposals, capitalising on patents and innovations, finding partners for research programmes, etc.)

The current administration supports faculty in their efforts to prepare and submit research proposals as described earlier. ELKE is well prepared to provide an assistance mechanism to the faculty and the University at large for proposal preparation and execution. Finding partners is done on an individual basis but, if the need emerges, the relevant administration office is there to assist. Patenting innovations is still a minor activity and no problems are reported or envisaged yet. The financial support of the PhD students (through research funds) should also be addressed with a view ultimately to covering the whole population of such students. The Karatheodori and other stipends to young scientists should be highly commended in this respect. Also, some support to the PhD graduates would be desirable in the preparation of proposals.

<i>Please decide in respect to the specific evaluation area (§3.1.4):</i>	Tick
Worthy of merit	
Positive evaluation	X
Partially positive evaluation	
Negative evaluation	

Justify your rating (optional):

UP is already one of the most productive universities in Greece in terms of the number of publications, visibility, and research grant funding. UP's administration is taking steps to ensure that the Institution's research productivity remains high and the research remains relevant. Many critical strategic components are missing though and the research culture is based on individual initiative and not a synergetic well-coordinated effort.

Please refer to "General Note" on page 17.

3.1.5 Financial Strategy

- General financial strategy and management of national and international funds
- Regular budget management strategy
- Public investment management strategy
- Organization and strategy of the Special Account for Research Funds (ELKE)
- Organization and strategy of the University Property Development and Management Company
- Existence of a Quality System for Financial Management (e.g. ISO), computerization management and Budget monitoring (Regular Budget, Public Investments Programme, ELKE Budget, etc.)

Like all other Greek universities UP has undergone dramatic cuts in its operating budget over the past six years. From 14.42 million euros in 2008, public operational funding fell to 10.35 million euros in 2011, 7.5m in 2015, and 5.7m (estimated) in 2016. In percentage terms public funding for 2016 represents a cut of 60% since 2008. Taking into account the additional funding provided for contract teaching staff and food services, the overall cut in the same period is of the order of 51%. At the same time the continuous increase in student numbers (around 25%) means that the budget per student has declined to an even greater extent yielding an average of 3,478 Euros per student in 2013-14. From a comparative point of view, these features are well below European and US standards (the average budget per student is 10,000 euros in France and about double in the US) especially if one accounts for the inclusion of the medical school. Medical studies are normally very expensive. This under-funding will inevitably have a negative impact on the quality of studies and, if the trend is not reversed soon, it may have irreversible adverse consequences in the near future.

The institution has set in train a variety of various strategies in order to cope with these cuts. They include:

- a significant increase in applications for research grants and partnerships, which has already produced positive results
- a proactive policy for the exploitation of intellectual capital, through patents and spin-off companies worldwide
- green policies, including a water purification plant, wind power, and recycling; strong steps have already been taken here, see §3.1.7.
- the introduction of tuition fees for some Master's courses (at present only a small number)
- a policy for the exploitation of the institution's real estate (in preparation)

However, there are a number of specific constraints which adversely affect the institution's ability to maximize its income, including:

- the fact that three departments are housed in Agrinio, with concomitant costs for buildings, infrastructure, transportation etc., and unnecessary duplication of expenditures
- a financial, budgetary and legal system which limits the institution's ability to manage its resources effectively
- the need for capital investment, e.g. to restore parts of the student residences damaged by earthquake in 2008, resulting in a loss of beds.

On the positive side UP has an efficient system of financial management, with strong IT support, and its strategies for budget and investment management are kept under regular review.

<i>Please decide in respect to the specific evaluation area (§3.1.5):</i>	Tick
Worthy of merit	
Positive evaluation	X
Partially positive evaluation	
Negative evaluation	

Justify your rating (optional):

The excellent management of ELKE makes a very positive contribution to the Institution's budgetary efficiency. There is considerable scope for improvement in the management of UP's assets, which could make important contributions to its overall financial effectiveness.

Please refer to "General Note" on page 17.

3.1.6 Buildings and Grounds Infrastructure Strategy

- Strategy key points
- Objectives and timetables
- Measures taken to reach goals
- Deviations from model 1 campus/HEI

UP is situated on a large campus at Rio, where the majority of the departments of the five Schools and all of the central facilities are housed, while three departments which were transferred from the former University of Western Greece remain at Agrinio. The Rio campus has an area of 4.5 km², attractively laid out, with the following installations: a main building which houses the office of the rector, the central administrative services, meeting rooms and hall of ceremonies; a large complex accommodating the majority of the departments and their laboratories, the central library and IT services; prefabricated buildings which house other departments and services; a conference centre and auditorium; the student residences, canteen and other facilities; a sports centre with gymnasium, pitches, tennis courts, and swimming pool; two museums; the University General Hospital of Patras; and other buildings. At Agrinio there are buildings for each of the three departments, with further accommodation for libraries.

Maintenance costs are high, given the extent of the estate, and the EEC was informed, in the course of meetings with teaching staff and students, that maintenance problems were a major cause of concern. Apart from the two campuses, the UP owns a tract of 238,949 m² at Riganokambo, which is yet to be developed to the benefit of the institution. Otherwise, the University does not own any real estate which would bring in additional income.

Apart from the high maintenance costs, there are issues of security: only five custodians have to cover

the very large area of the Rio campus, round the clock. The security issues are unlikely to be resolved unless the campus is completely surrounded by metal fencing; funding for this work has been sought, but so far without success. The need for restoration of the earthquake-damaged hostels has already been mentioned. In general the teaching rooms are well equipped, but much of the experimental equipment is in need of replacement.

The estate generates some income for the institution: rents from the catering outlets (but a stricter enforcement policy needs to be applied); and membership fees for the sports facilities. There is a plan for commercial exploitation of the olive trees on the campus, which deserves serious consideration. The conference facilities could become more attractive once better transportation links are in place, and if more high-quality hotel accommodation were available adjacent to the campus.

<i>Please decide in respect to the specific evaluation area (§3.1.6):</i>	Tick
Worthy of merit	
Positive evaluation	X
Partially positive evaluation	
Negative evaluation	

Justify your rating (optional):

The current situation with three departments located in Agrinio, cut off from the rest of the university, is unsustainable. Efforts must continue to be made to produce a solution which will serve both the academic (see e.g. § 3.1.3) and the financial interests of the institution.

Please refer to “General Note” on page 17.

3.1.7 Environmental Strategy

- Recycling strategy and measures taken to reach goals
- Hazardous waste management and measures taken to reach goals
- Urban waste management and measures taken to reach goals
- Green energy strategy and measures taken to reach goals

UP has a strong environmental policy, which is part of the remit of the Vice-Rector with responsibility for Infrastructures and Sustainability. The institution has had a committee for the management of the environment since 2010. The policy also aims to involve students at all levels and, by means of seminars and other activities, it reaches out to schools and the local community. The range of actions undertaken is impressive, covering recycling of batteries, metal, paper, plastic, waste water, etc., energy generation (wind and photovoltaic) and conservation, hazardous waste management, and various measures for the protection of the environment. Special terms have been negotiated with the public electricity company (ΔEH) and various measures have been taken to reduce electricity consumption, but quantitative data were not available. The Regional Governor has undertaken to obtain funding for the energy efficiency upgrades of the University Hospital.

The environmental committee’s policies and activities are publicized on the committee’s web page and in specific publications. Many of the institution’s goals have already been reached, but continuing vigilance is needed to ensure that good practices are maintained and enhanced. Future plans include collaboration with other universities in Greece in order to develop proposals for projects funded by national and European programmes for sustainable development.

Please decide in respect to the specific evaluation area (§3.1.7):

	Tick
Worthy of merit	X
Positive evaluation	
Partially positive evaluation	
Negative evaluation	

Justify your rating (optional):

UP is to be commended for devising and implementing a wide range of environmentally-friendly actions and policies.

Please refer to “General Note” on page 17.

3.1.8 Social Strategy

- Exploitation and dissemination of the Institution’s Research Activities for the benefit of society and economy
- Promotion of interaction between the Institution and the Labour Market
- Sustained relationships with key local and regional bodies
- Contribution to the cultural development of society, the city and the region
- Reciprocal and long-lasting relationship with the alumni community

A major field of interaction of UP with society is fostered through the Regional Hospital associated to the University and particularly to its Medical School, the faculty of which actually runs the Hospital. Additionally, deterioration of health-related services in the public sector of the country and the dire economic situation, has led to a diminished number of faculty and staff. The combination of those factors has resulted in increased workloads and less time for research.

The University produces a newsletter @up, which appears monthly and contains information about events and achievements, while announcements also appear on the main website. UP is actively developing a policy for research spin-offs and has had some degree of success in setting up such companies. The EEC was able to meet several graduates who had collaborated with members of teaching and research staff in various ways. However, the degree of interaction between the institution and local businesses remains unsatisfactory and this is a priority for UP.

Opportunities exist for students to obtain work placements in local companies, though both the incentives and the number of places may need to be enhanced. Anecdotally, the EEC came to understand that the location of some of the placements may present a problem to the students. The whole issue of work placements, and whether they are compulsory or optional, should be placed in a more regulated framework.

The Regional Governor for Western Greece is keen to encourage and enable the university to develop more outward-looking policies. The EEC heard that he (the Regional Governor) has created a Research and Innovation Council which has produced so far 19m euros for the support of research programmes at UP. The university will also benefit from a five-year regional plan. Particular priorities are underdeveloped sectors of the economy and areas of specialization.

The local Chamber of Commerce is also keen to develop contacts with UP and has made some noteworthy progress in that direction. Two highly successful events entitled “Patras IQ” (2012 and 2015) have been organized jointly by the Chamber of Commerce, the office of the Regional Governor and UP, with sponsorship from local and national companies, have focused on technology transfer in the region. Further collaborations, to include also the Hellenic Federation of Enterprises (SEV), are envisaged.

In the area of cultural activities the institution engages with the local community in a variety of ways: cultural events, lectures, musical and dramatic performances, the award of prizes to local people

distinguished in the world of arts and letters, and in collaborations with local cultural organizations. Open lessons are offered by a number of Schools, particularly the School of Humanities. There is a positive attitude to Life-long Learning, which figures among the university's objectives. The EEC hopes that, once the necessary funding is secured, the university will be able to proceed with its plans for a Life-long Learning Centre, which will benefit the whole region.

Relations with graduates of the Institution appear to be ad hoc, there being no formal framework within which contacts can be developed and maintained. UP may wish to explore the potential benefits of creating an alumni association, with regular events and mailings for alumni, in order to keep them in touch with developments at UP. Graduates can now keep their university email address, a fact which will make it much easier to maintain communication.

<i>Please decide in respect to the specific evaluation area (§3.1.8):</i>	Tick
Worthy of merit	
Positive evaluation	X
Partially positive evaluation	
Negative evaluation	

Justify your rating (optional):

While many steps have been made in the right direction, there is a need for a more co-ordinated approach to develop outward-looking policies and strategies.

Please refer to "General Note" on page 17.

3.1.9 Internationalization Strategy

- Integration of the international dimension in the curricula
- Integration of the international dimension in research
- Integration of the intercultural dimension within the campus
- Participation in international HEI networks
- Collaboration with HEIs in other countries (with a specific collaboration agreement) - measures taken to reach goals

One of the institution's principal objectives is the continuing development of its international presence and its synergies with internally recognised universities and research centres. UP is a member of 16 international organizations and participates in inter-university and interdisciplinary postgraduate programmes such as Erasmus+ and Marie S. Curie (Horizon 2020).

Joint postgraduate programmes (Erasmus Mundi) have been developed by the Department of Civil Engineering with the University of Pavia and the University of Rome Sapienza. Further examples of initiatives under development include a summer course in Greece in collaboration with the Hellenic Studies Center of Harvard University and arrangements for joint supervision of Master's and PhD degrees with foreign universities.

Collaboration agreements currently exist with 61 universities and research institutes in 31 different countries, with 6 further agreements in the pipeline. It is noteworthy that UP was the first Greek university to participate in the development and introduction of the European Credit Transfer System.

Erasmus agreements are also numerous (383 with 30 European countries), but despite the undoubted educational and social benefits, a number of factors inhibit student mobility, particularly the high cost of living in other European countries. The number of incoming students remains relatively low (86 in 2014-15), largely because there is no specific provision for teaching in a language other than Greek (though students can be supervised for a dissertation or project). However, in many departments there

would be considerable benefit to UP's own students (in terms of their professional development) if some courses were to be taught in English, and at the same time more foreign students could be attracted. The EEC understands that there will inevitably be obstacles, but such a development must remain an aspiration. At postgraduate (Master's) level, only a few programmes are currently taught in English. In other European countries postgraduate programmes taught in English have proved extremely popular. UP should be encouraged to enter this market by identifying niche areas where it has a particular specialization. A corollary is that such courses should be subject to tuition fees, at least for non-EU students, with scholarships available for (Greek) students who would not otherwise be able to continue their studies.

A positive step in the direction of encouraging mobility is that incoming Erasmus students are offered a Greek language programme (by the Centre for Greek Language and Culture), which confers transferable credits. As far as members of teaching staff are concerned, the university's internationalization strategy is held back by the lack of funding for attendance at conferences outside Greece. The university should make it a priority to overcome this serious problem.

Please decide in respect to the specific evaluation area (§3.1.9):

	Tick
Worthy of merit	
Positive evaluation	
Partially positive evaluation	X
Negative evaluation	

Justify your rating (optional):

Much significant progress has been made in UP's internationalization strategy. The obstacles to further developments must be overcome in order to enable UP to take its rightful place in the international Higher Education map.

Please refer to "General Note" on page 17.

3.1.10 Student Welfare Strategy

- Student hostel operation and development strategy
- Student refectory development strategy
- Scholarships and prizes strategy
- Sports facilities operation and development strategy
- Cultural activities strategy
- Strategy for people with special needs

The student hostel (Φοιτητική Εστία), now operated by the university itself, is the largest at any Greek university, with 709 beds, while some 100 other students are accommodated in hotels in the vicinity under special agreements. A further 280 beds are currently out of commission as a result of earthquake damage in 2008. The necessary rebuilding work is a high priority and the university must maintain its efforts to secure the necessary funding. The student canteen serves meals to some 7,500 entitled students every day and this must be regarded as a highly successful operation. Other catering outlets also exist on the campus, for the use of all members of the UP community.

There is no student hostel at Agrinio but students are able to rent accommodation there at reasonable rates.

Students who do not live in the hostel on the Rio campus can commute from Patras by bus or train, the latter being cheaper though trains are infrequent. The bus service covers the whole campus.

The campus possesses excellent facilities for a range of sports, including an athletics track, pitches, tennis courts, swimming pool and indoor gymnasium. The facilities are in a reasonably good state of

maintenance, and appear to be well used.

Health care is provided through a treatment centre and, of course, the University Hospital. The University employs the services of a psychologist and a psychiatrist. A Student Welfare and Entertainment Department provides support to students who have problems in relation to accommodation needs, personal matters etc. The University has also developed policies and facilities for students with special needs. For example, a Braille service is provided in the printing centre of the Library.

Please decide in respect to the specific evaluation area (§3.1.10):

	Tick
Worthy of merit	
Positive evaluation	X
Partially positive evaluation	
Negative evaluation	

Justify your rating (optional):

The EEC detected some elements of dissatisfaction (not always justified) on the part of students. It would be good to involve students more in the running of the campus, on a voluntary basis, where staffing and financial shortages pose a problem (e.g. clearing overgrown areas).

Please refer to “General Note” on page 17.

3.2 Strategy for Study Programmes

3.2.1 Programmes of Undergraduate Studies (first cycle)

Please comment on:

- the main strengths and weaknesses of the Programmes
- the basic obligations of students, e.g. attendance of lectures, course requirements, etc.
- the way the Central Administration of the Institution deals with any remarks and recommendations that the external experts pointed out in the External Evaluation of Academic Units

Do you wish to make any comment on a point not included above?

Main strengths of the Programmes

- (i) Curricula based on strong emphasis on basic and fundamental knowledge and skills.
- (ii) Initiation of curricula evaluation and updating to potentially streamline course offerings will eliminate duplication. (This approach has been adopted largely following the external evaluations of the departments by HQA experts). The Institution's internal evaluation report and the meetings with schools and departments shows strong intentions to continue critical evaluations of the programmes of study on an annual basis.
- (iii) Theoretical mastery as well as adequate hands-on training that is appreciated by alumni providing them with a strong basis for versatility in their careers.
- (iv) A move to collect student evaluations from all courses and to increase response rates.
- (v) Strong social relevance of programmes (e.g. topics of course projects or theses are motivated by immediate needs of broader society and local community). This is emphasized in Medicine by virtue of the subject matter.
- (vi) Excellent job placement for the top graduates of certain Schools due to quality training (testimonies on the quality of student training were received in the meeting with alumni).

Main weaknesses of the Programmes

- (i) Large number of students that increase at an unpredictable rate.
- (ii) Small number of faculty for the number of students, which is a threat to the accreditation of programmes.
- (iii) Extremely small number of teaching support staff for the number of students and the number of courses with laboratories.
- (iv) Small number of administrative staff for the number of students.
- (v) Shortage of funds to maintain and expand laboratories.
- (vi) Fragmented and distributed (rather than centralized) computing facilities are not as efficient to operate and encourage a silo mentality.
- (vii) Course prerequisites do not exist in explicit or implicit forms. As a result, students take courses without having mastered prerequisite material undermining their academic performance.
- (viii) Course lectures (theory) and laboratories (hands-on) are handled as independent entities undermining student learning outcomes.
- (ix) Poor attendance by students in lecture courses.
- (x) Average time to degree about 2 years in excess of required.
- (xi) Small number of offerings in English.

(xii) Lack of tracking of the majority of graduates through alumni outreach programmes.

- Basic obligations of students

- (i) Register and successfully complete the courses that define the programme curriculum; the curricula are a combination of required and elective courses.
- (ii) Each course has a number of credits; the total number of credits needed depends on the number of years required for a degree; the minimum number of years to complete the degree requirements varies by school and it is between 8 and 12 semesters.

- Central and External Evaluation of Academic Units

It was observed that all Schools have thoroughly reviewed their External Evaluations and addressed and implemented many recommendations included in the reports. It should be noted that many recommendations are impossible to address due to the extreme level of control of the central authority over the number of incoming students and their academic orientation, as well as the extreme and sudden budgetary cuts without concessions and flexibility in resolving resource constraints. Nevertheless a completion percentage for the various categories of 'internal' recommendations as high as 57% was mentioned by UP.

It was observed and uniformly maintained by the EEC that the Central Administration has good intentions in facilitating and directly supporting the implementation of the recommendations presented in the External Evaluation reports of the Schools.

General Comments and Suggestions for Improvement:

The University should consider developing orientation initiatives (particularly first year) and careful tracking of student progress with the aim to eliminate barriers for their advancement. The University should also consider developing peer-to-peer student programmes with senior students functioning as advisors and mentors of younger students. Best practices in other institutions should be researched and adapted for use in UP.

The State and the University must come to an agreement on the number of incoming students based on the funding the university receives from the State. The number of incoming students should remain stable for reasonably long periods of time so as to allow the University to optimally plan its academic activities, such as to ensure quality teaching, minimize alienation of students, decrease the number of stagnant students, and enable faculty to meet (even) higher academic standards.

The State should accelerate the approval of existing procedures and allow the creation of new revenue streams (e.g. tuition-based programmes for international students at all levels).

The University should also initiate development of public-private partnerships targeting a sustained revenue stream creation for undergraduate education support.

The University should also be commended for a positive climate between students and faculty and fostering constructive academic rapport (the EEC committee met with several recent and former graduates who had created successful international businesses).

The EEC did not find a strong entrepreneurship and innovation strategy in the undergraduate programmes. The Central Administration should develop an enhancement programme to support faculty that are ready to develop initiatives in this area.

Teaching course evaluations are overall good and cover a large number of courses in each semester. However, in meetings with faculty and students the EEC received the message that there is variance in the teaching performance of individual faculty and other teaching staff that is not handled in a systematic way. The EEC would like to recommend that the University develop a teaching enhancement programme and a support office (e.g. Teaching and Learning Centre) to provide guidance to faculty in developing better teaching skills.

The diversity in student performance and learning outcomes achievements is not addressed and the EEC believes that emphasis is given to the top performing students and not to the student body as a whole, including stagnant students, comprising about 22% of the total student body. More emphasis is needed to understand the range of achievements by all graduates.

Please decide in respect to the specific evaluation area (§3.2.1):

	Tick
Worthy of merit	
Positive evaluation	
Partially positive evaluation	X
Negative evaluation	

Justify your rating (optional):

The above rating is a reflection of how funding cuts, increases in student numbers, and loss of faculty and staff are jeopardizing the quality of education, which requires lower student to faculty ratios than current (particularly in some departments). It is also a reflection of lingering issues such as the lack of a method for enforcing course prerequisites and creating new sources of revenues (e.g., tuition for other educational programmes to support undergraduate education). Nevertheless, the UP administration, faculty, and staff must be commended for efforts made towards maintaining the quality of education despite all the external obstacles.

Please refer to “General Note” on page 17.

3.2.2 Programmes of Postgraduate Studies (second cycle)

Please comment on:

- the main strengths and weaknesses of the Programmes
- the basic obligations of students, e.g. attendance of lectures, course requirements, etc.
- the way the Central Administration of the Institution deals with any remarks and recommendations that the external experts pointed out in the External Evaluation of Academic Units

Do you wish to make any comment on a point not included above?

- The main strengths and weaknesses of the Programmes

UP currently offers 36 postgraduate programmes that lead to the equivalent of a Master's degree. In the academic year 2014-15 there were 2089 students with an incoming body of 530 students. There are also 7 joint degree programmes (<http://www.upatras.gr/en/coop-postgrads>). The overall ratio of applications over postgraduate positions was 1.576:1 for 2013-14 with a slightly decreasing trend when compared to 2010-11. In 2013-14 UP had 1870 registered students (page 64 MODIP report). The degrees are in:

1. Ancient Greek Theatre
2. Applications of Environmental Protection & Management
3. Applied Economics & Data Analysis
4. Architecture and Urban Design
5. Biology
6. Biomedical Engineering
7. Biomedical Sciences
8. Business Administration (MBA)
9. Chemical Biology
10. Chemical Engineering
11. Chemistry
12. Civil Engineering
13. Computer Science and Engineering
14. Current approaches to language and texts

15. Distributed Green Electric Power and the Advanced Network Infrastructure for its Management and Economy
16. Educational Sciences and Early Childhood
17. Electronics and Processing of Information
18. Environmental Sciences
19. Geosciences and Environment
20. Informatics for Life Sciences
21. M.Sc. in Hardware and Software Integrated Systems
22. Master in Education
23. Materials Science
24. Mathematics and their Modern Applications
25. Mathematics of Computers and Decision Making
26. MBA in Business Administration of Food and Agricultural Enterprises
27. Mechanical Engineering and Aeronautics
28. Medical Physics
29. Medicinal Chemistry: Design and Development of Pharmaceutical products
30. Networked Cities and Representations
31. Pharmacy
32. Physics
33. Public Health
34. Science and Technology of Polymers
35. Signal Processing and Communications Systems: Theory, Implementations and Applications
36. Theoretical and Practical Philosophy

The EEC finds that UP's postgraduate programmes cover a wide spectrum of disciplines. Requirements, success of recruiting, and selection of students varies by programme. The EEC observes excessive teaching loads due to the variety and the fragmentation (i.e. the inclusion of many options per programme) of the postgraduate programmes within departments, within schools, and throughout the UP campus.

The EEC had an opportunity to speak to several postgraduate students during the site visit and many seemed to be very satisfied with their experience, while others raised concerns on a variety of issues that are specific to their departments. Apparently not all the postgraduate students have the same opportunities and similar quality of facilities. Also, only a fraction of the postgraduate students have the opportunity to work on research tailored to their degree objectives and publish their research in peer-reviewed journal articles, or participate in peer-reviewed conferences and prestigious exhibitions and shows. The degree of integration of research and education between postgraduate education and doctoral studies (2nd cycle with 3rd cycle) is rather weak. Streamlining of these programmes and quality assurance of a postgraduate programme of this size and scope can be facilitated and ensured with the creation of a School of Graduate Studies. In a similar vein, a major integration issue concerns the Agrinio extension. Postgraduate students face isolation from academic life and the programmes at Agrinio face barriers to their growth and integration with the Patras programmes.

The proposed School of Graduate Studies can monitor and enforce common standards, develop an overall strategic and operational plan, promote the internationalization of postgraduate education, and develop a stable revenue stream that supports the programme components. Moreover, the creation of a formal graduate advising structure that coordinates schools and departments will lead to further rationalization of the entire enterprise of postgraduate education at UP. The EEC notes that there already exists a Committee for Postgraduate Studies, chaired by the Vice-Rector for Academic Affairs, which oversees postgraduate (including PhD) issues, and this is certainly a positive development.

A major problem for the sustainability of the current postgraduate programmes is funding. UP appears to have good intentions in offering postgraduate programmes in two languages (Greek and English) to attract fee-paying students, as a means of securing funding for these programmes. The EEC agrees that this is an approach of high potential to solve funding problems, which also has the advantage of significantly internationalizing the campus. However, revenues from the tuition paid by postgraduate students should allocate a substantial portion to subsidize underfunded undergraduate programmes, support under-represented

students with documented need for financial support, engage doctoral students in teaching and laboratory training, and tailor some programmes to emerging technical and scientific needs of currently underserved organizations. In addition, the creation of Clusters of Excellence can further enhance postgraduate education and is addressed in another part of this report.

The EEC also sees an opportunity for the current Dean's offices (in cooperation with the proposed School of Graduate Studies) of each school to play a leadership role in coordinating and streamlining postgraduate programmes and developing strategies for revenue generation.

- the basic obligations of students, e.g. attendance of lectures, course requirements, etc.

The postgraduate programmes require enrolled students to take courses and to some extent conduct research-oriented projects and final theses. The ECTS requirements differ by programme. In addition, many postgraduate programme courses are usually different from undergraduate courses but "bridge" undergraduate-graduate courses offer an opportunity for streamlining curricula. Attendance is not always mandatory for postgraduate programme lectures although a sample of students interviewed by the EEC indicated high interest and attendance rates.

- the way the Central Administration of the Institution deals with any remarks and recommendations that the external experts pointed out in the External Evaluation of Academic Units

The external review of the Schools and their postgraduate programmes is forwarded to the Schools by the Institution's administration and it is incumbent upon the School and Departments to address the review and make the suggested improvements. Suggested improvements to postgraduate programmes are discussed by the faculty and may be adopted and incorporated during the regular programme review periods, which typically occur annually.

Please decide in respect to the specific evaluation area (§3.2.2):

	Tick
Worthy of merit	
Positive evaluation	X
Partially positive evaluation	
Negative evaluation	

Justify your rating (optional):

UP currently has many postgraduate programmes that do not appear to be following a cohesive set of strong directions that provide a documented competitive advantage for UP. The current centres of excellence could be used to create clusters of development. Very few courses are taught in English but intentions exist to multiply them. Any positives are offset by: a) low numbers of applicants; b) very high acceptance rate; and c) duplication and fragmentation among the programmes.

Please refer to "General Note" on page 17.

3.2.3 Programmes of Doctoral Studies (third cycle)

Please comment on:

- the main strengths and weaknesses of the Programmes
- the basic obligations of students, e.g. attendance of lectures, course requirements, etc.
- the way the Central Administration of the Institution deals with any remarks and recommendations that the external experts pointed out in the External Evaluation of Academic Units

Do you wish to make any comment on a point not included above?

Twenty-four departments cover the programme for Doctoral Studies. The conditions for obtaining a PhD conform to the ones defined by the European System of Higher Education. A PhD student must obtain 180 ECTS during a minimal period of 6 semesters. ECTS are obtained through a series of courses including courses from the postgraduate programme. The number of registered doctoral students was 2114 in 2013-14, with 254 incoming students. Duration of studies varies among the 24 programmes considerably (page 65-66 of the MODIP report) with a few programmes not reporting duration and not tracking progress to graduation.

The EEC considers this to be a symptom of lack of consistency among graduate programmes, absence of a common administrative unit (The Graduate School), and also peculiar circumstances and context in different research activities. The EEC deems it necessary to update continuously the lists and status of PhD students and be made mandatory for UP programmes. It is also advisable to develop a detailed list of milestones and expectations for all 24 programmes with the possibility of tailoring each programme to the thematic area of specialty. The overall trend of PhD degrees completion is sinusoidal fluctuation with a rapid decrease in the last few years. In 2013-14, 116 degrees were conferred with many programmes exceeding 10 graduates (page 143 MODIP report).

From discussion with PhD students the EEC understands there is a positive interaction between students and advisors/supervisors, teaching for a minimum number of semesters is a requirement, opportunities for gaining paid teaching experience exist and they are welcomed by the Institution; the participation of PhD students in professional conferences is also appreciated. In any case the academic duties and rights of PhD students should be codified and made available to the students upon enrolment. The funding mechanism for travel to conferences is rapidly decreasing and it covers only a fraction of actual expenses. This excludes students that do not have other sources of income and pushes students to conferences that are less prestigious, inhibiting their career development. In spite of all these impediments the EEC had the opportunity to meet and discuss campus issues with graduates in very competitive positions in industry and academia.

The symptom of fragmentation and lack of communication among different programmes is also observed in the PhD programmes. The EEC has the same recommendation as in section 3.2.2 on postgraduate programmes, which is the creation of a Graduate School or at least development of an alternative horizontal organization of Postgraduate and Doctoral studies that: a) fosters cross-department and cross-school research collaborations; b) unifies rules and regulations in a consistent way; and c) creates a unified policy and tactical approach in attracting fellowships and scholarships. A separate and important issue is the lack of internationalization of the Doctoral programme.

A parallel initiative to push for interaction and communication among all actors involved in education is to create an annual student conference. The conference can be organized by more experienced students to bring together postgraduate and PhD students (with possible participation by undergraduate students) to discuss their research and exchange ideas. This eventually could be expanded to include other universities, research institutes, private companies, and public agencies.

Please decide in respect to the specific evaluation area (§3.2.3):	Tick
Worthy of merit	
Positive evaluation	X
Partially positive evaluation	
Negative evaluation	

Justify your rating (optional):

UP currently has many PhD programmes that, in similar ways to the postgraduate programmes, do not appear to be following a cohesive set of strong directions (e.g., research clusters) to provide a competitive advantage for UP. The current centres of excellence and the institutes external to UP could be used as “seed” to create clusters of research development targeting PhD student support. The existence of a Graduate School-like structure will also improve quality immensely. An updated and enforced code of practice may enhance this set of programmes (see e.g. 4.4).

Please refer to “General Note” on page 17.

3.3 Profile of the Institution under evaluation - Conclusions and recommendations

*Please complete the following sections regarding the overall **profile of the Institution under evaluation**:*

Underline specific positive points:

- The Institution is populated by highly skilled and highly motivated faculty, staff, and graduate students who have the potential, will, and ability to excel.
- The Institution’s leadership is dynamic and committed to developing strategic plans.
- The Institution has a variety of ideas to tactically solve both short- and long-term problems that may interfere with the strategic planning of the Institution.
- The leadership appears to have very good working relationships with the support staff, and the faculty leadership.
- An increasing number of incoming students identify the Institution as their first choice for their studies; for a few departments the proportion exceeds 40%. This is a positive trend that may be due to factors outside the Institution and can be used as an opportunity for UP to promote itself and make sure student satisfaction is high when compared with other campuses.
- All Schools of the Institution have started adopting the ECTS system and the Institution’s administration is promoting the use of diploma supplements that will start immediately after completing the ECTS system.
- The Institution has many postgraduate programmes addressing societal and market needs that could be taught in English to attract international students and provide a possible revenue stream for all academic functions.
- Research is a core mission for some departments and is becoming a core mission for the entire Institution.
- The society outreach is limited to very important and appreciated civic activities. One of these relates to the Hospital supported mainly by the Medical School.

Underline specific negative points:

- The mission statement and goals of UP as written in the Internal Evaluation Report are overly broad and require the creation of goals, objectives with associated indicators, and targets with

a timeline (e.g., create a self-funded English Master's in XX by 2018, enrol 200 foreign nationals by 2017).

- Problems persist with student attendance, lack of prerequisites, time to graduation, graduation rates, and other related issues in the undergraduate programmes of study.
- Although outside the Institution's grasp the following critical issues are underlined: excessive number of incoming students, faculty and staff numbers inadequate for this institution, level of funding far below accepted ranges.

- *Make your suggestions for further development of the positive points:*

1. Use the substantial current intellectual capital at UP to further scientific synergies and partnerships.
2. Implement financial and other incentives to support postgraduate programmes taught in English.
3. A plan should be in place to keep senior practising doctors in the University, for example by forging stronger ties with Institutions outside Greece.

- *Make your suggestions on needed steps for improvement:*

1. The Institution Leadership should develop strategic and tactical plans to increase the Institution's ability to serve its mission by fostering interactions internally. Internal partnering between Departments would contribute toward minimising the current large differences among various academic units.
2. Create an institutional process that allows streamlining of curricula and use of classrooms across the entire campus.
3. Develop a student centre and an online advisory centre for students leveraging other student-based organizations, as well as to help "stagnant" students.
4. Increase outreach and communication with the Institution's goals and culture to students so that they feel that they have a stake in the Institution's success.
5. School Deans and the Rector should develop a clear strategy to create a Graduate School and in the very short term initiate a coordination effort for undergraduate, postgraduate, and doctoral studies.
6. Initiate negotiations with the central governments to incoming student numbers, staff hiring, faculty hiring.
7. Initiate negotiations with the Regional Governor's office to identify funding opportunities for undergraduate, postgraduate, and PhD programmes.

4. INTERNAL SYSTEM OF QUALITY ASSURANCE

4.1 Quality Assurance (QA) Policy and Strategy

UP should be commended for dealing with quality assurance and enhancement (in short QA) as an integral part of its mission and a major priority for its further development policy and strategy. This is evidenced by the fact that personnel and other scarce resources are allocated to this effort (a Vice-Rector position has been created and quality assurance and information technology services have been given substantial support and high priority). UP took a bold first step toward the development of a solid QA system leading eventually to credible self-accreditation of its programmes and related activities. As a general observation, UP has all necessary elements ready to build a set of strong QA processes in the very near future leading to national (and/or European) accreditation of its programmes and activities. QA will help maintain a robust, high level of quality and competitiveness of the institution in Greece. It has also the potential to provide the basis for further internationalization of its programmes and activities in Europe (and beyond). A future analysis should include a carefully chosen “basket of comparable institutions” in size and perceived quality, with a similar mix of faculties, not only from Greece, but also from different countries in Europe (and beyond). Overall the EEC felt that the institution has responded in a timely way and with great eagerness to requests for additional evidence supporting the external evaluation.

Suggestions:

- The draft Regulations included in the Self-Evaluation document (June 2015) should be approved by the necessary governance bodies of the Institution.
- The implementation of QA should cover all strategic goals (research, teaching, programmes, and services) as identified in the Self-Evaluation process. So far, most of the UP effort has focused on QA of the programmes, and to a lesser extent to related research activities and relationships with interested stakeholders (such as local research institutes and clusters). The latter have the potential to enhance the institutional quality and added value of UP to its local, national and international environments.
- QA processes should be defined in a way that includes a detailed description of the data selection method, data analysis and evaluation method, and pertinent actions and reactions/feedback. This way we make sure that QA is a set of processes that safeguard collection of all relevant data from stakeholders within the institution implementation, control and transparency. Recommendations of previous evaluations should be dealt with in the QA processes.
- The QA processes should explain and justify matters pertaining to collecting and handling of personal data such as appropriateness of data size, respect of privacy, constitutional rights and be sufficiently robust to assure future academic quality review and actions for improvement in a rapidly changing and financially deteriorating environment. QA processes should be developed in such a way that contingencies are dealt with as rapidly as possible.
- The academic units should proactively increase their interaction and collaboration with the University Quality Assurance Unit (i.e. OMEAs and MODIP) so that they are better prepared for the future role of MODIP. (According to State planning, MODIP is expected to be assigned a substantial role and expected to be well aware of the available programmes, contribute to their development and eventually be their QA and accreditation body within the Institution.)
- The Office of Career Networking services should try to enhance the connections (and impact) of UP with industry, public bodies and community supported organizations, as well as the global alumni of the UP (including their endowments and donations).

<i>Please decide in respect to the specific evaluation area (§4.1):</i>	Tick
Worthy of merit	
Positive evaluation	
Partially positive evaluation	X
Negative evaluation	

Justify your rating (optional):

The EEC understands that QA policy (and strategy) is still in its infancy in Greek HEIs. The UP (through the Vice-Rector, MODIP, etc.) has the unequivocal will and momentum to thoroughly address this challenge top-down (this has to be coupled with bottom-up policy and strategies in the near future, see 4.2). The most important barrier however seems to be that national-level processes are not in place yet to check, legitimize and evaluate the ongoing institutional processes.

Please refer to “General Note” on page 17.

4.2 Design, approval, monitoring and evaluation of the study programmes and degrees awarded

The academic programmes of the UP are designed, reviewed, and modified by its Schools and Departments on a regular semester (or/and annual) basis. Programme descriptions are available both in electronic and printed forms. Modifications are approved by UP Senate. Assessment of Programmes is supervised by pertinent committees at the department level, i.e. the Departmental QA Team (OMEA) that provides regular input to the MODIP (and related information systems and services). OMEAs however need to be linked formally to their Heads of the Department so that there is a mechanism (and process) in place for taking appropriate actions for course monitoring and improvements at the point of contact with the relevant student bodies. Course sequencing is recommended by some of the Schools. Hence each student may plan his/her own individual study programme. Few out of the 24 departments have modified this practice by introducing pre-requisite courses. The programmes have mostly adopted the ECTS credit hour system; they are currently calibrating the mapping of credit hours to courses according to their programme characteristics and priorities. However, the EEC did not find a process to certify the accuracy of the assigned ECTSs. Students participate in the QA of programmes in various ways, mainly through quantitative course evaluations (survey questionnaires), participation in undergraduate programmes committees, and to a lesser extent job placements and qualitative interview data about general levels of satisfaction. Improving student attendance is a priority of the Institution and some steps have been taken already in this direction (e.g. advisor per class). The programmes include well-structured international mobility and placement opportunities for both faculty and students (the Office of Career Networking service is used to some extent for such purposes with the EU ERASMUS+ programme, etc.). EEC noticed that there are arising numerous external constraints, chiefly imposed from the centre (i.e., the State Ministries) that significantly worsened the overall environment for enhancing quality of programmes, with significantly higher quotas of students for entry at several leading departments in the past years, loss of faculty as a result of ongoing retirements and study leaves abroad, lack of available ongoing recruits for new posts in all departments, etc.

Suggestions

- The programmes should clearly formulate and publish learning outcomes at the programme level and use quantitative and/or qualitative metrics to show their level of achievement in each and every case. The learning outcomes should be compatible with the pertinent National (or European) Framework(s) describing the qualities of graduates at any exit level of Higher Education. The Departments and Schools should then make sure that graduates satisfactorily cover the above criteria and can be credibly assessed within specific framework(s). ECTS units ought to reflect actual work-load of individual courses.
- The programme assessment process should be defined in terms of data selection methods (quantitative or/and qualitative), data analysis and evaluation methods, and pertinent actions and reactions/feedback with clear leadership involvement, for assessing and rewarding quality

enhancement both bottom-up (OMEA to Head of the Department to Faculty) and top-down (Vice-Rector to MODIP to OMEAs); it should also be aligned with programme learning outcomes according to National (or European) framework(s).

- Alternative methods should be identified to address the low student attendance of courses whenever existing methods do not work as expected (e.g., use of student ambassadors, student mentors, etc.).
- The Leadership of the Institution is urged to consider, in collaboration with the Schools, the merit of using pre-requisite courses in all programmes of study as judged appropriately.
- EEC encourages the continuation and possible expansion of actions to strengthen not only the critical and academically reflective part of the learning outcomes, but also the practical/hands-on component in the academic programmes, such as small group course projects, practical training, educational trips, individual work-place placements, etc.

Please decide in respect to the specific evaluation area (§4.2):

	Tick
Worthy of merit	
Positive evaluation	X
Partially positive evaluation	
Negative evaluation	

Justify your rating (optional):

Learning outcomes are not yet clearly defined and embedded in the UP courses. ECTS units to be adjusted to reflect the amount of real work required. If too high (or low) the student workload needs to be adjusted so that students will be encouraged to participate in the class and project work. OMEA needs to be linked formally to the Leadership of departments and student bodies; and processes should be strengthened to take into account the student feedback and help the faculty improve their courses and satisfy the needs of students and linked stakeholders.

Please refer to “General Note” on page 17.

4.3 Teaching and learning - Assessment by students

The Institution/Schools provide multiple learning paths that are coherent and follow student needs and market trends as perceived by course leaders. Multiple paths are only within the same academic programme while there is considerable overlap of programmes between some departments. The student to faculty ratio is very high for a decent quality institution (under multiple criteria applicable to any top quality University). The classrooms are often too small for the size of core courses as the student population is externally dictated; laboratory infrastructures available to students do not meet requirements in terms of the number of available stations for the size of the student body (multiple sections that unavoidably involve a few of them taking place very late in the evening when students are required to complete laboratory assignments). The duration of the exam period is quite long at about 40% of the time devoted to teaching.

In general, students are informed adequately about the assessment criteria of their performance in courses. The Institution recently hired both a psychologist and a psychiatrist who support students on a need basis and this shows how UP cares about the mental health and psychological well-being of its members. Undergraduate students are potentially offered guidance and mentoring by the dedicated faculty and staff on a one-on-one or small group basis, but they do not often take advantage of these offerings during office hours (as published) or on a need, case by case basis. Student advisors are in place for most Schools, while some Schools are more proactive than others in terms of advising, mentoring and supporting their students. At the institutional level students are also informed about the programmes, course requirements and evaluation process of their performance electronically. An induction to the Campus and its services, however, would have been welcomed by many “freshers” (via

more advanced students) or/and their first year tutors in each and every department. Student complaints are addressed on a need basis by faculty advisors and the Head of the Department. Also the Vice-Rector for Academic Affairs handles student complaints at the Institutional level.

Suggestions

- The critical issue of student to faculty ratio should be urgently addressed by all parties involved within and outside of the Institution.
- Additional technical personnel to support laboratories and small group teaching and learning are clearly needed. Doctoral students should be used in all functions of practical course design and delivery, including invigilation, up to a maximum workload (for example, 6 hours per week).
- Schools should also make the most of the qualified teaching support staff (ΕΔΙΠ) not only in terms of laboratory and exercise activities but also toward supporting other teaching components.
- A shorter exam period should be aimed for, allowing space for other complementary activities, such as gaining of practical training experience within private or public workplaces, and small group projects that promote collaborative opportunities, social learning and possibilities for assessing work and teamwork, both at the individual and collective levels.
- The use of technology in classrooms and from distance needs to be supported and enhanced by computing and related services (e.g. the introduction and use of i-clickers for improving class content real time).
- Course assessment forms should contain a blank panel for eventual narrative statements by the students.

<i>Please decide in respect to the specific evaluation area (§4.3):</i>	
Worthy of merit	Tick
Positive evaluation	X
Partially positive evaluation	
Negative evaluation	

Justify your rating (optional): Please refer to “General Note” on page 17.

4.4 Admission of students, progression and recognition of studies

The EEC found that procedures and criteria for admission to the second and third cycles of studies are implemented with consistency and transparency. There are clear and distinct procedures regarding periods of study while transfer students are recognized according to published procedures within the Institution, mainly through written exams. Recognition of non-formal and informal learning is not foreseen in this Institution as well as procedures regarding mutual recognition of programmes among Institutions. The Institution has implemented an efficient electronic system that provides students with detailed information about their degree including student transcripts and course descriptions. It is worth mentioning that this information is available both in Greek as well as in English which facilitates potential employment of students, or further study opportunities abroad. Additional information that portrays the complete academic path of the student upon graduation (Diploma Supplements) has been planned to be electronically developed and delivered in the next year or so. In general, the Institution has in place well developed processes and tools to collect, monitor and use information regarding student progress and recognition of studies.

Comments:

The number of incoming undergraduate students is excessive for the size of the Institution's faculty and emerging trends (in some subject areas it has reached very high –rather unacceptable– levels that undermine the desirable quality standards and expectations for a leading Greek (or European) Institution. This number of incoming undergraduate students is primarily dictated by the State (i.e. the Ministry) and should not practically exceed the number suggested by the Institution to safeguard its autonomy and the quality of its students' education. This situation presents a very serious threat to the mission of a strong university. The EEC's warning is clear enough and actions need to be taken by the State and all stakeholders with immediate effect for protecting the quality of its programmes.

A related problem is the decreasing ratio of exit to incoming students leading to a high number of "stagnant" students (which might be predicted using the correlation between student attendance and performance). The latter has also an impact on programme quality and immediate actions need to be taken to provide an efficient and long-lasting solution to this problem.

The proportion of inactive Master's and PhD students is rather unknown. Attention is needed to collect and share data that would help determine what defines "good academic standing" of Master's and PhD students. In some departments we know the average time to completion but we did not find the attrition rates. The quality of supervision of doctoral students and what is considered as "good practice" is implicit and left to be defined by the thesis committee on a case by case basis. A need for an institution-wide code of practice for postgraduate research students should define the minimum standards for PhD students and supervisors of UP.

<i>Please decide in respect to the specific evaluation area (§4.4):</i>	Tick
Worthy of merit	
Positive evaluation	
Partially positive evaluation	X
Negative evaluation	

Justify your rating (optional):

This assessment is based primarily on the fact that the institution has no means of controlling the number or level of incoming undergraduate students and thus assuring a quality education for its students.

Please refer to "General Note" on page 17.

4.5 Quality Assurance as regards the teaching staff

At present, recruitment of faculty is stalled, while the retirement of faculty members continues aggravating the existing shortage of faculty. The Institution has well-documented faculty recruitment and hiring processes, as well as extensive working relationships with established academic communities in Greece and abroad. This provides all necessary assurances that progression of existing faculty or new faculty members could meet or exceed a certain level of competence for QA assurance, teaching and research purposes. Opportunities for career advancement are offered to the faculty through secondment to other Institutions, e.g. via the Erasmus programme, or sabbatical leave. The Institution should be highly commended for the faculty research performance “Karatheodoris” awards that were recently established to facilitate not only academic research and publications, but also the development of research-led teaching.

As Institutions are asked to perform periodic QA exercises, UP will need to have in place concrete performance evaluation processes of their faculty. Potential weaknesses of faculty in curriculum development and delivering their courses are normally identified through monitoring of the course evaluation questionnaires completed by students. Scientific activity of the faculty is reflected in their annual reports which are collected by the OMEAs and forwarded to MODIP. Detailed assessment of the teaching and related research is performed during the hiring or promotion process. No explicit connection between teaching and research is monitored so far. Faculty members receive the necessary feedback on their personal teaching performance through course evaluations completed by the students. A regulatory framework is in place for the investigation of the disciplinary and academic misconduct of the faculty. While faculty performance data are monitored by the Deans, who address potential issues, it is important that the faculty performance evaluation and pertinent actions follow an agreed procedure. The Institution has the necessary elements (electronic tools, governing committees, etc.) to establish such a procedure in the near future. It is important that UP reviews thoroughly the course evaluations and makes an effort to address the shortcomings identified. As course evaluations by students is just one dimension in the evaluating the instructional performance of faculty, other dimensions in the process such as peer-evaluation of teaching, a teaching dossier etc. should be developed and utilized to garner a more complete picture of the instructional performance. The MODIP should then be able to assess how successfully shortcomings were addressed.

<i>Please decide in respect to the specific evaluation area (§4.5):</i>	Tick
Worthy of merit	
Positive evaluation	X
Partially positive evaluation	
Negative evaluation	

Justify your rating (optional):

This component is not incorporated in the QA system of any Greek University.

Please refer to “General Note” on page 17.

4.6 Learning resources and student support

UP has taken significant steps to establish systematic monitoring, review and improvement of supporting services, including the on-campus restaurants, students' residencies, athletic infrastructure, heating and cooling systems. It is important that the Institution creates a collective process that deals with the monitoring of all supportive services provided to students as well as ensuring the health and safety of all who use the UP campus.

Library and information systems infrastructure are at a satisfactory level and are continuously improving against an increasing number of constraints. The continuous reduction in State operational funds imposes a genuine threat for the smooth operation of the Institution, both in terms of student support, but also for the academics and supervisors of students. For example, problems were identified with respect to the electronic access to full-text online journals due to a substantial reduction in the library's operational funds. EEC felt that an emphasis should be placed for a stronger Digital Library and partnerships with foreign institutions that could provide access to digital collections from distance. Also, the existence of departmental libraries in the era of diminishing resources should be reconsidered and weighed against consolidating these in the central library, or to School-wide libraries.

It is worth mentioning that recently athletic infrastructure management was significantly improved and created, for the first time, a small revenue stream for the UP.

Tutoring assistance is offered to some extent at the School level within and outside the context of a course. Within the context of a course tutoring can be offered by faculty and as well as teaching and research assistants on a systematic basis during office hours. Outside the context of a course tutoring is offered by faculty on a need basis.

Student counselling is provided through the professionals (i.e. psychologist and psychiatrist) of the Institution.

<i>Please decide in respect to the specific evaluation area (§4.6):</i>	Tick
Worthy of merit	
Positive evaluation	X
Partially positive evaluation	
Negative evaluation	

Justify your rating (optional): Please refer to "General Note" on page 17.

4.7 Information Systems for Recording and Analysing Data and Indicators

Please comment on:

- whether the Institution possesses reliable means for collecting, analysing and utilizing valid information in respect to key performance indicators, the profile of the student population and student progression, success and drop-out rates
- whether the Institution possesses reliable means for collecting, analysing and utilizing valid information regarding its other functions and activities
- whether the Institution collects information about student satisfaction with their programmes of study and the career paths offered to graduates
- whether the Institution seeks comparison with other similar establishments within and beyond the European Higher Education Area, with a view to developing self-awareness and finding ways to improve its operation

Do you wish to make any comment on a point not included above?

The University of Patras has developed systems to collect data, analyse data, facilitate the interaction of students, faculty and staff with the University, and present information relevant to the university to its stakeholders. The systems developed come under the umbrella of the so called “Digital Leap” (Ψηφιακό Αλμα).

Part of this system includes software developed through state funding that implements the collection and analysis of data relevant to performance, and through which performance indicators are generated and collected.

The University has also developed instruments (questionnaires) to survey the students as to their opinion of the courses they attend, which include questions relevant to the course, instructors, texts, and labs.

These questionnaires are distributed to and completed by the students during class time. The EEC was told that the questionnaires are distributed by the secretariat of the department and the instructor is not present during the time the students complete the questionnaires. The questionnaires are then collected, scanned and the data are input to the system for storage and processing.

The EEC was told by the students interviewed that the questionnaires did not allow the respondent (student) to include comments in free form. The EEC verified that this is indeed the case, and would like to **recommend** that the University modify its survey instruments and procedures so as to include the ability of entering free-form comments.

The EEC would also **recommend** that the University adopt clear procedures as to how these free-form comments are collected and distributed so as to safeguard personal information relevant to both the student and the instructor whose course is evaluated.

The EEC was also told by the students interviewed that the questionnaires did not match the actual activity they were supposed to survey. For example, they were asked to evaluate a lab that did not take place. The EEC would like to **recommend** that care must be taken so actual activities be surveyed.

The information collected through these questionnaires is then tabulated and deposited with the secretariat of the relevant department. The instructors have access to the results of the course evaluations of the courses they taught as well as averages of courses taught by the department. The departmental quality assurance team (OMEA) has access to all the data as does the Chair of the Department. The students, upon request, can see aggregated statistics.

The course evaluation results are taken into consideration when a faculty is considered for promotion. The EEC would like to **recommend** that UP develop processes that would utilize the results of these course evaluations on a continuous basis to improve instruction and the program of studies.

The EEC would also like to **recommend** that additional instruments (such as peer reviews of teaching, and/or a teaching dossier) be developed so that a more complete evaluation of the instructional activities be accomplished. In addition, the EEC would like to **recommend** that a University level Teaching and Learning Centre be established that would develop instructional techniques and help instructors improve their instructional styles and abilities.

The university also collects data relevant to the research and other activities of the faculty on an annual basis. UP has developed software (Εφαρμογή της ΜΟΔΙΠ για τις Αξιολογήσεις των Μελών ΔΕΠ του Πανεπιστημίου Πατρών) used by the faculty to directly enter the relevant data to the system.

The collected data is analysed by the departmental quality assurance team (OMEA) and it is used to create the unit's (department's) annual report.

The EEC was provided with the template of the annual report as well as copies of annual reports of all the departments for the academic year 2014-15. The EEC was impressed with the completeness of these reports as well as the quality of their appearance.

The University also collects numerous statistical data such as the number of students, the number of active students (i.e. students whose studies have not extended further than 2 years from the nominal duration), number of faculty, number of staff, expenses, research funding etc. However, the self-evaluation report provided did not include comparisons with similar establishments within and beyond the European Higher Education Area. The EEC identified this omission and UP during the visit provided a few example comparisons with institutions from the UK. The EC would like to **recommend** that a group of institutions, comparable in size, the number and types of programmes offered, and perceived quality, be identified from several EU countries and beyond. Further, UP should seek reliable data from the identified institutions to compare.

The EEC was impressed with the quality of the information systems developed and comprise the Digital Leap (Ψηφιακό Άλμα). However, it was not evident whether the software developed was validated especially with regard to the information it would relay to HQA (ΑΔΙΠ). The EEC would like to **recommend** that HQA define a validation framework with test cases so as the data it (HQA) needs, can be extracted reliably and seamlessly.

The EEC inquired as to the security of the data collected, as several aspects are personal. The EEC was given to understand that relevant legislation requires the security of this data and that the University is adhering to the legislation. The policy of network use (http://www.upnet.gr/wp-content/uploads/kanonismos_network.pdf) includes many aspects of well-established practice for access and use of the network and the prevention of unauthorized use, but it does not include terms of reference regarding data security. The EEC would like to **recommend** that explicit data security policies be implemented and publicized to the university community.

As per Table III.6 (page 239 of the self-evaluation report) the number of technical staff supporting the computing and network infrastructure is 13. It is not clear whether this staff is responsible of supporting and developing the software needed for the collecting and evaluating the data and in general the Digital Leap. If this is the case, the EEC thinks that this number is insufficient. The EEC would like to **recommend** that resources be identified and secured to ensure the long-term quality and maintenance of the software comprising the Digital Leap.

<i>Please decide in respect to the specific evaluation area (§4.7):</i>	Tick
Worthy of merit	
Positive evaluation	X
Partially positive evaluation	
Negative evaluation	

Justify your rating (optional):

This evaluation is based on the already developed QA framework, and the fact that more resources are needed to continuously evolve and maintain this framework.

Please refer to “General Note” on page 17.

4.8 Dissemination of information to stakeholders

Please comment on:

- how the Institution sees to the publication of information on the programmes offered, the expected learning outcomes, the degrees awarded, the teaching, learning and assessment procedures it uses and the learning opportunities it offers to students
- whether the information regarding the Institution's offered programmes of study is available in English or in other languages
- whether the teaching staff's CVs are included in the publicized information, both in Greek and in English

Do you wish to make any comment on a point not included above?

The University has undertaken efforts to ensure that its programmes, faculty and activities are publicized. One of the vehicles used is its web presence through the official UP website (<https://www.upatras.gr>). The website is well organized and is presented in both Greek and English versions. The website organizes and presents many aspects of university activity including programmes of study, the organization of the university, research programmes, as well as information about the departments and faculty (including elements of their CVs, such as lists of publications, courses taught, students graduated etc.). Most of the information is available in both Greek and English. However, the presentation is non-uniform especially as it becomes more specialized at the department and laboratory level.

The EEC would like to **recommend** that a UP branding and uniform framework be established so that it would be easier to navigate and access the sought for information.

Departmental annual reports include a rich set of information and indicators relevant to the unit and are available in print.

<i>Please decide in respect to the specific evaluation area (§4.8):</i>	Tick
Worthy of merit	
Positive evaluation	X
Partially positive evaluation	
Negative evaluation	

Justify your rating (optional):

Although the information required is mostly available, the look and feel of the web presence is not uniform.

Please refer to "General Note" on page 17.

4.9 Continuous monitoring and periodic review of the study programmes

Please comment on:

- the procedure followed with regard to assessment and periodic review of the contents of study programmes
- whether this procedure takes into account the changing needs of society
- whether this procedure takes into consideration the findings emanating from monitoring the graduates' career paths
- the procedure with which the reviews take into account the students' work load, the progress rate and completion of studies
- whether this procedure takes into account the cutting edge research activities in that particular discipline
- whether the involvement of students and other stakeholders is secured in the revision of the programmes

Do you wish to make any comment on a point not included above?

The University of Patras has applied the process of evaluating its programmes of study. This process includes the establishment of the University Quality Assurance Unit (MODIP) and the departmental Quality Assurance Teams (OMEA). These entities have worked cooperatively and have, in a short time, succeeded in establishing the processes and the necessary instruments (surveys, software, processes) for collecting data, primarily course evaluation data and faculty activity data. This data has been tabulated and statistically analysed.

However, as is true for the other Institutions in Greece as well as HQA, the feedback process, whereby this information is used to inform changes to the curriculum of the programmes of study, has not been established yet.

In addition to the data already being collected, such a process requires quantitative data regarding the career paths of the graduates, the opinion of the graduates and their employers as to the quality, completeness and usefulness of the knowledge and skills acquired during the graduates' studies at the University. In addition each programme of study needs to establish expected outcomes and a method of measuring the achieved attributes and comparing these to the expected ones. In other words, UP should strive to develop a robust system of quality assurance.

Such information could then be used to inform changes to the curriculum and eventually measuring the impact of such changes through continuous measurements of the achieved graduate attributes.

Please decide in respect to the specific evaluation area (§4.9):

	Tick
Worthy of merit	
Positive evaluation	
Partially positive evaluation	X
Negative evaluation	

Justify your rating (optional):

This rating is based only on the establishment of the processes of collecting course evaluation data and faculty activity data, but takes account of the absence of a system for establishing programmes of study outcomes and graduate attributes and the use of these to inform programme and curriculum changes.

Please refer to "General Note" on page 17.

4.10 Periodic external evaluation

Please comment on:

- the procedure already planned by the Institution in order to deal with the observations of the Institutional External evaluation
- how the anticipated implementation of plans by Departments / Faculties is monitored in response to any comments included in their external evaluation and in the accreditation of their programmes

All academic Departments have been evaluated in the past 5 years. These evaluations comprised internal evaluations and external evaluations. The external evaluation committees through their reports found in general that the programmes offered are of high quality; however they made several recommendations for improvement. Many recommendations identified external factors related to policies and resources dictated by the Greek State.

The University, through its Quality Assurance Unit (MODIP) and the departmental QA teams (OMEA), has received the reports of the external evaluation committees, studied their recommendations and started implementing them.

The EEC requested, and received expeditiously, data concerning the implementation of the recommendations of the external evaluations. The data provided indicate that the number of recommendations is close to 400 of which 64% target the departments, 20% target the University as a whole and 16% target the Greek State. Of these recommendations, close to 67% of the ones targeting departments have been implemented. The implementation rates of the recommendations for the other two categories are 45% for the University-targeting ones and 16% for the Greek State targeting ones.

The EEC is satisfied that the University is progressing at a good pace in implementing the recommendations of the external evaluation committees, and it can report on the pace of their implementation. However, the EEC does not have strong evidence that there is an established procedure nor a responsible authority that encourages and monitors the implementation of these recommendations.

The EEC would like to **recommend** that UP establish policies and a structure that would encourage and implement the recommendations of the external evaluations.

<i>Please decide in respect to the specific evaluation area (§4.10):</i>	Tick
Worthy of merit	X
Positive evaluation	
Partially positive evaluation	
Negative evaluation	

Justify your rating (optional):

The rating is based on the fact that UP has already implemented large portions of the recommendations made, but in the absence of concrete evidence of an overseeing authority that encourages and monitors the implementation of the recommendations.

Please refer to “General Note” on page 17.

4.11 Internal System of Quality Assurance – Conclusions and recommendations

Please complete the following sections regarding the **internal system of quality assurance**:

Underline specific positive points:

- The Digital Leap (Ψηφιακό Άλμα)
- The efficient and active
 - University Quality Assurance Unit (MODIP)
 - Departmental Quality Assurance teams (OMEA)

Underline specific negative points:

- The absence of established processes in general
- The absence of resources especially with regard to staffing

- *Make your suggestions for further development of the positive points:*

The Digital Leap infrastructure needs to be maintained and developed in the future. As such, the EEC would like to **recommend** that UP establish stable resources dedicated to its long-term quality and maintenance.

The EEC would like to **recommend** that the Quality Assurance Units (both at the University level and at the departmental level) need to establish formal relations and reporting to the University and departmental structures that receive their recommendations.

- *Make your suggestions on needed steps for improvement:*

The EEC would like to **recommend** that UP develop and implement a robust internal system of quality assurance.

Additionally,

The EEC would like to **recommend** that UP modify its survey instruments (course evaluation survey) and procedures so as to include the possibility of entering free-form comments

The EEC would like to **recommend** that care must be taken that actual activities be surveyed.

The EEC would like to **recommend** that UP develop processes that would utilize the results of these course evaluations on a continuous basis to improve instruction and the programme of studies.

The EEC would also like to **recommend** that additional instruments (such as peer reviews of teaching, and/or a teaching dossier) be developed so that a more complete evaluation of the instructional activities can be obtained.

The EEC would like to **recommend** that a University-level Teaching and Learning Centre be established that would develop instructional techniques and help instructors improve their teaching styles and abilities.

The EEC would like to **recommend** that explicit data security policies be implemented and publicized to the university community.

The EEC would like to **recommend** that a UP branding and uniform framework be established so that it would be easier to navigate and access the required information.

The EEC would like to **recommend** that UP establish policies and a structure that would encourage and implement the recommendations of the external evaluations.

5. OPERATION OF THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATION OF THE INSTITUTION

5.1 Central Administration Services of the Institution

Please comment on:

- The operation of the central administration services of the Institution in regard to the:
 - Special Account for Research Funds (ELKE)
 - Financial services
 - Supplies department
 - Technical services
 - IT services
 - Student support services
 - Employment and Career Centre (ECC)
 - Public/ International relations department
 - Foreign language services
 - Social and cultural activities
 - Halls of residence and refectory services
 - Institution's library

The EEC met with the directors of each of the administrative services groups and Ms Marina Korfiati, the Secretary General of UP. Ms Korfiati presented the functions and services offered by each group. The presentations were supplemented with printed and electronic documents provided to the EEC and visits to the libraries, the Hospital, and a variety of facilities. The EEC was impressed by the professionalism, dedication, and can-do attitude of the administrative services. The EEC was also impressed by the contingency plans to absorb any potential shocks due to central government circular regulatory changes. Out of this interaction, our impression is that the administrative services team provides excellent support to teaching and research programmes. EEC also urges all interest parties to make every effort to increase administrative personnel.

The EEC was positively impressed by the Digital Leap and associated services but not impressed by how effectively IT is handled at UP. Although the IT services team supports the campus, provision of Wi-Fi does not cover all rooms and computing laboratories are handled in a fragmented way with unknown impact on security, access to adequate facilities by all students, and campus ability to secure economies of scale.

The EEC also identified a lack of some critical functions of student services that are addressed in Section 3. Particularly important is the internationalization of the UP campus and the need to support it with additional resources.

<i>Please decide in respect to the specific evaluation area (§5.1):</i>	Tick
Worthy of merit	X
Positive evaluation	
Partially positive evaluation	
Negative evaluation	

Justify your rating (optional): Please refer to "General Note" on page 17.

5.2 Operation of the Central Administration of the Institution – Conclusions and recommendations

Please complete the following sections regarding the **operation of the Institution's central administration** :

- *Underline specific positive points:*

1. The administrative services team provides excellent support to the teaching and research programmes.
2. The ELKE (EAKE) office assists faculty with budget preparation if requested. Once proposals are approved for funding, the ELKE office will advance funds to the faculty member so that the research project can move forward according to the research timetable.
3. The ELKE office also provides, in part, vision and funding for new research directions that, as described elsewhere in this report, should become a separate function streamlined and coordinated by the Deans.
4. Activities in Central Administration include technical support to extra-university services with substantial revenue generation, demonstrating entrepreneurial spirit with substantive outcomes. This activity can be used as a best-practice example for research centres.
5. The ELKE office also manages and supports fellowship programmes funded by research programme revenues (Karatheodori) and endowments (e.g. <http://www.upatras.gr/el/mentzelopoulos> and others).
6. Implementation of the 'Digital Leap'.

- *Underline specific negative points:*

- *Make your suggestions for further development of the positive points:*

1. Within the QA system that it is to be developed, the operational processes of the administration should be revisited and possibly upgraded.
2. Consider adding staff for student support (student support services).
3. Consider creating an IT campus-wide computing services function that includes personnel, resources, and funding.
4. Consider increasing the Karatheodori programme and expand other fellowship programmes.
5. Consider creating an Outreach Development office for fundraising.

- *Make your suggestions on needed steps for improvement:*

None

6. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In connection with the

- general operation of the Institution
- development of the Institution to this date and its present situation
- Institution's readiness and capability to change/improve
- Internal system of Quality Assurance of the Institution

please complete the following sections:

- *Underline specific positive points:*

1. The EEC ascertained strong intentions for quality assurance and enhancement at UP.
2. The academic leadership show commitment and determination to improve quality and are working as a team towards excellence as their common goal.
3. UP has self-motivated, dynamic and internationally recognized faculty and high-quality staff.
4. Many research units at UP are productive, visible, and deliver high-quality research.
5. There is a commendable societal engagement with the local citizenry.

- *Underline specific negative points:*

1. The EEC found a negative external environment imposing excessive bureaucracy and regulatory interference, thus inhibiting the ability of UP to operate effectively and implement its strategic goals.
2. The EEC sees a need to strengthen outward-looking policies and activities, removing barriers for internal collaborations, outreach activities, and substantial external partnerships.
3. The mission statement and strategic goals of UP as formulated in the Internal Evaluation Report and discussed with the leadership are overly broad and difficult to implement. There is a lack of a clear priority-setting mechanism and an absence of clarity in pursuit of a common vision.
4. Although quality assurance is becoming an integrated part of UP life, added effort is needed to ensure a widespread acceptance of quality principles and creation of appropriate processes at all levels of the academic community.
5. The EEC found inadequate coordination between the quality assurance entities (i.e., MODIP and OMEA) and academic units (i.e., departments and schools). This deficiency creates major obstacles in fulfilling the goals of QA.
6. EEC found a lack of "separation of concerns" (e.g., ELKE is both a policy and an accounting unit, the departments both devise and manage policies).

- *Suggestions for further development of the positive points and suggestions for improvements:*

The EEC recommends that the Institution:

1. Develop and implement a pragmatic strategic planning process to set priorities for the Institution as a whole and for each School with an explicitly defined set of targets and timelines.
2. Develop a set of processes and metrics that will support QA and continuous monitoring, assessment, and enhancement of programmes of study within UP (see e.g. 4.11).
3. Enhance outward-looking policies to increase further synergies and partnerships both outside and within the Institution (see e.g. 4.1).
4. Take the initiative to eliminate duplication of courses (not only within Schools but also across

- disciplines with similar teaching requirements), functions, and activities where possible.
5. Create a coordinating structure that functions as a Graduate School, streamlining all relevant processes.
 6. Showcase best practices within the Institution and provide an incentive structure to reward best practices in teaching, research, professional activities, and service to the community.
 7. Establish an office of development that on the one hand creates community (e.g., an alumni association) to cultivate relationships (e.g., student placement and career development, and networking) and on the other hand generates fundraising opportunities (see e.g. 3.1.8, 3.2.1, 4.1).
 8. Strengthen research development activity and ensure coordination among the leadership (e.g., by the appointment of Associate Deans of Research in each School) to better focus research strengths and enhance visibility and the impact of UP on economy and society.

6.1 Final decision of the EEC

<i>Please decide in respect to the issues mentioned in the introduction of §6:</i>	Tick
Worthy of merit	
Positive evaluation	✓
Partially positive evaluation	
Negative evaluation	

Justify your rating (optional): Please refer to “General Note” on page 17.

Please note that an EEC member gave a worthy of merit vote by taking into account with a heavier weight the negative influence of the external environment on UoP’s ability to plan, strategise and operate.

The Members of the External Evaluation Committee**Name and Surname****Signature**

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

4. _____

5. _____