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

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

EXTERNAL EVALUATION REPORT

DEPARTMENT:
Cultural Heritage Management and New Technologies

UNIVERSITY:
UNIVERSITY OF PATRAS

European Union
European Social Fund
OPERATIONAL PROGRAMME
EDUCATION AND LIFELONG LEARNING
investing in knowledge society
MINISTRY OF EDUCATION & RELIGIOUS AFFAIRS, CULTURE & SPORTS
MANAGING AUTHORITY
NSRF 2007-2013
EUROPEAN SOCIAL FUND
Co-financed by Greece and the European Union

TABLE OF CONTENTS

D. All Other Services

APPROACH

- Quality and effectiveness of services provided by the Department.

IMPLEMENTATION

- Organization and infrastructure of the Department's administration (e.g. secretariat of the Department).

RESULTS

- Adequateness and functionality of administrative and other services.

IMPROVEMENTS

- Proposed initiatives aiming at improvement.

Collaboration with social, cultural and production organizations

E. Strategic Planning, Perspectives for Improvement and Dealing with Potential Inhibiting Factors

- Short-, medium- and long-term goals and plans of action proposed by the Department.

F. Final Conclusions and recommendations of the EEC on:

- The development and present situation of the Department, good practices and weaknesses identified through the External Evaluation process, recommendations for improvement.

External Evaluation Committee

The Committee responsible for the External Evaluation of the **Department of Cultural Heritage Management and New Technologies** of **The University of Patras** consisted of the following three (3) expert evaluators drawn from the Registry constituted by the HQA in accordance with Law 3374/2005 :

1. Professor Panayiotis Zaphiris (Coordinator)
   Cyprus University of Technology, Cyprus

2. Professor Emeritus, Rick M. Newton
   Kent State University, Kent, Ohio, USA

3. Professor Jason Karaindros
   Rouen/Le Havre Higher School of Art, France

N.B. *The structure of the "Template" proposed for the External Evaluation Report mirrors the requirements of Law 3374/2005 and corresponds overall to the structure of the Internal Evaluation Report submitted by the Department.*

The length of text in each box is free. Questions included in each box are not exclusive nor should they always be answered separately; they are meant to provide a general outline of matters that should be addressed by the Committee when formulating its comments.

Introduction

I. The External Evaluation Procedure

The External Evaluation Committee (henceforth: Committee) visited the Department of Cultural Heritage Management and New Technologies (henceforth: Department) of the University of Patras from 13 to 14 February 2014. To prepare for the visit, the Committee members had individually read and studied the Internal Evaluation Report which the Department had earlier submitted to ADIP/HQA, as well as other materials which were available electronically (e.g., faculty CVs, websites displaying research and other activities). The Committee also had access to links from the University and Departmental website. During the on-site visit, the full-time faculty and members of the Internal Evaluation Committee provided other materials (the most recently updated version of the Internal Evaluation Report, printouts of power-point presentations, faculty publication lists, and an exhibit of faculty research accomplishments and course materials assembled by each professor).

On the morning of 13 February, the Committee was driven from Rio to Agrinio, where they were welcomed by representatives from the University of Patras MODIP team and the Deputy Rector of Academic Affairs. After a welcome from all eleven full-time faculty members, power-point presentations ensued, outlining the history, structure, and operations of the Department as well as an overview of the curriculum. During each presentation, question-and-answer discussions took place. A short tour of faculty publications and selected course materials, which had been arranged in a display, followed.

In the afternoon of the same day, the Committee met with the full-time faculty in two separate groups: the four tenured members of the Department, followed by the seven non-tenured faculty. Two undergraduate students and one PhD candidate then met with the Committee, in the presence of the full faculty, to present brief demonstrations of their work. At the end of the day, the members of the Committee returned to their hotel.

On 14 February, the Committee returned to the Department for a presentation of the research activity of five members of the faculty. As on the first day, all eleven faculty members were present. The Committee then took a quick tour of all the

Department's classrooms, its single functioning laboratory, and faculty offices. The Committee also visited the other section of the Agrinio campus to tour the University Library, the Department's book holdings, and the auditoriums and classrooms available only to other departments.

In the afternoon of the same day, the Committee returned to the Department's building to meet with the two members of its secretarial staff. An hour-long session ensued in which the Committee engaged in discussion with 28 undergraduate students and alumni, followed by a brief meeting with one of the two Departmental PhD students.

The Committee then met with the three members of the Internal Evaluation Committee to present and discuss general impressions.

After a short lunch hosted by the Department, the Committee was driven to the University of Patras central administration building to meet with the Rector and MODIP representative. At day's end, the Committee returned to Athens, spending the entirety of 15 February discussing its findings and composing this report.

II. The Internal Evaluation Procedure

The materials and documents which had been submitted in advance of the visit were, in the Committee's estimation, informative and helpful. The materials which the Internal Evaluation Committee had assembled and presented in person were impressively well-organized and detailed. The professional attention dedicated to assembling and presenting such data is greatly appreciated. These materials were especially helpful in providing information essential for the Committee to form genuine and accurate impressions of the activities and quality of the Department.

The Committee maintains that the on-site visit was likewise extremely useful and very well-organized, providing many details crucial to a fair evaluation. The campus visit was the main source of information. In addition to the power-point presentations, which were well prepared, the person-to-person exchanges that took place in formal meetings and informal conversations established a healthy and friendly atmosphere for exchange of ideas and provided the most reliable foundation for a fair and accurate assessment. The personal contact and in-depth information that emerged from the on-site visit was especially beneficial in enabling the Committee to evaluate and assess the Department's programs and resources as presented on websites and formal documents.

The Committee also notes, however, that the time allotted by the schedule which had been mandated by ADIP imposed an undue burden and stress on both the Committee and the Department, potentially resulting in an evaluation that may not do full justice to the faculty. For example, shortage of time did not allow the Committee to request or examine other examples of student work, written examinations, projects, or student evaluations of teaching.

The two full days, which included driving from Rio to Agrinio, followed by a return trip to the Patras campus and a drive to Athens, were set at a grueling pace that did not allow the Committee time to reflect and discuss observations among themselves. If the Committee had been permitted to devote the amount of time normally allotted for such reviews (i.e., three full visiting days that include time to reflect and share impressions, followed by two days *in situ* to compose the External Evaluation Report), this evaluation may have been significantly more precise.

The Committee feels that this disclaimer is especially important with reference to this Department. Recently housed within the University of Patras and improperly placed within a School of Business Administration (see below), this Department faces challenges and obstacles which lie far beyond their control and responsibility. The Committee therefore submits this report with a call for special attention by the University of Patras central administration, concluding with specific recommendations for improvements that are the University's, not the Department's, responsibility. In the final section of this report, recommendations for improvement are submitted under two categories: the University's responsibilities, and the Department's responsibilities. The University which has adopted this Department is obligated to take significant, effective, and expeditious measures to support these faculty and their disciplines.

A. Curriculum

To be filled separately for each undergraduate, graduate and doctoral programme.

APPROACH

The greatest strength of this Department, which was created in 2004, lies in the quality and dedication of its current eleven full-time faculty members. These academics are energetic and dedicated scholars, representing a broad range of specialties that include traditional arts and humanities (e.g., art history, museology, architecture, philology, ancient Greek history, Byzantine culture, European social history, Mediterranean and Middle Eastern archaeology) and new technologies (e.g., computer sciences, cultural information systems, multimedia networks, digital cultural heritage systems). As the "Department of Cultural Heritage Management and New Technologies," this multidisciplinary collection of highly-qualified individuals

has much to offer in arts and humanities as well as in applications of new and emerging technologies to the preservation, promotion, and exploration of cultural heritage.

The undergraduate curriculum which, while offering a wide variety of subjects, is lacking in programmatic coherence. At present, the curriculum requires two initial years (4 semesters) of mandatory courses, followed by the students' selection of a major in either (1) management of cultural resources or (2) cultural technologies. The elective courses, chosen according to student interests within one of these two majors, are designed to be completed within two additional years (4 more semesters). In addition, students are required to complete a thesis project.

The required courses in the first two years include a mixture of theory (e.g., ancient history, ancient Greek art, art history, history of Western European art, modern Greek art, history of cultures, popular culture, ancient Greek literature, cultural theory, history of architecture, Byzantine civilization, etc.) and applied technology (e.g., principles of language programming, informatics, algorithms, databases, internet technologies, digital development of content, etc.). The upper-division electives are many. Upper-division theory courses include economic theory, museology, modern Greek literature, Greek historical geography, post-Byzantine civilization, contemporary theatre, cultural communication, history of cinema, etc. Upper-division electives include visual programming, software technology, digital software product management, operational systems in multimedia, digital libraries, teaching informatics, etc.

The Committee finds the undergraduate program disjointed and confusing. Interviews with the students, including alumni, confirmed this impression. The curriculum does not clearly articulate the relationships between cultural resources and technologies: they simply coexist in a pick-and-choose system, rendered even more confusing by the fact that upper-division courses are not sequenced and have no prerequisites.

In meetings with both students and faculty, the Committee received the impression that the degree offered by this Department does not qualify graduates for professional employment or careers in the public sector. The mission of the Department does not appear to be realized within its current curriculum.

In addition, although the curriculum reflects the many interests and strengths of the faculty, it does not appear to have been conceptualized from a student focus. In particular, incoming students from Greek high schools have little or no background

in the subject areas mandated during the first two years. Algorithms and digital technology, required during the freshman year, are totally foreign to the vast majority of high-school graduates. Such courses are challenging, calling for an intellectual maturity that many students may not have attained at the ages of 18-20 years old.

According to the interviews conducted by the Committee, students do not understand the rationale for these mandated courses and do not see the connections between theory and technology. Furthermore, the disorganized collection of theory courses in the first two years presents the students with no coherent picture of their emerging studies. Perhaps for these reasons, the degree-completion in this Department is low (approximately 40-45%) in comparison with national norms. Although students, in general, discontinue their university studies for a variety of reasons, the unusually-high drop-out rate in this Department may be attributed to the program itself, especially the required courses during the first two years.

The proliferation of upper-division electives presents another difficulty. Committee discussions with the faculty revealed that the professors themselves are taking on heavy teaching loads. In order to address this problem, they have requested additional full-time faculty, as well as the restoration of recently lost part-time positions.

Besides offering too wide a range of electives, the curriculum suffers from significant gaps in content. Although the curriculum offers multiple levels of ancient Greek art, ancient Greek literature, and western European art, for example, no courses in contemporary art or graphic design are available.

In discussions with the Committee and in the Internal Evaluation Report, a strong interest in creating a Masters program was expressed. No discussion appears to have taken place, however, as to what areas such a post-graduate degree might focus on. Before a Masters degree is developed, the Department should first come together and determine where it wants to move next – as a single and collaborative department. Once the unit's mission and goals are articulated in a coherent fashion, clear plans for a Masters degree will likely emerge.

IMPLEMENTATION

See above

RESULTS

- How well is the implementation achieving the Department's predefined goals and objectives?
- If not, why is it so? How is this problem dealt with?
- Does the Department understand why and how it achieved or failed to achieve these results?

See above

IMPROVEMENT

- Does the Department know how the Curriculum should be improved?
- Which improvements does the Department plan to introduce?

To address these issues, the Committee recommends the following:

- Redesign, streamline, and resequence the required courses in the first two years
- Incorporate more flexibility in the first two years of study so that students can begin exploring subjects of greater interest to them during their freshman and sophomore years.
- Create a required first-semester course that surveys the disciplines of cultural heritage and technology. Such a course should demonstrate the interaction of culture and technology, an area not addressed in the current structure of separate theory courses and separate technology courses. Such an introductory interdisciplinary survey might arouse students' curiosity and creativity as they begin thinking about the interface of these domains. The course could be team-taught by several faculty from within the subfields, thereby introducing students to the professors themselves.
- Reduce the number of upper-division electives and establish prerequisites for more advanced courses so that students can delve deeply into specific content areas. The establishment of fewer, but better enrolled, sections would make for more efficient use of current faculty resources.

B. Teaching

APPROACH:

From the students' perspective, the currently offered courses in the program do not constitute a coherent whole and do not lead to a degree that will help them secure employment in these specialties. In particular, the degree does not confirm state level certification.

Also from the students' perspective the following were noted:

- The courses offered by the Department are ethnocentric in focus and do not

expand to international issues.

- Within some subject areas, courses are redundant and overlapping.
- Within other subject areas, important content is absent (e.g., history of art in post-modern and contemporary periods, graphic design, philosophy of aesthetics).
- Students very rarely have exposure to guest lectures, educational visits to cultural centers outside Agrinio.
- Student internships are useful, but students often find it difficult to secure a slot.
- Some courses are misplaced in the sequence (e.g., especially confusing to the students is the first year required course on Algorithms).

As regards the approach to teaching, the Committee did not find information in the written materials as to the variety approaches that the faculty might in fact be using. Furthermore, the on-site visit took place during the examination period making it impossible for the Committee to observe teaching in action. ADIP should in the future, better align evaluation visits with the academic calendar.

IMPLEMENTATION

Please comment on:

- Quality of teaching procedures
- Quality and adequacy of teaching materials and resources.
- Quality of course material. Is it brought up to date?
- Linking of research with teaching
- Mobility of academic staff and students
- Evaluation by the students of (a) the teaching and (b) the course content and study material/resources

The single functioning computer laboratory in the building provides only 15 workstations. Faculty who teach classes with enrollments of 30 are required to teach the same class twice in order to accommodate everyone. As a result, not only is the delivery of teaching negatively impacted, but also faculty research time is significantly encroached upon. Structural inefficiencies are resulting in impaired teaching and research.

Attempts by the faculty to secure additional equipment for the purpose of establishing a larger (30 seat) computer lab have been successful through generous (around 280,000 euros) funding from ESPA. This purchase has resulted in the acquisition of state-of-the-art equipment, including a 3D scanner, a 3D printer, numerous bright new PCs, routers, video projectors and the like, most of which still remains in their boxes for nearly a year. The reason reported to the Committee for

this stagnation is the limited electrical capacity of the current building and delays by DEH to upgrade the power supply. As a result, the students currently enrolled in the program have missed an entire school year of utilizing this equipment. This is a Department of "new technologies" but these technologies remain in their boxes and grow obsolete before they are even plugged-in. As it is, students report that the building currently provides limited access to projectors.

In addition, a building that houses such expensive equipment provides no building security, no watchman, and no technician to give regular access to the students.

In terms of teaching effectiveness, the faculty report that the student evaluations of teaching are collected by the office but that the summarized and tabulated results are never shared with the teachers themselves. In practice, therefore, there is no feedback or evaluation in place that might lead to improvement in teaching.

From the data provided to the Committee, it is evident that only a very small number of incoming students select the Department as their first choice. This results in recruiting many students with weaker and often unrelated academic backgrounds. Faculty attention to effectively reaching such students and raising them to the levels needed for success in these concentrations is currently absent. The Department needs to establish a student-centered culture for effective teaching.

There is no mobility of faculty and students, as no bilateral ERASMUS agreements exist. Some interaction with students from other universities national and international has been reported as part of the presentation for the excavation project in Argos Orestiko.

RESULTS

Please comment on:

- Efficacy of teaching.
- Discrepancies in the success/failure percentage between courses and how they are justified.
- Differences between students in (a) the time to graduation, and (b) final degree grades.
- Whether the Department understands the reasons of such positive or negative results?

Under 50% of the students admitted into the program graduate. Those who do take between 4 and 7 years to finish the degree.

Around 70% of the students enrol in the Management of Cultural Resources concentration whereas the other 30% pursue the Cultural Technologies concentration.

IMPROVEMENT

- Does the Department propose methods and ways for improvement?

- What initiatives does it take in this direction?

In order to achieve improvements in the effectiveness of teaching, the Department should consider the following:

- Process student evaluations of teaching so that the faculty can document their best and worst practices.
- Create a Departmental tradition by which faculty discuss concerns pertaining to students' success, students' absences, dropouts, etc. Such discussions should take place at least once per semester.
- The University must support the Department's needs in establishing computer classrooms, with adequate wiring, power sources etc.
- The University should provide support for student and staff mobility in order to take advantage of the opportunities provided by ERASMUS.
- The Department should revise its current curriculum addressing all the concerns of the students as itemized above.

C. Research

For each particular matter, please distinguish between under- and post-graduate level, if necessary.

APPROACH

- What is the Department's policy and main objective in research?
- Has the Department set internal standards for assessing research?

The Department is multidisciplinary, with academics from both from humanities and sciences. A number of the faculty have established a good research portfolio that includes the supervision of PhD students, the securing of external funding, and the production of quality research outputs.

The Department's research potential, however, has been hampered by many distractions that have resulted from the many administrative relocations that have been imposed on them from above. For example, because no technical support staff has been assigned to this Department, the faculty have taken on the setup and maintenance of all computer and technical equipment.

The Department as a whole lacks a clearly articulated long-term strategy as well as an internal process for assessing research activity.

IMPLEMENTATION

- How does the Department promote and support research?
- Quality and adequacy of research infrastructure and support.
- Scientific publications.
- Research projects.
- Research collaborations.

The Department does not provide dedicated research labs for either faculty or students. At present, the bulk of faculty research activity takes place in traditional office spaces or in collaboration with departments and facilities at other Universities.

The constraints within which the Department operates (non- funding for equipment, absence of support for attending international academic conferences, lack of post-doctoral research positions, isolated location, their housing in a former high school that has never been retro-fitted to accommodate university level activities) have a pronounced negative impact on actualizing and maximizing the full research potential of the Department.

The faculty produce a steady stream of journal and conference publications (approximately 5 journal articles and 7 conference papers per year). Given the low overall number of citations, the Committee suggests that the faculty begin publishing at a higher rate and, where possible, attempt to target higher-impact international journals and conferences. Publishing in Greek venues should continue, but in order to attain an international reputation in research, the faculty should place more emphasis on publishing internationally.

The recently issued EU calls for funding (Horizon 2020) may provide opportunity for research projects with wide international scholarly potential and prestige. Acquisition of such funding would strengthen and confirm the momentum of the Department.

The Department has only two PhD students, an insufficient number for the creation of a PhD culture.

RESULTS

- How successfully were the Department's research objectives implemented?
- Scientific publications.
- Research projects.
- Research collaborations.
- Efficacy of research work. Applied results. Patents etc.
- Is the Department's research acknowledged and visible outside the Department? Rewards and awards.

See above

IMPROVEMENT

- Improvements in research proposed by the Department, if necessary.
- Initiatives in this direction undertaken by the Department .

To cultivate and strengthen the Department research culture, the Committee recommends the following:

- The faculty should identify the Department's multidisciplinary research strengths. More attention should be paid to establish intradepartmental collaborations that will identify this unit as not only distinctive but even as

unique. The aggregate quality most of the work presented to the Committee does not reach the standard of creative, novel and groundbreaking.

- The University should explore ways of providing consistent and adequate funding for research/conference travel for faculty and PhD students. Junior members of staff should be provided with funding (especially equipment and research time) for initiating and executing research projects.
- The University should establish research laboratories for the Department. In terms of budgeting, furthermore, allocations must be provided for up-to-date research equipment, including software and all licenses.
- The Department should maximize the opportunities which have arisen from being place inside the University of Patras, which has a strong established tradition and an international reputation in research. Specifically, faculty in technology should reach out to the University's Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering and establish research collaborations. Faculty in the Humanities should likewise reach out to the University's Department of Philosophy. Such collaborations would contribute significantly both to the Department's status and to the University of Patras.
- In order to establish a critical mass of PhD students and thereby establish a research-centered student culture at this level, the Department should reach out to the other PhD programs in Agrinio. Workshops and colloquia might be offered in key areas of significance to all PhD studies, thereby bringing together enough candidates to form a critical mass (e.g. research methodologies, identification and articulation of research questions, dissertation writing skills etc.).

D. All Other Services

For each particular matter, please distinguish between under- and post-graduate level, if necessary.

APPROACH

- How does the Department view the various services provided to the members of the academic community (teaching staff, students).
- Does the Department have a policy to simplify administrative procedures? Are most procedures processed electronically?
- Does the Department have a policy to increase student presence on Campus?

The Committee finds the various administrative services provided to the faculty as extremely poor, to the point of non-existent. A thoroughly unacceptable working environment has resulted from the University's negligence in this area.

The faculty and students at Agrinio have access to a very small library with poor holdings, limited reading space, and insufficient hours of operation (closing in the afternoon from Monday to Friday, and no services provided on weekends). Students report that they must pay their own money in order to use the inter-library loan

system. The Department library's very small and inadequate collection of books was closed for approximately 1.5-2.5 years simply because of the Department's physical relocation. Such delays have a profound negative effect on the quality of teaching and the student experience.

There is a total absence of "central" administration services at Agrinio, and the Department is served only by two departmental administrators who have no one to guide or advise them. In addition, they have received no training in using the electronic system.

Technical support is totally absent, forcing the faculty to engage in tasks (e.g. act as technicians for repairing equipment) that are not their responsibility.

The University of Patras has an impressive system of administrative services in Patras itself, but these benefits have not been extended to this recently adopted Department.

IMPLEMENTATION

- Organization and infrastructure of the Department's administration (e.g. secretariat of the Department).
- Form and function of academic services and infrastructure for students (e.g. library, PCs and free internet access, student counseling, athletic- cultural activity etc.).

See above

RESULTS

- Are administrative and other services adequate and functional?
- How does the Department view the particular results.

See above

IMPROVEMENTS

- Has the Department identified ways and methods to improve the services provided?
- Initiatives undertaken in this direction.

Immediate actions to be taken:

- The University should take immediate steps to extend all of its Patras-based services to include this Department situated at Agrinio. Appropriate and equal access to all services must reach this faculty and staff. In some cases, electronic access might be possible. In other cases, a strong and trained team of administrators and technicians will be needed in Agrinio itself.
- The Department should be provided with well-trained technical support.

Academics, who are required to focus their energies on teaching and research, must not be misused as would-be technicians or managers.

Collaboration with social, cultural and production organizations

Please, comment on quality, originality and significance of the Department's initiatives.

Over the last few years, the Department has built strong links with the local community and authorities at Agrinio. This has resulted in a number of activities, such as public lectures, the awarding of an honorary PhD to a internationally known Agriniot sculptor in the presence of nationally prominent art personalities, publications concerning local history, architecture and culture. The Committee encourages strengthening these outreach efforts and expanding them beyond Agrinio, in order to expose the Department to society at large and to broaden the perspective of its students.

E. Strategic Planning, Perspectives for Improvement and Dealing with Potential Inhibiting Factors

For each particular matter, please distinguish between under- and post-graduate level, if necessary.

Please, comment on the Department's:

- Potential inhibiting factors at State, Institutional and Departmental level, and proposals on ways to overcome them.
- Short-, medium- and long-term goals.
- Plan and actions for improvement by the Department/Academic Unit
- Long-term actions proposed by the Department.

As stated earlier, the greatest strength of this Department lies in the quality and dedication of its current eleven full-time faculty members. The Department has not, however, formulated specific plans for strategic development. The faculty anticipate an additional seven faculty members to join them, but the Department has not articulated clearly how these new additions will fit in with the overall mission of the unit. Similarly, the faculty have expressed strong interest in developing a Masters program, but they have not linked their plans with the current market.

In particular, because this Department it is not "autonomous" it lacks a head from within its own group. In the absence of content-based leadership, the members of this

unit speak with multiple voices and have yet to come together as a coherent entity.

Although all universities throughout Greece are undergoing a protracted period of difficulty stemming from a severe and deepening national economic crisis and a turbulent succession of ever-changing legislative and bureaucratic restraints, this Department has been especially impacted (for example the budget for this Department has now dramatically dropped from around 45,000 euro/year to 15,000 euro/year). Within the first ten years of its existence, this unit has been housed in three separate Greek universities (University of Ioannina, University of Western Greece, and [as of Summer 2013] the University of Patras). The perpetually shifting sands on which the Department has stood for the past decade have posed serious challenges and created difficulties that impact every aspect of its operations. Upon reviewing the many accomplishments which these long-suffering faculty members have achieved under such adversities, the Committee does not consider it hyperbolic to designate them as "heroes" for the unwavering commitment they have shown to higher education.

The most significantly inhibiting result of the unstable administrative framework has been the inability of the Department to establish its own collective identity and mission. The Committee views the unit as holding rich potential in the broad area of "applied humanities." The University of Patras, however, has not housed them in a school that oversees humanities, social sciences, or technology – their very areas of expertise. Instead, through a bureaucratic decision which no one on this Committee or in this Department understands, they have been placed in the University's School of Business Administration. The Rector of the Universiy of Patras has himself indicated that, despite his desire to administratively house this Department under the School of Humanities and Social Sciences, the Ministry of Education decided otherwise. Neither are the faculty in this Department business administrators nor are its students training to open and run businesses.

As a result, a Department which has come together as a "multidisciplinary" body, with many individual strengths and talents, has been unable to progress to the maturity of a genuinely "interdisciplinary" body. Expressed succinctly, this unit has yet to advance from "coexistence" to "collaboration."

F. Final Conclusions and recommendations of the EEC

For each particular matter, please distinguish between under- and post-graduate level, if necessary.

The Committee summarizes its key findings below:

Particular strengths include the following:

- The faculty are dedicated professionals, actively pursuing a wide range of topics.
- The Department has built a strong network of associations with local and regional organizations and societies.
- The Department is housed in a building with ample space for classrooms, laboratories, and offices.

Areas for improvement lie within two realms of responsibility.

A. The University must quickly and efficiently address the following:

- Identify a more appropriate School for the administrative housing of the Department. The Committee recommends placement within the humanities.
- Extend all Patras-based services (on the student and faculty level) to the Agrinio campus, both electronically and in-person.
- Make all necessary building adaptations (especially the electrical infrastructure) so that the Department can install and operate essential technological equipment.
- Allocate funds for technical support staff.
- Provide the Department with an ongoing budget for consumables.
- Improve the University Library and stock the Departmental holdings with up-to-date materials, both printed and digital/technological.

B. The Department must quickly and efficiently address the following:

- Through ongoing meetings, discuss and establish a Departmental mission and identity in which arts, humanities, and technologies not only coexist but also interact and inform one another.
- Revise current courses and create new ones that present a broader scope of content and applications in culture and technology. Expand the presently Hellenocentric curriculum. Fill in essential content-gaps that currently exist.
- Significantly revise the undergraduate program to better meet the needs and interests of students and also to equip them with skills needed in the marketplace.
- In order to orient high school students to its wide range of offerings, generate and circulate publicity materials drawing attention to the Department and the career opportunities its degrees provide.
- Establish a biannual Departmental workshop on teaching. Provide a regular forum for the discussion of teaching evaluations with a focus on addressing student dropouts and generating fresh pedagogical methodologies and approaches.
- Collaborate with Erasmus in order to expose students to the international

level of these emerging disciplines.

- Incorporate more field-trips and excursions into the student experience in order to broaden their educational horizons.
- Establish intradepartmental connections to generate more creative and cutting-edge interdisciplinary research.
- With the support of the Rector and the University of Patras, reach out to colleagues in affiliated departments.
- While maintaining and cultivating ties with Agrinio and regional communities, reach out to an international audience by publishing in other language.
- In order to gain international exposure as scholars and generate more citations, the faculty should begin publishing in international languages, as well as in Greek.
- Reach out to the other departments in Agrinio to establish a research community of PhD candidates.

The Members of the Committee

	Name and Surname	Signature
1.	_____	
2.	_____	
3.	_____	
4.	_____	
5.	_____	