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1. EXTERNAL EVALUATION COMMITTEE

The Committee responsible for the External Evaluation of the **School of Pedagogical and Technological Education (ASPETE)** 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. Thomas Panagopoulos (Chairman)
   University of Algarve, Faro, Portugal

2. Prof. Gabriel Colletis
   Université Toulouse 1, Toulouse, France

3. Prof. Kostas Giannopoulos
   Neapolis University, Pafos, Cyprus

4. Prof. emer. George Yadigaroglu
   ETH-Zurich, Switzerland

5. Prof. Yorgos Zotos
   Cyprus University of Technology, Limassol, Cyprus
2. INTRODUCTION

The External Evaluation Committee (EEC) recognized the difficulty of evaluating an institution within the climate of uncertainty that characterizes the situation of the tertiary education in Greece at the present time. On one hand, the severe economic crisis plaguing every aspect of Greek society, and on the other hand the unstable administrative environment (frequent changes of the Governing Board (Διοικούσα Επιτροπή) of the Institution) produce a volatile and troubling situation makes it difficult to assess the realism and applicability of the EEC’s assessment and recommendations.

The EEC believes that ASPETE, despite the negative impact of exogenous factors, is functioning under a good academic climate which has been achieved with strong efforts over the past years on the part of the faculty and staff, who had to account for the various asymmetries, such as understaffing of the personnel and with gaps in specific domains. The collective effort was evident in the way the faculty approached the EEC and the academic review process in general without suspicion or reluctance, but with an open mind, transparency, accountability, and willingness to respond to questions.

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 Committee (EEC) visited the School of Pedagogical and Technological Education (ASPETE) between 18/4 and 23/4/2016. On 18/4 the EEC had a briefing meeting with Prof. Prodromos Yannas, Member of HQA (ΑΔΙΠ) Council. The site visit began on this day and continued until Saturday, 23 April according to the plan prepared by HQA. The EEC met the leadership of the Institution: the President, Deans, Chairs of the Departments, QAU (MODIP) Members. The EEC also met Heads of Administrative Units, members of staff, undergraduate and postgraduate students, and external stakeholders. The EEC notes that a representative of Technical Chamber was not present at the stakeholders meeting. On the 19th of April, the EEC visited the campus. On Thursday 21/4 the EEC held a debriefing meeting with representatives of the Institution. The rest of the time was used for drafting the External Evaluation Report (EER). Most meetings took place on time and within time limits. The EEC did not split up into pairs at any point during the visit.

The visit took place in a highly professional but equally cordial and collegial atmosphere. The EEC members are unanimous in wishing to express in writing their appreciation to the Faculty and Staff of ASPETE for their hospitality and assistance in all aspects of the evaluation visit and to HQA for the logistical support.

Details of the programme and meetings follow.
**Organization of the EEC Visit**

**Monday, 18 April 2016**

9:00 - 11:00 Orientation meeting at the HQA premises
EEC and Prof. Prodromos Yannas, Member of HQA Council
Briefing of HQA mission, standards and guidelines of QA institutional evaluation, national framework of HEIs in Greece

11:00 Departure for Marousi Town

12:00 Arrival of EEC members in ASPETE, EEC Meeting with the President, Prof. Saridakis Ioannis, Welcome, acquaintances

12:15 - 13:15 EEC Meeting with the Governing Board
- Prof. Saridakis Ioannis, President
- Prof. Antoniou Evangelia, Vice president
Discuss key issues for evaluation from the Institution’s perspective (arising from self-evaluation and from president’s and vice president’ experience)

13:30 - 14:45 Meeting with the Quality Assurance Unit (QAU/MODIP)
- Prof. Antoniou Evangelia, Vice President of GB and President of QAU
- Kyriakopoulou Niki, Secretary General
- Prof. Chatzarakis Georgios
- Prof. Botsari Evanthia
- Prof. Sotiropoulou Anastasia
- Prof. Vaxevanidis Nikolaos
- Oikonomou Apostolos, Administrative Staff
- Sideris Konstantinos, EDIP
- Antoniou Illias, Student Representative
Discuss the Institution’s structures, 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?

14:45 – 15:45 Lunch break EEC only
Reflect upon impressions of first meetings and complete information as necessary

15:45 – 17:00 tour of the campus (student refectory and hostel services, sport facilities, laboratories)

17:00 - 17:45 EEC meeting with heads of departments and directors of EPDAIK and PESISYP.
- Prof. Peleakis Panagiotis
- Prof. Pagiatakis Gerasimos
- Prof. Vaxevanidis Nikolaos
- Prof. Kalliopi Koumenou
- Prof. Kassimati Ekaterini
- Prof. Kalouri Ourania

Introduction to faculty operations: structures, quality management and strategic management; discuss the relationship of faculty with the institution’s Administration; input in self-evaluation; role of quality control activities in faculty; recruitment of academic staff

18:00 - 19:00 EEC Meeting with the Internal Evaluation Groups (OMEA) representatives
- Prof. Pagiatakis Gerasimos
- Prof. Papadakis Andreas
- Prof. Zalimidis Pavlos
- Prof. Savaidis Alexandros
- Prof. Aliefs Alexandros
- Prof. Antonopoulos Konstantinos
- Prof. Koumenou Kalliopi
- Prof. Kechrakos Dimitrios
Discuss the Institution’s structures, 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?

19:45 Transfer of the EEC members to the hotel

**Tuesday, 19 April 2016**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09:45</td>
<td>Meeting of EEC and academic staff representatives: Introduction to the structures, quality, management and strategic, management; discuss relationships of academic staff with the central level and students; staff development; motivation policies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30-11:00</td>
<td>EEC Meeting with directors of post graduate studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discuss structure, quality control, selection procedure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:15-11:45</td>
<td>Visit to faculties (part D) EEC Meeting with students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students’ views on experience [teaching and learning, student input in quality control and (strategic) decision making in quality control and (strategic) decision making]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:45-12:30</td>
<td>EEC Meeting with the Heads of the Administrative Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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 President.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30-15:30</td>
<td>Lunch break EEC only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reflect upon impressions of first meetings and complete information as necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:30-14:15</td>
<td>EEC meeting with postgraduate students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:30-15:30</td>
<td>EEC meeting with alumni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:30-16:15</td>
<td>EEC Meeting with external partners EEC and industry, society and/or local authority representatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Vice-Mayor of Neo Heraklio Municipality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Vice Mayor of Marousi Municipality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:30-17:30</td>
<td>Debriefing meeting (EEC only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exchange impressions, review day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:15</td>
<td>Transfer of the EEC members to the hotel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Wednesday, 20 April 2016**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09:00-20:00</td>
<td>Working on the draft EER (EEC only)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Thursday, 21 April 2016**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10:00-11:00</td>
<td>Informal presentation of the Institution key findings by EEC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EEC and President, members of the Institution (invitations decided by the president),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:30-18:00</td>
<td>Continue Working on the draft EER</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Friday 22 April 2016**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09:00-19:00</td>
<td>Working on the draft EER (EEC only)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Saturday, 23 April 2016**

Departure of the EEC from Greece
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 sources and documentation used were not of uniformly high quality. The Internal Evaluation Report (IER) did not answer in a pertinent way all the questions raised in the HQA template and some of the answers were vague or too generic to be truly useful.

The present Governing Board (GB) had just been appointed. The ASPETE did not present any strategic plans drawn up by the previous GB. The goals of the Institution that were presented orally during the visit were apparently not produced by a systematic, institution-wide discussion process.

The schedule of the visit ran smoothly (without any disruptions by students or others).

Overall, the preparation of material and prompt response to requests for additional information during the visit were very good. Staff motivation and willingness to receive comments was evident throughout the site visit; this is obviously positive and helps the Institution. Specific comments are to be found in the report.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Worthy of merit</th>
<th>Tick</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially positive evaluation</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Justify your rating:

The IER had a number of shortcomings. In particular, although the IER contained lots of information descriptive of the Institution, sections on strategy were not adequately covered either in the IER or during the visit.
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
- Priorities set by goals
- How are the goals achieved
- Procedures established by the Institution to monitor the achievement of goals
- What is your assessment of the Institution’s ability to improve

The EEC, read thoroughly the Internal Evaluation Report (IER), and had difficulties in identifying information dealing with the vision and goals of the Institution. The main piece of information to these topics was one PowerPoint slide presented orally by the Governing Board. The process, the criteria and the means through which this mission and goals were established, were not mentioned at all.

*The EEC suggests that ASPETE prepares a clear mission, vision and goals statement that is specific, achievable and usable. Additionally, the EEC suggests that the Institution sets up a process through which its strategic plan is established and it is widely adopted by the constituents (i.e. faculty, staff, students, community). Such a framework will form the foundation of the internal quality assurance (QA) system and should be conveyed to the departments which should align their individual mission statements and goals with those of the Institution.*

The EEC notes that beyond the remarks made above, the current state of Greek tertiary education and future changes are subject to ongoing technological changes. All these are affecting dramatically the function of this institution and should be considered in setting its mission and goals.

The first two priorities set by goals in the oral presentation slide of the GB were the self-governance of the Institution and the upgrading of ASPETE to university level and status. The implementation of these priorities is heavily depended upon uncontrollable externalities such as new openings for hiring faculty members, creation of new departments and upgrading laboratory infrastructure. This procedure requires an increased budget allocation from the Greek government.

The absence of a detailed strategic plan and the severe economic crisis of the country are the main obstacles that hinder and delay the achievement of the goals of the Institution.

The EEC believes that ASPETE should develop specific, realistic and attainable targets, and should describe in a clear manner the procedures which has to follow for achieving its goals. At the present, and to the EEC’s knowledge there is no institutional, written, procedures manual which can help ASPETE to create its own benchmark status and evaluate improvements and progress.

Although ASPETE faculty members and the administrative personnel are quite active and competitive, the Institution has been continuously confronted with an extensive regulatory framework, along with budget cuts, which are considered as the main obstacles for creating a benevolent environment for progress and improvement. If these obstacles continue to exist in the future, the EEC cannot see an effective way of tackling this situation and letting the Institution move forward. In addition, all the constituents should clearly understand, that no progress and improvement can be obtained in the Institution if there are no procedures, well defined criteria, and benchmarks for self-evaluation, even more under the present difficult conditions of operation.
Please decide in respect to the specific evaluation area (&3.1.1):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Worthy of merit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially positive evaluation</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Justify your rating:
The vision and goals of the Institution were not stated in the IER and the visit did not reveal a systematic clear, realistic statement as well as a procedure for arriving at such a statement.

Please decide in respect to the specific evaluation area (&3.1.2):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Worthy of merit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially positive evaluation</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.1.2 Organizational Development Strategy

- Effectiveness of administrative officials
- Existence of effective operation regulations
- Specific goals and timetables
- Measures taken to reach goals

The EEC had a meeting with the administrative staff officials and had an extensive and fruitful discussion on matters related to their duties. During the discussion, the shortage of the personnel and its sub-optimal allocation in various duties and tasks were repeatedly underlined.

It seems that the administrative staff, having established a good relationship with other fellow administrative personnel, are happy with their jobs. The EEC was told, that quite often the staff is working over-time with no extra compensation. They are not complaining for this, but they asked for recognition for their efforts and a “thank-you” from the Institution. Positive reinforcements and creation of motives are suggested by the EEC for the personnel when there are no other ways the faculty members to express their gratitude for their efforts.

The quality of the administrative support to the faculty members of the Institution is very good and at a satisfactory level, counteracting hindrances that are facing in their duties.

There is an absolute lack of specific achievable goals, processes and timetables for delivering the administrative staff duties. In some cases a workload calculator could be useful.

The EEC could not locate in the IER any specific measure for facilitating the efforts and the job of the administrative staff. Once more, the EEC notes the necessary emphasis to the fact that no progress and improvement can be made in the Institution if there are no procedures, well defined criteria, and benchmarks for self-evaluation, even more under the present difficult conditions of operation and limitations imposed by the national legislation.
The administrative staff is performing adequately its duties, but there are not yet explicit, institutional goals, measures and timetables for improvements.

3.1.3 Academic Development Strategy
- Response of the Institution to Faculties and Departments
- Goals and timetables
- Measures taken to reach goals

ASPETE has four Departments; the three of them offer undergraduate degrees, whereas the fourth supports the three undergraduate departments by providing the pedagogical courses that constitute an integral part of their curriculum, always in line with their two-fold mission (technological and pedagogical). The Institution recently developed eight Master-level programmes.

Special mention must be made to the one-year programmes of pedagogical training (EPPAIK) and specialization (PESYP) successfully organized and implemented by ASPETE all over Greece. The establishment of a new Branch to this end in the prefecture of Sterea Ellada (situated in Livadia) has recently been approved.

Realistic development goals, given the budget limitations and the number of the faculty members, should be clearly established and spelled out and a time schedule for achieving these goals should be clearly developed. Possible future development goal considered by the Institution, is the development of a fourth undergraduate program of studies in the General Department of Education providing that viability study can justify such decision.

The EEC believes that the constraints which are pertinent to the Institution, (lack of a written procedural manual and the need of creating benchmark criteria) are the main reasons for not taking effective measures to reach the goals. More staff and budget allocation are needed.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Worthy of merit</th>
<th>Tick</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially positive evaluation</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Justify your rating:

ASPETE is offering double-major (pedagogical-technical) undergraduate degrees that respond to a national need as they provide trained teachers for the technical secondary education. However, there is no specific plan and objectives for future developments.

3.1.4 Research Strategy
- Key points in research strategy
- Research strategy objectives and timetables for achieving them
- Laboratory research support network
- Research excellence network
- Existence of research assistance mechanisms (for preparing proposals, capitalising on patents and innovations, finding partners for research programmes, etc.)

There is no coherent research orientation as a whole and research policy, which sets the framework for all related activities. Research policy relies in self-motivation and is not
taking advantage of synergies, collaborations and collective efforts. Practically, research activities are based on individual initiative, interest and merit.

*The EEC recommends that a research strategy in terms of areas of emphasis of the Institution and of the departments be developed, applied and coordinated at all levels of the Institution. Synergies and collective efforts should be exploited.*

Faculty members are striving hard, through difficult conditions to be active in research efforts and to participate more frequently in international conferences, disseminating their research output. The absence of financial support, the lack of modern infrastructure facilities, the lack of specific time allocated to research in the overall duties of the faculty and the absence of an institutionalized doctoral program are inhibiting factors for them to be internationally more competitive.

Despite of all these negative factors, we noted that there is an ambition, shared in most departments, to engage in competitive research with international recognition and to seek external funding. The degree of success, however, is variable across the departments.

Departments also are publishing books (mainly in Greek), which serve the related subjects of the study programs.

The last five years faculty members have engaged in a number of research projects which are funded by the European Commission and other institutions.

Despite the lack of financial resources, faculty members continue to participate in international conferences, frequently covering their own expenses.

The Departments show an active interest in developing research ties with national and international Universities.

Overall the impression of the EEC is that the Departments are striving to be active in research, in spite the absence of clear research goals, and effective strategies of how to reach them. The Departments are trying to build a reputation nationally and are working with enthusiasm toward this direction. It has though to face all the inhibiting factors, and to tackle the obstacles and attitudes that have grown over the past years.

There is a ground for improvement, especially in the area of foreign-language publications and more citations. A greater publication effort in general will also bolster the faculty’s capacity to compete for EU research funds, which will provide benefits in all domains of the research activity. Given the evident points of intersection in expertise among faculty members and the general collaborative climate among faculty in the Departments such practices would not be difficult to implement.

*The EEC recommends that ASPETE creates ways of promoting faculty research, such as “best-paper” awards, funding to attend international conferences, etc. The creation of synergies and collaborative efforts should also be rewarded, e.g. via some complementary funding.*

---

**Please decide in respect to the specific evaluation area (3.1.4):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Worthy of merit</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially positive evaluation</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Justify your rating:**

The Institution has not identified systematically strategic focal areas of research and has no research strategy and is not actively promoting research synergies. Research efforts are left to the initiative of individual faculty members.
### 3.1.5 Financial Strategy

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

The ASPETE is a small institution and one could anticipate that it could self-administrate its financial resources. Nevertheless, its governing board is appointed by the Ministry of Education. Financial policy and targets are mainly set by the central government. This justifies the lack of any strategic financial plan. This largely explains the weak degree of flexibility the Institution has to manage its own financial resources.

The IER report does not mention any measures towards a Quality-Assurance System for Financial Management (e.g. ISO), computerised management and budget monitoring. In its response to the EEC’s draft report ASPETE commented that it is certified for operational capability, “an accreditation scheme which is more significant than the typical quality management system accreditation according to ISO9001.” Furthermore, ASPETE commented that it implements the RESCOM management system developed by the Aristotle University of Thessaloniki especially for the Special Research Funds Accounts (ELKE) of the Institutions.

The EEC was told that the Institution has noticeable reserves in bank accounts, but due to the economic restrictions, cannot spend these funds. Therefore, regular maintenance of essential teaching equipment, such mechanical laboratory machines, has been stalled. For example, the EEC was told that the administrative rules do not allow for a provision in the “regular” budget to purchasing the fuel needed to run the engines in the automobile laboratory. We strongly believe that the under-used laboratories compromise the quality of teaching.

There are several separate budgets and accounts running in parallel and this could be better coordinated and even integrated. The EEC was made aware that there is not an integrated budget account, but rather the operations are segmented among several accounts, each one having its own policy, targets and constraints, e.g., separates budget for student restaurants and dormitories.

The newly created post-graduate programmes are charging tuition fees, where a 10% goes to the Research Committee of the Institution (ELKE) and an additional 25% to the institution for covering corresponding operating costs.

*The EEC recommends the full implementation of a Quality System for Financial Management (e.g. ISO), the full computerisation of the management and of the budget monitoring.*

*The EEC recommends promoting a paperless administration.*

*Also, a more strategic and proactive approach in funding and fundraising activities is recommended as the principal response to a largely negative financial situation in the country as a whole.*

*The EEC recommends the creation of an institutional Property Development and Management Company that could fill some financial needs and contribute to management of any university activities, property and resources.*
Please decide in respect to the specific evaluation area (&3.1.5):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Worthy of merit</th>
<th>Tick</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive evaluation</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially positive evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Justify your rating:
Although the Institution is coping with the economic crisis and the budget cuts, a larger degree of pro-activeness and additional actions are necessary to overcome the present, obvious budgetary problems. Components of financial QA are missing.

3.1.6 Building and Grounds Infrastructure Strategy

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

ASPETE is situated on a large central campus adjacent to the Olympic stadium in the north of Athens. There are several buildings on campus hosting the administration, teaching classrooms, the library, laboratories and offices. The laboratories are located in separate large buildings resembling modern factory plants. On campus, there is a large student restaurant, student dormitories and sports facilities. ASPETE owns the buildings where technical high schools are hosted; these schools are used for pedagogical training of the ASPETE students. In addition ASPETE runs ten smaller satellite campuses and branches across Greece which offer the specialization programmes in parallel with the campus in Athens. The EEC has only inspected the main campus in Athens.

The Athens campus has an area of 230,000 m², attractively laid out. There are older buildings, with the first one dated in the late 1950’s when the school was established. The central administrative services, meeting rooms and hall of ceremonies, library, faculty offices and classrooms are located on modern and well equipped buildings. On campus there is a student residence and a restaurant on separate buildings. The numerous mechanical and electric laboratories are in separate buildings, as already mentioned.

The area is well secured as the campus is surrounded by a wall and a metallic barrier. There is security staff on the entrance checking all persons entering the campus.

Next to the entrance there is a metro terminal and another one on the north side, providing easy access to the campus.

Presently, there is no need for additional buildings and no plans or strategy for further development are apparently necessary.

The EEC recommends that plans are made for better use of certain parts of the existing good buildings infrastructure such as the central auditorium and the old library.

Please decide in respect to the specific evaluation area (&3.1.6):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Worthy of merit</th>
<th>Tick</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive evaluation</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially positive evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Justify your rating:
The buildings and grounds infrastructure is generally very good, although plans could be made for better use of some older buildings. No new buildings are needed.

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

The Institution has not a proper environmental policy in place. An exception is the building that hosts the library which was built on green standards, with ergo-economic design and sensors for optimal temperature and light controls. The older buildings are obviously more difficult to upgrade environmentally.

The small number of students, faculty and staff are not causing any serious threat to the beautiful and green sounding environment landscaped with a large number of trees, flowers and other plants. Still, it will be essential that the wastes of the laboratories are managed according to the EU standards. A necessary protocol for the management of such waste must be drawn the earliest. There was little evident of recycling policy in place during the visit of the EEC.

*The EEC recommends that an environmental policy be drafted and put in place and efforts to approach the green energy strategy be made. The beautiful surrounding grounds merit some thought about their valorisation and use.*

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Worthy of merit</th>
<th>Tick</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially positive evaluation</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Justify your rating:
The Institution has not a proper environmental policy in place.
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

As it would have been expected from its special mission (an institute providing the needs of the secondary vocational technical schools), ASPETE has established long term relationships with many technical schools across the country. Its students are undergoing pedagogical training during the final year of their study and its alumni are placed in every technical secondary school in Greece fulfilling a national need.

On the technical side, there is little interaction with the industry. This is partly justified by the fact that the Greek industry focusses its activities mainly on production and spends very little effort on research and development.

There is very little contribution to the cultural development of the society but this is justified by the nature of this institution.

- There is a plan to offer existing programmes under the umbrella of Life-long Learning. The EEC hopes that, once the necessary funding is secured, the Institution will be able to proceed with its plans for a Life-long Learning Centre, which will benefit the whole region.

Relations with graduates (alumni) of the institution appear to be ad hoc, with a limited database of contacts. ASPETE may wish to explore the potential benefits intensifying exchanges with the existing alumni association, with regular events and mailings to alumni.

Please decide in respect to the specific evaluation area (3.1.8):

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

Justify your rating:

The ASPETE fulfils a national educational need; however, there is very little interaction with the industry and the local community.

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

ASPETE has a rich portfolio of bilateral agreements with institutions from 22 different EU Member States as well with institutions of candidate states. Several of these agreements are exchange agreements under the Erasmus scheme.

In the most recent past, ASPETE had participated in joint research projects funded under the FP7 framework. The FP7 research programmes have now expired and there is very little going on at the
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The ASPETE research is embedded in the international framework. There have been several agreements signed under the Erasmus+ which will be running till the year 2021. Overall the ASPETE research is embedded in the international framework.

In 2014-15 they were 8 outbound students and in 2015-16, they were 18 outbound students (14 for studies and 4 for traineeships).

The number of incoming foreign students remains relatively low largely because there is no specific provision for teaching in a language other than Greek. The EEC understands that the main objective of the institution, to produce secondary education teachers for the Greek technical schools, does not allow running any courses in other than the Greek language.

The data for incoming students that were given to the EEC (after the visit) mentions two PhD students one from the Technical University in Sofia and the other from the Czech Technical University in Prague. In the years 2015 and 2016 there has been some significant activity in STAFF mobility (incoming only), http://erasmus.aspete.gr/index.php/en/8-english-articles/160-erasmus-announcements.html.

From the response to the EEC’s draft report that ASPETE sent, it is worth to mention that ASPETE has developed a strategic plan for internalization, formulated in the frame of its Erasmus Policy Statement which has been approved by the E.U. and led to the award of ECHE/Erasmus Charter of Higher Education (relevant link: http://erasmus.aspete.gr/allextrafiles/erasmus/erasmus_standard/ECHE%20Erasmus%20Policy%20Statement.pdf)

The EEC suggests to develop a strategic plan for internationalization of the institution, including increased student mobility.

---

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Worthy of merit</th>
<th>Tick</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially positive evaluation</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Justify your rating:

Overall the ASPETE research is embedded in the international framework, although there are presently no active European projects. There are a number of Erasmus exchanges; numbers of students are, however, low.

---

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

ASPETE students are entitled to:
- Free textbooks and other teaching material
- Scholarships (for distinguished students with low family income)
- Accommodation at the Student Residence Hall of ASPETE, conveniently located on campus (students with low family income)
- Loans under certain provisions
- Free health care (students with no health insurance coverage)
- Student Union membership

ASPETE students receive:
- A Pass Card for reduced fares (valid for one year and renewable annually)
- Complementary meal coupons for use at the Campus Restaurant.

According to the ASPETE web site, other student services include:
- Library facilities
- Computer and networking facilities
- Printing and photocopying facilities
- Workshop and laboratory facilities
- Web-based videoconference facilities
- OPEN eCLASS (http://eclass.aspete.gr)
- Sports facilities (indoor gymnasium, basketball and volley courts)
- Confidential support services and personal counselling
- Support services for students with disabilities
- Erasmus mobility services (www.aspete.gr – Erasmus+ Icon)
- Liaison/Career Office services (comprehensive range of resources including links with the labour market, careers service, information on postgraduate studies, scholarships and grants, etc).

The EEC witnessed the existence of a very pleasant student restaurant with good food.

There is no strategy for cultural activities.

There is no comprehensive strategy for persons with special needs. Any problems are addressed on an ad hoc basis.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Worthy of merit</th>
<th>Tick</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive evaluation</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially positive evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Justify your rating:**
The essential student welfare needs are well covered.
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…
- 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 structure of the studies is very clear and homogeneous: the duration of studies is 10 academic semesters; the total student working load is 7500 hours or 300 ECTS.

The organization of each programme is clearly linked to the departments:

- **Department of Electrical and Electronic Engineering Educators** with two degree options
  - Degree Option: Electrical Engineering Educator
  - Degree Option: Electronic Engineering Educators
- **Department of Mechanical Engineering Educators**
- **Department of Civil Engineering Educators**.

The content and structure of the above degree programmes reflect and promote ASPETE’s two-fold orientation, i.e. the pedagogical and the technological, as well as the principles of the concurrent model of education on which they are based.

The courses taught fall into two main categories: Technological Courses and Pedagogical Courses offered concurrently with a balanced emphasis.

The course categories are further clearly classified into the following discipline-specific groups:

- General Core Courses
- Special Core Courses
- Specialization Courses
- Administration, Economics, Law, and Humanities Courses.

As from June 2008, all ASPETE graduates receive a Diploma Supplement (DS), which follows the model developed by the European Commission, Council of Europe and UNESCO/CEPES. The DS is issued both in Greek and in English, automatically and free of charge. ASPETE is a holder of the DS Label 2012/15, an honorary distinction awarded by the European commission and EACEA to Higher Education Institutions demonstrating excellence in applying and issuing the DS.

There is no standardized procedure for the redesign of the curriculum.

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 is covered in section 4.2 of the present report.

As there is little hope that public funding increases in the future, the EEC recommends to the Institution to develop closer relations to the industrial firms. This, not only for financial reasons, but also for the quality of its own integration and that of the students within the Greek economy and society.
Please decide in respect to the specific evaluation area (3.2.1):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Worthy of merit</th>
<th>Tick</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive evaluation</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially positive evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Justify your rating:

The positives aspects are here clearly dominant. According to the fact that there is little hope that public funding increases in the future, we recommend the School to develop closer relations to the enterprises. This, not only for financial reasons, but also for the quality of its integration and the students’ one within the Greek economy and society.

### 3.2.2 Programmes of Postgraduate Studies (second cycle)

Since 2005 and until recently, ASPETE has been offering several high-level postgraduate 2nd cycle degrees (MA/MSc) promoting teaching and research in relation with the departments and laboratories of the School:

- “MA in Subjects Didactics and New Technologies”: Offered jointly with the National & Kapodistrian University of Athens/School of Philosophy, Faculty of Philosophy, Education and Psychology.
- MA in Education (Education Sciences)”, offered jointly with Roehampton University, London, UK.
- MA “Organization and Management of Education”
- MA “Education Sciences”
- MSc “Master of Science in Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics”
- MSc “Applied Computational Structural Engineering
- Interdisciplinary MSc “Upgrading of Buildings” with two degree options:
  - “Structural Upgrading of Buildings,” and
  - “Energy Upgrading of Buildings.”

**Programmes of Training, Further Training or Specialization**

The pedagogical training programme (EPPAIK) offered by ASPETE has a duration of one-year and leads to the award of a “Certificate of Pedagogical and Teaching Competence”. The programme is tailored to meet the needs of in-service or prospective teachers with degrees from all higher education disciplines and specializations.

The programme integrates theoretical instruction and laboratory work, is supplemented by the Teaching Practice Sessions, and is supported by a variety of extra-curricular on-campus and off-campus activities. Apart from Athens, it is decentralized and delivered in Thessaloniki, Patras, Ioannina, Heraklion- Crete, Volos, Sapes, Rhodes, Mytilene, Kozani, and Argos.

**Programmes of Further Training or Specialization**
The programmes of further training or specialization offered by ASPETE are for up to two semesters and are intended for higher-education graduates from all academic disciplines and specializations.

Those who have successfully completed the programmes, are awarded a “Certificate of Further Training” or “Specialization Training”, accordingly.

The acceptance rate in the postgraduate programs is about 10% of the applicants. This suggests that the Institution enjoys a high reputation; ASPETE has a recognised quality of its graduates.

However, the way the programmes are designed is based on the knowledge and experience of the teachers and their personal relations with enterprises; there is no clear and organised way to collect the needs of the industry or of the enterprises.

Overall, the relationship and links between enterprises and the Institution are not sufficient, even though individual teachers and departments do have personal contacts.

Each course is evaluated by the students (two-page evaluation), but it seems that the students do not get any direct feedback of this evaluation.

Overall, the students seem to be very satisfied to be in this institution: the contact with the teachers is very close; the students do not seem preoccupied by their future chances in the employment market once they have graduated. These are of very high importance for this evaluation.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Worthy of merit</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive evaluation</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially positive evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Justify your rating:
The evaluation exercise is partially complete: there is no feedback from the student evaluations; there is no systematic way to collect the needs of the enterprises and all stakeholders. The opinion of former students was asked only occasionally.

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

ASPETE does not offer any doctoral programmes. Individual faculty may, however, be members of doctoral programme committees elsewhere.
Please decide in respect to the specific evaluation area (& 3.2.3):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Worthy of merit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially positive evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative evaluation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Justify your rating: not applied*

Not applicable
### 3.3 Profile of the Institution under evaluation - Conclusions and recommendations

**Underline specific positive points:**

**Programmes of study**
- The structure of the studies is very clear and homogeneous; the programmes are clearly related to the departments.
- The content and structure of the degree programmes reflect and promote ASPETE’s two-fold orientation, i.e. the pedagogical and the technological.
- ASPETE’s graduates receive a Diploma Supplement automatically and free of charge.
- The pedagogical training programme (EPPAIK) offered by ASPETE is tailored to meet the needs of in-service or prospective teachers.
- There is student evaluation of all courses offered in each semester.
- The student body is very satisfied: the contacts with the teachers are very good.
- The students do not have concerns regarding their future employment.

**Faculty and Staff**
- ASPETE faculty members and the administrative personnel are quite active and competitive.
- The faculty members are satisfied with the administrative support; the administrative staff are happy with their job.

**Research**
- There is an ambition, shared in most departments, to engage in competitive research with international recognition and to seek external funding.

**General infrastructure**
- The Institution is using funds collected as fees from the postgraduate programmes to cover some of its basic needs.
- The buildings and grounds infrastructure is adequate although partly aging.
- The essential student welfare needs are well covered.

**Underline specific negative points:**

**Vision and Goals**
- The vision and goals of the Institution are not clearly defined.
- There are no procedures, well defined criteria, and benchmarks for self-evaluation of the Institution.
- The absence of a detailed strategic plan in conjunction with the severe economic crisis of the country hinder and delay the achievement of the goals of the Institution.
- The IER does not cite any specific measure for facilitating the efforts and the job of the administrative staff.
- There is no coherent research orientation as a whole and research policy, the research policy is highly individual and is not taking advantage of synergies, collaborations and collective efforts.

**Study Programmes**
- The Institution is suffering from supporting-staff cuts.
- The study programmes are designed on the basis of the knowledge and experience of the teachers, and their relations with enterprises; there is no clear and organised way to collect the needs of the industry or of the enterprises.
- There has not been until now systematic, periodic evaluation of the programmes of study according to set procedures and criteria aimed at safeguarding their consistency and regular updating has to be performed.
- The students do not get a direct feedback of their evaluations of the courses.
- The international mobility of the students is weak.

**Interaction with external stakeholders**
- The interactions with enterprises is weak; nevertheless individual faculty members and departments maintain relationships and contacts.
- On the technical side, there is very little interaction with the industry.
- There are very few cultural interactions with the local community.

**Quality Assurance**
- The overall QA procedure is still not fully implemented.
- There is no plan towards a QA system for Financial Management (e.g. ISO), computerised management and budget monitoring.

**Financial strategy**
- Lack of any strategic financial plan.
- Available noticeable reserves in bank accounts are not used.

**Supporting services**
- The Institution has not a proper environmental policy in place
- There is no comprehensive strategy for persons with special needs.

Make your suggestions for further development of the positive points:

**Quality Assurance**
- The overall QA procedure has to be fully implemented and the students should be consulted.
- The EEC recommends the full implementation of a QA system for Financial Management (e.g. ISO), the full computerisation of the management, and of the budget monitoring.
- The EEC recommends promoting a paperless administration.
- A systematic periodic evaluation of the programmes has to be performed.
- The use of student records to get a better view of the progress of studies and better understanding of individual progress is recommended.

**Financial Strategy**
- A more strategic and proactive approach in funding and fundraising activities is recommended.
- The EEC recommends the creation of an institutional Property Development and Management Company.

**Supporting services**
- The EEC recommends that an environmental policy be drafted and put in place and also a valorisation and use of the campus landscape.
- The plans for a Life-long Learning Centre should be promoted.

**Internationalization**
- The EEC suggests to develop a strategic plan for internationalization of the institution, including increased student mobility.

Make your suggestions on needed steps for improvement:

**Mission, vision and goals**
- ASPETE should prepare a clear mission, vision and goals statement that is specific, achievable and usable.
- ASPETE should develop specific, realistic and attainable targets, and should describe in a clear manner the procedures which has to follow for achieving its goals.

- The Institution should set up a process through which the strategic plan of the Institution is established so that it would be widely adopted by the constituents (i.e. faculty, staff, students, community). The strategic plan should be conveyed to the Departments which should align their individual statements of mission and goals with those of the Institution.

- Realistic development goals, given the budget limitations and the number of the faculty members, should be clearly established and spelled out, and a time schedule for achieving these goals should be developed.

Quality Assurance

- Periodic systematic evaluation of the programmes according to set procedures and criteria aimed at safeguarding their consistency and regular updating has to be performed.

- The Institution should develop closer ties to all external stakeholders.

Research strategy

- The EEC recommends that a research strategy in terms of areas of emphasis of the Institution and of the departments be developed, applied and coordinated at all levels of the Institution. Synergies and collective efforts should be exploited.

- The EEC recommends that ASPETE creates ways of promoting faculty research, such as “best-paper” awards, funding to attend international conferences, etc. The creation of synergies and collaborative efforts should also be rewarded, e.g. via some complementary funding.

Supporting Services

- The EEC recommends that plans are made for better use of certain parts of the existing good buildings infrastructure such as the central auditorium and the old library.
### 4. INTERNAL SYSTEM OF QUALITY ASSURANCE

#### 4.1 Quality Assurance (QA) Policy and Strategy

*Please comment on:*

- the Institution’s policy and goals regarding QA and Improvement
- whether the Institution has developed a specific system of QA
- how the Institution’s internal QA system has been organized
- how the students and staff of the Institution are protected from biased interventions and discriminations
- whether a detailed implementation guide has been put together, containing an analysis of the QA system’s operating procedures
- the involvement of students in QA
- how the Institution evaluates the effectiveness of its QA system regarding the achievement of its goals

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

ASPETE supports quality assurance and has QA as 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. The digital QA data collection system has been procured and installed and the EEC was told that it will become fully operational by the end of 2016.

As a general observation, the Institution started building a set of QA processes and in the near future will be better prepared for accreditation of its academic programmes. QA will help build a robust, high level of quality and competitiveness of the institution in Greece with potential to provide the basis for internationalization of its programmes and activities in Europe. A future analysis should start by finding “comparable institutions” in size and mission and use them to create benchmarks, indices and best practices.

**Suggestions:**

- 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 effort has focused on QA of the programmes of study, and to a lesser extent to research activities and relationships with interested stakeholders.
- QA policies and practices should be well defined and should include a detailed description of the data selection and analysis methodology and evaluation. Pertinent actions and reactions/feedback should also be defined. Recommendations of previous evaluations should be part of the QA processes.
- The QA processes should comply with existing legislation to ensure respect of privacy, personal data and rights. QA should be sufficiently extensive to facilitate future academic quality review and actions for improvement. 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 institutional QA Units (OMEAs and MODIP) so that the OMEAs are better prepared for the future interactions with MODIP. It is noted that 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.
Justify your rating:
The EEC understands that QA policy and strategy are still in their infancy. This is general for all Greek Institutions. The Institution apparently has the will to thoroughly address this challenge.
4.2 Design, approval, monitoring and evaluation of the study programmes and degrees awarded

Please comment on:
- whether the learning outcomes have been clearly formulated and whether they have been published
- whether the programmes are designed in such a way as to involve students and other stakeholders in the work
- how the achievement of learning outcomes is monitored
- whether there is a published Guide regarding the organization of programmes of study
- whether the ECTS system is taken into consideration and implemented
- whether there is a periodic evaluation of the programmes according to set procedures and criteria aimed at safeguarding their consistency and regular updating
- the student participation in the QA procedure of the study programmes
- whether the programmes include well-structured international mobility and placement opportunities

The learning outcomes have been clearly formulated and have been published.
The students are involved through their representatives in the Departmental Councils.
The achievement of learning outcomes is monitored through examination rules that are clearly defined.
A published Guide regarding the organization of the programmes of study exists and the necessary information is electronically available.
The ECTS is taken into consideration and implemented as in all Greek Universities.
There is no periodic evaluation of the programmes according to set procedures and criteria aimed at safeguarding their consistency and regular updating. This aspect has to be implemented.
The overall QA procedure has to be implemented including student participation.
International mobility is weak. It has to be improved.

Mode of Delivery and Language of Instruction

Courses are delivered through a variety of teaching methods including formal lectures, laboratory and workshop tutorials, fieldwork and projects aiming at consolidating the learning goals and objectives. The balance between theory and practice is further enhanced by various extra-curricular activities ranging from special-topic seminars, conferences and panel discussions to educational visits and trips.
Courses in ASPETE are normally taught in Greek. This may be one of the reasons why ASPETE does not receive many foreign students. It is difficult to change this point; offering preliminary Greek language courses for foreign students could be considered as well as offering some courses in English.

Assessment and Grading

Each course unit or subject is assessed separately by means of assignments and mid-term exams (progress-tests), as well as formal examinations at the end of each semester. A grading scale from 0 to 10 is used, with 5 being the lowest passing grade. A student with a failing final grade in a subject is entitled to resit the second examination period of the corresponding semester. The overall award classification is based upon the final overall mark.

Admission Requirements
Admission to the five-year undergraduate programmes offered by the technological departments of ASPETE is through the procedures specified by the national (panhellenic) system regulating entrance to tertiary/higher education in Greece.

Graduation Requirements

ASPETE’s first cycle degree (ptychio) is awarded following the successful completion of a course of study of ten academic semesters. Students receive their degree when they have achieved a total of 300 ECTS credits, and specifically when they have successfully:

- completed all courses of their Department’s study-programme
- submitted their graduation thesis
- completed a six-month practical training in the field
- completed their teaching practice sessions, and
- have completed five years of study.

ECTS Credit Allocation

The European Credits Transfer System (ECTS) is applied to all undergraduate study-programmes offered by ASPETE. Each academic semester is consistently equivalent to 30 ECTS credits, which gives a total of 300 credits corresponding to a total of 7,500 hours of workload. ECTS credits are allocated to all compulsory course units.

The undergraduate programs seem to be stable and are adjusted when necessary.

There is no student participation in the QA procedure of the study programmes.

The Institution is involved in many international programs, especially Erasmus +. However, the Erasmus mobility (inbound but also outbound) seems to be rather low, concerning a few students only.

---

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Tick</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Worthy of merit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive evaluation</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially positive evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Justify your rating**

Overall, the evaluation is positive. However, periodic evaluation of the programmes according to set procedures and criteria aimed at safeguarding their consistency and regular updating has still to be performed. Despite Erasmus + programmes, there is too little mobility.
4.3 Teaching and learning - Assessment by students

Please comment on:

- whether multiple and coherent learning paths are provided according to the needs of students in the Institution’s Departments / Faculties
- how proper guidance and support is offered to students by the Departments / Faculties’ teaching staff
- whether students are informed clearly and in detail regarding the strategy of evaluation that is implemented for their programme of study, the exams or other methods of assessment they will be subjected to, what is expected of them and which criteria will be applied for the evaluation of their performance
- whether there is a formal procedure for addressing complaints and objections by students in the Departments / Faculties of the Institution

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

The general and the specific learning paths are clearly specified.

The academic year is well organized. Exact dates are determined by the Departmental Councils and ASPETE’s Administrative Board on a yearly basis and are published on the website.

The teachers availability to provide off class tutorials and help is very good, and the EEC observed positive teacher-student relations, which has implications in academic and professional development of ASPETE students. Each teacher knows his/her students quite well, using sometimes questionnaires to better understand their demands and needs.

The students are very well informed about their evaluation (grading) and the evaluation criteria.

We did not notice a formal procedure for addressing complaints and objections by students in the Departments/Faculties of the Institution. The EEC thinks that the teachers proximity to the students makes such a procedure not very useful, but in a formal sense, it should be institutionalized.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Tick</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Worthy of merit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially positive evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Justify your rating:

Teaching and learning are the core missions of this Institution. The QA assessment of teaching should be formalized.
4.4 Admission of students, progression and recognition of studies

Please comment on:

- whether the procedures and criteria for admission to the second and third cycle of studies are implemented with consistency and transparency
- whether there are clear and distinct procedures within the Departments/Faculties, as regards recognition of higher education degrees, periods of study and knowledge acquired at an earlier stage
- whether there are clear and distinct procedures of recognition of study periods and prior learning (including the recognition of non-formal and informal learning)
- whether there are clear procedures in place regarding the cooperation of other Institutions with national ENIC/NARIC centres for ensuring coherent recognition and mobility among programmes within / among Institution(s)
- whether students are provided with detailed information (e.g. Diploma Supplement) regarding the degrees conferred to them, the achieved learning outcomes as well as the framework, the level and the content of studies they successfully completed
- whether the Institution has in place processes and tools to collect, monitor and use information regarding student progression

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

The national procedures and criteria for admission to the second cycle of studies are used.

There are clear and distinct procedures within the Departments/Faculties, as regards the recognition of higher education degrees.

The ECTS facilitates student mobility.

The European Network of Information Centres – National Academic Recognition Information Centres System is probably not often used because of the low student mobility.

The students are provided with detailed information (the Diploma Supplement) regarding the degrees conferred to them, the achieved learning outcomes as well as the framework, the level and the content of studies they successfully completed.

As any institution of higher learning, ASPETE keeps student records. These records should be utilized to get a better global view of student performance and simultaneously a better understanding of individual progression.
Please decide in respect to the specific evaluation area (4.4):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Worthy of merit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive evaluation</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially positive evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Justify your rating:

No specific negative aspects were identified in this section. ASPETE should use student records for the QA of the study programmes.
### 4.5 Quality Assurance as regards the teaching staff

**Please comment on:**

- how it is guaranteed that the vacancy notices and recruitment of teaching staff include procedures which provide assurance that all new teaching staff members have at least the basic teaching skills
- how potential weaknesses of the teaching staff are identified as regards the delivery of their teaching courses
- the procedures in place so that the teaching staff members receive the necessary feedback on their personal performance as well as on the opinion of students
- opportunities offered to the teaching staff for their professional/scientific advancement
- The Institution’s procedures for the support of new teaching staff as regards the teaching and evaluation methods
- how scientific activity is assessed and encouraged among the teaching staff in order to strengthen the connection between education and research
- whether a regulatory framework is in place for the investigation of disciplinary and academic misconduct of the teaching staff

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

The student feedback is the main tool for identifying (a posteriori) teaching weaknesses. The results are given to the faculty member as well as the head of the department who can make recommendations. Although there is no possibility of further action for permanent faculty, the EEC was told that the faculty members are sensitive to the evaluations of teaching as these are considered in their personal promotion cases. The appointments of temporary lecturers may not be re-conducted in case of severe deficiencies.

*The EEC recommends discussion of the course evaluation results between students and the teacher after the evaluation. The open publication of the evaluation results remains a remote but attainable goal and should be considered at the proper time.*

The EEC was not made aware of any opportunities offered to the teaching staff for their professional and scientific advancement such as internal grants, funds to attend conferences and various types of leaves that go beyond what is normally available in universities. There are, however, regular ERASMUS exchanges of the faculty.

The EEC was told that procedures for the support of new teaching staff are not necessary as, in principle, the Institution does not hire inexperienced teachers. However, it was also mentioned in the Institution’s comments to the EEC draft report that during selection procedures all candidates for faculty positions are asked to give a trial lecture to the electoral body and student representatives, the aim being to be evaluated for their teaching skills and abilities.

As the research activities of the individual faculty members are an essential part of their personal promotion, they are implicitly encouraged at the personal level. There are examples of very good research work, but these can be attributed to personal efforts and achievements of certain faculty members rather than to a collective departmental or institutional effort. Efforts to direct some funding to research from, say, post-doctoral fees were not followed up. There were ubiquitous complaints about lack of research support staff.

According to the IER, scientific activity is encouraged among the teaching staff in order to strengthen the connection between education and research; the IER states that this is accomplished through links between teaching and research programmes. The EEC found, however, no systematic ways of promoting such actions.

The ASPETE has a well-endowed special research account but the faculty members complained that the funds are not used to support research, in particular doctoral candidates; this, however, may be partly due to legal limitations. Although the institution traditionally was well equipped in laboratories, funding was not used to strengthen these.
The EEC recommends that systematic procedures for periodically evaluating the quality and extent of the research of individual faculty members as well as that of Departments be implemented.

The IER report states that the draft Statutes of the Institution that have been deposited with the Ministry but not approved yet provide the institutional and legal ways of dealing with disciplinary and academic misconduct of the teaching staff as provided by the national legislation. The EEC recommends the implementation as soon as possible of a procedure by which complaints of academic or social misconduct of faculty members can be dealt with at the institutional level by a systematic, carefully established internal procedure safeguarding the rights of all parts involved.

Faculty members told the EEC that the assessment of students is based on examinations, as well as other measures of performance, something that the EEC finds as good practice.

The members of the EEC noticed the willingness of the teaching and support staff to provide efforts beyond their regular duties for the benefit of the students and of the institution.

In spite of the shortcomings in the quality assurance of the teaching staff noted above, the students and alumni interviewed were very satisfied with the teaching and with the openness and the ease of access to the faculty.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please decide in respect to the specific evaluation area (&amp;4.5):</th>
<th>Tick</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Worthy of merit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially positive evaluation</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Justify your rating:

Although quality assurance as regards the teaching staff has some deficiencies, student evaluations of teaching are conducted systematically for all courses and the students and alumni were very satisfied with teaching.
4.6 Learning resources and student support

Please comment on:

- whether there are procedures for the systematic monitoring, evaluation, review and improvement of the appropriateness and effectiveness of supporting services available to students
- the available support services in regard to Libraries, Information systems and infrastructure
- the procedure in place for offering individual assistance (counselling and tutoring) to students

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

There are no procedures for the systematic monitoring, evaluation, review and improvement of the appropriateness and effectiveness of supporting services available to students, libraries, information systems, infrastructure, etc. The EEC recommends that a student evaluation of the various supporting services (library, counselling, residence and food services, etc.) be conducted every semester in parallel with the evaluation of courses.

The available central support services such as libraries, information systems and general infrastructure are addressed in Section 5.1 of the present EER; the results were quite satisfactory.

There is no institutionalized counselling and tutoring position, but the students indicated that in case of need for counselling, they have easy access to the head of the department or other responsible persons.

The EEC recommends that academic advisor positions covered by a faculty member be created in each department. In addition the EEC recommends full deployment of the services of a Liaison Office, the Erasmus exchange Office, and the Practical Training Office.

A Liaison Office (Γραφείο Διασύνδεσης) was created about a decade ago, but lastly it has been unattended due to lack of personnel.

The EEC had the opportunity to learn from the students and the alumni their satisfaction with the good quality of the educational infrastructure and support services offered to the students. The ASPETE has an open culture, facilitating the direct contact between students and teaching staff.

Please decide in respect to the specific evaluation area (4.6):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Worthy of merit</td>
<td>Tick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially positive evaluation</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Justify your rating:

The ASPETE provides good support services for its students, such as libraries, food services and dormitories. However, no QA for such services has been implemented. The students have good access to the faculty for advice and counselling although this has not been institutionalized formally.
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?

A QA software system for the collection and analysis of data and quality indexes has already been installed (since November 2015) and its pilot operation phase has already been completed. ASPETE is expecting it to be in full operation by the end of 2016. Partial data collection systems were mentioned as being operational.

The EEC recommends to make every effort to bring the ASPETE-wide QA information system in full use and to link it with the other information systems in place at soon as possible.

The means of collecting student satisfaction with their programmes of study are the student evaluations of teaching that take place towards the end of each semester. Students informed the EEC that the participation in these surveys is good (the evaluations are conducted in hard-copy, paper form that seems to much better guarantee participation as well as dispel any fears of non-anonymity).

Although there is no formal mechanism for collecting student satisfaction information about the programmes of study, the students and alumni that the EEC met were generally satisfied.

The EEC was not made aware of any efforts to seek institutional comparisons 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.

The Institution should utilise the QA system for comparisons with other higher education institutions within and beyond the European Higher Education Area, with the aim of strengthening self-awareness and finding possible ways to continuously and increasingly enhance its operation at institutional and individual levels, in terms of programmes, teaching and research.

The EEC recommends that the Institution develop a formal system to monitor the paths of all graduates. Furthermore the QAU/MODIP should systematically monitor the overall progress of students in their studies (progress rates, success rates in the examinations, drop-out rates, graduation rates, time to graduation etc.)

Please decide in respect to the specific evaluation area (4.7): Tick

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Worthy of merit</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially positive evaluation</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Justify your rating:
Although QA system software that will allow collection of all the relevant information has been already acquired and installed, the EEC was told that the system will be fully operational only by the end of 2016. In the meantime, the student evaluations of teaching provide the main QA information.

4.8 Dissemination of information to stakeholders

Please comment on:
- how the Institution sees to the publicization 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 ASPETE web site and sites of the departments serve as the principal means of disseminating information, such as Study Guides containing the details of degree programs, the expected learning outcomes, the teaching, learning and assessment procedures, and teaching staff curriculum vitae, etc. A quick inspection of the system revealed some missing information and numerous dead links that should be taken care.

The EEC recommends that the English-version websites be completed to contain the same information, especially when it could be useful to foreign students.

The EEC learned that traditionally an alumnus of the institution was included in the Governing Board, certainly a good practice.

As the creation of ASPETE from the former SELETE is relatively recent, an effort could be made to promote the brand name and the character of the institution.

Please decide in respect to the specific evaluation area (&4.8):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Worthy of merit</th>
<th>Tick</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive evaluation</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially positive evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Justify your rating:
Standard procedures based on electronic dissemination of relevant data via the Internet are widely used.
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?

There is no systematic, formal QA procedure for the periodic assessment and review of the contents of the study programmes at either the graduate or the post-graduate levels. The continuous monitoring of the undergraduate study programmes is conducted through the procedures provided by Greek law for annual review, reconsideration and revision of the study programmes (specific committees and General Assemblies of departments). More specifically, the IER states that the programmes of study will be prepared in the future by an interdepartmental committee that was created in February 2015. The last revision of the programmes was performed in September 2013.

Additionally, the EEC was informed that the recommendations of the periodic external evaluations are also taken into consideration. External industrial and other stakeholders were not systematically solicited although individual faculty members may have numerous industrial contacts.

The EEC recommends that a formal QA procedure for continuous monitoring and periodic review of the study programmes be implemented taking into consideration all stakeholder opinions and needs.

Regarding the undergraduate programmes, there is no formal procedure for taking into account the changing needs of society and for obtaining feedback by monitoring the graduates’ career paths. For the post-graduate programmes that have just started, it is too early to address this issue.

The needs of the labour market have been impacted by the ongoing economic crisis and this has affected the national entrance examination choices of the student body. The Faculty is well aware of this fact and is attempting to re-evaluate the situation, but has no concrete plans on this matter.

The Faculty stated that in the design of the post-graduate programs the needs of society are taken into consideration (e.g., energy conservation needs and future regulations) but this is done on an ad-hoc and personal-connections basis.

The EEC was told that international standards are used in developing the Curricula and programmes of study. The faculty of the Institution stated that the faculty members themselves take into account the latest developments in their fields and the changing needs of society. As an index of success it was mentioned that the labour market welcomes the graduates.

The lack of procedure does not allow a systematic consideration of the cutting edge research activities in a particular discipline. This is left to the individual instructors.

The alumni were not called systematically to comment on the study programmes although one of the graduates that the EEC met was indeed called by a department for such a
consultation. The external stakeholders (Ministry) feel, however, that they should be consulted more systematically.

*The EEC recommends that all the stakeholders (including the professional organizations and industrial actors) be systematically invited to express their opinions regarding the study programmes.*

*The EEC recommends that a system be developed for following the graduates’ career paths both in employment and in further studies and used as an input for curriculum development.*

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

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

**Justify your rating:**

Although there is no formal QA procedure for the continuous monitoring and periodic review of the study programmes, these are evaluated according to the current Hellenic educational system practices. The views of the external stakeholders, in particular the graduates of the programmes are not systematically considered.
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

This one is the first external institutional evaluation. No plans were mentioned during the visit for ways to deal with the outcomes.

External evaluations have been conducted for most of the departments of ASPETE. The implementation of the recommendations of the departmental evaluations should be monitored by the QAU/MODIP and the academic staff of the respective Departments. The EEC was told that: actions where responses were within the decision capability of the Institution (such as redesign of curricula) were considered; the ones that required State actions (such as hiring new faculty or reducing workloads) could not be considered.

A major, general recommendation found in the previous departmental evaluations regards the integration of the pedagogical and technical aspects of the institution both in teaching and research; this does not appear to have been fully implemented.

Documentation of all processes at all levels as a QA tool was also recommended but still pending full implementation.

Development of a research policy at the departmental levels at least was also recommended but apparently did not take place.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please decide in respect to the specific evaluation area (&amp;4.10):</th>
<th>Tick</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Worthy of merit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially positive evaluation</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Justify your rating:
This is the first external evaluation of the Institution as a whole. The recommendations of the prior departmental evaluations were considered but not fully implemented yet.
### 4.11 Internal System of Quality Assurance – Conclusions and recommendations

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Underline specific positive points:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- The QUA and departmental EIG units exist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The QA information system has been installed and will be operational by the end of 2016.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The general and the specific learning paths are clear and well understood by everyone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The academic year is well organized and details are published on the website.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The teachers/students contacts are very good as the EEC has learned.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Underline specific negative points:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- The QA policy and strategy are still in their infancy. There is no fully operational QA information collection and evaluation system yet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- There has not been until now systematic formal QA evaluation of the programmes of study according to set procedures and criteria aimed at safeguarding their consistency and regular updating.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- There is no systematic, formal QA procedure for the assessment and review of the contents of the study programmes at either the graduate or the post-graduate levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The overall QA procedure has to be implemented including student participation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The EEC was not made aware of any opportunities offered to the teaching staff for their professional and scientific advancement such as internal grants, funds to attend conferences and various types of leaves.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- There is no departmental or institutional research strategy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Efforts to direct some funding to research from, say, post-graduate fees were not followed up. The ASPETE has a well-endowed reserves account, but the faculty members complained that the funds are not used to support research. There were ubiquitous complaints about lack of research support staff. Funding was not used for the laboratories.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- There are no procedures for the systematic monitoring, evaluation, review and improvement of the appropriateness and effectiveness of supporting services available to students, libraries, information systems, infrastructure, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- There is no institutionalized counselling and tutoring.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The EEC was not made aware of any efforts to seek institutional comparisons 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Regarding the undergraduate programmes, there is no formal procedure for taking into account the changing needs of society and for obtaining feedback by monitoring the graduates’ career paths.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The recommendations of the prior departmental evaluations were considered but not fully implemented yet.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

- The EEC recommends discussion of the course evaluation results between students and the teacher after the evaluation. The open publication of the evaluation results remains a remote but attainable goal and should be considered at the proper time.
• The EEC recommends that a student evaluation of the various supporting services (library, counselling, residence and food services, etc.) be conducted every semester in parallel with the evaluation of courses.

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

• The periodic evaluation of the programmes according to set procedures and criteria aimed at safeguarding their consistency and regular updating should be included in the QA procedures.
• The EEC recommends that systematic procedures for periodically evaluating the quality and extent of the research of individual faculty members as well as that of Departments be implemented.
• The EEC recommends the implementation as soon as possible of a procedure by which complaints of academic or social misconduct of faculty members can be dealt with at the institutional level by a systematic, carefully established internal procedure safeguarding the rights of all parts involved.
• The EEC recommends that academic advisor positions covered by a faculty member be created in each department. In addition the EEC recommends full deployment of the services of a Liaison Office, the Erasmus exchange Office, and the Practical Training Office.
• The EEC recommends to make every effort to bring the ASPETE-wide QA information system in full use and to link it with the other information systems in place at soon as possible.
• The EEC was not made aware of any efforts to seek institutional comparisons 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.
• The EEC recommends that the Institution develop a formal system to monitor the paths of all graduates. Furthermore the QAU/MODIP should systematically monitor the overall progress of students in their studies (progress rates, success rates in the examinations, drop-out rates, graduation rates, time to graduation etc.)
• The EEC recommends that the English-version websites be completed to contain the same information, especially when it could be useful to foreign persons.
• The EEC recommends that a formal QA procedure for continuous monitoring and periodic review of the study programmes be implemented taking into consideration all stakeholder opinions and needs.
• The EEC recommends that all the stakeholders (including the professional organizations and industrial actors) be systematically invited to express their opinions regarding the study programmes.
• The EEC recommends that a system be developed for following the graduates’ career paths both in employment and in further studies and used as an input for curriculum development.
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 (SARF)
  - 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 heads of each of the administrative services groups and the Secretary General of institution (Niki Kiriakopoulou). She presented the functions and services offered by each group. The presentations were supplemented with documents provided to the EEC and a visit of the main administrative building of the ASPETE and its facilities. The EEC was impressed by the professionalism, dedication, and attitude of the administrative services. Out of this interaction, our impression is that the administrative services team provides good support to teaching and research programmes.

The EEC was not informed about any the contingency plans to absorb any potential shocks due to central government circular regulatory changes, but it seem to exist a good collaboration between personnel to cover any gaps.

Administrative services have 52 members in total and some of them (12) belong to ASPETE (for student refectory and hostel needs). The Financial services have 4 members and they appear to work well. Meanwhile, new staff is needed especially for the IT services (only one member covering all needs of the campus). Also there was no administrative staff for the international affairs office that had one professor to cover the administrative needs. There was no permanent administrative staff for postgraduate studies, while for the legal affairs the Institution has a lawyer but without administrative support.

The EEC supports any effort to increase administrative personnel, and this is urgent.

The EEC was positively impressed with the use of IT and associated services for administration services of the Institution and students, but not impressed by how effectively IT is handled. IT services are handled in a fragmented way with unknown impact on security and ability to secure economies of scale. Software needs to be updated and many secretarial services should use IT systems.

There is care for students with special needs and occasionally the problems are solved by the staff when they appear. Only some of the buildings have adequate installations for people with special needs, while in others they have to move lectures to first floor.

The International relations office works well and has sufficient number of actions due to the personal sacrifice of the professor that keeps it but without any administrative support.

There is sufficient number of Social and cultural infrastructure but with limited number of activities it is underused.
The Hall of residence have sufficient number of residences offered by the Institution. The refectory services are worth of merit and all students have free meals.

An Employment and Career Centre (ECC) exists but is not operating due to lack of funds. Data about it can be found in http://dasta.aspete.gr/. Such information could be a strong point of the Institution. This initiative should be further enforced. However, it has unstable financial resources that threaten the continuity and quality of services.

The Institution’s library is modern and adequate for the size and needs of the Institution, but has lack of staff and opening hours are mostly guaranteed from temporary staff of other programs.

No Supplies department exists, and those services are performed through the department of finances (with 4 member of staff for the general needs of the Institution) and through the ASPETE (with 12 member of staff for the needs of student refectory and hostel). This department needs improvement.

There is a Technical services department with eight staff members that can be considered excessive due to unclear tasks to be performed.

There is a Special Account for Research Funds, with one member of staff and six staff members with limited-time appointments.

**Please decide in respect to the specific evaluation area (5.1):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Worthy of merit</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive evaluation</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially positive evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Justify your rating:

The EEC was impressed by the professionalism, dedication, and can-do attitude of the administrative services. IT services should be improved; additional staff should be hired. A better organization of QA processes is needed.
### 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:**
- Professionalism, dedication, and can-do attitude of the administrative services.
- Excellent support for student refectory and housing needs.

**Underline specific negative points:**
- Lack of staff in the International relations department as well as some other departments.
- Low use of IT.

**Make your suggestions for further development of the positive points:**
- Continuous training of the staff.
- Create appropriate facilities and services for people with special needs, providing solutions that are fast and discrete.
- Support DASTA services.
- Encourage the staff of the Research and other departments of the Institution to become proactive in revenue generation and entrepreneurial spirit.

**Make your suggestions on needed steps for improvement:**
- Increase the number of staff to improve the ratio of staff to students.
- Increase the use and upgrade IT services.
- Use the data collected from the QA system of MODIP to improve the operational processes of the administration and evaluate and reward the staff.
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:

General Remarks

ASPETE is governed by an externally appointed Governing Board that frequently changes, and as a result the institution’s staff and faculty may not be able to implement reforms. This situation has hardly contributed to the institution’s self-confidence and self-assurance about the institution itself and its future.

The Institution welcomes change, but the degree of achievable adjustment remains a challenge: dependence on the State for all important decision making, absence of bold initiatives and fear that actions may be crossing the lines of specific legislation with exposure to potential personal or collective risk.

Meanwhile, a strong willingness is noted to serve and clearly display loyalty to the institution, which motivates both administrative and academic staff, despite on-going challenges.

In the EEC’s view, the main challenges, in addition to the above, include underfunding by the State, insufficient number of staff, entering student class quality, small size of the institution, weak internationalization.

In order to face these challenges, a strategic plan undertaken in consultation with all relevant parties, is essential. Ability and readiness to improve should be reflected on the strategic plan and its implementation.

The internal system of Quality Assurance of ASPETE is still in its early steps of development and requires considerable further work, in order to become appropriate for a higher education institution.

Underline specific positive points:

- The mission of the Institution is clearly defined as that of providing education to technical secondary-level teachers.
- The EEC ascertained that ASPETE has strong intentions for QA and quality enhancement.
- The academic leadership shows commitment and determination to improve quality and is working towards excellence, as one of the institutional common goals.
- ASPETE has dynamic and self-motivated faculty.
- Several research units at ASPETE are productive, visible, and deliver good-quality research.

Underline specific negative points:

- The vision and goals of the Institution are not clearly defined.
- The absence of a detailed strategic plan.
- There is no coherent research orientation as a whole and research policy.
- Lack of strategic financial plan.
- The interactions with local and national industries is weak.
- On the technical side, there is very little interaction with the industry.
- The overall QA procedure is still not fully implemented.
- There are no procedures, well defined criteria, and benchmarks for self-evaluation of the Institution.

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

- Strengthen research development activity and ensure coordination among the leadership that would streamline all relevant research processes, including postgraduate courses. This would better focus research strengths and enhance visibility and the impact of ASPETE on local economy and society.
- Establish through existing structures, an office of development that creates communities, cultivates relationships, and generates fundraising opportunities.
- Identify and strengthen support to niche research and collaborations in both research and educational subjects.
- Enhance outward-looking policies to increase further synergies and partnerships.

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

- ASPETE should prepare a clear mission, vision, and goals statement that is specific, achievable, and that could be followed by any future GB.
- ASPETE should develop specific, realistic, and attainable targets, and should describe in a clear manner the procedures which it has to follow for achieving its goals.
- ASPETE should define a process and mechanisms through which the strategic plan of the Institution is established.
- A research strategy in terms of areas of emphasis of the Institution and of the departments should be developed, applied, and coordinated at all levels of the Institution. Synergies and collective efforts should be exploited.
- The pragmatic strategic planning process should ensure viability and set priorities for the Institution as a whole and for each Department, with an explicitly defined set of targets and time-lines should be developed and implemented.
- A set of processes and metrics that will support QA and continuous monitoring, assessment, and enhancement of programmes of study should be developed.
- Best practices within the Institution should be showcased to provide an incentive to reward best practices in teaching, research, professional activities, and service to the community.
- Efforts should be made to increase the number of staff and faculty members to arrive at a reasonable staff to student and teacher to student ratios.
- The Institution should develop closer ties to all external stakeholders.
- The EEC recommends that all the stakeholders (including the professional organizations and industrial actors) be systematically invited to express their opinions regarding the study programmes.
- The use of IT services should be increased and upgraded.
- The data collected from the QA system of MODIP should be used to improve the operational processes of the administration and evaluate and reward the staff.

---

**6.1 Final decision of the EEC**
Justify your rating:

Overall, the positive evaluations of the various aspects of the assessment overcome the negative ones noted above. Three points are considered: Satisfying quality assurance procedures are missing. The mission of the institution is clear and is fulfilled. However, strategic planning designed with clear goals and timetables, though considered as crucial in all aspects, does not exist at the moment. ASPETE should produce strategic planning and simultaneously implement fully its Quality Assurance system.
## The Members of the Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and Surname</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prof. Thomas Panagopoulos</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Algarve, Portugal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prof. Gabriel Colletis</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Université Toulouse 1, France</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prof. Kostas Giannopoulos</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neapolis University, Cyprus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prof. George Yadigaroglu</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eidgenoessische Technische Hochschule Zurich, Switzerland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prof. Yorgos Zotos</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus University of Technology, Cyprus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>