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The Committee responsible for the External Evaluation of the Technological Education Institution of Peloponnese comprised the following four (4) expert evaluators drawn from the Registry kept by the HQA in accordance with Law 3374/2005 and the Law 4009/2011:

1. Professor Emeritus Dimitrios Spigos (Chairman)  
   Ohio State University

2. Professor Emeritus Dionyssis Kladis  
   International Expert, Qatar

3. Dr Panos Konandreas  
   International Expert, Switzerland

4. Dr George Lyrintzis  
   Former Senior Researcher,  
   Institute of Mediterranean Forest Ecosystems, Greece
2. INTRODUCTION

2.1 The External Evaluation Procedure

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

In accordance with the established procedures of Hellenic Assurance and Accreditation Agency (HQA), the External Evaluation Committee (EEC) visited the Technological Educational Institution of Peloponnese (TEIPEL) from the 11th to the 15th of April 2016, in order to fulfil their obligation of an external evaluation process for the entire Institution.

On Sunday 10th, all of the EEC members held a private meeting in Athens to discuss organizational matters.

On Monday 11th, the EEC members were transferred from Athens to Tripolis, where Prof. George Stamelos, member of the Board of Directors of HQA made a presentation to the EEC members for the TEIPEL and the University of Peloponnese.

Subsequently, the EEC members were transferred to the premises of TEIPEL at Kalamata, where met on Monday 11th with:

- The President of the TEIPEL, the Deputy President for Academic Affairs and Personnel and the Deputy President of Finance and Development.
- The President of the Institution’s Quality Assurance Unit-MODIP and the internal self-evaluation team.
- The President, the Deputy President (externals) and one (internal) member of the Institution’s Council.

On Tuesday 12th with:

- The Deans and the Heads of the Departments of: a. School of Management & Economics-Depts. of Business Administration and of Accounting & Finance, b. School of Agricultural Technology and Food Technology & Nutrition-Depts of Agricultural Technology and of Food Technology & Nutrition and c. School of Health & Welfare Professions- Dept. of Speech Therapy.
- The Internal Evaluation Groups-OMEA representatives of the above Departments except the Dept of Speech Therapy.
- The academic staff representatives of the above Departments.
- The students’ representatives of the above Departments.
- The Institution’s General Secretary and the Heads of Administration Department.
- The post-graduate students and alumni of the above Departments.
- The external stakeholders: the Region Governor, the Deputy Region Governor for Messinia, the Deputy Mayor of Kalamata city, the representative of FARIS-Kalamata Municipality Organization, the representatives of Captain Vassilis Foundation, the President of Messinian Chamber, the Deputy President of Economical Chamber of Greece-Department of Peloponnese, the Head of the General Hospital of Messinia, the Director of the Special School of Kalamata, the President of the Papadimitriou C.C. S.A. agricultural food industry, the representatives of AGROVIM S.A., Compo Hellas S.A. and P. Kosteas agricultural industries and the Head of the Rural Economy & Veterinary Directorate of Trifylia.

Finally, the EEC members visited key representative Institution’s facilities like teaching halls, the Auditorium, the Olive Oil Taste Laboratory, the laboratory of Speech Therapy, the Library, research laboratories, the laboratory of Electronic Microscope, the open field, protected (in green-houses) and soilless cultivations, the refectory facilities and toured the campus.

On Wednesday 13th, the EEC members travelled to Sparta, where they met:
The Head of the Department of Computer Engineering of the School of Applied Technology.
- Professors of the above Department.
- Undergraduates and the alumni of the above Department.
- The Head of the Secretary and the administration officers of the above Department.
- External stakeholders: the Deputy Region Governor for Laconia, the Mayor of Sparta, the Deputy President of Economical Chamber of Greece-Department of Peloponnese, the President of the Traders Association of Sparta, the Director of the Central Public Library of Sparta, and the responsible of the Educational Centre of Lifelong Learning of Sparta.

The EEC members visited key representative facilities like teaching halls, the Auditorium, the Library and the research laboratories.

Subsequently, the EEC members were transferred back to Kalamata and visited the Residence-dormitories for the students and then returned to the premises of TEIPEL, for working on the draft of the External Evaluation Report (EER).

On Thursday 14th, the EEC members worked on the draft of the EER.

On Friday 15th, the EEC members worked on the draft of the EER and had an informal one-hour presentation regarding key findings to the President of the TEIPEL, the two Deputy Presidents, and other leaders of the academic community.

Upon completion of the presentation the EEC members were transported to Tripolis and together with the EEC members of the University of Peloponnese were transferred back to Athens.

Finally, on Saturday 16th, the EEC members were working on the completion of the draft EER and the submission to the HQA.

In the process of the visit, the EEC members examined the Institution’s Self Evaluation Report prepared by the Unit of Quality Assurance (MODIP), the Institution’s Strategy presented by the President of the TEIPEL, the List of ERASMUS courses for the period 2012-2015, the List of the Unit of Innovation and Entrepreneurship (MOKE) the List of Publications, the List of Congresses for the period 2008-2016, the List for Administrative Services and the questionnaires for the professors and courses evaluation, as well as for the Directorate of Computing & Technical Services.

Please decide in respect to the specific evaluation area (&2.1):

<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>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:
### 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

All the available sources and documentation presented to the EEC members were appropriate. The quality and completeness of evidence provided and presented was sufficient and reflects the institutional practices. The information was inclusive and adequate for the purpose of the EEC visit. The Institution’s Self Evaluation Report documents could have included information about the academic periods from 2014 to 2016, some of which was provided upon request.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Please decide in respect to the specific evaluation area (2.2):</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Worthy of merit</strong></td>
<td>Tick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Positive evaluation</strong></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Partially positive evaluation</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative evaluation</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Justify your rating:**
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 Institution’s mission is appropriate and comparable to those of the Technological and Educational Institutions (TEI) in Greece. In general terms, its goals are pragmatic and well described. The Institution’s vision is well articulated and has a sense of commitment to its goals. On this point, the EEC is impressed and feels compelled to express its appreciation for the institution’s enthusiasm and sense of community engagement efforts.

The EEC suggests that goals could be set more clearly and could be enumerated with a specific purpose and timeline. Goals and objectives can be accompanied with measurable steps towards their achievement. The Institution may have increased possibilities to achieve and monitor their set goals if these were internalized and articulated according to S.M.A.R.T. (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound) criteria. For example, the goal of the Institution to strengthen research is positive and encouraging, yet a more specific plan for action should be articulated by relying on the S.M.A.R.T. criteria. Administratively TEIPEL shows remarkable cohesion, at this stage of its existence, even though there are two separate campuses separated by the large Taygetos mountain range.

The EEC observed the commitment among faculty and staff for continuous improvement, which guarantees the Institution’s future success. The TEIPEL infrastructure, the staff’s skills and sense of optimism are the necessary ingredients for further and continuous improvement; therefore the EEC is confident the Institution will continue its successful course into the future.

TEIPEL fulfils a large part of its mission by providing the necessary academic and cultural environment. TEIPEL promotes good academic and research opportunities for faculty and students, who also are sensitive and have integrated well with the local community. By all accounts from administrators, faculty, administrative staff, students, and many representatives of the community at large, TEIPEL is an indispensable component of the community and contributes to the economic, social and cultural development of the region. TEIPEL takes advantage of the cultural and geographic advantages from its locations in Southern Peloponnese and incorporates them in its educational mission by focusing on areas such as: Business Administration, Accounting and Finance, Agricultural Technology, Food Technology and Speech Therapy. TEIPEL does have capable professors and state-of-art laboratories, the sine qua non, to becoming a leader in novel research in certain fields. However, due to the lack of adequate number of regular professors resulting from the state of the Greek economy, it is difficult for TEIPEL to fulfil its commitment. Nonetheless, to the level of its capacity the research and contributions are commendable and at times exceed expectations. The mission of contributing to the development of the communities of Kalamata and Sparta and the surrounding countryside has been fulfilled, as stakeholders at regional and local level as well as representatives of business community all agreed.

From the our visits to the TEIPEL buildings, grounds and the laboratories, as well as interviews conducted with faculty, students and alumni, the level of education and research conducted at all levels was above average. EEC members felt that students and alumni believe teaching and research conducted at TEIPEL is providing them with adequate knowledge, competence and skills.
TEIPEL in collaboration with regional and local authorities have sought funding and partnerships. This is an area, in which TEIPEL can be more aggressive and in which there is ample opportunity to leverage its unique and distinct geographic, agricultural, environmental and cultural characteristics to achieve better outcomes.

The fields of study at TEIPEL are well placed to meet professional and technical needs of the local community in Greece and Europe at large. The Institution focused in areas that will continue to be in demand in national and global markets.

TEIPEL has been very active, in seeking partnerships on many levels and aims to become a leader of ESPA/NSRF funding, which is a significant contributor in meeting laboratory infrastructure needs, as well as for paying the salaries of part time faculty. TEIPEL has the potential of becoming a leading academic centre based on its well-known agricultural products and its geographic location.

---

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

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

Justify your rating:

---

3.1.2 Organizational Development Strategy

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

TEIPEL President and Deputy Presidents have a collaborative relation with the President and members of the Institution’s Administration Council and are committed in achieving the Institution’s set goals. Despite the constraints imposed on them by the political and legal framework in which they operate, they work effectively together. Their commitment to the Institution and its operational needs is selfless and sincere. They are all well qualified for the positions they fill and work diligently, amicably, collegially to advance the Institution, while adapting to the financial constraints they face.

TEIPEL’s laboratories are in good condition, with many of the faculty indicating they are satisfied with the equipment and support that is currently provided which has heightened their ability to conduct their educational and research missions. In some of the laboratories such as in electron microscopy and spectroscopy lab and in oil tasting laboratory faculty proudly presented their equipment and set up, which makes their laboratories unique in the entire country. Faculty, students and physicians from Kalamata General Hospital have access and are supported by a state-of-art library that has an extensive collection of relevant books and periodicals. In addition and equally important they have access to three databases - HEALink (http://www.heal-link.gr/?lang=en), Agrotypos (http://www.agrotypos.gr/) and Nomotelia (http://www.nomotelia.gr/) - that allows...
access to 20 publishers, 12000 journals and 40000 e-books via computers either in the library or remotely from their homes.

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

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

Justify your rating:

3.1.3 Academic Development Strategy

- Response of the Institution to Faculties and Departments
- Goals and timetables
- Measures taken to reach goals

The EEC had the opportunity to recognize that some of the structural changes imposed upon the TEIPEL by the Athena Plan in 2013 did not foster the development of the Institution but rather hampered its efforts to improve its quality and to raise its effectiveness and efficiency. The EEC is aware of the discussions that took place and the concerns expressed by the Institution, as they have been outlined in its strategic plan. The EEC shares many of these concerns, especially with regards to the abolishment of the Department of Speech and Language Therapy, and the marginalisation of the Department of Computer Engineering in Sparta and the resulting ambiguities due to mergers of Departments, changes in content and replacement of study programmes by study tracks based on specialisations. The EEC is of the view that continuous uncertainty is detrimental for the development of the Institution’s academic strategy.

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

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

Justify your rating:
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.)

Beginning in 2001, all TEIs in Greece were legislatively empowered to conduct research. Therefore, TEI’s academic staff is expected to engage and conduct research. TEI’s junior academic staff is keenly aware that they must conduct research and publish in peer-reviewed journals in order to be promoted. The EEC is of the view that the staff’s expressed desire to pursue research should be matched by the development and implementation of a comprehensive research strategy at the institutional level.

According to the Internal Evaluation Report the key points in research strategy include: expansion of scientific laboratories; collaboration of the Institution in research activities; creating partnerships with public and private organizations by addressing local and regional problems.

Although state-of-art research facilities are generally in place, the existing laboratory research support including human resources is limited. Additionally, the academic staff is overloaded with teaching and administrative responsibilities, which hamper research activities.

In view of the above, the EEC feels that efforts should be made to foster partnerships with sister research Institutions, aiming at joint and innovative projects, increasing funding possibilities and strengthening the position of the Institution academically.

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

<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:

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 financial strategic plans follow the operational parameters determined by the funding provided by the state. In addition, the institutional leadership has explored and succeeded in arranging for the economic support of initiatives aiming at generating additional income.

From data presented in the Internal Evaluation Report and additional data given during the site visit, it is obvious that due to the country’s fiscal crisis budgetary support was reduced by about 70% during the period 2010-2015. Similarly an important reduction was also affected to the Public Investment Program.

The most noticeable impact of the financial constrains were on research and participation of the scientific staff in international professional meetings. Presently, in order to ensure its effective dissemination the only way to design and implement research is through participation in European programs.

The Institution has done a remarkable job in practicing fiscal restraint. However, it should also make additional efforts to create partnerships with local businesses and/or individuals to fund projects or support salaries for personnel recruitment. Also, the EEC feels that the Institution could explore further ways to generate income by providing services to local businesses or through charitable donations for the purpose of creating endowed chairs (professorships which carry the name of the donor).

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:

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

A strategic objective of the Institution is to further improve existing infrastructures and facilities, and ensure their good maintenance, so as to provide students and staff quality working and living conditions in a pleasant and sustainable environment.

The campus is generally attractive although not consistently as several facilities require improvements and regular upkeep in order to attain the standard expected from an institution of higher education.
On the other hand, several facilities of the Institution are of the highest quality. Prominent examples of quality infrastructure and facilities are the Institution’s modern and well-equipped library, the certified olive oil tasting laboratory, the state-of-the-art speech therapy facilities, all of which are located in the Kalamata campus, as well as the new and impressive Valiotis building in Sparta.

The Institution has also made some important strategic decisions by upgrading and improving key laboratory facilities and related equipment (such as the electron microscope and spectroscope) for carrying out experimentation and research in agricultural technology, food technology and nutrition.

These facilities and equipment allow the Institution to carry out high-level experimentation and applied research and thus help in differentiating itself from other Institutions, both nationally and internationally. In turn, this may help strengthening networking and building stronger research bonds with other Institutions and also in competing for grants and other resources, having demonstrated competence in unique applied research areas.

---

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Worthy of merit</th>
<th>X</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:*

---

### 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

Among the strongly expressed strategic objectives of the Institution is its environmental responsibility and there are good examples of this taking place.

As stated in the Internal Evaluation Report, all the Institution’s solid waste is channeled through the public waste collection network it is systematically processed biologically. The Institution participates in the programme of recycling of the municipality for the disposal of plastic, paper, aluminum, etc. as well as by having collection points for batteries, ink cartridges, the collection of caps of plastic bottles in the dormitories, recycling of cooking olive oil of the restaurant, etc.

The biological waste generated in the context of experimentation in the laboratories is properly disposed of, including the proper processing of generated by-products (seeds, oils, etc.) with the cooperation of local enterprises (e.g. for soap production).

Other concrete examples of environmental sensitivity and responsible practices include waste reduction measures such as the changing of internal working practices and adopting new technologies, such as implementation of an electronic registry system, electronic protocol and e-class, all of which entail substantial savings in the use of paper while offering improved services to students.
The Institution is also taking other steps to reduce its carbon footprint by reducing energy consumption and experimenting with a variety of innovative alternative energy sources. For example, a pilot project uses green form of energies such as photovoltaic, geothermal, Aeolic and other sources in an effort to meet part or all of the energy needs for research conducted in greenhouses.

The Institution has identified areas where more steps could be taken to reduce its carbon footprint, including: upgrading of its old building in Kalamata through better insulation, replacement of aluminium radiators as well as the replacement of all electric light bulbs with energy efficient ones. Another commendable goal of the Institution is to make maximum use of photovoltaic energy by utilizing the flat roof of its building in Sparta, in conjunction with necessary works to insulate the roof to avoid excessive heat in the summer and avoid occasional water seepage and humidity due to rainfall.

The Institution is also making concrete efforts to promote an environmental culture to the student body and the greater community by organizing and/or participating in initiatives aimed at the protection and/or upgrading of the natural environment, such as tree-planting of the Taygetos mountain following destructive fires.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Worthy of merit</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive evaluation</td>
<td></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 Institution has implemented initiatives that resulted in concrete results to reduce its carbon footprint as described above.

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

The Institution promotes and solicits strong and lasting collaboration with important players from the local business community and government administrations by streamlining and adapting, to the extent possible, its applied research programme to respond to the needs of the local stakeholders, especially in the agricultural sector. In turn, the local community is very supportive of this relationship with the Institution because of its economic and cultural contribution to society. Concrete outcome of this mutually beneficial relationship is the numerous cases of students carrying out their required practical training in local business with result in many of them being employed locally upon graduation.

The Institution also collaborates with numerous regional and national chambers of commerce in the areas of its competence as well as with relevant public organizations at municipal and district level in Peloponnese and other parts of Greece.
There is also evidence of good collaboration with entities promoting local pursuits (e.g. Captain Vasilis foundation) as well as schools of primary and secondary education demonstrating the technologies being developed. The Institution is also active in several initiatives that have a social dimension by helping vulnerable members of the society affected by the on-going economic crisis (e.g. distribution of food products produced in the context of its research activities).

While there are many examples of the Institution in promoting its research activities and seeking actively the development of sustained relationships with relevant local and regional organizations, the EEC considers that this effort is rather ad hoc and merits more systematic treatment by forming a standing committee to act as a liaison with major stakeholders in the public and private sector. This could help in a more targeted dissemination of knowledge generated by the Institution and transfer of technology, increasing the Institution’s visibility with activities that may have most impact, as well as attracting funds for additional demand-driven applied research.

Finally, the Institution has tried to stay in contact with its graduates and maintain a database on their professional development. This is on ad hoc basis, although the Institution appreciates its importance and the benefits from a more systematic tracing of the alumni by digital recording of their evolution and exploiting possibilities to benefit from their experience.

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

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

Justify your rating:

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

The Institution seeks to broaden its educational and research collaboration with other universities in Greece and abroad, so as to gradually strengthen its reputation. Among the means in achieving this objective is better identification of the unique strengths of the Institution’s academic programmes and the standing of its graduates in relation to other comparable Institutions and the needs of the market.

An important metric in the international dimension of the curricula of the Institution is the demand from international students in attending courses offered by the Institution. The Institution has the capacity to offer instruction to international students in some subjects as most of the staff are fluent in other languages (having obtained post-graduate degrees from abroad). During the last 3 years the Institution organized and offered courses in English and/or French for Erasmus students. The
Institution’s ERASMUS program is limited, primarily due to financial constraints. The Institution aims to further expand and improve such possibilities.

An important objective of the Institution is in improving its internationalization and its visibility by disseminating its academic work and applied research through outreach activities. There is good evidence that this objective is being achieved as seen by increasing number of research publications and participation of staff in international professional conferences.

The Institution is also keen to develop further options for post-graduate studies in collaboration with other Universities abroad. Such programmes contribute to making more relevant educational and research activities, including ensuring better correspondence and responsiveness to changing needs of the labour market.

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

<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:

3.1.10 Student Welfare Strategy

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

The Institution has its own dormitory building in the Kalamata centre composed of 232 beds of which 20 are used for hosting students of the Erasmus program, summer school students, visiting professors and guest scientists, exchange programs and cooperation with other educational institutions, scientific and research entities domestic or foreign. Eligibility of students for housing is based on well-established and transparent socioeconomic criteria.

The Institution operates a restaurant at its premises, which offers free breakfast and two meals to eligible students as well as access to others at a modest fee. Quality and cleanliness control of the company serving the restaurant is ensured by ISO certifications and HACCP.

The Institution facilitates access for people with disabilities in all its premises. Such access is possible in all areas (rooms, offices, laboratories, cafeteria, restaurant, library, secretariats) in both Kalamata (including the student dormitory) and Sparta.

The Institution maintains a small health facility providing basic health care to students and staff. Students who require specialized care are referred to the Hospital of Kalamata.
Sporting facilities in the Institution are rudimentary. The administration recognizes this problem and while there is an expressed desire to improve the condition by building an inside sporting facility, it finds itself unable to proceed with plans in view of funding constraints.

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

<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>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:

3.2 Strategy for Study Programmes

3.2.1 Programmes of Undergraduate Studies (first cycle)

Please comment on:

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

The programmes of undergraduate studies offered by the academic Departments meet the general requirements of quality education. Two of the academic Departments, those of School of Agricultural Technology, Food Technology & Nutrition, have undergone an external evaluation process. The curriculum is systematically reviewed and updated through an interactive process between the faculty and the students. The evaluation procedures with questionnaires improve study programmes. Students are generally satisfied with the curriculum. The students of the School of Applied Technology expressed a strong view that the curriculum is better when compared to those of comparable institutions. All students have access to e-classes, exercises, presentations and the laboratory infrastructure is modern and fully utilized.

Academic staff must deal with the reality that the academic preparation of the first-year students varies drastically representing a challenge in providing effective instruction in the classroom. One of the major weaknesses of undergraduate education at the School of Applied Technology is the limited number of academic staff.

While seen within their strict academic domains the programmes of undergraduate studies offered are adequate, there is an apparent lack of overall coherence and connect between the “technical” and the “management” Departments of the TEIPEL. The latter on “management and economy”, focussing on management of Local Administrations and of Healthcare & Welfare Units have very little to do with the needs of the core technical Department of the TEI (Agricultural Production and Food Technology) which could have benefited from an emphasis on entrepreneurial-ship by helping in adding value to the technical skills taught and the research undertaken leading to promising technological innovations. This includes such important areas as skills in drafting business plans, intellectual property protection, analysis of market trends for products being developed, possible financing and how to approach financial institutions, how to seek partnerships with private sector,
etc. It is recognized that this serious disconnect in the programmes of studies offered by TEIPEL is the result of its original architecture. However, the EEC feels strongly that this apparent disconnect is an issue that needs to be consciously and determinedly addressed at appropriate levels and needed changes in the TEI’s programme of studies need to be made for it to be able to respond effectively to the increasing exigencies for adding value to promising innovations for the benefit of the institution itself and society at large.

A number of students do not attend classes but are allowed to participate in examinations. On the other hand, practice in laboratories is compulsory, thus creating a problem of space and personnel availability in the laboratories. Financial constraints create problems for part-time staff recruitment.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Description</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:

3.2.2 Programmes of Postgraduate Studies (second cycle)

Please comment on:

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

The Institution responded to the need for postgraduate education effectively and placed itself in a favourable position by offering relevant programmes. Three postgraduate programmes offered by the Institution on “Finance”, “Techno-economic Systems for Healthcare” and “Controlled Environment in Agriculture-Soilless Culture”, while two others are offered in cooperation with other Institutions on “Historic Demography” and “Entrepreneurship and Governance”. The flexibility in the timetable of the offered courses facilitates attendance, in particular for working students and those that do not live in Kalamata. In general terms the postgraduate curriculum satisfies the needs of students as confirmed during the meeting with them. They expressed a genuine excitement about their postgraduate education and were positive about their choice.

In relation to the serious disconnect referred to above, the EEC is of the view that the postgraduate studies offer an opportunity for addressing this problem by judiciously choosing areas that create complementarities between the “technical” and “management” fields. In particular, postgraduate students could be guided in pursuing projects that offer opportunities for value addition of the valuable research undertaken in the TEIPEL.
Justify your rating:

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

<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:

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

Not applicable

Justify your rating:

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>
### 3.3 Profile of the Institution under evaluation - Conclusions and recommendations

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

**Underline specific positive points:**

- Institution’s vision is well articulated and fosters a sense of commitment.
- Commitment for continuous improvement, guaranteeing Institution’s future.
- Capable professors and state-of-art laboratories.
- Good collaborative relationship between the leadership of the Institution and the Administration Council.
- Institutional leadership has explored and succeeded in arranging for the economic support of initiatives aiming at generating additional income while it practiced fiscal restraint.
- Several buildings of the Institution are of the highest quality.
- Institution made some important strategic decisions by upgrading and improving key laboratory facilities and related equipment thus it differentiated itself from competing Institutions.
- Environmental practices represent a high priority of the Institution.
- Increasing volume of research publications and participation of staff in international professional conferences.
- The programmes of undergraduate studies meet the general requirements of quality education.
- The curriculum is systematically reviewed and updated through an interactive process between the faculty and students.
- Students have access to e-classes, and other instructive material and laboratory facilities.
- The Institution responded to the need for postgraduate education effectively by offering relevant programmes.

**Underline specific negative points:**

- Existing laboratory research support, including human resources, is limited.
- Sporting facilities in the Institution are rudimentary.
- Lack of complementarities in the programmes of studies (both undergraduate and postgraduate) between the “technical” and “management” Departments of TEIPEL.

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

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

- The EEC is of the view that the staff’s expressed desire to pursue research should be matched by the development and implementation of a comprehensive research strategy at the institutional level.
- The EEC feels strongly that the apparent disconnect between the “technical” and “management” Departments of TEIPEL is an issue that needs to be consciously and
determinedly addressed at appropriate levels and needed changes in the TEI’s programme of studies need to be made for it to be able to respond effectively to the increasing exigencies for adding value to promising innovations for the benefit of the institution itself and society at large.

- The EEC recognizes that the serious disconnect referred to above may take time to materialize. However, it is of the view that, in the short term, the postgraduate studies offer an opportunity for addressing this problem by judiciously choosing areas that create complementarities between the “technical” and “management” fields. In particular, postgraduate students could be guided in pursuing projects that offer opportunities for value addition of the valuable research undertaken in the TEIPEL.

- The EEC also feels that efforts should be made to foster partnerships with sister research Institutions, aiming at joint and innovative projects, increasing funding possibilities and strengthening the position of the Institution academically.

- The EEC feels that the Institution could explore further ways to generate income by providing services to local businesses or through charitable donations for the purpose of creating endowed chairs.

- EEC considers that the Institution’s effort in seeking the development of sustained relationships with relevant local and regional bodies is rather ad hoc and merits more systematic treatment by forming a standing committee to act as a liaison with major stakeholders in the public and private sector.
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

The EEC could not identify any concrete reference to the Institution’s policy for quality assurance either on the website of the TEIPEL or in any of its official documents. In fact, the QA policy of the TEIPEL appears to be interrelated with the overall mission and tasks of the Quality Assurance Unit (QAU/MODIP). In this regard, according to the SER, the Institution’s policy for QA could be the on-going improvement of the teaching and research performance and of the efficiency of the services offered by the Institution to its stakeholders (both internal and external).

However, the EEC considers quite necessary that the Leadership of the TEIPEL, together with the QAU/MODIP, make the QA policy of the Institution clear, visible and easily understood by all members of the academic community but also by the external stakeholders and the community at large.

The QA policy is implemented through the internal QA system of the Institution, which is based on the operation of the Quality Assurance Unit (QAU/MODIP) at institutional level and the Internal Evaluation Groups (IEGs/OMEAs) at departmental levels. The development of the overall internal QA system is an on-going procedure which is based on the guidelines of the Hellenic Quality Assurance and Accreditation Agency (HQA) and which follows the stipulations of the Greek legislative framework for Quality Assurance and the European Standards and Guidelines (ESG) for Quality Assurance in Higher Education. The TEIPEL has not yet finalised the development of its internal QA system. As the EEC was informed, the internal QA system is implemented only partially in some specific administrative units of the Institution. However, the characteristics and the goals of the internal QA system are in general described in the SER, and they were also discussed in some details during the various meetings. The EEC understands that the internal QA system will be based on a detailed and structured Quality Management System (QMS) and on its own Information System within the Institution. This QMS is expected to include guidelines for internal QA and analytical description of operating procedures and documents, aiming also at the standardisation of the management procedures. As for the Information System, the aim is that it will be linked with all the existing information systems within the Institution.

The QAU/MODIP of the TEIPEL is responsible for the effective operation of the overall QA system, the coordination of all evaluation processes within the institution, and the support of the external evaluation and accreditation procedure of the study programmes. A comprehensive analysis of the tasks and the goals of the QAU/MODIP is presented at the SER, while a shorter presentation of them can be found on the website of the QAU/MODIP. Additionally, the QAU/MODIP is responsible for the preparation of all documents that are used in the context of the QA procedures. It is worth noting, in this regard, that all basic documents of the internal QA system of the Institution, together with the external evaluation reports, are uploaded on the website of the QAU/MODIP.

There are no concrete and official structures and procedures in the context of the internal QA system of the TEIPEL to deal with appeals and complaints posed by students or staff for any kind of biased
interventions or discriminations. If such issues appear, it is upon the responsibility of the collective and participatory decision-making bodies of the Institution to handle them. Additionally, the students informed the EEC that they could raise any similar issue during their everyday cooperation with their professors and with the leadership of the Departments.

Students participate in the overall QA procedures of the institution through providing formative feedback on the courses, the study programmes and the teaching performance of the academic staff by filling the related questionnaires. However, they do not participate in the QAU/MODIP of the Institution and the IEGs/OMEAs of the Departments. In this regard, the EEC recommends that the TEIPEL should find the appropriate ways in order to motivate and ensure students’ active involvement also in the internal QA structures at both institutional and departmental levels.

The achievement of the objectives and the overall effectiveness of the QA system are ensured, on the one hand, through monitoring from the QAU/MODIP and, on the other hand, through the periodic external evaluations. Only two out of the five Departments of the TEIPEL have undergone external evaluation from the HQA. The remaining three Departments did not undergo external evaluation because of problems related to the structural changes imposed by the Athena Plan and/or because of specific directives given by the HQA.

Please decide in respect to the specific evaluation area (&4.1):

<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>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:

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 -where appropriate- placement opportunities

In general, the study programmes have clearly stated learning outcomes which are published in the Study Guide of each individual Department and are available online also in English. The Study Guide contains also information regarding the curriculum, the level of qualification, the organisation of
studies and the student workload expressed in ECTS. In the module descriptions, the following are described: the teaching methods, the relevant literature and the whole range of written, oral and practical tests/examinations; additionally, group projects, performances, presentations and portfolios that are used to assess the student’s progress and ascertain the achievement of the learning outcomes of each separate course are described as well. All information related to the study programmes is available in the Study Guides, which are uploaded on the webpage of the respective Department.

The study programmes are designed by the General Assemblies of the respective Departments with the participation of students’ representatives and are approved by the Assembly and the President of the Institution after consultation with the Dean of the respective Faculty in accordance with the stipulations of Greek legislation. Students’ involvement is also ensured through the questionnaires that they fill with regards to the quality of the study programmes. On the other hand, the involvement of external stakeholders (e.g. future potential employers) is only indirectly practiced through their participation in informal consultation and information procedures and also through the practical training of students offering important feedback and input with regards to the relevance of the study programmes and the curricula. The EEC has the view, and recommends to that aim, that the Leadership of the TEIPEL should take the appropriate initiatives to ensure on the one hand the more active involvement of students and on the other hand the involvement of external stakeholders in more direct and formal way.

The study programmes are expected to be reviewed and reassessed on a regular and periodical basis, while in parallel, according to Greek law, all study programmes will undergo an accreditation procedure in the coming academic year by the HQA. The involvement of students in the QA procedures of the study programmes is ensured through the questionnaires that they fill with regards to the quality of the programmes.

The EEC has realised that the international mobility of students and staff (either outgoing or incoming) is rather low. Therefore, the EEC recommends that the Leadership of the Institution and the Heads of the Departments should establish a strategy aiming to the improvement of international mobility. As regards especially the study programmes, they should contain provisions that encourage and reinforce international mobility and, where appropriate, placement opportunities. Especially with regards to placement opportunities, the EEC has the view that the TEIPEL should consider the fact that many students originated from Cyprus move to their home country in the context of Erasmus placement procedures. This is undoubtedly legal, but in fact it jeopardises the concept of the Erasmus mobility.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please decide in respect to the specific evaluation area (4.2):</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:

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

The EEC was informed that a variety of teaching methods are used especially in the practically oriented study areas. However, the EEC recommends that the teaching staff in all Departments, irrespective of the study areas and in cooperation with the students, should further explore the development of modern teaching methods on the basis of the paradigm of “student-centred learning”, taking also advantage of the e-class possibilities.

There are no multiple learning paths provided by the institution to accommodate special needs of students (e.g. part-time students, evening courses, summer courses etc.), apart from those related to some of the elective courses and the possibility to follow a study period in an institution abroad (international mobility).

Guidance and support are offered by various procedures to the students regarding progress in their studies, career information and study counselling. These are offered either by the teaching staff through direct contact with the students (formally or informally) or by established administrative structures (e.g. DASTA).

The Study Guide of each separate programme contains clear and detailed information with regards to the strategy of the respective Department for the assessment of students, and, more specifically, to which exams, or other methods of assessment, they will be subjected; what is expected of them; and which criteria will be applied for the evaluation of their performance.

Close cooperative relations have been established between students and staff, which allow for handling effectively any problem arising related to complaints of students. As the EEC was assured, there was no need up to now for an official handling of such problems outside the narrow space of the specific Department.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please decide in respect to the specific evaluation area (&amp;4.3):</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:

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

Admission of students to undergraduate studies is determined uniformly for all Greek HEIs by national entrance examination process administered by the Ministry of Education. As for the postgraduate studies, the admission requirements and criteria are described in the respective Study Guides that are uploaded on the webpage of each Department.

The recognition of qualifications obtained in foreign HEIs falls under the responsibility of the National Academic Recognition Information Centre (DOATAP - the Hellenic NARIC). Furthermore, each individual Department has the authority for the recognition of periods of study abroad in the context of Erasmus mobility. The EEC is aware that so far there have been no problems at all concerning the recognition of periods of study abroad for the outgoing students upon their return. However, it is not clear to the EEC whether this recognition policy applies also to courses abroad which are not consistent to the curriculum at home.

There are no provisions in Greek legislation allowing for the recognition of former knowledge gained through prior learning (including non-formal and informal learning).

The Diploma Supplement is not yet implemented in TEIPEL. The EEC recommends that the Institution should proceed to the full implementation of the Diploma Supplement according to the provisions of the Greek legislation without any further delay, with the aim to improve both the employability of graduates and the visibility of the study programmes.

The Institution has not yet implemented any systematic procedure for monitoring the progress of students during their studies. These data are expected to be collected (and analysed) through the Information System that is in place at the QAU/MODIP, when it comes to full operation. At present, this information is collected through the separate system on the student records that operates in the secretariat of each Department. The EEC recommends that the TEIPEL fully develops the Information System to that aim, so that the collection and analysis of data are conducted in a systematic way, and so that the Institution acts and be in position to take the necessary steps towards improving the progress of students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please decide in respect to the specific evaluation area (&amp;4.4):</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: The EEC is of the view that the Institution should stress its efforts in order that it fully implements the Diploma Supplement and that it takes full advantage of the Information System for the collection and analysis of data related with the progress of students during their studies.
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
- Opportunities offered to the teaching staff for their professional/scientific advancement
- How potential weaknesses of the teaching staff are identified as regards the delivery of their teaching courses
- 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
- 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
- Whether a regulatory framework is in place for the investigation of disciplinary and academic misconduct of the teaching staff

According to Greek legislation, the teaching skills are included among the qualifications required for the election of a member of academic staff. The procedure for the demonstration and assessment of the teaching skills is expected to be defined in the statute and/or the internal regulation of each higher education institution. The EEC has been informed that the statutes and the internal regulations of all Greek higher education institutions have not yet been approved by the Ministry of Education. In this regard, such a procedure is not yet in place at the TEIPEL.

The Institution offers opportunities to the teaching staff to pursue further professional/scientific development through participation in international conferences, seminars etc. and in international mobility programmes. The Greek legislation also provides for paid leaves of absence for educational purposes. However, the small number of teaching staff and its increased workload in teaching and management tasks do not leave enough room for them to take full advantage of these opportunities. Furthermore, there are no concrete actions or measures taken by the Institution in order to improve the capacity of academic staff with regards to innovative teaching and assessment methods, and in order to raise their teaching and pedagogic skills. The development of such actions and measures is something that the EEC recommends to the Institution.

The teaching performance of academic staff is evaluated by the students by filling the relevant questionnaires. The questionnaires are filled in paper and not electronically and then are collected, scanned and analysed by the QAU/MODIP. The outcomes are communicated to the respective Heads of the Departments. Each academic staff member receives the necessary feedback on his/her personal questionnaire. The EEC received controversial information from the students regarding their awareness on the outcomes of the questionnaires and regarding the real impact that the results of the questionnaires have on the quality of teaching performance of the various professors. The EEC recommends that the Leadership of the Institution works, together with the internal QA structures (QAU/MODIP and IEGs/OMEA), in order that the students realise the importance, the purpose and the impact of the evaluation procedure, meeting also the related concerns of the students.

The scientific activity and the research performance of the academic staff are considered also in their assessment for election and/or promotion. Moreover, the balance between teaching and research tasks of the academic staff is crucial for the overall operation of a HEI. It is under the responsibility of the Departments’ Heads to ensure for the balanced performance of the staff between teaching and research. In this regard, the EEC recommends that the Heads of the Departments ensure for the balance between teaching and research tasks, while at the same time the Leadership of the Institution should oversee the implementation of such a policy.

Finally, violations of rules of conduct from the academic staff may be regarded as cause for disciplinary action according to the provisions of Greek legislation and the Statute and Regulation of the Institution.
Please decide in respect to the specific evaluation area (&4.5):

<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:
The EEC is of the view that the Institution should put emphasis on the need to raise the teaching and pedagogical skills of the academic staff and also on the need to make the procedures of evaluation of academic staff by the students more effective and more inclusive.

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

The services that support students (Library, Information Systems, DASTA, students’ welfare services) as well as the administration service in each Department (Secretariat of Department) are subject to the systematic evaluation in the context of the internal QA system of the Institution under the overall responsibility of the QAU/MODIP. The EEC had the opportunity to realise the good quality of the available support services in regard to libraries, information systems and infrastructure, as well as of welfare services (especially student dormitory and student restaurant).

Furthermore, the EEC had the opportunity to realise the good quality of the educational infrastructure, including also the scientific-educational equipment. This reality was also communicated to the EEC during its meetings with the students. However, the unavoidable difference in quality between old and new premises has to be reported.

The TEIPEL puts emphasis on the operation of the supportive structures in the context of DASTA (practical training, liaison office and entrepreneurship) as well as guidance and consultation. However, it is not clear to the EEC whether the students take full advantage of these opportunities or restrict themselves to the face-to-face assistance received through direct contact between students and teaching staff.
Please decide in respect to the specific evaluation area (&4.6):

<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:

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

The TEIPEL has developed an Information System in the context of the QAU/MODIP. It currently offers a reliable means of collecting and processing feedback on the data concerning the questionnaires filled by the students for the assessment of the study programmes, the courses and the teaching performance of the teaching staff. The Institution does not take full advantage of the possibilities that may be offered by the Information System of the QAU/MODIP. The EEC considers important for the Institution to further improve the Information System of the QAU/MODIP and to link it with the other information systems in place at the Institution and primarily with the information system managing the student records and performance.

The student experience and satisfaction is measured through formal feedback (questionnaires filled and submitted on a semester-basis) and processed through the Information System of the QAU/MODIP. Apart from the database preserved by the DASTA, there are no processes for tracking systematically the path of graduates in employment or further studies. The EEC recommends that the Institution should develop a formal system to monitor the paths of all graduates building at the first stage on the database of DASTA.

Furthermore, the EEC considers important that the Institution should utilise the Information System of the QAU/MODIP in order to 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 Institution should utilise the Information System in order to seek 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, also in terms of research.

For other functions and activities of TEIPEL, the administration collects and analyses information from several sources; however, since there is no central design, these systems do not always interconnect and are not interoperable. Ensuring the total system integration is quite necessary in order to offer the top management a systematic means for monitoring the success of the strategic goals, or for drawing helpful conclusions for future planning and strategy.
The Institution needs not only to document the most important administrative procedures, but also ensure that all relevant documentation is effectively communicated to students, together with regular reminders of all administrative procedures. Course descriptions, assignments, presentations, exercises and solutions, laboratory guides and other useful material must be available online and coordinated by an appointed course administrator. The same holds for all kinds of useful information like events, important deadlines, lecture cancellations and any changes to timetables.

The EEC understands that it is not easy to accomplish a total quality information system taking into account the fragmented approach that has been followed for many years in the past. The near future vision should be to attain full interconnectivity with HQA’s Information System when this will be operating. Considerable fund savings could be achieved on a long-term basis if the Ministry of Education addresses the above issues with concrete, stable and durable plans.

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

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

Justify your rating:

4.8 Dissemination of information to stakeholders

Please comment on:

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

Detailed information on the degree programs offered, the expected learning outcomes, the qualifications, the teaching, learning and assessment procedures, and teaching staff curriculum vitae are available on the websites of each Department and the online Study Guides. The above data are illustrated in Greek and English languages.

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

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

Justify your rating:

The Institution fulfils all requirements for full publicity regarding the teaching and learning procedures through the websites of the various Departments.
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

The continuous monitoring of the study programmes of TEIPEL is conducted on the one hand through the procedures provided by the Greek law for yearly reconsidering and revising the study programmes (specific committees and General Assemblies of Departments), on the other hand through the typical internal QA procedures under the responsibility of the QAU/MODIP, taking also into consideration the results of the questionnaires filled by the students. Additionally, the recommendations of the periodic external evaluations are also taken into consideration.

The periodic review and revision of the study programmes take into consideration the recent international trends and developments in the respective scientific field through the involvement of the academic staff in the overall procedure. The changing needs of the society (in its wider sense) are currently affecting the review and revision of the study programmes through the input acquired from the practical training of students regarding the relevance of the curricula. The issues related to the students’ work load and the students’ progress in studies are taken into consideration through the respective questionnaires filled by the students, but also through their overall involvement in the process of programme review. However, the EEC recommends that the TEIPEL should aim to make the above procedures as systematic as possible in order to improve their effectiveness. The active involvement of students and stakeholders in the procedures should be among the essential means to that improvement. Furthermore, monitoring of graduates’ paths both in employment and in further studies is another important factor that should be taken into account for curriculum development.

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

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

Justify your rating:
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

The current external evaluation is the first one for the TEIPEL. External evaluations have been conducted only in two out of the five Departments of the Institution. The QAU/MODIP and the academic staff of the respective Departments monitor the implementation of the recommendations of the departmental evaluations. As for the periodicity of the external evaluations, it follows the provisions of Greek legislation and does not depend on the will or the plans of each Institution and each Department.

Please decide in respect to the specific evaluation area (4.10):

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

Justify your rating:

4.11 Internal System of Quality Assurance – Conclusions and recommendations

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

- Underline specific positive points:
  - All basic documents of the internal QA system of the Institution, together with the external evaluation reports, are uploaded on the website of the QAU/MODIP.
  - The study programmes have clearly stated learning outcomes which are published in the Study Guide of each individual Department and are available online also in English. The Study Guide contains also information regarding the curriculum, the level of qualification, the organisation of studies and the student workload expressed in ECTS. In the module descriptions, the following are described: the teaching methods, the relevant literature and the whole range of written, oral and practical tests/examinations; additionally, group projects, performances, presentations and portfolios that are used to assess the student’s progress and ascertain the achievement of the learning outcomes of each separate course are described as well.
  - The Study Guide of each separate programme contains clear and detailed information with regards to the strategy of the respective Department for the assessment of students, and, more specifically, to which exams, or other methods of assessment, they will be subjected; what is expected of them; and which criteria will be applied for the evaluation of their performance.
- Good quality of the available support services in regard to libraries, information systems and infrastructure, as well as of welfare services (especially student dormitory and student restaurant).
- Good quality of the educational infrastructure, including also the scientific-educational equipment.
- The TEIPEL has developed an Information System in the context of the QAU/MODIP.
- Detailed information on the degree programs offered, the expected learning outcomes, the qualifications, the teaching, learning and assessment procedures, and teaching staff curriculum vitae are available on the websites of each Department and the online Study Guides. The above data are illustrated in Greek and English languages.

- **Underline specific negative points:**
  - The EEC could not identify any concrete reference to the Institution’s policy for quality assurance either on the website of the TEIPEL or in any of its official documents.
  - Students do not participate in the QAU/MODIP of the Institution and the IEGs/OMEAs of the Departments.
  - The EEC has realised that the international mobility of students and staff (either outgoing or incoming) is rather low.
  - The Diploma Supplement is not yet implemented in TEIPEL.
  - The Institution has not yet implemented any systematic procedure for monitoring the progress of students during their studies.
  - There are no concrete actions or measures taken by the Institution in order to improve the capacity of academic staff with regards to innovative teaching and assessment methods, and in order to raise their teaching and pedagogic skills.

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

- **Make your suggestions on needed steps for improvement:**
  - The EEC considers quite necessary that the Leadership of the TEIPEL, together with the QAU/MODIP, make the QA policy of the Institution clear, visible and easily understood by all members of the academic community but also by the external stakeholders and the community at large.
  - The EEC recommends that the TEIPEL should find the appropriate ways in order to motivate and ensure students’ active involvement also in the internal QA structures at both institutional and departmental levels.
  - The EEC recommends that the Leadership of the TEIPEL should take the appropriate initiatives to ensure the more active involvement of students and the involvement of external stakeholders in more direct and formal way in the design of study programmes.
  - The EEC recommends that the Leadership of the Institution and the Heads of the Departments should establish a strategy aiming to the improvement of international mobility.
  - The EEC was informed that a variety of teaching methods are used especially in the practically oriented study areas. However, the EEC recommends that the teaching staff in all Departments, irrespective of the study areas and in cooperation with the students, should further explore the development of modern teaching methods on the basis of the paradigm of “student-centred learning”, taking also advantage of the e-class possibilities.
  - The EEC recommends that the Institution should proceed to the full implementation of the Diploma Supplement according to the provisions of the Greek legislation without any further delay, with the aim to improve both the employability of graduates and the visibility of the study programmes.
  - The EEC recommends that the TEIPEL fully develops the Information System to the aim of monitoring the progress of students during their studies, so that the collection and analysis of data are conducted in a systematic way, and so that the Institution acts and be in position to take the necessary steps towards improving the progress of students.
• The EEC recommends that the TEIPEL takes concrete actions and measures in order to improve the capacity of academic staff with regards to innovative teaching and assessment methods, and in order to raise their teaching and pedagogic skills.

• The EEC recommends that the Leadership of the Institution work, together with the internal QA structures (QAU/MODIP and IEGs/OMEA), in order that the students realise the importance, the purpose and the impact of the evaluation procedure, meeting also the related concerns of the students.

• The EEC recommends that the Heads of the Departments ensure for the balance between teaching and research tasks, while at the same time the Leadership of the Institution should oversee the implementation of such a policy.

• The EEC considers important for the Institution to further improve the Information System of the QAU/MODIP and to link it with the other information systems in place at the Institution and primarily with the information system managing the student records and performance.

• The EEC recommends that the Institution should develop a formal system to monitor the paths of all graduates building at the first stage on the database of DASTA.

• The EEC considers important that the Institution should utilise the Information System of the QAU/MODIP in order to 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 Institution should utilise the Information System in order to seek 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, also in terms of research.

• The EEC recommends that the TEIPEL should aim to make the procedures for continuous monitoring, periodic review and revision of the study programmes as systematic as possible in order to improve their effectiveness. The active involvement of students and stakeholders in the procedures should be among the essential means to that improvement. Furthermore, monitoring of graduates’ paths both in employment and in further studies is another important factor that should be taken into account 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

Regarding the Central Administration, all the Institution’s necessary services are adequate generally satisfactory. The Student Support Services are computerised as well as the Institution’s Library. The implementation and functioning of a Unique Students Registry from September 2015, by the Secretary of Academic Departments will cover the student affairs at Kalamata. Good practices of green development projects are implemented, and efforts should be made to increase the application of photovoltaic and geothermal systems, as well as reduction of water consumption by using underground water resources, mainly for the cultivations irrigation needs. Health and first aid services are in place.

However, there is lack of enough human resources at certain Departments (Expenditure & EU Framework, Research Projects). The students are not enough informed about the existence of Studies Advisor. The Institution does not offer foreign language courses, which are necessary for internationalization and research.

Please decide in respect to the overall Institutional evaluation:

<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:
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:**
  - administrative services highly satisfactory.
  - computerisation throughout including the Institution’s Library
  - implementation and functioning of a Unique Students Registry
  - application of good practices of green development
  - basic health and first aid services, including psychological support for students and personnel.

- **Underline specific negative points:**
  - lack of enough human resources at certain Departments (Expenditure & EU Framework, Research Projects).
  - students are not enough informed about the existence of Studies Advisor.
  - lack of foreign language courses, which are necessary for internationalization and research.

- **Make your suggestions for further development of the positive points:**
  - Strengthening further computerisation of administration procedures, thus reducing the administrative load and increase efficiency.

- **Make your suggestions on needed steps for improvement:**
  - All students should be informed about the Studies Advisor and his/her importance in guiding them throughout their studies.
  - The offer of foreign languages is absolutely necessary, inter alia, for internationalization and career development.
  - Implementation of friendly environmental projects should continue to receive priority, including recycling paper and waste materials.
### 6. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

**In connection with the**

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

*please complete the following sections:*

- **Underline specific positive points:**

- **Underline specific negative points:**
  - Lack of complementarities in the programmes of studies (both undergraduate and postgraduate) between the “technical” and “management” Departments of TEIPEL.

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

- **Make your suggestions on needed steps for improvement:**
  
  - The TEIPEL should respond effectively to the needs of the society and the economy at regional and local levels in consistency with the mission of the TEIs. In this regard, it needs to work and take initiatives in order to improve the tripartite cooperation between TEIPEL, the University of the Peloponnese and the Region of the Peloponnese.

  - The EEC feels strongly that the apparent disconnect between the “technical” and “management” Departments of TEIPEL is an issue that needs to be consciously and determinedly addressed at appropriate levels and needed changes in the TEI’s programme of studies need to be made for it to be able to respond effectively to the increasing exigencies for adding value to promising innovations for the benefit of the institution itself and society at large.

  - The EEC recognizes that the serious disconnect referred to above may take time to materialize. However, it is of the view that, in the short term, the postgraduate studies offer an opportunity for addressing this problem by judiciously choosing areas that create complementarities between the “technical” and “management” fields. In particular, postgraduate students could be guided in pursuing projects that offer opportunities for value addition of the valuable research undertaken in the TEIPEL.

  - Need for strengthening the procedures of evaluation of academic staff by the students. Foster active student involvement in filling the questionnaires, overcoming students’ concerns.

  - Encourage students’ active participation in decision-making procedures at all levels.

  - The EEC fully endorses the efforts of the academic staff of TEIPEL aiming to the improvement of research activity and improvement of its research performance. However, the EEC believes that this research activity should primarily focus on the principal research mission of the TEIs serving on the one hand the specific educational identity of the TEIs (focusing on the application of science, technology and arts) and on the other hand the role of the TEIs in the society and the economy. In other words, the research activities of TEIPEL should be purposeful and focused, aiming to meet the role and the mission of the TEIs.
The EEC considers that of major importance for the Greek Higher Education system is a stable environment in terms of legislation, funding and autonomy of HEIs. Continuous changes hamper the ability of HEIs to strategically plan, develop and improve, and undermine the quality of the Greek Higher Education system.

### 6.1 Final decision of the EEC

| Please decide in respect to the overall Institutional evaluation: | Tick |
| Worthy of merit | | |
| Positive evaluation | x | |
| Partially positive evaluation | | |
| Negative evaluation | | |

*Justify your rating:*
The Members of the Committee

TECHNOLOGICAL EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTE
OF PELOPONNESE

Name and Surname

Signature

Prof. Emer. Dimitris Spigos
Ohio State University, USA

Prof. Emer. Dionyssis Kladis
International Expert, Qatar

Dr. Panos Konandreas
International Expert, Switzerland

Dr. George Lyrantzis
Institute of Mediterranean Forest Ecosystems and
Forest Products Technology, Greece