



**Εθνική Αρχή
Ανώτατης Εκπαίδευσης**
Hellenic Authority
for Higher Education

**STANDARDS
FOR QUALITY ACCREDITATION
OF NEW UNDERGRADUATE STUDY PROGRAMMES
OF UNIVERSITY LEGAL ENTITIES**

September 2026

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE	4
STANDARDS FOR QUALITY ACCREDITATION OF NEW UNDERGRADUATE STUDY PROGRAMMES OF UNIVERSITY LEGAL ENTITIES.....	8
CRITERION 1. STRATEGIC PLANNING, FEASIBILITY AND SUSTAINABILITY OF THE ACADEMIC UNIT	8
CRITERION 2. QUALITY ASSURANCE POLICY AND GOALSETTING	11
CRITERION 3. DESIGN, APPROVAL AND MONITORING OF THE NEW UNDERGRADUATE STUDY PROGRAMMES QUALITY	13
CRITERION 4. STUDENT-CENTRED APPROACH IN LEARNING, TEACHING AND ASSESSMENT OF STUDENTS.....	15
CRITERION 5. STUDENT ADMISSION, PROGRESSION, RECOGNITION OF ACADEMIC QUALIFICATIONS, DEGREE AWARD AND CERTIFICATES OF COMPETENCE OF THE NEW STUDY PROGRAMMES	17
CRITERION 6. ENSURING THE ADEQUACY AND HIGH QUALITY OF TEACHING STAFF OF THE NEW USPs	19
CRITERION 7. LEARNING RESOURCES AND STUDENT SUPPORT SERVICES OF THE NEW STUDY PROGRAMMES	21
CRITERION 8. COLLECTION, ANALYSIS AND USE OF INFORMATION FOR THE ORGANISATION AND OPERATION OF NEW USPs.....	23
CRITERION 9. PUBLIC INFORMATION CONCERNING THE NEW UNDERGRADUATE STUDY PROGRAMMES	25
CRITERION 10. PERIODIC INTERNAL EVALUATION OF THE NEW STUDY PROGRAMMES.....	27
CRITERION 11. INITIAL EXTERNAL EVALUATION AND ACCREDITATION OF THE NEW STUDY PROGRAMMES	29

PREFACE

I. Scope of application of Standards, concepts and definitions

I.1 Scope of application

These Standards apply for the evaluation and quality accreditation of the new Undergraduate Study Programmes (USPs) offered by University Legal Entities (ULEs), as part of their initial application for licensing or at a later stage, pursuant to Article 140 of Law 5094/2024. These Standards set the criteria, indicators and requirements to be met by the USP, which are offered on site by the ULEs under review, in order to be compliant and granted with accreditation. As an exception, Medical USPs must comply with other specialised Standards, for which a separate regulatory act is issued by the Supreme Council of the Hellenic Authority for Higher Education (HAHE).

These Standards constitute the basic quality framework used by the U.L.E. under review in order to draft the self-evaluation report (following an **internal evaluation**) and submit its application for the USP accreditation; on the other hand, it serves as the basic framework for the **external evaluation** carried out by independent external experts, who assess the degree of compliance of the U.L.E. branch with these Standards. The **reference framework** of these Standards is the national legislation, in particular Law 4653/2020 (A'12) and Law 5094/2024 (A' 39) still in force, as well as the Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area (hereinafter called as ESG).

I.2 Reference Framework

1. The National Legislation provides that HAHE “evaluates and accredits the quality of services offered by Higher Education, based on specific, predetermined, internationally accepted quantitative and qualitative criteria and indicators, in line with the Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area” (Art. 145, par. 4 of Law 5094/2024).

2. The National Legislation also provides that the object of the accreditation is the assurance of quality in Higher Education as a public and transparent process (Art. 9 of Law 4653/2020, and Art. 145 par. 5 of Law 5094/2024).

3. The term of “quality assurance”, as the object of the accreditation, is used to describe all activities within the “continuous improvement cycle” (i.e. assurance and enhancement activities, [ESG 2015](#), page 7).

4. Similarly, the National Legislation underlines that “quality assurance in Higher Education promotes the optimization of the effectiveness and transparency of the overall operation of Institutions (Art. 9, par. 1 of Law 4653/2020).

5. The ESG set a common framework for quality assurance systems in learning and teaching at European, national and institutional levels. They apply to the entire higher education offered in the EHEA, regardless of the mode of study or place of delivery of the educational services. Thus, the ESG are also applicable to all higher education, including transnational and cross-border provision ([ESG 2015](#), page 7).

6. The ESG provide the criteria at European level against which quality assurance agencies and their activities (like HAHE) are assessed. This ensures that quality assurance agencies in EHEA adhere to the same set of principles, and the processes and procedures are modelled to fit the purposes and requirements of their national contexts ([ESG 2015](#), page 8).

I.3 Definitions

In these Standards, as in the Standards for Higher Education Institutions, each criterion aligns with the European criterion which is included respectively in the ESG and defined by indicators and requirements for the evaluation of compliance. This evaluation is conducted by the External Evaluation and Accreditation Panels, consisting of experts who form a documented judgement, as provided by National Legislation.

The use of the term “criterion” in the context of quality assurance, and of these Standards as well, refers to the requirement that needs to be met by a Study Programme in order to be compliant. Each criterion may have a qualitative and quantitative dimension (e.g. high quality of the teaching staff and numerical adequacy of the teaching staff.).

Compliance of the Study Programme with the Standards is achieved primarily through the implementation of policies, procedures, staffing, resources, structures, etc., as specified in the Standards’ criteria in accordance with the principles of quality assurance. Consequently, the assessment of compliance by an external quality assurance body, i.e. HAHE, is conducted with respect to the policies, procedures, staffing, resources, structures, etc., implemented by U.L.E.

The use of the term “indicator” in these Standards refers to a tool for assessing different qualitative and quantitative dimensions of a criterion. The values assigned to quantitative indicators are numerical, while the values assigned to qualitative indicators are scaled according to the degree of adequacy: adequate - partially adequate - inadequate. The indicators are not evaluated separately but they are co-estimated with other data and findings to form the overall evaluation judgment.

The use of the term “requirement” in these Standards refers to the obligation to provide evidence and documents deemed necessary for the evaluation of each specific criterion.

Consequently, these Standards consist of eleven (11) specific criteria for a Study Programme’s compliance, which are further specified by a description of their individual qualitative and quantitative elements. Each criterion specifies the requirements for submitting supporting evidence, which are necessary to evaluate the criterion, and the indicators which serve as the evaluative elements for the quantitative and qualitative dimensions of the criterion.

II. Evaluation Procedure

II.1 General Principles

The evaluation procedure is defined by Law (Article 145, par. 4–6 of Law 5094/2024, Articles 9–13 of Law 4653/2020) and it is based on the specialized, detailed and evidence-based assessment of external experts, following a review of the accreditation proposal and the conduct of an onsite visit, which includes interviews and discussions with the staff of the institution under review. These elements are evaluated based on the object, features and

mission of each USP, allowing for a documented adaptation to the specific nature of the academic field.

The assessment of each criterion is based on a comprehensive evaluation of the academic documentation, indicators, and findings of the external evaluation, in accordance with the methodological guidelines presented in Section A of the chapter entitled “Judgement of the External Evaluation and Accreditation Panel” below. The assessment of each criterion constitutes a process of substantive judgement by the experts and not a mere numerical addition or verification of individual elements or indicators. In making this judgement, the Panel does not merely examine whether a numerical or qualitative goal is met, but also assesses whether the educational processes are appropriate, coherent, sufficiently documented, and capable of leading to the intended learning and academic outcomes. The final evaluation judgement regarding the overall compliance of the Undergraduate Study Programme with the Standards is formed after taking into account the degree of compliance with each criterion, in accordance with the methodological rules presented in Section B of the chapter entitled “Judgement by the External Evaluation and Accreditation Panel” below.

This approach meets the fundamental objectives of (a) quality assurance, which consists of the systematic assurance and continuous improvement of quality and is not limited to a fragmentary or occasional compliance with individual requirements, and (b) accreditation, which consists of providing assurance that an Institution, an academic unit, a study programme, or an internal quality assurance system complies with the minimum quality criteria set by HAHE, which are in line with the Standards and Guidelines of the European Higher Education Area, as currently in force. Quality assurance in higher education promotes the optimization of the effectiveness and transparency of the overall operation of Institutions (see Art. 9, par 1 of Law 4653/2020).

II.2 Judgement of the External Evaluation and Accreditation Panel

A. Judgement of the Panel regarding the compliance with individual criteria

The degree of compliance with each Criterion of these Standards is structured in the following three levels:

1. Compliance:

The Programme meets the Criterion overall. Shortcomings may occur, but they do not significantly undermine the Programme’s ability to effectively comply with the Criterion.

2. Partial compliance:

The Programme meets some parts or aspects of the Criterion, but others are not met. These shortcomings limit the programme’s compliance with the Criterion.

3. Non-compliance:

The Programme does not meet the Criterion. There are significant shortcomings which prevent the programme’s ability to comply with the Criterion.

B. Overall judgment of the Panel regarding the compliance of the USP

To form the overall judgement, i.e. the Programme’s degree of compliance, the External Evaluation and Accreditation Panel considers the following:

- To achieve overall “compliance”, the Programme must not be characterized as non-compliant with none of the criteria; however, it may be partially compliant with up to three (3) criteria utmost.
- The Programme is overall characterized as “partially compliant”, if it is partially compliant with at least four (4) criteria; however, it must not be non-compliant to none of the Criteria.
- The Programme is overall characterized as “non-compliant”, if it is non-compliant with at least one Criterion.

III. Accreditation Decision

The decision of the Evaluation and Accreditation Council of HAHE may be positive, positive under conditions or negative, pursuant to Art. 12, par 1 of Law 4653/2020.

STANDARDS FOR QUALITY ACCREDITATION OF NEW UNDERGRADUATE STUDY PROGRAMMES OF UNIVERSITY LEGAL ENTITIES

CRITERION 1. STRATEGIC PLANNING, FEASIBILITY AND SUSTAINABILITY OF THE ACADEMIC UNIT

The University Legal Entities (ULEs) must have developed an appropriate strategy for the establishment and operation of new academic units and the provision of new Undergraduate Study Programmes. This strategy should be documented by specific feasibility and sustainability studies.

In particular, the following should be met:

By decision(s) of the authorized body, ULEs should address in their strategy issues related to their constitution in academic units and study programmes, which support the profile, the vision, the mission and the strategic focus of the ULE, within a specific time frame. The strategy of ULE should articulate the potential strengths, weaknesses, opportunities or/and threats from the operation of new academic units and study programmes, and plan all the necessary actions towards the achievement of their goals.

The strategy of their academic structure should be documented by specific feasibility and sustainability studies, especially for new academic units and new study programmes.

The feasibility study of new Undergraduate Study Programmes should be accompanied by a four-year business plan (or a five-year business plan, in case of a USP with a five-year duration of studies) to meet their specific needs in facilities, services, human resources, procedures, financial resources and management systems.

During the evaluation of the ULE and its individual academic units in terms of meeting the criteria for the organisation of undergraduate study programmes, particular attention must be placed upon:

a. The academic profile and the mission of the academic unit

The profile and the mission of the academic unit should be specified. The scientific field of the unit should be included in the internationally established scientific fields of Higher Education, as they are designated by the international classification of scientific fields in education by UNESCO (ISCED 2013).

b. The strategy of the University Legal Entity for its academic development

The academic development strategy for the operation of the academic unit and the new study programme should be set out. This strategy should result from the investigation of the factors that influence the studies and the research in the scientific field, the investigation of the institutional, economic, developmental, and social parameters that apply in the external environment of the ULE, as well as the potentials existing within its internal environment (as reflected in a SWOT analysis: strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats). This specific analysis should demonstrate the reasons for selecting the scientific field of the new study programme.

c. The feasibility of the academic unit and the study programme

The feasibility of the operation of the new USP should be justified based on:

- the needs of the national and regional economy (economic sectors, employment, supply-demand, expected academic and professional qualifications),
- comparison with other national and international study programmes of the same scientific field,
- the state-of-the-art scientific developments,
- the existing academic map. In particular, it must be analysed whether and how the proposed USP differentiates itself from the existing USPs, which are already offered by the HEIs and ULEs, along with the implications from the current situation of the academic map in the specific scientific field.

d. The sustainability of the new academic unit and the study programme

A Brief mention must be made to the facilities, human resources, funding perspectives, services and available resources in terms of:

- educational and research facilities (buildings, rooms, laboratories, equipment, etc.),
- staff (existing and new, per category, specialisation, rank and laboratory). A distinct plan is required for the teaching staff, documenting the commitment of the academic unit and the ULE to cover the necessary vacancies and to respect the timeline set.
- funding (funding perspectives from public or non-public resources),
- services (central, academic unit / student support, digital, administrative, etc.).

e. The structure of studies

A brief presentation of the studies structure must be made, concerning in particular:

- **The organisation of studies:** The courses and categories to which they belong; the distribution of courses into semesters; the alignment of courses with the European Credit Transfer System (ECTS).
- **The learning process:** The teaching methods and the assessment of students must be briefly presented.
- **The Learning outcomes:** Main knowledge, skills and competences acquired by graduates, as well as the professional rights awarded with the degree must be briefly mentioned.

These elements are specified and described in detail in the next criteria of these Standards.

f. The number of admitted students

- The suggested number of admitted students over a four-year period (or a five-year period for the USPs of a five-year standard duration) period should be specified.
- Any similar departments in other HEIs and other ULEs should be mentioned.

g. Research

- It is necessary to indicate research priorities in the scientific field, opportunities for interdisciplinary research, the challenges towards new knowledge, possible research collaborations, etc.

h. Quality assurance

- The quality assurance policy and goalsetting of the U.L.E. branch should be overall stated.

Criterion Evaluation Requirements

The following must be submitted:

- 1.1 Explanatory report by the ULE, addressing the above points with the necessary documentation.
- 1.2 Strategic Plan of the ULE, including its suggested academic structure and a SWOT analysis on a ULE level.
- 1.3 Feasibility and sustainability studies for the establishment and operation of the new academic unit and the new study programme.
- 1.4 Four-year planning of the USP operation (or five-year planning for a five-year USP), including an annual recording of the intended number of students, the USP staffing with teaching, administrative and technical staff, the key operational and development needs, the financial resources required respectively and the main deadlines for their implementation.

Quantitative/Qualitative Indicators

1. Compatibility of the new USP with the Institution's strategy (education and research)
2. Feasibility study adequacy
3. Sustainability study adequacy
4. 100% coverage of the USP's staff needs for its first year of operation, with at least 3 members of the teaching staff working on a full-time basis.
5. 100% coverage of the USP's overall staff needs within a 3-year period, after the USP's starting date of operation (or within a 4-year period for the 5-year USPs).
6. 100% Financial coverage of the anticipated annual operational and development needs of the USP for the first 4 years of operation (or 5 years for the 5-year USPs).

CRITERION 2. QUALITY ASSURANCE POLICY AND GOALSETTING

The University Legal Entities, in the context of the internal quality assurance system, should form and apply a Quality Assurance Policy, as part of its strategy, which should specialise in the operation of the new study programmes, and be accompanied by the annual quality assurance goalsetting for their continuous development and improvement.

This criterion aligns with ESG 1.1.

In particular, the following should be met:

a. Drafting and submission of the Quality Policy Statement

The quality policy of the academic unit offering the USP should be expressed as a written statement, which should be approved by the academic unit, implemented by all stakeholders and published.

The quality assurance policy statement sets the framework for the academic unit in order to implement continuous improvement, based on the quality assurance policy of the Institution. The quality assurance policy supports the development of a quality culture and the public accountancy of the academic unit which offers the USP. It is based upon the fundamental rights of academic independence, equal treatment, professional conduct and ethics, as well as upon the Standards and Guidelines of the European Higher Education Area.

According to the quality policy, the academic unit is committed to:

- Draft and respect the policy procedures, and monitor the effectiveness of their implementation, based upon the Quality Standards involved.
- Provide adequate resources for the USP operation and care for the adequacy and competence of the teaching staff, the quality of the learning environment, the quality of supportive services and the adequacy of their staffing.
- Conduct regularly and periodically the intended internal and external evaluations and proceed with the implementation of the continuous improvement cycle of the USP based on their results.

The quality procedures are specified and described in Criteria 3-11 of these Standards.

b. Drafting and submission of quality goalsetting

The quality assurance policy is implemented and monitored based on annual quality goals. According to the S.M.A.R.T. methodology, the following should be defined for each annual quality goal:

- The strategic goal connected with the respective indicator, which serves as the basis for measuring the goal's progress
- The base value of the indicator
- The target value of the indicator
- The time needed to achieve the goal
- The authorized body or person for the goal's implementation

The achievement of quality goals should be followed at least on an annual basis; in case of significant divergencies, documented corrective or improvement actions should be taken consequently.

c. Recording of quality data in the National Information System for Quality Assurance (NISQA)

The ULE records in the National Information System for Quality Assurance (NISQA) of HAHE a number of data, including students details (admissions, transfers, graduations, drop-out rates), details of the teaching and administrative staff, study programmes, facilities, financing and research activity on an annual basis, according to the instructions of HAHE and the related manuals for quality data and indicators, which are published in the digital platform.

Especially for the initial accreditation, the only data recorded are those referring to the identity of the USP, which are monitored by the subsystem entitled “Institutions Register” of the NISQA.

Criterion Evaluation Requirements

The following should be submitted:

- 2.1 Quality Policy Statement, with reference to the authorized Quality Assurance agencies and related procedures.
- 2.2 Quality Goalsetting (using the S.M.A.R.T. methodology)

Qualitative/Quantitative Indicators

1. Publication of the quality policy statement and related procedures on the Academic Unit’s website.
2. Completeness of the quality policy statement (with reference to the Institution’s strategy, structures, procedures, quality assurance bodies and stakeholders).
3. Quality goalsetting adequacy and procedures for monitoring and response.
4. Number of measurable goals in the annual quality goalsetting of the USP (indicatively 10 goals).
5. Completeness of compulsory quality data records in NISQA (100% of the fields in the Institutions Register during the initial accreditation).
6. Participation of stakeholders in the authorized quality assurance bodies of the USP (at least 1 representative of the parent Institution and 1 students’ representative).

CRITERION 3. DESIGN, APPROVAL AND MONITORING OF THE NEW UNDERGRADUATE STUDY PROGRAMMES QUALITY

The ULEs should design their new USPs following a specific written procedure, which should provide for the participants, the information sources and the approving bodies of the programme. The goals, the expected learning outcomes, the intended professional qualifications and the ways to achieve them are set out in the USP design. The above details, as well as the information on the programme's structure, are published in the Student Guide.

This criterion aligns with ESG 1.2

In particular, the following should be met:

a. Design and approval of the USP

The authorized bodies of the parent Institution and the ULE should submit the official design and approval procedure of the USP, which involves the participation of teaching staff, students and other stakeholders, including the information sources related to the above design.

b. Academic profile, structure, ECTS and learning outcomes

The approved design of the SP should be submitted, defining the academic profile, the identity and orientation of the USP, its goals, subjects, structure and organisation, the expected learning outcomes which correspond to the level of the awarded degree, in accordance with the European and National Qualifications Framework for Higher Education, and the intended professional qualifications. The USP should deeply cover the key subjects which correspond to the degree and scientific field of the programme, according to international academic practice and, where applicable, to the recognized academic or professional qualifications. The USP also provides the development of digital skills and literacy in Artificial Intelligence, in a way that embraces the programme's subject matter.

The design of the study programme should also specify the total number of ECTS credits for the USP, the distribution of courses, the required courses, and their sequence. Each semester of full-time study corresponds to 30 credits, and each academic year to 60 credits, while the total number of the USP's ECTS credits is consistent with the expected duration of studies and the requirements of Greek legislation for the corresponding level and type of studies. The allocation of ECTS credits per course or other educational activity (e.g. internship) is based on the student's total workload in accordance with the European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System (ECTS). For each course, the contact hours are clearly specified, along with their division, where applicable, into lectures, tutorials, seminars, laboratories, clinical and practical training. All contact hours should take place in person and at the designated locations; they should be evaluated as part of the USP accreditation and they should be provided exclusively to students enrolled in that specific USP, without any joint instruction

with students from programmes of other educational agencies. The scheduled teaching hours and the total workload must be sufficient to achieve the learning outcomes.

The link between teaching and research, including the international experience in USPs of a similar subject matter, the provision of work experience opportunities to students, and the consideration of labour market data with the graduates' employment prospects are also documented

Criterion Evaluation Requirements

The following should be submitted:

- 3.1 Procedure of designing, approving and monitoring the USP.
- 3.2 Decision(s) of the authorised bodies on the establishment of the USP.
- 3.3 Draft Curriculum of the new USP (with special reference to any courses providing the acquisition of digital skills).
- 3.4 Student Guide.
- 3.5 Courses outlines (including the least expected learning outcomes, teaching methods and assessment methods per course).

Qualitative /Quantitative Indicators

- 1. Completeness and suitability of procedures concerning the design and approval of the USP.
- 2. Fitness for purpose of the expected learning outcomes concerning the level of study and the awarded degree.
- 3. USP's adequacy in covering the key subject areas of the degree.
- 4. Total ECTS credits of the USP, depending on the standard duration of studies (240 ECTS for a 4-year and 300 ECTS for a 5-year USP).
- 5. Student workload per ECTS credit (25–30 hours per ECTS).
- 6. Credits corresponding to an internship or organised work experience, where applicable (minimum 5 ECTS).
- 7. Credit units for the thesis, where applicable (minimum 10 ECTS).

CRITERION 4. STUDENT-CENTRED APPROACH IN LEARNING, TEACHING AND ASSESSMENT OF STUDENTS

ULEs should ensure that the new Undergraduate Study Programmes provide students with the necessary conditions that will encourage them to take an active role in the learning process. The assessment methods of students should therefore be designed to reflect this approach.

This criterion aligns with ESG 1.3.

In particular, the following should be met:

a) Implementation of the student-centered learning approach in teaching and students' assessment.

The student-centred approach in learning should:

- Respect the students' diversity and their multiple needs,
- Investigate the students' background knowledge and adapt teaching accordingly,
- Use different modes of teaching and a variety of pedagogical methods,
- Regularly evaluate the methods of teaching, learning and assessment,
- Evaluate the quality and effectiveness of teaching,
- Reinforce the student's autonomy, while providing sufficient guidance and support,
- Promote mutual respect in the student-teacher relationship,
- Apply procedures for managing students' complaints,
- Enable students to form their individual studies path through the elective courses
- Provide the appropriate procedures for dealing with extraordinary situations which affect the attendance or the academic performance of students.

b) Student assessment

Student assessment methods should be tailored to the expected learning outcomes; they should be applied based on predetermined criteria, which should be published, consistent and transparent. Feedback should be provided to students to support their continuous improvement.

c) Transparency and rights

The methods, criteria, and coefficients of the individual course assessment criteria in the final grade should be communicated in a timely manner. For the evaluation of teaching by students, feedback procedures should be launched using questionnaires that students should be encouraged to complete. To strengthen support and guidance for students, a complaints and appeals policy should be in force, as well as a procedure for academic counselling.

d) Academic integrity

Clear rules should be provided to ensure academic integrity and validity of the assessment, including rules against plagiarism and rules regulating the use of Artificial Intelligence tools.

Criterion Evaluation Requirements

The following should be submitted:

- 4.1 Internal operating regulation of the new USP, which describes at least the principles and procedures of the student-centered learning and teaching approach, the methods and rules for students' assessment, feedback mechanisms, complaints and appeals procedures, academic counselling and rules for academic integrity.
- 4.2 A questionnaire template for the evaluation conducted by students.
- 4.3 Regulation for the students' complaints and appeals management mechanism.
- 4.4 Regulation for the position of the academic advisor.

Qualitative /Quantitative Indicators

- 1. Completeness of the student-centred learning procedures.
- 2. Suitability of the assessment procedures as to the expected learning outcomes.
- 3. Sufficiency of procedures concerning the evaluation of teaching.
- 4. Sufficiency of the Complaints Management policy.
- 5. Sufficiency of the students' feedback mechanism; sufficiency of counselling and support procedures.
- 6. Frequency of the teaching evaluation conducted by students (per semester and per course).
- 7. The rate of courses using predefined and published criteria, and methods for the students assessment (100%).
- 8. Rate of academic advisor per students (for example 1:30).
- 9. Maximum response time to student complaints and appeals (30 calendar days).

CRITERION 5. STUDENT ADMISSION, PROGRESSION, RECOGNITION OF ACADEMIC QUALIFICATIONS, DEGREE AWARD AND CERTIFICATES OF COMPETENCE OF THE NEW STUDY PROGRAMMES

ULEs should develop regulations addressing all aspects and phases of studies of the Programme (admission/initiation of studies, progression, recognition of studies and degree award).

This criterion aligns with ESG 1.4.

In particular, the following should be met:

a) Selection, enrollment, and commencement of studies

Clear and publicly available procedures should be established for the selection and registration of newly admitted students, the required supporting documents, support services for first-year students, rights and obligations of all students.

b) Student Progression

Specification of procedures for monitoring the academic progress, requirements for progression, and duration of studies.

c) Internships, Scholarships, Theses, and Student Mobility

Specification of internship and scholarship details, procedures and requirements for writing the thesis, and terms and conditions for student mobility.

d) Recognition of Studies and ECTS Credits

Recognition procedures are based on relevant academic practices for the recognition and transfer of credits between different Departments and Institutions in Europe, in accordance with the principles of the Lisbon Convention on the Recognition of Academic Qualifications. The transfer of ECTS credits to a USP of a ULE is permitted only for studies attended at a recognized Institution of Higher Education.

e) Degree award

Graduation marks the completion of the period of studies. Graduates receive the relevant documents describing their specialization and their learning outcomes, as well as the knowledge context, level, content, and status of studies they have successfully attended and completed. The ULE awards the degree of the parent Institution.

Criterion Evaluation Requirements

The following should be submitted:

5.1 Regulation of Studies (including internship, mobility and postgraduate/undergraduate thesis details).

5.2 Degree and Diploma supplement templates.

Qualitative/Quantitative Indicators

1. Completeness of Studies Regulation.
2. Clear, objective, appropriate and published criteria for student admission or transfer.
3. Clear and appropriate framework for scholarship granting.
4. Clear and appropriate framework for part-time attendance, suspension of studies, degree award and student deletion.
5. Standard duration of studies of the USP
4 years (8 semesters) or 5 years (10 semesters).
6. Maximum duration of studies
v+2 years for a 4-year USP, v+3 for a 5-year USP.
7. Rate of recognisable ECTS credits, acquired from another Institution to the total ECTS number required for the Degree (max. 50%).
8. Automatic and free granting of the Degree in Greek and English (to 100% of students).

CRITERION 6. ENSURING THE ADEQUACY AND HIGH QUALITY OF TEACHING STAFF OF THE NEW USPs

ULEs should assure themselves of the adequacy, level of knowledge and competence of their academic units' teaching staff, and apply fair and transparent procedures for recruitment, training and further development.

This criterion aligns with ESG 1.5.

In particular, the following should be met:

a. Staff selection and development

Clear, transparent, and merit-based procedures for selecting teaching staff should be applied. Opportunities for training, professional development and mobility should also be provided. Research activity and participation in conferences should be supported, together with a policy of attracting high-quality teaching staff.

b. Adequacy of staff and coverage of subject areas

ULEs should ensure the numerical and qualitative adequacy of the teaching staff. ULEs should also make sure that the key scientific fields of the USP are covered sufficiently by staff of related categories and subject areas. The adequacy should be documented in terms of actual Full-Time Equivalents (FTE), taking into account the number of students, the structure and requirements of the USP, the total academic workload, and its specific educational requirements, including laboratory, practical, or clinical training. The Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) is a unit of measurement that expresses the workload of a full-time employee, enabling comparisons between employees with different work schedules (part-time, seasonal work, etc.). The ratio of students to Full-Time Equivalents of teaching staff is documented and compared with the corresponding ratio of the parent Institution or other USPs of the same or a related scientific field. The core curriculum of the USP and most of the required teaching work should be covered by members of the teaching staff who work under a full-time status in the ULE. A specifically designated and academically qualified course leader should be appointed to each course of the first year. The ULE should also provide specific staffing plans for the next academic years, until the USP is fully developed.

c. Quality of Teaching and Research Work

ULEs should document the academic qualifications and their relevance to the proposed teaching work, the development of research activity and research performance of the teaching staff, previous experience in linking research and education, innovation in teaching methods, and use of new technologies. The evaluation of the research work quality should be based primarily on qualitative academic judgment, considering quantitative indicators and selected research achievements and in accordance with the principles of responsible research evaluation.

Criterion Evaluation Requirements

The following should be submitted:

- 6.1 Procedures and criteria for teaching staff selection.
- 6.2 Regulations or employment draft contracts, obligations of the teaching staff.
- 6.3 Policy on staff recruitment, support and development.
- 6.4 Teaching staff (name list and subject areas, degrees, employment relation, assignment of teaching work to the USP or other USPs, actual Full-Time Equivalent in the specific USP).
- 6.5 Table presenting the total actual FTE of full-time teaching staff in the USP, the number of students and the teachers-to-students ratio, according to the Institution's planning, annually and for a 4-year period (or 5 years in case of a five-year USP).
- 6.6 Documentation of the academic, teaching, and research qualifications of the teaching staff, including, for each member the title, institution and year of acquisition of his/her doctoral degree, teaching experience at HEIs, research experience, the number of publications and citations, the h-index, as well as up to 6 selected research papers, funded research projects and other scientific achievements or distinctions from the past five years.

QUALITATIVE / QUANTITATIVE INDICATORS

1. Fit-for-purpose procedure for staff selection and development.
2. Adequacy of the teaching staff who will cover the subject areas of the USP and support the student-centred learning approach.
3. Quality of research and teaching work of the teaching staff.
4. Rate of ECTS credits for required courses taught by members of the teaching staff of the ULE Branch under a full-time employment contract (minimum 60%).
5. Rate of teaching staff holding a Doctoral Degree relevant to their instruction subject (minimum 90%, including the exceptions provided by Law).
6. Rate of first-year courses with a specifically designated and academically qualified course leader (100%).
7. Rate of teaching staff with documented proficiency in the programme's language of instruction (100%).

CRITERION 7. LEARNING RESOURCES AND STUDENT SUPPORT SERVICES OF THE NEW STUDY PROGRAMMES

ULEs should have adequate funding to cover all their teaching and learning needs. They should provide sufficient facilities and services for student learning and support and they should facilitate direct access by establishing internal rules (e.g., lecture rooms, laboratories, libraries, networks, food and housing, career and social policy services, etc.).

This criterion aligns with ESG 1.6.

In particular, the following should be met:

a. Adequacy of Learning Resources and Services

Adequate resources and facilities should be available to support learning and academic activities, such as libraries, study rooms, educational and scientific equipment, information and communication services, and support or counseling services. Their adequacy should be documented in relation to the number of students and the requirements of the specific USP.

b. Needs of Different Student Groups

When allocating and distributing resources, the needs of all students should be taken into consideration, including full-time and part-time students, working students and students with disabilities, with respect to the student-centred learning approach.

c. Laboratory, clinical and practical activities

The capacity for each laboratory, clinical or practical activity should be sufficient for all students who are required to attend. The availability of any external collaborations which are necessary for the implementation of the educational activities required should also be documented.

d. Supporting staff

The supporting, technical and administrative staff should be numerically adequate to ensure the smooth operation of the USP; they should possess the appropriate qualifications to provide relevant services and they should be given opportunities for further professional training and skills development.

Criterion Evaluation Requirements

The following should be submitted:

- 7.1 Description and documentation of the adequacy of facilities and services available for the new USP, with reference to the capacity of lecture rooms, library, laboratories and other necessary educational spaces, as well as to their potential use by the USP under review, by currently operating programmes or other proposed USPs. The availability

of external facilities or collaborations for mandatory educational activities should also be documented where applicable.

7.2 Administrative/technical supporting staff of the new USP (job descriptions, qualifications and responsibilities).

7.3 Information material provided to students with reference to the available services.

Qualitative / Quantitative Indicators

1. Adequacy of available learning resources and services for the new USP, considering the use by other USPs of the Branch as well, until the Programme is fully operational.
2. Availability and suitability of a digital educational platform to support the educational process.
3. Adequacy and suitability of administrative, technical and supporting staff for all students in the USP.
4. Capacity for required laboratory, clinical or practical activities, where applicable (100% coverage of students required to attend).
5. Access to digital literature and scientific resources relevant to the USP for 100% of the students and teaching staff.

CRITERION 8. COLLECTION, ANALYSIS AND USE OF INFORMATION FOR THE ORGANISATION AND OPERATION OF NEW USPs

The ULEs and their academic units bear full responsibility for collecting, analysing and using information, aimed at the effective management of the USPs and their related activities, in an integrated, effective and easily accessible way.

This criterion aligns with ESG 1.7.

In particular, the following should be met:

a. Collection of key data

The procedures for collecting and analysing information must cover at a minimum the following categories of data during the period of full operation of the Study Programme:

- applications, admissions and enrollments,
- transfers and credit transfers/recognition,
- number of active students per academic year,
- academic progress and ECTS credits,
- pass/fail rates per course,
- drop-out rates,
- completion rates and duration of studies,
- student evaluation and satisfaction,
- teaching staff and Full-Time Equivalents,
- ratio of students to teaching staff,
- practical or clinical training,
- graduates,
- complaints and appeals.

b. Data Quality

The data should be complete, accurate, verifiable and available at the level of the specific USP, after they have been entered into the National Information System for Quality Assurance (NISQA) of HAHE, in accordance with the instructions in the relevant user manual. For each key indicator, the definition, source, and calculation method should be also specified.

c. Analysis and Use

The key indicators are analysed at least annually, tracked over time and used by the academic unit and the Institution to evaluate and improve the USP. They should also be available for analysis by HAHE for quality assurance purposes and for supporting the national strategy for Higher Education.

Criterion Evaluation Requirements

The following should be submitted:

- 8.1 Report (standardised list of fields or indicators) from the National Information System for Quality Assurance in Higher Education-NISQA (Register of Institutions), at the level of the ULE, the academic unit and the new USP.
- 8.2 Operation of an information management system for the collection of the USP's administrative data (Students' Record)
- 8.3 Other tools and procedures for the collection, verification, analysis and utilization of data regarding the academic and administrative operation of the USP, including the identification of key indicators, their sources, and their calculation methods.

Qualitative/Quantitative Indicators

1. Suitability of information collection procedures and data completeness.
2. Suitability of data analysis and utilization procedures.
3. Rate of the USP key indicators for which the definition, data source, and calculation method have been predefined (100%).
4. Frequency of information system updates:
 - In real time, for the student record
 - Annually, for the indicators
5. Frequency of analysis and utilization of the USP key indicators (annually).

CRITERION 9. PUBLIC INFORMATION CONCERNING THE NEW UNDERGRADUATE STUDY PROGRAMMES

The ULEs and their academic units have the obligation to publish information about their educational and academic activities in a direct and readily accessible way. The relevant information should be up-to-date and expressed in a clear and objective way.

The criterion aligns with ESG 1.8.

In particular, the following should be met:

a. Identity of the USP

The USP website should clearly and distinctly state the ULE, the parent institution, the degree-awarding body, the degree and level of studies, the standard duration, the location and provision of studies, and the accreditation details.

b. Completeness of Public Information

The USP website should publish in Greek, English and the language of instruction (if different) the information on the programme's structure and content, the expected learning outcomes, the teaching and learning processes, the assessment methods and criteria, and the available learning opportunities. After the USP starts its operation, key data on students' academic progress and, to the extent possible, on graduates' career paths are also published once they become available.

c. Financial and Career Information

ULEs should clearly publish on the USP website the total cost of tuition per semester or academic year and the total cost for the entire duration of studies, as well as any mandatory additional fees. Any information regarding the recognition of the degree and professional rights should be based on the current regulatory framework; they should be stated with accuracy and not create any misleading expectations.

d. Accuracy and Non-Misleading Presentation

All public and promotional information on the USP should be accurate, verifiable, and clearly attributed to the person or institution to which it pertains. Any rankings, indicators, distinctions or achievements of the parent institution should not be attributed to the Branch or to the specific USP; in case this information is mentioned, it should be clearly specified that it pertains to the parent institution.

e. Digital Accessibility

The USP website and the key information published on it should be accessible to people with disabilities and they should be designed and maintained in accordance with applicable requirements and recognised digital accessibility standards.

f. Updating of Public Information

A procedure to verify the accuracy and to update the information published on the USP website should be implemented by the ULE. Any substantial changes should be reflected on the website within the specified timeframe.

Criterion Evaluation Requirements

The following must be submitted:

- 9.1 A section on the ULE's website, dedicated to the USP under review, where the information specified above is published, particularly the information deemed mandatory under Article 155 of Law 5094/2024.
- 9.2 Publication of the USP website in Greek, English, and the language of instruction, if different.
- 9.3 Procedure for reviewing, maintaining and updating the USP website and the information published on it.

Qualitative/Quantitative Indicators

1. Completeness of the publication of the required information on the USP.
2. Accuracy and non-misleading presentation of public and promotional information.
3. Language coverage of the required information on the USP website in Greek, English, and the language of instruction, if different.
4. Timeframe for updating published information following a substantial change (maximum 30 calendar days).
5. Compliance rate of the USP website with the digital accessibility requirements currently in force (100%).

CRITERION 10. PERIODIC INTERNAL EVALUATION OF THE NEW STUDY PROGRAMMES

ULEs and their academic units should design the procedures for their internal quality assurance system, which will also guide the review and the annual internal evaluation of their new undergraduate study programmes (USPs). Through monitoring and potential corrections, ULEs will achieve their goals, reaching eventually their continuous improvement. As part of these actions, it is considered necessary to keep all stakeholders informed.

This criterion aligns with ESG 1.9.

In particular, the following should be met:

a. Annual internal evaluation

The USP is subject to an annual internal evaluation, which includes at least the following fields: an examination of the programme's content, the workload, the progress and completion of studies, the effectiveness of assessment procedures, the satisfaction of students' needs, the learning environment, and supporting services, ensuring at the same time that the programme is up to date.

b. Stakeholders Participation

The internal review requires the participation of the parent institution and the students, including, where appropriate, graduates, employers, or other relevant stakeholders.

c. Utilization of Results

The results of the internal review should be analysed, and in case any areas for improvement are identified, specific corrective or improvement actions should be taken, designating responsible parties and a timeline for their implementation.

d. Documentation and Monitoring

The results of the annual review, the decisions made and the progress of the implementation of improvement actions are recorded in a manner that allows for the monitoring and evaluation of the USP's progress over time.

Criterion Evaluation Requirements

The following must be submitted:

- 10.1 Procedure for the annual internal evaluation, revision and update of the USP, specifying the participants, the data under review, and the authorised bodies.
- 10.2 Procedure for utilizing the results of the internal review, for making decisions, and monitoring any corrective or improvement actions.

Qualitative/Quantitative Indicators

1. Frequency of the USP internal evaluation (at least once a year).
2. Sufficiency of the USP evaluation procedures; full coverage of the key thematic areas of the internal evaluation.
3. Sufficiency of procedures concerning the utilization of the results of the internal evaluation, revision, update, and ongoing monitoring of the USP development.
4. Participation of the parent institution and students in each annual evaluation.
5. Participation of external stakeholders in each comprehensive revision of the USP.
6. Frequency of the overall revision of the USP (at least every five years).

CRITERION 11. INITIAL EXTERNAL EVALUATION AND ACCREDITATION OF THE NEW STUDY PROGRAMMES

The new Undergraduate Study Programmes (USPs) should undergo an initial external evaluation, carried out by Panels of external experts appointed by HAHE, with the purpose of the accreditation. The term of validity of the accreditation is determined by HAHE.

This criterion aligns with ESG 1.10.

In particular, the following should be met:

a. Completeness of the accreditation proposal, accuracy, and responsibility for documentation

ULEs should submit complete, accurate, up-to-date, and verifiable information, along with all required supporting documents for the specific USP, in accordance with the guidelines of the HAHE's Call for Proposals. By means of a relevant declaration, the Branch should certify the completeness, accuracy and truthfulness of both the information in the accreditation file, and of any additional information or supporting documentation provided during the external evaluation; it declares that it has verified the USP's compliance with the current legislative and regulatory framework, and undertakes the obligation to notify HAHE of any substantial change in the information or the requirements upon which the accreditation was based.

b. Verifiability and collaboration with the Panel

ULEs should provide the External Evaluation and Accreditation Panel with any additional information, primary data or other supporting evidence requested for the verification, documentation or clarification of the information included in the accreditation file, and it should facilitate the on-site verification.

c. Utilization of the Results of the External Evaluation

The recommendations and any required improvement actions resulting from the external evaluation should be incorporated into the monitoring and internal review procedures of the USP; their implementation should also be monitored.

d. Periodic External Review and Reaccreditation

The USP should be subjected to periodic external evaluation and accreditation, in accordance with the current regulatory framework, at least every five years. During the reaccreditation procedure, ULEs should provide evidence of the implementation of recommendations and of any conditions from previous accreditation, including the sustainability of compliance with the current Standards.

Criterion Evaluation Requirements

The following should be submitted:

- 11.1 The procedure followed by the academic unit for preparing and submitting the accreditation proposal, as well as for organising the external evaluation of the new USP.
- 11.2 A declaration by the ULE regarding the completeness, accuracy, and truthfulness of the information and documentation included in the accreditation file, and any additional information provided during the external evaluation regarding the assessment of the USP's compliance with the current legislative and regulatory framework, as well as regarding their undertaking to notify HAHE of any substantial change in the information or the requirements upon which the accreditation was based.

Qualitative/Quantitative Indicators

- 1. Sufficiency of procedures concerning the preparation and submission of the accreditation proposal.
- 2. Completeness, clarity, and accuracy of the accreditation proposal.
- 3. Sufficiency of responsiveness to the Panel's requests.
- 4. Sufficiency of the procedure concerning the responsiveness to the recommendations and the accreditation criteria.