Accreditation Report
for the Undergraduate Study Programme of:

Law
Institution: National and Kapodistrian University of Athens
Date: 24 April 2021

Report of the Panel appointed by the HAHE to undertake the review of the Undergraduate Study Programme of **Law** of the **National and Kapodistrian University of Athens** for the purposes of granting accreditation

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART A: BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT OF THE REVIEW

I. The External Evaluation & Accreditation Panel

The Panel responsible for the Accreditation Review of the Undergraduate Study Programme of **Law** of the **National and Kapodistrian University of Athens** comprised the following five (5) members, drawn from the HAHE Register, in accordance with Laws 4009/2011 & 4653/2020:

1. **Prof. Efstathios Banakas (Chair)**
   University of East Anglia, Norwich, United Kingdom

2. **Prof. Dr. Georgios Gounalakis**
   Phillips-Universität Marburg, Marburg, Germany

3. **Associate Professor Dr. Thomas Skouteris**
   The American University in Cairo, New Cairo, Egypt

4. **Prof. Dr. Nicholas Tsagourias**
   University of Sheffield, Sheffield, United Kingdom

5. **Dr. Thrasyvoulos Kontaxis**
   Athens Bar Association, Athens, Greece

II.   Review Procedure and Documentation

The External Evaluation and Accreditation Panel (hereinafter "The Panel") was constituted by HAHE in March 2021, approximately one month before the review process took place. The Panel was duly provided with two files; one containing HAHE material whereas the second containing material prepared by the School of Law of the National and Kapodistrian University of Athens (hereinafter "The Unit"). The latter file also included the Accreditation Proposal (hereinafter "The Proposal") which addressed the 10 principles of accreditation concerning the undergraduate Law Program (hereinafter "The Study Program"). The provided material was comprehensive and informative.

Where necessary, the Panel requested additional information which the Unit provided promptly. The Panel wishes to express its gratitude to the Unit for this. There was no on-site visit due to COVID-19 restrictions. The online visit took place during the week of 19-25 April 2021. The Panel conducted online interviews via Zoom with various stakeholders, including the Vice-Rector, the Head of Unit, members of the MODIP and OMEA, members of the Faculty, groups of students selected by the Unit, Alumni, and external stakeholders selected by the Unit. The Panel would have preferred the students to have been nominated by the student body itself instead of being selected by the Unit. Because of the online character of the visit, the Panel did not have the opportunity to informally interact with the broader student community. Consequently, the input of students in the accreditation process is tempered by the aforementioned limitations. Online interviews ran smoothly over two working days.

The Panel found that, unlike on-site visits, online visits require additional time to become effective. Consequently, the Panel would have preferred longer sessions and more opportunities for interaction. Notwithstanding such limitations, discussions were collegial, constructive, and productive. The Panel wishes to express its gratitude to the Unit and all stakeholders for facilitating the process and for engaging with the Panel constructively and in a spirit of good faith and openness. The Panel wishes to especially thank the Head of Unit, and the members of OMEA, for their cooperation. The Panel also wishes to thank MODIP for its informative responses to questions which assisted the Panel greatly in its deliberations. The Panel finally wishes to thank everyone involved for sharing the Panel's commitment to constructive dialogue, transparency, and inclusiveness.

III.   Study Programme Profile

The School of Law of the National and Kapodistrian University of Athens was established in 1838 and it is the oldest Law School in Greece. It admits on an annual basis approximately 750 new students. At the time of writing, approximately 4000 students are within the 4-year cycle of studies. Another approximately 10,000 students are registered students who have exceeded the 4-year cycle of studies without graduating. The Unit is home to an additional population of approximately 400 Master's level students and 540 Ph.D. candidates. The Unit employs 97 Faculty members, including 33 First Grade Professors; 20 Associate Professors; 40 Assistant Professors; 2 Lecturers; 3 Special Teaching Staff; and 3 Technical Laboratory Staff. The Unit is supported by 18 Administrative Staff.

The Study Program evaluated in the present report is the Law Degree (Πτυχίο Νομικής). The minimum duration of studies is 8 semesters. The total number of courses students must complete to receive a degree is 41, including 31 compulsory courses; 6 compulsory-elective courses; and 4 free-elective courses. Compulsory-elective courses are divided in sectors (Private Law, Public Law, Criminal Law, History and Theory of Law, and International Studies). There are no prerequisite courses. The Program uses the ECTS system of credit calculation. The Program does not allow for specialization. The grading system is divided into three bands: Good, Very Good, and Excellent. Graduates may enrol as trainee lawyers. After taking the Bar, graduates may be sworn in as lawyers. They are also entitled to participate in national exams for the Judicial and Prosecutor Schools; for Notary Publics; and the Diplomatic service. In terms of student and Faculty mobility, the Unit cooperates with 7 CIVIS Universities (Umbrella Erasmus agreement) and participates in 96 Erasmus agreements with other European Universities, and 2 Erasmus agreements with Swiss Universities. On average, 100-120 outgoing students and 100-120 incoming students participate in mobility programs annually. The language of instruction is Greek, but a range of courses is also offered in English, French, and German.

PART B: COMPLIANCE WITH THE PRINCIPLES

Principle 1: Academic Unit Policy for Quality Assurance

INSTITUTIONS SHOULD APPLY A QUALITY ASSURANCE POLICY AS PART OF THEIR STRATEGIC MANAGEMENT. THIS POLICY SHOULD EXPAND AND BE AIMED (WITH THE COLLABORATION OF EXTERNAL STAKEHOLDERS) AT ALL INSTITUTION'S AREAS OF ACTIVITY, AND PARTICULARLY AT THE FULFILMENT OF QUALITY REQUIREMENTS OF UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMMES. THIS POLICY SHOULD BE PUBLISHED AND IMPLEMENTED BY ALL STAKEHOLDERS.

The quality assurance policy of the academic unit is in line with the Institutional policy on quality, and is included in a published statement that is implemented by all stakeholders. It focuses on the achievement of special objectives related to the quality assurance of study programmes offered by the academic unit.

The quality policy statement of the academic unit includes its commitment to implement a quality policy that will promote the academic profile and orientation of the programme, its purpose and field of study; it will realise the programme's strategic goals and it will determine the means and ways for attaining them; it will implement the appropriate quality procedures, aiming at the programme's continuous improvement.

In particular, in order to carry out this policy, the academic unit commits itself to put into practice quality procedures that will demonstrate:

a) *the suitability of the structure and organization of the curriculum;*

b) *the pursuit of learning outcomes and qualifications in accordance with the European and the National Qualifications Framework for Higher Education;*

c) *the promotion of the quality and effectiveness of teaching;*

d) *the appropriateness of the qualifications of the teaching staff;*

e) *the enhancement of the quality and quantity of the research output among faculty members of the academic unit;*

f) *ways for linking teaching and research;*

g) *the level of demand for qualifications acquired by graduates, in the labour market;*

h) *the quality of support services such as the administrative services, the Library, and the student welfare office;*

i) *the conduct of an annual review and an internal audit of the quality assurance system of the undergraduate programme(s) offered, as well as the collaboration of the Internal Evaluation Group (IEG) with the Institution's Quality Assurance Unit (QAU).*

Study Programme Compliance

<u>Overall</u>: The Unit has introduced, in cooperation with MODIP, a Quality Assurance Policy which is in line with the University's Quality Assurance Policy. In the opinion of the Panel, the Unit's

Quality Assurance Policy is fit for the Study Program as it measures a range of parameters set out in HAHE's accreditation template. The Unit has established an internal quality assurance Committee (OMEA) and processes for the revision of the Study Program. There is an annual assessment process, which is coordinated by OMEA, and involves the participation of all relevant stakeholders. The annual assessment involves the collection and monitoring of quantitative data concerning student admission and graduation; appointment and progression of teaching and scientific staff; the implementation of study programs; individual and collective research outputs; and other matters. The results of the annual assessment are compiled by OMEA in an annual Report which is posted on the Unit's and University's websites. The Report is discussed at a special meeting of the School (Unit) Board, which has the power to act upon it. The Panel finds that the quality assurance system described above promotes continuous improvement of the Study Program. The Unit sufficiently communicates its policy to all parties involved. As also stated elsewhere in this Report (*see* Principle 10, *infra*), the Panel wishes to commend the Unit for implementing the recommendations of the 2013 evaluation report.

The goals that have been set by the Unit regarding the Study Program are detailed in Annex B6 of the Proposal. The Panel finds that the goals are specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, and timely. The Panel finds that the goals and standards stated in Annex B6 focus mainly on student progression and graduation (which the Panel commends); teaching questionnaires and their completion rate; research outputs; student-to-Faculty ratio; and student mobility. The Panel would encourage the Unit to expand the list of measurable goals in order to reflect more fully the range of issues covered by the 10 accreditation principles set out by HAHE. Examples of such additional goals are listed in Section C, *infra*.

Panel Judgement

Principle 1: Institution Policy for Quality Assurance	
Fully compliant	**X**
Substantially compliant	
Partially compliant	
Non-compliant	

Panel Recommendations

The Panel recommends that the Unit expands the list of measurable goals to reflect all accreditation principles as set out by HAHE.

Principle 2: Design and Approval of Programmes

INSTITUTIONS SHOULD DEVELOP THEIR UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMMES FOLLOWING A DEFINED WRITTEN PROCESS WHICH WILL INVOLVE THE PARTICIPANTS, INFORMATION SOURCES AND THE APPROVAL COMMITTEES FOR THE PROGRAMME. THE OBJECTIVES, THE EXPECTED LEARNING OUTCOMES, THE INTENDED PROFESSIONAL QUALIFICATIONS AND THE WAYS TO ACHIEVE THEM ARE SET OUT IN THE PROGRAMME DESIGN. THE ABOVE DETAILS AS WELL AS INFORMATION ON THE PROGRAMME'S STRUCTURE ARE PUBLISHED IN THE STUDENT GUIDE.

Academic units develop their programmes following a well-defined procedure. The academic profile and orientation of the programme, the objectives, the subject areas, the structure and organisation, the expected learning outcomes and the intended professional qualifications according to the National Qualifications Framework for Higher Education are described at this stage. The approval or revision process for programmes includes a check of compliance with the basic requirements described in the Standards, on behalf of the Institution's Quality Assurance Unit (QAU).

Furthermore, the programme design should take into consideration the following:

- *the Institutional strategy*
- *the active participation of students*
- *the experience of external stakeholders from the labour market*
- *the smooth progression of students throughout the stages of the programme*
- *the anticipated student workload according to the European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System*
- *the option to provide work experience to the students*
- *the linking of teaching and research*
- *the relevant regulatory framework and the official procedure for the approval of the programme by the Institution*

Study Programme Compliance

The aim of the Study Program, as stated in the Proposal and other relevant documents, is to provide students with a broad legal education and develop their critical skills in order to prepare them to enter a diverse range of careers in the public or private sector, such as lawyer, judge, prosecutor, notary public, diplomat and others. To support this goal, the Study Program offers a general degree, without specializations, which includes 41 courses covering a wide range of subjects. They are divided into 31 compulsory courses and 10 elective ones. As stated in the Proposal, the Study Program places particular emphasis on courses that have an international and European dimension. The Study Program follows the ECTS system. The Study Program also purports to respond to the needs of society (national, European, and international); provide students with legal knowledge to succeed in their chosen career; and acquire analytical and problem-solving skills.

The Panel finds that the curriculum is generally comparable to appropriate, universally accepted, standards in legal education. The number of courses is however higher compared to most foreign institutions although comparable lower compared to Greek institutions. During interviews, external stakeholders, students, and Alumni have expressed the view that

more opportunities for the acquisition of vocational skills should be provided, such as the writing of legal briefs, court visits etc. The Panel agrees with this view and invites the Unit to consider ways of increasing the exposure of students to the practical requirements of certain career paths popular among graduates, such as that of the lawyer, the prosecutor, or the judge. While the relative absence of learning modules for the acquisition of vocational skills is not uncommon to Law Faculties in Greece, it is considered a good practice in leading academic institutions worldwide. It is the view of the Panel that efforts in this direction would help the Unit retain a leading position in the field.

The Unit has established procedures for the periodic revision of the Study Program that generally meet accreditation standards. While Faculty and students (through elected representative) participate in the process of Study Program Revision, there is no evidence that the Unit has put in place institutionalized modes of consultation with external stakeholders, the professional community, or alumni. Again, while this is not a common practice in Greek Higher Education Institutions, it is a good practice followed by leading institutions elsewhere. It is the Panel's view that the Unit would benefit from the participation of said stakeholders in the periodic revision of the Study Program.

Panel Judgement

Principle 2: Design and Approval of Programmes	
Fully compliant	X
Substantially compliant	
Partially compliant	
Non-compliant	

Panel Recommendations

The Panel recommends that the Unit monitors the curriculum to remain in sync with market needs through institutionalized partnerships with relevant stakeholders.

Principle 3: Student-centred Learning, Teaching, and Assessment

INSTITUTIONS SHOULD ENSURE THAT THE UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMMES ARE DELIVERED IN A WAY THAT ENCOURAGES STUDENTS TO TAKE AN ACTIVE ROLE IN CREATING THE LEARNING PROCESS. THE ASSESSMENT METHODS SHOULD REFLECT THIS APPROACH.

Student-centred learning and teaching play an important role in stimulating students' motivation, self-reflection and engagement in the learning process. The above entail continuous consideration of the programme's delivery and the assessment of the related outcomes.

The student-centred learning and teaching process

- *respects and attends to the diversity of students and their needs, enabling flexible learning paths;*
- *considers and uses different modes of delivery, where appropriate;*
- *flexibly uses a variety of pedagogical methods;*
- *regularly evaluates and adjusts the modes of delivery and pedagogical methods aiming at improvement;*
- *regularly evaluates the quality and effectiveness of teaching, as documented especially through student surveys;*
- *reinforces the student's sense of autonomy, while ensuring adequate guidance and support from the teaching staff;*
- *promotes mutual respect in the student - teacher relationship;*
- *applies appropriate procedures for dealing with students' complaints.*

   In addition:

- *the academic staff are familiar with the existing examination system and methods and are supported in developing their own skills in this field;*
- *the assessment criteria and methods are published in advance;*
- *the assessment allows students to demonstrate the extent to which the intended learning outcomes have been achieved. Students are given feedback, which, if necessary is linked to advice on the learning process;*
- *student assessment is conducted by more than one examiner, where possible;*
- *the regulations for assessment take into account mitigating circumstances;*
- *assessment is consistent, fairly applied to all students and carried out in accordance with the stated procedures;*
- *a formal procedure for student appeals is in place.*

Study Programme Compliance

<u>Overall</u>: The Panel finds that student-centred learning and teaching is a strategic goal of the Unit and that substantial resources are devoted to its attainment. Yet, two significant challenges must be overcome for the principle to be fully satisfied: (a) the unfavourable student-to-Faculty ratio; and (b) the lack of uniformity in good practices across the Study Program. While point (b) may be a function of point (a) (i.e., may be attributable to the lack of resources), there are cases where uniformity in good student-centred practices could be achieved without additional resources.

Student support and welfare services: Student support and welfare services are in place. According to the students selected for interview, the Unit generally treats students with respect. They also said that they were not aware of any reported instances of sexual or other serious forms of harassment. There is a formal procedure for student appeals. According to the same students, individual Faculty and the Secretariat are responsive to student complaints. There is a University Ombudsperson, but only a small number of cases from the Unit reach the Ombudsperson (5 per year, according to the data provided by the Unit). In 2011 the Unit appointed Faculty to act as student advisors but, for reasons that remain unclear to the Panel, the institution of student advisor has fallen into disuse. Overall, relations between students and faculty are based on mutual respect. Students suggested that support and welfare services could become more student-friendly and accessible; information about these services could be better disseminated; and that this would lead to increased recourse by students.

Pedagogical methods: Classes take place in large groups which limit the possibility for interaction, let alone for the Socratic method of teaching. The Unit follows the good practice of dividing compulsory courses (whenever possible, i.e., approx. 80% of courses), into sections of 100-200 students. Thirty percent of all courses also offer one-hour tutorials per week, but groups are not necessarily smaller. Timetables are generally adhered to, and students report that the quality of instruction is high. Assessments mostly take the form of proctored, written, in-class exams, and sometimes, oral exams. Research papers and group-work are exceptional and complementary to the standard assessment process, rather than stand-alone modes of assessment. In-class presentations are not common pedagogical methods and/or modes of assessment. While course goals and objectives are published on e-class, it is uncommon for assessment rubrics or descriptors to be published. According to the Faculty members interviewed, exam expectations are communicated orally during lecture. Overall, students have reported that grading is fair. It has been reported by the interviewed students that textbooks are sometimes delivered late.

Exam feedback: Students have reported that receiving individual exam feedback is cumbersome due to the large number of students. While the Unit has institutionalized the good practice of providing individual feedback, the unfavourable student-to-faculty ratio does not allow the full benefits of this important process to be maximized.

Review of Teaching: Student satisfaction surveys are regularly conducted. As stated elsewhere in this report, the student response rate is, however, statistically too low to be useful.

The Unit, the Sections, and individual Faculty members engage with several additional good practices that foster student-centred learning. The practices often go beyond the call of duty and are commendable. These latter activities are unfortunately not always part of the mainstream Study Program and, consequently, neither mandatory, nor available to all students. Such activities include participation in the law clinics; moot court competitions; oral exams and research papers; small-group seminars; and so on. A special mention must be made for the successful record of participation in international moot court competitions.

The above findings have been corroborated by the interviewed focus groups. The general view is that the Unit makes a considerable effort to provide student-centred learning and teaching; and does afford interested students with realistic and productive opportunities to learn independently. Most of said opportunities are however neither systematic nor compulsory. Therefore, they are not taken by all students. There is a difference between a compulsory

moot court course for all students; and the possibility of exceptional participation in moot courts for some students. There is a difference between compulsory clinics; compulsory small group tutorials for all courses; compulsory research papers for all students; and occasional, non-systematic opportunities to participate in such activities. There is finally a difference between research, presentation, and teamwork as regular components of assessment methods; and their sporadic and exceptional use. The Panel acknowledges that the lack of human resources is a real (sometime prohibitive) obstacle in achieving this goal. Yet, within existing means, there might be room for standardizing and mainstreaming more student-centred learning and teaching practices across the entire Program of Studies.

Panel Judgement

Principle 3: Student- centred Learning, Teaching and Assessment	
Fully compliant	
Substantially compliant	**X**
Partially compliant	
Non-compliant	

Panel Recommendations

- The Unit develops measurable indicators (e.g., percentages of students that take part in specific student-centred activities) to measure progress in student-centred learning and teaching;
- The Unit increases the range of student-centred learning and teaching practices that become compulsory for all students and are mainstreamed across the Study Program;
- The Unit further publicizes and fosters recourse to formal student-welfare institutions and services (e.g., Ombudsperson; the student advisor);
- Student-participation in questionnaires is increased to a statistically relevant percentage (e.g., above 30%);
- The Unit introduces additional modes of review of quality of teaching (e.g., peer review of teaching), on the basis of good practices used worldwide;
- The Unit implements processes that guarantee transparency, certainty, and predictability in assessment criteria;
- The Unit facilitates further the possibility of individual exam feedback.

Principle 4: Student Admission, Progression, Recognition and Certification

INSTITUTIONS SHOULD DEVELOP AND APPLY PUBLISHED REGULATIONS COVERING ALL ASPECTS AND PHASES OF STUDIES (ADMISSION, PROGRESSION, RECOGNITION AND CERTIFICATION).

Institutions and academic units need to put in place both processes and tools to collect, manage and act on information regarding student progression.

Procedures concerning the award and recognition of higher education degrees, the duration of studies, rules ensuring students progression, terms and conditions for student mobility should be based on the institutional study regulations. Appropriate recognition procedures rely on institutional practice for recognition of credits among various European academic departments and Institutions, in line with the principles of the Lisbon Recognition Convention.

Graduation represents the culmination of the students' study period. Students need to receive documentation explaining the qualification gained, including achieved learning outcomes and the context, level, content and status of the studies that were pursued and successfully completed (Diploma Supplement).

Study Programme Compliance

Rules and Regulations: The Unit follows the good practice of publishing rules and regulations covering the main aspects and phases of studies (admission, progression, recognition, and certification). Such regulations are readily accessible to the students.

Integration of new students: The Unit does not provide for a comprehensive process for the integration of newly admitted students. The Panel understands that such processes are underdeveloped across most Greek academic institutions. A change of culture must, however, begin by recognizing the significance, and the dividends, of ensuring that new students are fully and smoothly integrated into the academic community taking also into account students coming from diverse backgrounds. The Unit distributes a 2-page document to new students containing basic information. In the Panel's opinion this is not sufficient. Additional effort is needed to inform students of their rights, responsibilities, student-support services, facilities, and so on. While the precise mode is to be determined by the Unit, certain cost-effective good practices (e.g., an induction e-booklet, information on the website; advisors for newly admitted students; etc.) could help achieve this goal.

Student Mobility: The Panel commends the Unit for its commitment in, and strong record of participation in student mobility programs, such as ERASMUS. It finds that such mobility opportunities are readily available to students, duly publicized, and the number of partnerships with renown academic institutions abroad is appropriate.

ECTS: The Panel finds that the ECTS system has been applied across the curriculum. It might be opportune that during the next few years the Unit takes a fresh look at ECTS allocation and makes necessary adjustments to remain in sync with developments in the field.

Diploma and Diploma Supplement: The Diploma Supplement is provided to all graduates in

compliance with the relevant rules and regulations. The graduation oath is published and is sensitive to cultural and religious diversity. Student organizations, according to data received by the Panel, appear to have asked the Unit to consider the possibility of offering copies of the Diploma and Diploma Supplement in English. Should that be compatible with domestic legislation, it is a good practice that the Panel would strongly encourage.

Panel Judgement

Principle 4: Student Admission, Progression, Recognition and Certification	
Fully compliant	X
Substantially compliant	
Partially compliant	
Non-compliant	

Panel Recommendations

- The Unit develops a more robust strategy of fostering integration of newly admitted students.

Principle 5: Teaching Staff

INSTITUTIONS SHOULD ASSURE THEMSELVES OF THE QUALIFICATIONS AND COMPETENCE OF THE TEACHING STAFF. THEY SHOULD APPLY FAIR AND TRANSPARENT PROCESSES FOR THE RECRUITMENT AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE TEACHING STAFF.

The Institutions and their academic units have a major responsibility as to the standard of their teaching staff providing them with a supportive environment that promotes the advancement of their scientific work. In particular, the academic unit should:

- *set up and follow clear, transparent and fair processes for the recruitment of properly qualified staff and offer them conditions of employment that recognize the importance of teaching and research;*
- *offer opportunities and promote the professional development of the teaching staff;*
- *encourage scholarly activity to strengthen the link between education and research;*
- *encourage innovation in teaching methods and the use of new technologies;*
- *promote the increase of the volume and quality of the research output within the academic unit;*
- *follow quality assurance processes for all staff members (with respect to attendance requirements, performance, self-assessment, training etc.);*
- *develop policies to attract highly qualified academic staff.*

Study Programme Compliance

Recruitment of Staff: The Unit's accreditation proposal mentions several measures in force to safeguard fairness and transparency in the recruitment of qualified staff. These are welcome and enhance the Unit's academic standing. From statistical data supplied by the Unit both in writing and orally, it appears that recruitment is primarily and, for long periods of time, drawn exclusively from existing Faculty members who set in motion, as they have a right to do by law, the process of their promotion. Most, if not all new posts are advertised at the entry level of Assistant Professor. Those appointed at that level, have a statutory right to set in motion the procedure of their promotion after a certain period. At that moment, the post to which they seek promotion is advertised and external candidates may also apply. They rarely do. Also, external candidates are very rarely appointed to senior roles, such as Professor. This may be ascribed to issues beyond the Unit's power, as all University appointments in Greece must be approved by the Ministry of Education. In the opinion of the Panel, increasing the number of external applicants would have a positive effect on the diversification of the Teaching Staff and the learning and teaching experience provided.

Conditions of employment: Conditions of employment, as those of recruitment, are set by national legislation, applicable to all Universities (which the Greek Constitution dictates must be directly funded and governed by the State). Academics are civil servants. Conditions of employment include teaching, marking, research and administrative duties. Staff are obliged to self-certify at the end of the teaching period the total amount of teaching hours they have delivered. The legal framework within which the Unit operates is therefore strict. When a Unit such as this Unit, has a large number of students, the teaching and administrative load is considerable, and this may impact on research. Additionally, Teaching Staff salaries are

considerably lower than the European average, and a large percentage of Teaching Staff are also practicing lawyers or doing other jobs to supplement their income.

<u>Opportunities and promotion of the professional development of the teaching staff</u>: The Unit does not report any process for the professional development of Teaching Staff. The Unit's proposal only refers to ERASMUS staff exchanges and attendance of international conferences, collaborative research Programs, inter-university agreements of staff exchange and the like, which are important, but there does not appear to make any special provision for classes, seminars, or other special events to support the continuing professional development of staff.

<u>Encouraging of scholarly activity to strengthen the link between education and research and innovation in teaching methods and use of new technologies</u>: The Unit reports good practices of technological support in classrooms and extensive use of information technology for the delivery of teaching, teaching support and student information. It appears that several, but not all, teaching rooms are equipped with computer systems and power point facilities, and it is hoped this can be improved further. Particularly to be lauded is the apparent success of the Unit in transforming all teaching to distance learning through its E-Class platform, allowing the study Programme to continue and be fulfilled when the University closed in March 2020 because of the Covid-19 pandemic. Well done!

<u>Promoting the increase of the volume and quality of the research output within the academic Unit</u>: The Proposal reports that Teaching Staff carry out individual research, or research in collaboration with other members of the School or other Greek or foreign higher education institutions in their areas of interest. The research activity of the Unit at the level of individual (Teaching Staff and EDIP) and wider (research programs) research is published and constantly updated on the Unit's website, as well as on individual websites that several Teaching Staff maintain on independent international websites from around the world (e.g., www.scopus.com, www.researchgate.net, https://scholar.google.com). The Unit also asserts that the research and scientific work of the members of the Unit, as confirmed by the relevant quantitative data, is maintained at a high level both in terms of publications, but also in terms of its recognition. The research and scientific achievements of its academic and scientific staff continue to be high despite the constantly decreasing funding to Greek universities.

Research is therefore highly valued by the Unit and the research activity of Teaching Staff is extensive and well-recognised internationally. It is also evident that the financial support for Teaching Staff to make research visits and attend international conferences and other events must increase. We are happy to add our voices to that of our colleagues that the Greek Government should increase research related funding to levels corresponding to those in other European countries.

<u>Quality assurance processes for all staff members (with respect to attendance requirements, performance, self-assessment, training etc.):</u> The Unit reports that it seeks to ensure that all Teaching Staff comply with their statutory obligations (systematic presence on campus in addition to teaching, participation in the collegiate bodies and other administrative tasks assigned to them) and it controls performance through a strictly organized administrative pyramid. The Unit operates a system of continuous student evaluation of Teaching Staff. It is noted, however, that the participation of students in the assessment process is much lower than expected, especially since the transition from print to electronic assessment. Despite the

encouragement by Teaching Staff members (both oral during the lessons and written, through announcements in the e-class and on the website of the School), only a small percentage of students (not exceeding 10% of the enrolled in each course) completes the relevant questionnaires, and only 25-30% of them justify the grade given. The Panel notes in this regard a rather similar problem with student evaluations in other European Higher Education Institutions. In relation to this principle, good practices in Universities elsewhere in Europe include performance monitoring by the academic departments of their Staff, annual formal Staff appraisals, and regular formal peer review of teaching, as specific quality processes. We were not advised of any such practices adopted by the assessed Unit.

Panel Judgement

Principle 5: Teaching Staff	
Fully compliant	
Substantially compliant	**X**
Partially compliant	
Non-compliant	

Panel Recommendations

- The Unit considers the introduction of performance monitoring of Teaching Staff, annual formal Staff appraisals, and regular formal peer review of teaching;
- The Unit actively seeks and welcomes applications by external applicants for Faculty positions;
- The Unit reviews teaching and administrative load of Staff, by reviewing the number of offered optional courses;
- The Unit takes measures to strengthen the link between teaching and research, innovation in teaching methods, and the use of new technologies.

Principle 6: Learning Resources and Student Support

INSTITUTIONS SHOULD HAVE ADEQUATE FUNDING TO COVER TEACHING AND LEARNING NEEDS. THEY SHOULD –ON THE ONE HAND– PROVIDE SATISFACTORY INFRASTRUCTURE AND SERVICES FOR LEARNING AND STUDENT SUPPORT AND –ON THE OTHER HAND– FACILITATE DIRECT ACCESS TO THEM BY ESTABLISHING INTERNAL RULES TO THIS END (E.G. LECTURE ROOMS, LABORATORIES, LIBRARIES, NETWORKS, BOARDING, CAREER AND SOCIAL POLICY SERVICES ETC.).

Institutions and their academic units must have sufficient funding and means to support learning and academic activity in general, so that they can offer to students the best possible level of studies. The above means could include facilities such as libraries, study rooms, educational and scientific equipment, information and communications services, support or counselling services.

When allocating the available resources, the needs of all students must be taken into consideration (e.g. whether they are full-time or part-time students, employed or international students, students with disabilities) and the shift towards student-centred learning and the adoption of flexible modes of learning and teaching. Support activities and facilities may be organised in various ways, depending on the institutional context. However, the internal quality assurance ensures that all resources are appropriate, adequate, and accessible, and that students are informed about the services available to them.

In delivering support services the role of support and administrative staff is crucial and therefore they need to be qualified and have opportunities to develop their competences.

Study Programme Compliance

The Unit Proposal states that the amount of human resources (academic and auxiliary staff) and material resources (teaching spaces) is insufficient to serve the educational needs of the Unit. The Unit also reports understaffing at the level of the School's Secretariat, given that only 19 administrative staff are called upon to serve 97 faculty members, 4,000 active undergraduate students, 400 postgraduate students and 550 doctoral candidates.

The Panel takes this comment by the Unit seriously. Proper human and material resources are indispensable for ensuring high quality education. As the Unit is entirely dependent for financial support on the State for undergraduate programs, the Panel cannot but urge the Ministry of Education to pay particular attention to the lack of human and material resources and provide necessary funds to remedy it.

The Panel commends the Unit for making good use of the available resources, serving so far as possible the needs of all students, whether they are full-time or part-time, employed or international students, or students with disabilities), and student-centred learning is valued (see Principle 3, *supra*).

A dedicated University Accessibility Unit is available for the assistance of students with disabilities (www.access.uoa.gr). The Accessibility Unit offers, among other things, a service of recording the specific needs of each student with special needs, accessible textbooks, accessible workstations in libraries, a service of volunteer peer support, instructions on the appropriate

ways of examining students with special needs, a service of psychological counselling, etc. A Faculty Advisor and also a specific staff member of the Secretariat has been appointed, who can be contacted for any issue. However, it appears from information received from the Unit that students make only scarce use of the services of Faculty Advisors, which, in any event, are very hard to perform properly with a very low Staff/Student ratio. There is no information in the Unit's Proposal on whether staff dealing with issues of student welfare are qualified and have opportunities to develop relevant competences. The Unit's Proposal does not contain information regarding the extent to which physical access to teaching spaces is available to disabled students.

Turning to general teaching aids, the Panel was not able to cast an eye on textbooks offered to students or a comprehensive sample of lists of recommended reading materials in different subjects. For this reason, the Panel cannot comment on the quality/appropriateness of such materials.

Regarding the quality/appropriateness of lectures and seminars (frontistiria), the Panel was unable to access any online lectures or seminars. This was due to technical and timing issues, as our colleagues in Athens did their best to make it happen. The Panel is of the view that the number of students attending lectures or 'frontistiria' is quite large, far greater than most European Higher Education Institutions. This is, of course, not due to lack of effort by our colleagues in Athens, who do their best in light of the punishingly low student-to-Faculty ratio. This is an issue that the Ministry needs to address urgently.

Worth mentioning is the excellent Law Library, offering a substantial amount of printed and online resources to all students and staff, reading spaces, inter-library loan facilities, as well as access to major national and international legal databases to all students.

In terms of internal quality assurance that ensures that all resources are appropriate, adequate, and accessible, and that students are informed about the services available to them, there is no information in the Unit's Proposal of a departmental system of quality control, such as a Teaching or Student Welfare Committee. It appears that the task of keeping the students informed is allocated to the secretariat and is performed mainly electronically on the School webpage. From our interviews with the students presented by the Unit, it was difficult to gauge if the student population is content with the level, timing, and quality of information about teaching and other activities communicated to them.

There is no information in the Unit's report of any available career services. Career advice and preparation, through meetings and placements with potential employers and other consultation and events, is an essential service offered by modern Law Schools worldwide. In some Universities abroad there are career events for students, in which representatives of the legal professions and distinguished School alumni are regularly attending, during Term time.

Panel Judgement

Principle 6: Learning Resources and Student Support	
Fully compliant	**X**
Substantially compliant	
Partially compliant	
Non-compliant	

Panel Recommendations

- The Unit revives, supports, and monitors the use of Faculty advisors;
- Faculty and Staff dealing with issues of student welfare are properly qualified;
- The size of classes and tutorials is reduced;
- The Unit creates a career advice service.

Principle 7: Information Management

INSTITUTIONS BEAR FULL RESPONSIBILITY FOR COLLECTING, ANALYSING AND USING INFORMATION, AIMED AT THE EFFICIENT MANAGEMENT OF UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMMES OF STUDY AND RELATED ACTIVITIES, IN AN INTEGRATED, EFFECTIVE AND EASILY ACCESSIBLE WAY.

Institutions are expected to establish and operate an information system for the management and monitoring of data concerning students, teaching staff, course structure and organisation, teaching and provision of services to students as well as to the academic community.

Reliable data is essential for accurate information and for decision making, as well as for identifying areas of smooth operation and areas for improvement. Effective procedures for collecting and analysing information on study programmes and other activities feed data into the internal system of quality assurance.

The information gathered depends, to some extent, on the type and mission of the Institution. The following are of interest:

- *key performance indicators*
- *student population profile*
- *student progression, success and drop-out rates*
- *student satisfaction with their programme(s)*
- *availability of learning resources and student support*
- *career paths of graduates*

A number of methods may be used for collecting information. It is important that students and staff are involved in providing and analysing information and planning follow-up activities.

Study Programme Compliance

The Unit is committed to formal data collection and analysis procedures for the purposes of future planning and decision-making. It has established and operates an information system for managing and monitoring data with relevant key performance indicators for students, teaching staff, course structure and organization, teaching, as well as services to students and academics. The data appears to be up to date, clear, and easily accessible. This data, supplemented by other data submitted by the Unit, were used by the Panel to prepare its Proposal. The Unit complies with the General Data Protection Regulation.

Student satisfaction data are being collected for the courses, but student completion is very low (about 10%). As noted elsewhere, this seems to be inadequate to provide accurate information with respect to student satisfaction. The course evaluation by students must be improved. This is a very important issue to enhance the quality of the courses.

Panel Judgement

Principle 7: Information Management	
Fully compliant	**X**
Substantially compliant	
Partially compliant	
Non-compliant	

Panel Recommendations

- The Unit intensifies efforts to motivate the students to participate in the course evaluation.

Principle 8: Public Information

INSTITUTIONS SHOULD PUBLISH INFORMATION ABOUT THEIR TEACHING AND ACADEMIC ACTIVITIES WHICH IS CLEAR, ACCURATE, OBJECTIVE, UP-TO-DATE AND READILY ACCESSIBLE.

Information on Institution's activities is useful for prospective and current students, graduates, other stakeholders and the public.

Therefore, institutions and their academic units provide information about their activities, including the programmes they offer, the intended learning outcomes, the qualifications awarded, the teaching, learning and assessment procedures used, the pass rates and the learning opportunities available to their students, as well as graduate employment information.

Study Programme Compliance

A well-designed and informative website is offered. Needed information regarding study program, courses, teaching, and research staff as well as internal regulations is available online. The information, in most cases, is current, transparent, and accessible. In addition, the website offers numerous links that directs students to additional information. The Unit communicates its teaching and academic activities mainly through its website. The provided information is adequate, but it refers primarily to the present. The information should be combined with links to the Unit's activities and data from the near past. This would help portray a continuation of the research, teaching, and outreach.

The Unit website provides details about the structure, human resources, and infrastructure, e.g., undergraduate studies, moot court competitions, Erasmus exchange programs. Announcements are available on the homepage. The Study Program Guide, as well as the outline of the individual courses, is available online for download in Greek but not in English.

The Panel acknowledges the assigned personnel's willingness and dedication to maintain and upgrade the Unit's website.

The English version of the website only provides an outline of the Study Program.

The Unit does not have an e-platform for Alumni. This would be a useful and valuable tool to assist students with career decisions and support for the Unit when needed. An alumni forum can serve both as aid to alternative learning practices (lectures, seminars, conferences) and as group funding tool. The professional prospects of graduates are not adequately covered by Unit's information resources, as they should be.

There appears to be limited social media presence of the Unit. This presence could help to increase the visibility of its research and teaching activities.

Panel Judgement

Principle 8: Public Information	
Fully compliant	**X**
Substantially compliant	
Partially compliant	
Non-compliant	

Panel Recommendations

- The English version of the website mirrors the content of the Greek version;
- The Unit establishes an Alumni e-platform and tracks the employability and career paths of graduates;
- The website needs to better serve the professional prospects of graduates;
- The Unit is encouraged to take advantage of social media presence with academic focus.

Principle 9: On-going Monitoring and Periodic Internal Review of Programmes

INSTITUTIONS SHOULD HAVE IN PLACE AN INTERNAL QUALITY ASSURANCE SYSTEM FOR THE AUDIT AND ANNUAL INTERNAL REVIEW OF THEIR PROGRAMMES, SO AS TO ACHIEVE THE OBJECTIVES SET FOR THEM, THROUGH MONITORING AND AMENDMENTS, WITH A VIEW TO CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT. ANY ACTIONS TAKEN IN THE ABOVE CONTEXT SHOULD BE COMMUNICATED TO ALL PARTIES CONCERNED.

Regular monitoring, review and revision of study programmes aim to maintain the level of educational provision and to create a supportive and effective learning environment for students.

The above comprise the evaluation of:

- *the content of the programme in the light of the latest research in the given discipline, thus ensuring that the programme is up to date;*
- *the changing needs of society;*
- *the students' workload, progression and completion;*
- *the effectiveness of the procedures for the assessment of students;*
- *the students' expectations, needs and satisfaction in relation to the programme;*
- *the learning environment, support services and their fitness for purpose for the programme*

Programmes are reviewed and revised regularly involving students and other stakeholders. The information collected is analysed and the programme is adapted to ensure that it is up-to-date. Revised programme specifications are published.

Study Programme Compliance

The Unit has established an internal quality assurance system (IQMS/OMEA) which discharges its duties competently. It has also become evident to the Panel that IQMS/OMEA is supported in this role by the Unit's management team.

The content of the program in the light of the latest research in the given discipline: There is an internal process for the modification, adaption, or revision of the Study Program. This may involve the withdrawal of modules or the introduction of new modules. The process is also informed by set criteria reflecting the Unit's aims, in particular its aim of offering legal education which serves the needs of modern society, responds to changes in discipline, and fosters critical thinking. According to the provided information, new modules have been introduced whereas others were withdrawn in line with the above policy.

Student workload, progression and completion: The Panel understands that the Unit should operate within the general legislative framework set by the Ministry. However, the Panel believes that, where possible, the IQMS/OMEA, the Unit, and external stakeholders should review the amount of student workload in order to establish a better balance between directed and independent learning. Based on the provided data, an average student has up to 23 hours of directed teaching and learning (i.e., classes) per week, which, in the opinion of the Panel, is far too onerous and does not allow sufficient time for independent learning. Reviewing the balance between directed and independent learning will chime well with the aim of the Study Program of fostering critical thinking. In relation to completion rates, in the Panel's opinion, the Student Advisor should monitor student completion and advise individual students accordingly.

<u>Student expectations, needs and satisfaction in relation to the program</u>: The quality and effectiveness of teaching (teaching evaluation) is assessed by way of a questionnaire. The questionnaire contains specific questions and has five evaluation grades. There is also space for students to provide comments. In the Panel's opinion, the questionnaire is well-designed, and the questions cover the whole teaching and learning process. The Panel commends this policy although, as will be explained, there are certain issues that require attention. Student satisfaction with the Study Program is in general high, with certain exceptions. The rate of completion is however low. It is IQMS/OMEA's stated policy to increase the rate of completion and has set targets. The Panel believes that this is in the right direction and commendable. According to Annex B6, the Unit will do so by increasing the rate of announcements. The Panel however believes that more actions are needed in order to improve the rate of completion.

One point that was made quite often is that a cultural shift is needed in relation to teaching evaluations. The Panel agrees but also believes that such a cultural shift should involve both staff and students. IQMS/OMEA did not provide us with any specific information as to how such a shift will be initiated and realized. From our discussion with students, it became apparent to us that there is no or very little information about the value and importance of teaching evaluations and that implementation is uneven. More critically though, students have expectations from this process.

In the Panel's opinion, the issues that require attention are (i) mainstreaming teaching evaluations among staff and students; (ii) monitoring compliance; and (iii) follow up action. The Panel believes that the Unit needs to become pro-active; it should explain to both students and staff the importance and benefits of teaching evaluations; it should make the process and the questionnaire more visible; it should engage in 'information campaigns' through emails, social media, and other electronic means to ensure that students complete the questionnaires. Institutionally the Unit should monitor this policy closely. It should also take follow up action to respond to the findings of the questionnaire. The latter is important because it creates a sense of ownership among students and the Unit in general.

<u>The effectiveness of the procedures for the assessment of students:</u> Assessment is carried out mainly by way of exams. Exams are written or oral. According to the information provided to us, exam questions are scrutinized by members of the teaching team. This is good practice that contributes to the quality of the assessment process. In the Panel's opinion the scrutiny of assessment questions should be formalized, and compliance thereto monitored. Teaching goals and learning outcomes are often available on e-class. The latter however are not marking criteria as such. In the Panel's opinion, each teaching team should publish and communicate to students in advance marking criteria pertinent to the module and the assessment form (for example essay or exam). Grade descriptors should be formulated and published for each grade band: excellent; very good, good, and fail. This is good practice which will enhance the quality of the assessment process and support the student-centred character of the program. It will also ensure its transparency as well as inclusion, in particular regarding students coming from diverse backgrounds. Feedback is mainly provided through model answers. This practice is commended because it supports the quality and student-centred character of students' educational experience. However, the Panel notes that this is more effective in relation to exam papers but also that it is not the only means of fostering student-centred education. There are

processes for students to review their papers and receive feedback upon request. However, as students indicated, this method is not always practiced consistently or effectively.

The learning environment, support services and their fitness for purpose for the program: The Panel was not able to physically visit the School due to the pandemic. Based on the video presentations and the discussions with administrative staff and faculty, the Panel is convinced that the physical environment and the supporting services are adequate and appropriate to deliver the assessed program of study within the strictures explained earlier (*see also* Principle 6, *supra*). The Panel was particularly impressed by the Library and the services it provides to students and staff which demonstrably enhance their learning experience (*see also* Principle 6, *supra*). The Panel commends the dynamic and forward-looking attitude of the library staff to create a student-centred learning environment which supports but also enhances their learning experience and their ability to respond to the needs of the program.

Panel Judgement

Principle 9: On-going Monitoring and Periodic Internal Review of Programmes	
Fully compliant	
Substantially compliant	**X**
Partially compliant	
Non-compliant	

Panel Recommendations

The Panel recommends that the Unit:

- Increases the visibility of teaching evaluations and their completion rate by adopting specifically designed policies and actions;
- Monitors compliance with the teaching evaluation process;
- Adopts follow up action to address issues raised in the teaching evaluation questionnaires;
- Mainstreams the scrutiny of exam and/or essay papers;
- Introduces module-specific and assessment-specific marking criteria;
- Introduces grade descriptors.

Principle 10: Regular External Evaluation of Undergraduate Programmes

PROGRAMMES SHOULD REGULARLY UNDERGO EVALUATION BY COMMITTEES OF EXTERNAL EXPERTS SET BY HAHE, AIMING AT ACCREDITATION. THE TERM OF VALIDITY OF THE ACCREDITATION IS DETERMINED BY HAHE.

HAHE is responsible for administrating the programme accreditation process which is realised as an external evaluation procedure, and implemented by a committee of independent experts. HAHE grants accreditation of programmes, with a specific term of validity, following to which revision is required. The accreditation of the quality of the programmes acts as a means of verification of the compliance of the programme with the template's requirements, and as a catalyst for improvement, while opening new perspectives towards the international standing of the awarded degrees.

Both academic units and institutions participate in the regular external quality assurance process, while respecting the requirements of the legislative framework in which they operate.

The quality assurance, in this case the accreditation, is an on-going process that does not end with the external feedback, or report or its follow-up process within the Institution. Therefore, Institutions and their academic units ensure that the progress made since the last external quality assurance activity is taken into consideration when preparing for the next one.

Study Programme Compliance

The Unit was last assessed in 2013. The 2013 Committee made several recommendations regarding the Study Program. One such recommendation was to reduce the number of taught modules. The Unit reduced their number from 111 to 90. The Unit introduced to the Program curriculum modules offered in their Erasmus program which are taught in English. In response to another recommendation, it offered several modules across different Sections. Module information is included in the Program guide and in e-class, as recommended. The Unit introduced law clinics. The Unit also introduced its Handbook containing all Unit-specific regulations and policies. The Unit has implemented the recommendations of the previous external evaluation report.

Panel Judgement

Principle 10: Regular External Evaluation of Undergraduate Programmes	
Fully compliant	X
Substantially compliant	
Partially compliant	
Non-compliant	

Panel Recommendations

- The Unit continues to engage in on-going as well as periodic processes of quality assurance and accreditation and introduces, if required, additional policies, regulations, and organs to effectuate quality assurance;
- Continues to engage proactively with HAHE and any other quality assurance bodies, external stakeholders, and external evaluation committees to effectuate quality assurance.

PART C: CONCLUSIONS

I. Features of Good Practice

- The Unit has developed a clear and adequate Quality Assurance Policy, has put in place all relevant mechanisms of quality assurance and periodic reviews. It has aligned goals and KPIs with the HAHE template.
- The notion of "critical legal thinking" as the main goal of the unit's educational strategy; broad range of courses; catering for a broad range of career paths; preparing students for the labour market.
- The division of compulsory courses into Sections; offering of tutorials; adhering to schedules; high quality of teaching; respectful student/faculty relations; the University Ombudsperson; the responsiveness of Faculty and Staff to student concerns; the possibility of participation in moot court competitions and other extra-curricular activities.
- Publication of rules and regulations; student mobility; consistent application of ECTS across the curriculum; prompt issuing of diplomas and diploma supplements.
- The Unit values research; extensive and internationally recognised research; peer recognition of research; external impact of research.
- Good use of the available resources, serving so far as possible the needs of all students; student-centred learning is valued; dedicated University Accessibility Unit is available for the assistance of students with disabilities; excellent Law Library.
- Data is up to date, clear, and easily accessible; Data Protection Regulation for data protection and privacy is ensured.
- Information about the structure, human resources, and infrastructure as well as announcements is available on the homepage; the Study Program Guide, as well as the outline of the individual courses are available online for download in Greek.
- The introduction of an IQMS/OMEA and its support by the Unit; guidelines and processes for Program change and modification; alignment of the Programme with the Unit's quality template and educational goals; exam question scrutiny.
- Full implementation of the 2013 Report's recommendations.

II. Areas of Weakness

- Limited set of measurable goals and KPIs in strategic plan.
- Need for further development and inclusion of vocational skills in the Study Program.
- Size of classes; publication of assessment/marking criteria/rubrics on e-class; under-utilization of student support and welfare institutions; range of instruction and assessment methods; difficulties in receiving individualized exam feedback; number of students that benefit from certain good student-centred learning practices.
- Process of integration of newly admitted students.
- Recruitment mostly limited to existing Faculty members; most, if not all new posts are advertised at the entry level of Assistant Professor; limited number of external applicants for Faculty positions, virtually no external appointments at senior level for some time.
- Human and materials resources, while well utilized, are not sufficient to fully serve the educational needs of the Unit; size of classes.

- Low teaching evaluations completion rate.
- Not all information of the undergraduate courses is provided in the English version of the website; lack of e-platform for Alumni; limited social media presence.
- Low completion rate of teaching evaluations; strategy to increase teaching evaluation completion rate; lack of follow up action in relation to teaching evaluations; absence of module-specific and assessment-specific marking criteria; absence of grade descriptors.

III.   Recommendations for Follow-up Actions

The Panel recommends that:
- The Unit expands the list of measurable goals to reflect all accreditation principles, as set out by HAHE.
- The Unit monitors the curriculum to remain in sync with market needs through institutionalized partnerships with relevant stakeholders and the strengthening of vocational skills.
- The Unit develops indicators to measure progress in student-centred learning and teaching.
- The Unit increases the range of student-centred learning and teaching practices that become compulsory for all students.
- The Unit further publicizes and fosters recourse to formal student welfare institutions and services (e.g., Ombudsperson; the student advisor).
- Student participation in questionnaires is increased to a statistically relevant percentage and Unit develops clear strategies to attain this goal.
- The Unit considers additional modes of review of quality of teaching (e.g., peer review of teaching), on the basis of good practices used worldwide.
- The Unit implements processes that guarantee transparency, certainty, and predictability in assessment criteria (grading/marking criteria/rubrics and grade descriptors).
- The Unit supports further the possibility of individual exam feedback.
- The Unit develops a more robust strategy of fostering integration of newly admitted students.
- The Unit considers the introduction of performance monitoring of Teaching Staff, annual formal Staff appraisals, and regular formal peer review of teaching.
- The Unit actively seeks and welcomes applications by external applicants for Faculty positions.
- The Unit reviews teaching and administrative load of Staff.
- The Unit takes measures to strengthen the link between education and research and innovation in teaching methods and use of new technologies.
- Faculty and Staff dealing with issues of student welfare are properly trained and qualified.
- The size of classes and tutorials is reduced.
- The Unit develops modes of providing a career advice service.
- The English version of the website mirrors the content of the Greek version.
- The Unit establishes an Alumni e-platform and tracks the employability and career paths of graduates.

- The Unit is encouraged to take advantage of social media presence with academic focus.
- The Unit adopts follow up action to address issues raised in the teaching evaluation questionnaires.
- The Unit continues to engage in on-going as well as periodic processes of quality assurance and accreditation and, if required, introduces additional policies, regulations, and organs to effectuate quality assurance.
- The Unit continues to engage proactively with HAHE and any other quality assurance bodies, external stakeholders, and external evaluation committees to effectuate quality assurance.

IV. Summary & Overall Assessment

The Principles where full compliance has been achieved are: **1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 8 and 10.**

The Principles where substantial compliance has been achieved are: **3, 5 and 9.**

The Principles where partial compliance has been achieved are: **None.**

The Principles where failure of compliance was identified are: **None.**

Overall Judgement	
Fully compliant	**X**
Substantially compliant	
Partially compliant	
Non-compliant	

The members of the External Evaluation & Accreditation Panel

Name and Surname   **Signature**

1. **Prof. Efstathios Banakas (Chair)**
   University of East Anglia, Norwich, United Kingdom

2. **Prof. Dr. Georgios Gounalakis**
   Phillips-Universität Marburg, Marburg, Germany

3. **Associate Professor Dr. Thomas Skouteris**
   The American University in Cairo, New Cairo, Egypt

4. **Prof. Dr. Nicholas Tsagourias**
   University of Sheffield, Sheffield, United Kingdom

5. **Dr. Thrasyvoulos Kontaxis**
   Athens Bar Association, Athens, Greece