EXTERNAL EVALUATION REPORT

Piraeus University of Applied Sciences

TABLE OF CONTENTS	pages

1. EXTERNAL EVALUATION COMMITTEE

The Committee responsible for the External Evaluation of the University/Technological Education Institution named: *Piraeus University of Applied Sciences -PUAS* comprised the following five (5) expert evaluators drawn from the Registry kept by the HQA in accordance with Law 3374/2005 and the Law 4009/2011:

1. Prof **Yannis Georgellis** (Chairman)
    University of Kent, UK

2. Prof **Mike Kagioglou**
    University of Huddersfield, UK

3. Prof **Philippos Pouyioutas**
    University of Nicosia, Cyprus

4. Mr. **Manolis Stratakis**
    CEO, Innobatics, Greece

5. Prof **Ioannis Vlahos**
    ex member HQA Council,
    Professor Emeritus TEI Crete, Greece

2. INTRODUCTION

2.1 The External Evaluation Procedure

The site visit of the External Evaluation Committee (EEC) took place between the 7 and 10 of March, 2016. The evaluation process was conducted according to the schedule provided by the PUAS although in some cases the meetings were extended due to the interest of the participating members.

The EEC met with the following groups:

- The President and the Vice Presidents
- The self – evaluation team
- The President
- Faculty members of the Council of the Administration
- The Deans and Chairmen of the Departments
- The Internal Evaluation Group
- Faculty members
- The undergraduate and postgraduate students
- Central Administration Officers
- Erasmus students
- Alumni
- External Stakeholders

During the first day of the visit the Committee met with the following staff members in the following order:

- The President, Prof Lazaros Vryzidis and the Vice Rectors Prof D.Tseles and Prof V. Panagou
- The President of PUAS and the self-evaluation steering group (MODIP of PUAS)
- Prof D. Tseles, Vice Rector
- Prof V. Panagou, Vice Rector
- Prof A. Danos
- Prof M. Karamolegos,
- Prof G. Nikolaidis,
- Prof St. Patsikas,
- Prof M. Ragoussi
- The administrative support staff of MODIP of PUAS: M. Sigala and T. Larissi

Later in the day the EEC met with *the President and the members of the Institutional Council (IC)*: Dr. J. Maroulas, Emeritus Professor, President of Council, Prof G. Alexis, Prof S. Vasiliadis, Prof P. Giannakopoulos, Prof G. Nikolaidis, Prof A. Spyridakos, Mr. V. Korkidis, President of ΕΒΕΠ (met also on the following day in the meeting with stakeholders)

In the afternoon of the first day the EEC was split into groups and met separately with the *Deans and Heads of Departments of the two Schools (Engineering and Business)*.

1. EEC members Prof I. Vlahos and Prof Y. Georgellis met with: The Dean of the Business School, Prof D. Giannakopoulos and the Head of Department of Accounting and Finance, Prof M. Rodosthenous and Prof A. Danos, Head of the Department of Business and Administration.

2. The EEC members, Prof Kagioglou, Prof Pouyioutas and M. Stratakis met with the Dean of the Engineering School Prof P. Malatestas and the Heads of its Departments:
   Prof S. Vasiliadis, Department of Electronics Engineering
   Prof K. Alafodimos, Department of Automation Engineering
   Prof Eft. Gravas, Department of Textile Engineering
   Prof K. Stergiou, Department of Mechanical Engineering
   Prof G. Ellinas, Department of Computer System Engineering
   Prof G. Ioannidis, Department of Electrical Engineering
   Prof K. Dimakos, Department of Civil Engineering

The EEC concluded the first day meetings with the academic staff of the Internal Evaluation Groups of the two Schools:

Prof Papadeas, Academic Staff of Department of Accounting and Finance

Prof Psaromiligos, Academic Staff of Department of Business and Administration

Prof Kiriakis - Mpitzaros, Academic Staff of Department of Electronics Engineering

Prof Ganetsos, Department of Automation Engineering

Prof Vasiliadis, Academic Staff of Department of Textile Engineering

Prof Panagiotatos, Academic Staff of Department of Mechanical Engineering
Prof Nikolopoulos, Academic Staff of Department of Computer System Engineering

Prof Psomopoulos Academic Staff of Department of Electrical Engineering
Prof Repapis, Academic Staff of Department of Civil Engineering

On the second day of the visit the EEC met with academic staff members from all departments of the PUAS:

Prof Kalantonis, Academic Staff of Department of Business and Administration

Prof Koukouletsos, Academic Staff of Department of Electronics Engineering

Prof Papoutsidakis, Department of Automation Engineering

Prof Priniotakis, Academic Staff of Department of Textile Engineering

Prof Nikas, Academic Staff of Department of Mechanical Engineering

Prof Nikolopoulos, Academic Staff of Department of Computer System Engineering

Prof Papailias, Academic Staff of Department of Accounting and Finance

Prof Hyz, Academic Staff of Department of Accounting and Finance

Prof Stathopoulos, Academic Staff of Department of Electronic Engineering

Prof Kantzos, Academic Staff of Department of Automation Engineering

Prof Malikouti, Academic Staff of Department of Civil Engineering

After the academic staff, the EEC met with 15 student representatives from various departments of the Institute.

The EEC also asked to meet the 8 ERASMUS students that are currently registered in the PUAS for the Spring Semester (not included in the original schedule). The students were from Sweden, Germany, Czech Republic, and Turkey. The EEC also met with four prospective ERASMUS Greek students.

The EEC also requested to meet teaching assistants (research scholars) of the PUAS. The following were present in the meeting:

Mrs. Dagli
Mr. Tsotsolas
Mr. Bellisiotis
Mr. Moschonas
Mr. Kogias
Mrs. Larissi
Mr. Katsouleas
Mrs. Drits
Mrs. Zachmanoglou
Mr. Stasis

The EEC met with the following Chief Administration Officers:

Dr. G. Papadopoulos, General Director of PUAS
Dr. S. Patsikas, Head of Erasmus Department
Mr. I. Psicha, Head of Human Resource Department
Mr. J. Agiopetritis, Head of IT Department
Mr. P. Douzenis, Head of Financial Department
Mrs. M. Papadopoulou, Head of Students Service Department
Mr. A. Vamvakas, Head of Procurement Department
Mrs. Androulaki, Supervisor of Research Funding Deposit Research
Mrs. Kaltsogianni, Supervisor of Internal Affairs of Liaison Office
Mrs. Drimi, Supervisor of Library Department
Mrs. Sigala Maria, Supervisor of Public Relations Department

Later in the afternoon the EEC met with a groups of postgraduate students. Following the meeting with the postgraduate students, the EEC met with the following Alumni students:

Mr. Kaltsonidis I.
Mr. Sofianopoulos E.
Mr. Oikonomidis A.
Mr. Potiriadis P.
Mr. Andrianakos
Mr. Skordoulis M.
Mrs. Muho E.
Mrs. Sandalidi E.
Mrs. Pouloudi E.
Mr. Kamateri D.
Mr. Adamopoulos G.
Mr. Vynias D.
Mr. Panagiotou D.
Mr. Mpatatoudis K.

Mr. Zoumpoulakis S.
Mr. Christodoulou G.
Mr. Andrianakos

The meeting with the external partners (stakeholders) concluded the visit of the second day. External Partners from industry, society and/or local authority representatives who were present in the meeting were:

Mr. Korkidis, President of ΕΒΕΠ (Piraeus Chamber of Commerce and Industry)
Mr. Dimopoulos, President of EETEM (Union of Engineers TE)
Mr. Mihalaros, President of ΒΕΠ (Chamber of Industries of Piraeus)
Mr. Karageorgiou, Vice President of SVAP, (Federation of Attica and Piraeus Industries)
Mr. Kyriakopoulos G., Vice Mayor of Kallithea Municipality
Mr. Papakonstantinou D., Vice Mayor of Penteli Municipality and manager of Crethidev Company
Mrs. Dimitropoulou Anna, Representative of "ΚΕΘΕΑ ΝΟΣΤΟΣ"
Mr. Politakis P., representative of ΕΣΕΕ (Federation of Traders Association of Attica)
Mr. Manesiotis, representative of ΕΣΠ (Piraeus Commerce Union)
Mr. Pantelakis, member of the board SVAP

The site visit was concluded on the fourth day Thursday, March 11, (as the day before was devoted to the private meetings of the EEC members for preparation of the report) with an oral feedback of the results and impressions of the EEC to the President, the Vice Presidents, the Deans, the Heads of Departments and the President of the Institutional Council as well other interested staff members.

During this visit, the EEC also visited the following areas in the PUAS campus:

The Library

The Erasmus Office

The Careers and Liaison Office

The Center of Counseling and Psychological Support

The restaurant

The Sport facilities

List of reports and other Documents submitted to the EEC

Additional material included: Report of the Institutional Strategy; Internal Quality Assurance System; Two volumes (2010) of the Applied Research Review (Journal of TEI Piraeus); Brochures of PUAS, Library, Liaison Office and the International Relations Office; Mobility Statistics of the International Relations Office (IRO).

The Institution provided the members of the EEC with important additional information in a memory stick with data and information about the PUAS activities and records. It is to be noted here that the original Internal Evaluation Report (as it was handed to the HQA) was not up to date, lacking some substantial information. However, the administration promptly provided any documents the EEC asked for such as: Samples of student questionnaires; Copies of Diploma supplements issued to students recently; A memory stick with relevant data.

Please decide in respect to the specific evaluation area (&2.1):	Tick
Worthy of merit	
Positive evaluation	V
Partially positive evaluation	
Negative evaluation	

Justify your rating: Overall, the documents and other related material that the Institution provided to the EEC were appropriate and relevant. Further documentation and requested information sources were promptly provided and helped the EEC to form a good idea of the PUAS structure and functions. Ideally, the EEC would like to have all documentation from the very beginning. Some of the additional documents submitted during the evaluation visit were not always applicable /relevant to the evaluation period covered by the exercise.

2.2 The Self-Evaluation Procedure

It is understood that this was the first Institutional self-evaluation report. Therefore, initial problems were expected. For example, the report that was forwarded to the EEC prior to the site visit was not complete with all necessary information. However, this shortcoming was overcome by the additional information provided by the handed memory stick on the first day of the visit as well as on the following days. Admittedly, the EEC was not able always to know what the updated documents (quantitative or qualitative) in the memory stick were, but the MODIP (QUA - Quality Assurance Unit) administration personnel were able to provide very promptly any information needed and to clarify any issues that the EEC members had doubts about during the visit.

MODIP in PUAS was established in 2013, a year prior to the completion of the self-evaluation report in 2014. The decision was taken early on to establish MODIP within the office of the central administration and as such provided the unit with both implicit and explicit authority to undertake its work. Individual schools and departments established individual units to gather and compile data and information relevant to the work of MODIP. Relevant administrative staff at various locations in the institution, including library, student services, Erasmus office, etc.

MODIP's function has also been incorporated in various institutional committees such as the general assembly. The function of MODIP, where it sits and how it functions is still to be determined fully but there appeared to be institutional support to embed MODIP within the normal operation of the institution.

The MODIP members expressed their reservation as to the willingness of some staff to contribute to the completion of the Internal Evaluation Report, so the collective contribution of this effort and the interaction of staff cannot be determined with certainty. The EEC, however, noticed a good working relationship and collaboration among members of staff of the various Departments, which is a strong indication that the level of cooperation is harmonious and a collaborative atmosphere exists among its members.

Please decide in respect to the specific evaluation area (&2.2):	Tick
Worthy of merit	V
Positive evaluation	
Partially positive evaluation	
Negative evaluation	

Justify your rating: This evaluation posed a steep learning curve for PUAS, but the enthusiasm and the good working relationship of academic and administration staff in various departments helped the institution to overcome any initial obstacles.

3. PROFILE OF THE INSTITUTION UNDER EVALUATION

3.1 Institutional Governance, Leadership & Strategy

3.1.1 Vision, mission and goals of the Institution

PUAS has articulated its vision, mission and goals as follows:

Vision

To be a modern and innovative higher education institution of international recognition, capable of offering education and research, at a high standard, in key areas that are currently of high economic, scientific and technological interest/value.

Mission

The PUAS mission is orientated around 3 key areas:

- Education (excellence in)
- Research (excellence in)
- Outreach and Internationalisation (reported in the self-evaluation document as connectivity/alignment with market demands and social contribution)

Goals

Education

- Undertaking consistent and appropriate educational programs
- Ensuring the international recognition of academic programs and their learning outcomes through, for example, ECTS, DS, etc.
- Promotion of excellence in teaching for permanent academic staff through competitions, awards of excellence for exceptional performance at subject level and through the student evaluation questionnaires
- Closer and more responsive connectivity with market forces so that education academic programs are developed and reviewed so that they have currency in the market place and respond to market demands for skills across all areas
- Provision of second and third cycle degrees (i.e. Masters and PhDs) either wholly or partially through collaboration with other A.E.I in Greece and international higher education institutions

Research

- Encouragement of staff in actively engaging in research activity and programs
- Encouragement of staff to bid and win internationally funded research programs
- Active support of early career researchers and of innovative ideas through internal promotion to aspire other academic staff
- Aiming to establish and participate in national and international collaborations

Outreach and Internationalisation

- International recognition of students' skills and qualifications as well as provision in Greek and English languages

- Increase staff (academic and professional services) and student mobility towards the attainment of a truly international experience through, for example, ERASMUS

- Provision of English language programs for postgraduate students and for ERASMUS undergraduate students

- Encouraging student to undertake their practice abroad, funded from international exchange programs

- Encouragement for students to gain membership of international professional institutions such as IEEE, etc.

- Lecturing program from professionals and other academics from abroad both for staff and students

- Establishment and utilisation of regional connections for placing students during their practice

- Contribution of know-how to the region at times of crisis and also to solve problems and work on regional challenges

- Contributions and participation at regional, national and international level as requested

- Running conferences and international seminars/workshops in collaboration with other higher education institutions nationally and internationally

The establishment of the institutional vision, mission and goals follows the governance structure outlined in the documentation. As such, there is a top-down approach in setting the overall vision and mission as well as institutional goals. The report provides clear evidence of how the various academic departments have informed this process by contextualising overall goals.

Throughout the evaluation, the EEC has seen evidence of progress made across a number of areas and it is clear that there is a strong institutional drive in achieving goals set implicitly. The various subject areas, departments and schools monitor the goals set through their various committees, which ultimately report to the general meeting/congress/senate of the institution.

However, there was no evidence of explicit, internal target-setting in any of the goals across any of the areas in the institution. The following are a very small number of examples, which apply across the board:

- In promoting excellence across academic programs there are no metrics of how this excellence is measured other than the student questionnaire survey. Even if completion/response rates are high, these questionnaires measure only students' perceptions. One might have expected to see a set of Key Performance Indicators (KPIs), which might include: retention of students per year, per module and per program, attainment figures, continuation of students from one year to the next, completion in 'n' and 'n+2' years. More importantly, after agreeing the set of KPIs it is crucially important to establish a baseline level of performance for comparison purposes, i.e. current levels of performance, and then project forward for a pre-defined period of time

(say 3-5 years) how those KPIs will be improved and at what level. Otherwise, the reporting of improvements becomes vague and non-evidence based.

- In promoting excellence in research there are no KPIs and no projected improvement targets. The data provided show very significant variations in performance in this area across departments but with no specific plans on improvements and at what required level. For example, one might have expected to have seen KPIs such as, increase in number of publications, money generated through external sources, attendance of international conferences, etc.

The above is not to say that no improvements have been made, rather, there is no evidence of an internal quantitative/qualitative framework upon which goals are translated into clear targets, which are then tracked against a pre-agreed level of performance over a specific period of time, to be reviewed periodically through its cycle.

The EEC has seen evidence of the institutions' agility in meeting market demands e.g. KTEO skills accreditation as well as those working in the Piraeus harbour, etc. Likewise, at Masters level, the EEC has seen evidence of both horizontal (i.e. more generic level knowledge across specialisations) and vertical (i.e. enhanced knowledge in a specialised subject area) innovations, for example, in logistics, finance, politics and automation.

The EEC is convinced that the current institutional setting is conducive to a very responsive and flexible way of operating within a (arguably) very tight national framework (e.g. level 3 degree provision). This also applies to the institutions ability to improve, which is significant.

There are two areas that the EEC feels the institution can benefit in this sections' area:

1. Establishment of a clear baseline and targets over a specified period, as described above, and also the system to track them.

2. Examine the possibilities of driving the strategy forward through formal academic and professional services staff appraisal systems, which translate institutional targets into individual targets, appropriately contextualised for each employee. Currently the assumption is made that because, for example, research performance is good for someone's career, it will happen automatically. Even if this is true there can still be varying levels of performance, which are contextual.

The EEC recognises that the above are not established universally at a national level, rather, they present an opportunity for PUAS to spearhead this area nationally.

Please decide in respect to the specific evaluation area (&3.1.1):	Tick
Worthy of merit	
Positive evaluation	V
Partially positive evaluation	
Negative evaluation	

Justify your rating: The lack of evidence of <u>internal</u> KPIs prevented the committee from awarding the MERIT grade. Otherwise, PUAS is an institution with a clear vision and mission, with enthusiastic and committed staff who are driven to take the institution forward.

3.1.2 Organizational Development Strategy

The EEC had the opportunity to meet with heads of administration at all levels.

This section relates directly to the previous section in the sense that any organisational development strategy should aim to achieve specific goals, which serve the fulfilment of the vision and mission of the institution. The recommendations made in 3.1.1 apply also for this section. However, the EEC would also like to make some additional comments.

The regulatory framework within which higher education institutions operate in Greece is at a crossroads in that it is heavily centralised. Defining the legal and financial framework of operations whilst also claiming to have autonomous institutions generates a lack of clarity. For example, there are limited possibilities to reallocate resources within an institutions' budgets. This constraint can be counterproductive when some needs become challenging whereby other areas can make significant contributions.

Within the above context all administrative processes appear to be effective in what they do, i.e. managing the pre-allocated resources in specific areas. There are clear examples of significant improvements in areas such as: alumni relations, employability of students, work placements for final degree students, participation of significant stakeholder groups in identifying market conditions and developing programs of study around specific opportunities, significant contributions at regional level and in particular specific sectors such as automotive, harbour skills development, automation, etc. It is also clear that, although MODIP is not institutionally part of the organisational chart, its location within the President's/Vice Presidents office offer a degree of authority, which facilitates the process of self-evaluation and one hopes the implementation of actions that come out of such a process. The EEC believes that there is adequate operational capacity to undertake existing processes.

On the other hand there appears to be little planning in relation to when specific goals will be achieved (not which ones alone) and at what magnitude (the issue of metrics). In that sense the goals are not measurable and therefore absent of concrete action within a timescale. The relevance of this fact is that implementation happens on an ad-hoc basis and the EEC suspects that the syndrome of 'who shouts the loudest' will prevail. In that way implementation can be heavily affected by internal politics and makes the process less transparent, which inevitably affects organisational development and ownership.

The EEC would make the following recommendations:

1. Following the recommendations in 3.1.1 the institution should be allowed to prioritise their budgetary needs (and be accountable for the overall budget and performance of the institution). As such areas that need significant development such as updating of ageing infrastructure, modernisation of catering facilities, overall landscape development of the campus, etc. should be prioritised

2. The effectiveness of administrative services should be quantifiably measured under the direct accountability of heads of administration services. As such, existing performance and future targets should be established

3. The measures taken towards goals should be positioned around a framework of evaluation so that it can be clearly seen which measure contributes to which goal, realising that there is not necessarily a mutually exclusive relationship between measures and outcomes, i.e. one measure can serve many goals

4. Within an environment of uncertainty it is extremely difficult, nearing impossible, to plan with any certainty on optimum allocations of staff to specific activities, but this should not always be a reason for not having an

internal plan and/or different scenarios on a 'what-if' basis. The EEC did not see any plans of that nature. That is not to say that the institution did not react flexibly and appropriately to significant changes. Indeed, it did that very well.

Please decide in respect to the specific evaluation area (&3.1.2):	Tick
Worthy of merit	
Positive evaluation	V
Partially positive evaluation	
Negative evaluation	

Justify your rating: Areas of potential improvement are highlighted in the aforementioned EEC recommendations.

3.1.3 Academic Development Strategy

The academic leadership team consists of Deans, Heads of Department and Heads of Subject areas as well as their respective teams. The various governance mechanisms both for quality assurance e.g. MODIP, OMEA (IEG – International Evaluation Group), etc. and also for management operate on the same principle of top-down and bottom-up. In that sense subject area and departmental needs are captured, discussed and debated at various committees, which then inform the institutional strategy and operational plan. There was clear evidence of this taking place at PUAS. The ability of the institution to respond to these needs is very restricted. This restriction manifests in the following ways:

- Restrictions in the replacement of full-time, permanent faculty (not allowed)
- Permission and decision making routes for transferring money between budget lines
- Capital monies for renewal of lab infrastructure
- Ability to award PhDs
- Ability to claim full fees for transferring students form other national institutions and hence restricting the ability to finance additional student number needs in terms of splitting classes in smaller sizes, addition equipment, larger spaces, etc.
- Risky planning of semester exam participation due to a large number of n+2 students who can, in theory, participate at any time

However, there are a number of recommendations that the institution can consider in helping faculties and departments achieve their needs:

1. Critically evaluate and plan in advance for potential retirements and allocation the occasional lecturer pool (both University fellows and others). That way resource should follow the needs for academic capacity in specific areas

2. Establish short to medium plans so that resources can be committed for 1-3 years to ensure consistency of provision and continuity for students

3. Optimise assessment schedules and automate as many processes as possible. In effect prioritise funds to address automation

4. Operate a 'students' first' philosophy and as such map out their journey at the University and optimise the various steps in that process as well as a whole

5. Actively manage the research performance specifically and overall performance in general across the departments. There are high degrees of variation in relation to research performance ranging from around 12 journal papers per academic in one department to just 1 in another over a 5 year period

6. Consider the introduction of an academic teaching qualification internally which ensures that all (both those that are new to the profession and others that have been practising for a while) academic staff are fully aware of modern forms of teaching, assessment and feedback, etc.

7. Critically consider the resource needs of lab work as it is obligatory to all students. Consider also opportunities for reallocation of existing spaces to where there are more pressing needs

Finally, as in previous sections, establish a clear starting point and establish clear, actionable targets, which are tracked over a pre-specified period.

Please decide in respect to the specific evaluation area (&3.1.3):	Tick
Worthy of merit	
Positive evaluation	V
Partially positive evaluation	
Negative evaluation	

Justify your rating: Recommendations 1-7 above highlight areas of potential improvement.

3.1.4 Research Strategy

The key items in the PUAS Research strategy were outlined in 3.1.1. Some additional, more specific points in relation to the faculty strategies relate to:

- Support and encouragement for full-time, permanent faculty staff to engage with Undergraduate (UG) and Post Graduate Taught (PGT) students in their research.

- Support and appropriate function of the ELKE (SARF – Special Account for Research Funds) account as to support the research strategy.

- Establishment of a committee which will aim to identify and support the development of significant research opportunities.

- Ensuring the support and operation of research labs at equivalent levels to those at other Universities both home and abroad.

- Organisation and running of significant international conferences.

- Relationship building and networking with other research institutions home and abroad.

It is quite clear that PUAS considers research to be an integral part of its strategy. The EEC has seen evidence of encouragement for staff to publish work and also to participate in conferences and relevant research related activities. There was also evidence of the sabbatical policy being implemented across the board and where relevant. The EEC has compiled a summary Table (see below) based on evidence provided by PUAS. This table includes the current staffing level (lowest in the review period), outputs per department (individual data was also provided but it is not relevant to this report) and research funding over the period (coming from the ELKE account and stripping away anything that is not formulae based and won through open and peer reviewed competition – effectively leaving only EU funded research projects). The table points to the following facts:

- There are pockets of excellence in some departments and more specifically with some individuals.

- Comparatively, there are some departments which clearly underperform by any standard.

- The amounts of research funding won are significantly skewed by the 'TELOS' European energy project, without which the research funds are very small.

- The EEC computed some KPIs which are included in the table and can be useful indicators of performance.

ΣΤΟΙΧΕΙΑ ΜΕΛΩΝ Ε.Π.		ΔΗΜΟΣΙΕΥΜΕΝΟ ΕΡΓΟ 5-ΕΤΙΑΣ 2011-2015		ΑΝΑΓΝΩΡΙΣΗ ΔΗΜΟΣΙΕΥΜΕΝΟΥ ΕΡΓΟΥ, ΣΤΟΙΧΕΙΑ 5-ΕΤΙΑΣ 2011-2015 *Πηγή: Ετήσιες Απογραφικές Εκθέσεις*		ΑΚΤΟΡΙΚΕΣ ΔΙΑΤΡΙ	ΣΥΝΟΛΟ ΔΗΜΟΣΙΕΥΣ ΕΩΝ ΙΔΡΥΜΑΤΟΣ (journals) / ΜΕΛΗ ΕΠ	Total Research funds for between 2012-2015	total research funds / total number of teaching staff (2015)
ΤΜΗΜΑ	ΜΕΛΗ ΕΠ* 2015-2016	ΔΙΕΘΝΗ ΕΠΙΣΤ. ΠΕΡΙΟΔΙΚΑ *(Πηγή: Scopus)*	ΣΥΝΟΛΙΚΕΣ ΑΝΑΦΟΡΕΣ *(Πηγή: Scopus)*	ΠΡΑΚΤΙΚΑ ΔΙΕΘΝΩΝ ΣΥΝΕΔΡΙΩΝ	ΒΙΒΛΙΑ/ ΚΕΦΑΛΑΙΑ ΒΙΒΛΙΩΝ	ΣΥΜΜΕΤΟΧΗ ΣΤΗΝ 3-ΜΕΛΗ ΣΥΜΒΟΥΛΕΥΤΙΚΗ ΕΠΙΤΡΟΠΗ	Ratio		
ΜΗΧΑΝΙΚΩΝ ΑΥΤΟΜΑΤΙΣΜΟΥ	15	50	1009	191	6	7	3.33	0	0
ΜΗΧΑΝΙΚΩΝ ΗΛΕΚΤΡΟΝΙΚΩΝ	22	265	14188	291	18	10	12.05	1049148	47689
ΗΛΕΚΤΡΟΛΟΓΩΝ ΜΗΧΑΝΙΚΩΝ	15	35		121	21		2.33	0	0
ΚΛΩΣΤ/ΡΓΩΝ ΜΗΧΑΝΙΚΩΝ	10	12	419	45	2	3	1.20	191444	19144
ΜΗΧΑΝΟΛΟΓΩΝ ΜΗΧΑΝΙΚΩΝ	17	111	2989	182	19	4	6.53	11000088	647064
ΠΟΛΙΤΙΚΩΝ ΜΗΧΑΝΙΚΩΝ	9	84	1462	56	20	2	9.33	0	0
ΗΛΕΚΤΡΟΝΙΚΩΝ ΥΠΟΛ. ΣΥΣ/ΤΩΝ	15	67	1011	116	19	10	4.47	411283	27419
ΔΙΟΙΚΗΣΗΣ ΕΠΙΧΕΙΡΗΣΕΩΝ	19	90	211	1	221	14	4.74	99822	5254
ΛΟΓΙΣΤΙΚΗΣ - ΧΡΗΜΑΤΟΟΙΚΟΝΟΜΙΚΗΣ	15	71		32	17		4.73	0	0
ΣΥΝΟΛΟ	137	785	21289	1035	343	50	5.73	12751784	93079

*ΑΦΟΡΑ ΜΟΝΟ ΤΑ ΜΟΝΙΜΑ ΜΕΛΗ ΚΑΙ ΟΧΙ ΤΟΥΣ ΠΑΝ/ΚΟΥΣ ΥΠΟΤΡΟΦΟΥΣ

The EEC would recommend that PUAS considers:

1. The adoption of KPIs in key areas of research, establish a baseline and then drive performance in key departments and performance of full-time, permanent faculty. A main risk identified relates to key individual academic members of staff retiring or leaving the institution. If this was to happen, the indicators will be altered significantly.

2. Developing a 3-5 year action plan that takes the overall research goals, projects them over the review period and ensures that appropriate robust, measurable actions drive performance forward. For example PUAS might consider to increase the performance of a department from say 2 to 7 journal papers per full-time, permanent member of staff, during this period. It is the view of the EEC that not all support needed is financial and most of it is within the remit of the institution.

3. Focusing efforts in key strategic areas for consideration, which might also differentiate itself, from other Universities and 'competitors'. Areas that were identified by PUAS during the evaluation include energy and energy systems, automation, etc.

4. Developing partnerships with more national and international institutions, which can increase the success rate of bidding, participation in more competitive bids, increase in joint PhD supervision, running of key conferences and workshops, joint student projects and practical experience, among others.

Please decide in respect to the specific evaluation area (&3.1.4):	Tick
Worthy of merit	
Positive evaluation	V
Partially positive evaluation	
Negative evaluation	

Justify your rating: Recommendations 1-4 above highlight potential areas for improvement.

3.1.5 Financial Strategy

The basis of the EEC evaluation in the area of financial strategy focused on how PUAS institutionally managed the current and previous period, which had significant financial challenges. The following were reported by PUAS:

- The institution entered these financially challenging times without any reserves and therefore had the challenge of financing everything through a revenue income stream as well as special provision made through applications for additional funding.

- The development of Masters programs has provided PUAS with significant additional monies to continue retaining full-time, permanent faculty and other administrative staff. This is an exemplar for the sector. Indeed, over the evaluation period the significant reductions in staffing have not affected administration staff, which are at the levels observed at the start of the evaluation period.

- The number of full-time, permanent faculty has reduced slightly (about 10%) over the period.

- Non-permanent staff (both University fellows and others) have been reduced significantly (over 60% over the evaluation period).

- Infrastructure investment has more or less completed and the institutions does not see a significant need for new buildings or capital projects.

- There is a need for refurbishment for existing facilities and in particular a very significant need for lab technological support.

- The additional student numbers that come to PUAS through transfers, reported to be 500 in 2015-16 only carried with them additional funds of 50000 Euros where the real need is significantly higher.

- Additional financial streams have been identified through accreditation of prior skills (the case of harbour skills), KTEO, etc.

The EEC committee did not evaluate the technical aspects of the financial system nor their accuracy, however, the parts that it has seen comply with quality assurance standards. For example, the research and other funds in SARF are administered to staff and other external partners appropriately and PUAS is gaining significant experience in administering financially large European grants.

The EEC did not see any evidence of how the budget is prioritised according to the Institutions' strategic goals. That is not to say that it did not happen. For example, considering the goals identified in 3.1.1, it was not clear how much money was invested in research, over and above what is formulae; which parts of the budget were allocated for turnkey projects in improving the student experience, etc.

The EEC has the following recommendations to make to PUAS:

1. Consider starting from a zero base budgeting in evaluating what actually adds value to the delivery of the institutions' core goals.

2. Critically evaluate the efficiency, effectiveness and utilisation of the existing infrastructure through new forms of organising theoretical and practical lab work, ensuring full utilisation of labs, reducing cohort sizes and multiple delivery of classes to ensure small number of students per course, etc.

3. Following a 'putting the students first' strategy re-evaluate the conditions of classrooms, availability of technological provision, catering services, etc.

4. Consider the generation of new funds through for example, charging staff members for parking, sport facilities and other provisions. Also, consider charging nominal amounts for some catering services and enhance them so that they become profit generating services. Consider the staff and student facilities and bring both at the same level, without exemption.

5. Target very specific EU programs for capacity building in key areas.

6. Consider the distribution of research monies won so that the institutional take can be increased e.g. additional overheads, reduction of staff intake of monies. It is worth examining in some detail how such areas are managed abroad, both in Europe and in the USA in informing any potential decision making.

7. Identify a clear budget for additional and key strategic areas, some of which could be targeting new opportunities.

8. Run a scenario of how the institution can survive and prosper without government support as a learning exercise for key decision makers.

Please decide in respect to the specific evaluation area (&3.1.5):	Tick
Worthy of merit	V
Positive evaluation	
Partially positive evaluation	
Negative evaluation	

Justify your rating: Despite the limited financial autonomy, due to the institutional framework of the Greek Higher Education system, there is room for some improvement in the areas suggested above (see aforementioned recommendations 1-8). However, we feel that the senior management team have managed to create a high quality physical environment for learning and research, despite the limited funds and regulatory constraints, worthy of merit.

3.1.6 Building and Grounds Infrastructure Strategy

PUAS has two Schools and nine Departments and is located in a main campus in the municipality of Egaleo, in the region of Attica, close to the port of Piraeus. The TEI of Piraeus, as was originally named, is built on the grounds of the Ancient Olive Grove of Plato, covering an area of approximately 90.000 sq. meters with offices, labs, classrooms, administration, library, restaurant, and other facilities totaling 49.000 sq. meters of built space on 23.000 sq. meters.

The above infrastructure was built originally in 1982 and has been ever since improving and extending its facilities in the above grounds. The building and ground infrastructure is well maintained and the EEC was impressed with the clean and tidy halls and outside facades of the campus buildings, compared to other similar institutions in Greece. The various campus facilities visited were well maintained and a modern library building, built in 2008, as well as the Auditorium of the Conference Center are very impressive structures in the campus. The new power plant, to be put in operation soon, will secure the energy sufficiency of the campus by providing the heating and cooling of the main buildings. The PUAS has very effectively preserved the age old historical olive trees and has incorporated them harmoniously in the campus environment (transplanting some of them when it was necessary).

The EEC noticed, however, that a better use of building space would serve the students better. The restaurant facilities need more space to accommodate the large number of students during rush hours. Additionally a provision for dormitories in the campus grounds (or nearby) would greatly benefit student life. The senior management team has indicated its intention to propose an extension of the restaurant facilities to avoid the overcrowding. In general the PUAS building infrastructure is in good condition and order, but the outside areas have room for improvement with the ancient olive trees becoming focal points along with more practical landscaping design. The need for a better signage system was also noted, as it was not always easy to locate buildings and get proper orientation. It is understood that some of these building and grounds improvements would need state funding, but others could be approved by the senior management team and be implemented within the current budgetary limits.

It is noteworthy that PUAS owns a building in the Exarchia area of Athens, donated by A. Anastasiadis which houses the Life Long Learning Center and there are plans for utilizing this building for extra activities (conferences, meetings, etc.).

Please decide in respect to the specific evaluation area (&3.1.6):	Tick
Worthy of merit	
Positive evaluation	V
Partially positive evaluation	
Negative evaluation	

Justify your rating: Although it was reported that there were no capital investment needs, it seems that there are parts of the infrastructure, which could be improved and spaces that could be better utilised.

3.1.7 Environmental Strategy

PUAS states that it does not produce or handle any hazardous waste in its premises. Urban waste is collected by the Municipality of Egaleo waste services. The main volume of recyclable waste is generated by offices and teaching classrooms around campus and it is mostly paper, plastic, and metals. There are special bins around campus for the recycling of paper and inside the buildings are bins for the collection and recycling of batteries and small electric appliances.

The circulation of electronic documents has contributed substantially to lesser amounts of paper used. The cooked oils and fats produced in the restaurant are collected and removed in special tanks by a private company for oil recycling.

Construction debris and other related remains from building works are handled and disposed properly in special containers during construction works. Similar procedures are used for disposing green waste from garden and trees maintenance.

The administration has set goals in making the campus energy autonomous. An impressive project for the production of electric power combined with a system of heating and cooling of the buildings has been completed and will be put in operation in a couple of months aiming to reduce the energy costs and power autonomous.

Furthermore, a system of bioclimatic structures, such as green roofs and shades, have been applied in order to reduce energy loss. The PUAS has taken part in the ECOMOBILITY project for environmental friendly transport means and maintains in operation a station for charging electric automobiles with the use of photovoltaics.

The EEC also noticed the ramps and elevators, which can be used by people with physical disabilities.

Please decide in respect to the specific evaluation area (&3.1.7):	Tick
Worthy of merit	V
Positive evaluation	
Partially positive evaluation	
Negative evaluation	

Justify your rating: PUAS has shown its commitment to upgrade the campus facilities, taking into consideration environmental issues and energy efficiency as well as taking care of the buildings appearance and surrounding areas.

3.1.8 Social Strategy

PUAS has fostered a good relationship and cooperation of many of its external stakeholders in society, the local industry, and among its alumni. PUAS boasts an impressive record of cooperation with the labour market, the professional and scientific associations, the chamber of commerce, and many private and state organizations.

The EEC was informed for a variety of activities that aim to connect and disseminate the research activities of the Institution to the local community and industry, for the benefit of society and the economy.

There is an impressive list of collaborations with a wide spectrum of companies and organizations in a variety of projects. The Piraeus Chamber of Commerce and Industry has established a strong link with PUAS focusing on programs and actions that have a substantial social impact and contribute to the development and improvement of the region. A worth noticed initiative has been the cooperation with a non-profit charity KETHEA (the largest Greek rehabilitation and social reintegration network), whose members participated in the collection of olives from the historical olive trees in the campus.

PUAS contributes to the cultural development of society, and cooperates with local artists and other organizations hosting cultural activities such as theatrical productions and exhibitions.

Through the Careers' Office, PUAS maintains a good and long lasting connection with its alumni society. The EEC noted the active participation of the alumni who support and contribute to the goals of the institution by being consulted on issues dealing with the course content and the practical training of students. Such cooperation needs to be fostered further in the future on an organized and systematic basis.

Please decide in respect to the specific evaluation area (&3.1.8):	Tick
Worthy of merit	V
Positive evaluation	
Partially positive evaluation	
Negative evaluation	

Justify your rating: PUAS is an integral part of the social and economic community in this region of Attica. This symbiotic relationship needs to maintained and strengthened in the years to come.

3.1.9 Internationalization Strategy

The PUAS is putting a great effort to achieve an international dimension in its teaching and research areas. From the meetings and information gathered from academic staff and students, it was made evident that the Institution promotes the idea of internationalization:

- The Erasmus+ program is well applied and promoted among the student and staff members.

- Delivery of certain courses in English is made possible for the incoming students but also for Greek students provided there is adequate number of visiting students. At least one of its postgraduate programs is delivered in the English language and there are plans for more.

- PUAS students are also participating in the Erasmus+ program for a semester of studies abroad or for their 6 month practical training.

- PUAS has established a good number of collaborating Universities under the Erasmus+ program and actively participates in the mobility of students, academic as well as administrative staff.

- Foreign professors are also visiting PUAS for week-long teaching visits under the same program.

- There is a collaboration with other Universities in the US (Kentucky, Texas) and has links with various international organizations.

- PUAS has been awarded the Diploma Supplement Label, a proof of its correct application of ECTS in the courses offered according to EU standards.

There are several examples confirming the importance that PUAS has placed on the internationalization agenda. For example, the ERASMUS international week (22-26 September 2014) successfully organised by the committee comprising Vryzidis, Kalkanis, Tseles, Cantzos, Rangoussi, Patsikas, Yannakopoulos, Alafodimos and Stasinopoulou, was warmly embraced by staff and students and it was well attended. A long list of international collaborations is a testament to the enthusiasm and dedication of staff to the internationalisation agenda. For example, visiting staff appointments to SRH (Heidelberg)-Germany, Vives Flanders,- Belgium, Bratislava – SK, with visits by academics from ETH Zurich - SWISS, Georgian Technical University –Georgia, Russian Academy of Natural Sciences – Russia, Cranfield University – UK, are only few of these examples. International distinctions by staff are numerous, with Prof P. Giannakopoulos's 'Chevalier of the Legion of Academic Phoenix (AMORA)' recognition in 2015 and the award from the Russian Academy of Physical Science of Lomonosov University are particularly notable.

The EEC met with 8 incoming Erasmus students who expressed their satisfaction for the way the Institution arranged for their welcome, induction meeting, facilitated their registration procedures, assisted them in finding accommodation, provided them with student passes, and offered free lunches/dinners at the campus restaurant.

However, the EEC notes that the student and staff mobility could be further enhanced by increasing the number of both incoming and outgoing students. A more active support from the departmental Erasmus liaisons is strongly advised so that students are better informed about the possibilities the program offers.

Please decide in respect to the specific evaluation area (&3.1.9):	Tick
Worthy of merit	
Positive evaluation	V
Partially positive evaluation	
Negative evaluation	

Justify your rating: The EEC acknowledges that PUAS strategy has set a goal to internationalize its education and research. The Erasmus co- operations for student and staff exchange as well as the participation of its staff in international conferences and research projects are indicators for such strategy. However, there is room for further development in this area. A greater involvement of staff and students in exchange visits and a greater collaboration with institutions abroad could strengthen the international profile of PUAS. Introducing more joint degree programs, which are accredited internationally could be pursued more aggressively.

3.1.10 Student Welfare Strategy

The PUAS campus does not have dormitories for the housing of students. As a result, students seek accommodation in the vicinity near the campus or elsewhere. However, in cooperation with other Institutions a small percentage of students, about 1%, can be accommodated in dormitories operated by other Universities in the greater Athens area.

There is a great range of other services available to students:

- There are 3 cafeterias and one restaurant operating on campus. More than 2000 students are served daily (3 meals a day) free of charge in the restaurant.

- There is a well-organized sports centre, fully equipped and supervised by qualified trainers. It includes an open air basketball field. There are organized sports teams for football, basketball, volley ball and swimming, with tournaments taking place at the facilities of the municipality of Egaleo.

- PUAS offers first aid services and a counselling office that deals with student personal crises, family problems and related issues for all staff members as well.

- There is a theatrical group participating in productions of plays and other cultural activities.

- All students are assigned a Student Advisor (Personal tutor), a professor assigned to each student upon registration to deal with students' academic affairs. However, this practice did not seem to be utilized by a number of students or some did not even know it existed.

- Additionally, there is the Student's Advocate, but it is not clear whether this service has been utilized by students.
- The EEC was not informed explicitly about a strategy for people with special needs unless these cases are dealt with by other services (counselling or student advisor).

Please decide in respect to the specific evaluation area (&3.1.10):	Tick
Worthy of merit	
Positive evaluation	V
Partially positive evaluation	
Negative evaluation	

Justify your rating: The EEC recommends that the senior management team considers the needs of students in accommodation and refectory facilities. A plan for dormitories and expansion of the dining facilities should be a priority in the strategy planning.

3.2 Strategy for Study Programs

3.2.1 Programs of Undergraduate Studies (first cycle)

The undergraduate studies curriculum is structured around a 240 credits (ECTS) over 8 semesters. It comprises core modules, optional modules, labs, and a dissertation. Attendance is compulsory and it is strictly monitored in all labs. In general, non-attendance of two or more lab sessions results in automatic failure of the module. Compulsory attendance improves students' engagement with the program and strengthens the personal mentoring system. Likewise, compulsory attendance facilitates the creation of a more vibrant academic community on campus.

By and large, most modules place emphasis on both theory and practice. The strong emphasis of the undergraduate curriculum on practical applications is one of its main strengths and a unique selling point. Linking theory to practical application is valued highly by employers, which has a direct beneficial effect on student employability. Indeed, external stakeholders, including representatives from the chamber of commerce and local businesses, expressed explicitly their views that the emphasis on practical application is what makes the PUAS curriculum attractive and strengthens their commitment to support and to collaborate with PUAS.

PUAS have embraced the external evaluation process with enthusiasm and they are committed to improving the quality of their programs of study. It is highly commendable that most departments implemented almost 90 percent of the recommendations made by the HQA departmental external evaluation committees. They restructured their programs, rationalised their curriculum, and improved their processes, which had a direct, beneficial effect on the quality of their programs and the student learning experience.

Please decide in respect to the specific evaluation area (&3.2.1):	Tick
Worthy of merit	
Positive evaluation	V
Partially positive evaluation	
Negative evaluation	

Justify your rating: Well-designed undergraduate studies curriculum, relevant an up to date. Student progression statistics raise some concern about prerequisites and assessment design. This is an area that requires some attention, perhaps a rethink.

3.2.2 Programs of Postgraduate Studies (second cycle)

PUAS offers 19 MSc Programs. All programs are well designed, relevant, and up-to-date. As a result, they recruit quite well, with the total number of MSc students reaching almost 1000. The success of these programs is to a great extent due to the unique blend of theoretical foundations and practical applications. The strong link of PUAS with external stakeholders, including employers and alumni, facilitates the updating of the MSc programs curriculum to reflect changing market demand and skills requirements.

All MSc programs are fee-paying and attendance is compulsory. Postgraduate students are highly motivated, highly skilled, and fully engaged. A significant number of MSc students are aspiring to pursue doctoral studies in order to pursue an academic or research focused career. There is also a large number of mature students, with jobs in the private and public sector, who are highly motivated to upgrade their skills in their respective career tracks.

As in the case of undergraduate studies, PUAS have implemented many of the suggestions made by the HQA evaluation committees. It is noticeable that the expansion of the postgraduate provision at the MSc level goes beyond those recommendations to exploit opportunities in newly emerging areas of market demand. Yet, this rapid expansion has not compromised the quality of the programs in terms of admissions standards or academic content.

Please decide in respect to the specific evaluation area (& 3.2.2):	Tick
Worthy of merit	V
Positive evaluation	
Partially positive evaluation	
Negative evaluation	

Justify your rating: The introduction of an MRes (Masters by Research) could be a potential avenue for future expansion. Such a programme could focus on research methods training and could pave the way for the introduction of third cycle degrees (doctorates).

3.2.3 Programs of Doctoral Studies (third cycle)

Currently, the legislation does allow PUAS to offer programs of Doctoral Studies. This is a constraint that does necessarily reflect the ability of PUAS to offer such programs. The success of the MSc program and improvements in the research culture strengthens the case for the introduction of Doctoral Studies programs. For example, the research output, research culture and staff expertise in the Department of Electronics Engineering and in the Department of Mechanical and Electrical Engineering could easily support the provision of such doctoral programs. This is true also for the department of Civil Engineering. However, as research activity is less evident in some departments some caution needs to be exercised before the weaker departments in terms of research could offer programs of Doctoral studies. In general, it is the view of the committee that the legal constraint to introducing Doctoral Studies needs to be relaxed, as long as there are some clear guidelines about the quality and requirements for introducing such programs. These guidelines could refer to requirements for research outputs in international journals, requirements for PhD supervisors in terms of experience and publication records, requirements for setting up experienced supervisory teams.

Please decide in respect to the specific evaluation area (& 3.2.3):	Tick
Worthy of merit	
Positive evaluation	
Partially positive evaluation	
Negative evaluation	

Justify your rating: NA

3.3 Profile of the Institution under evaluation - *Conclusions and recommendations*

PUAS is a modern higher education establishment with a clear vision, led by a strong senior management team and enthusiastic academic and administrative staff, committed to continuous improvement. The main strengths of PUAS are its strong links with industry and local business and the unique blend of theory and practice embedded in the curriculum of both UG and PG studies. There is evidence of significant achievements in all areas covered in section 3 of the report, for which the EEC felt comfortable awarding a positive evaluation or a merit. The EEC noted the lack of internal KPIs as a tool for strategic planning and performance evaluation. A number of suggestions have been included in each sub-section of Section 3 above for potential improvements.

4. INTERNAL SYSTEM OF QUALITY ASSURANCE

4.1 Quality Assurance (QA) Policy and Strategy

PUAS has a clear policy and goals regarding Quality Assurance (QA) and Enhancement and has implemented through MODIP a sound system for QA. This is clearly described on the website of the institution http://www.teipir.gr/index.php/el/services/adminsupport/2013-02-28-12-15-11 (but not on the English version of the site). Thus, all relevant information and relevant laws, rules and regulations, are transparent and detailed described, as expected from a quality assurance system. Furthermore, the website provides the compositions and membership of MODIP and OMEA, the internal rules and regulations of MODIP, the internal and external evaluation reports of the Departments, the institution's self-evaluation report, access to the information system supporting MODIP's function and operations, samples of reports on students questionnaires, templates in pdf format for staff and students to submit some data/complaints, FAQ and finally, information on events and information sessions organized, as well as on-line contact facility.

As pointed above, MODIP has developed a detailed guide for QA (26 pages, September 2015, Internal System for Quality Guide (ISQG)) available at http://www.teipir.gr/index.php/el/2016-02-18-13-52-29 (pdf file, bottom of the page), which provides a detailed description of MODIP's strategy, role, aims, function, responsibilities and processes. The ISO Guide of Academic Departments (Εγχειρίδιο Χρήσεως ISO ακαδημαϊκών τμημάτων) provides further quality assurance guidelines.

During the meetings with ADIP and OMEA members, staff and students, as well as through studying the various documents and reports provided, the following areas of improvements were noted:

1. Students are not represented in MODIP and OMEA, despite of the provisions of the law and internal rules and regulations. The response provided by PUAS was that students were formally invited but they did not appoint any representative(s). According to students, the main reason was the disagreement between various student groups. Students are represented however, in the Department Councils.

2. MODIP does not appear in the university organizational chart, as presented in the Self-evaluation report.

3. MODIP is mainly supported by only one officer, who has other responsibilities in the institution. School administrative staff provides support to MODIP.

4. As both the system for QA and MODIP are newly established, there is still no evidence of the effectiveness of the system regarding the achievement of its goals.

5. PUAS Information System (IS) supports MODIP's basic functions and operations. In some case however, e-services are not fully support and provide for the submission of pdf files (e.g. student complaints, staff reports, etc. http://www.teipir.gr/index.php/el/2016-02-17-07-40-29).

6. The main survey conducted centrally by MODIP is the student evaluation of courses and staff. Other questionnaires are conducted by other Units of the institution (but not under MODIP's umbrella).

Based on the above areas of improvement noted, it is recommended that:

1. A solution is found to the problem of the lack of student representation in ADIP and OMEA so that the provisions of the law are satisfied and there is compliance with the philosophy and provisions of the European Standards and Guidelines for

Quality Assurance in European Higher Education. http://www.enqa.eu/wp-content/uploads/2015/11/ESG_2015.pdf.

2. MODIP is officially structured within the organizational chart.

3. The administrative support of MODIP is enhanced.

4. MODIP provides QA in all aspects of education (teaching and learning, research and community outreach).

5. MODIP defines Key Performance Indicators (KPIs).

6. MODIP develops a self-evaluation appraisal system.

7. MODIP seeks external evaluation (both academic and not academic such as the EFQM - European Foundation for Quality Management).

8. PUAS Information System (IS) is further enhanced to provide full electronic services.

9. PUAS Information System (IS) is further enhanced to produce comparative analysis reports in summary/graphical/visual form for the various years, so comparative conclusions can be drawn and there is a continuous monitoring of KPIs.

10. More general questionnaires are developed aiming at receiving feedback from the students with regards the various services (both academic and administrative) and the general infrastructure of the university.

11. Stakeholder questionnaires are developed and surveys are centrally conducted by MODIP in order to solicit feedback from alumni, business representatives and other stakeholders.

Please decide in respect to the specific evaluation area (&4.1):	Tick
Worthy of merit	
Positive evaluation	V
Partially positive evaluation	
Negative evaluation	

Justify your rating: PUAS is clearly committed to Internal Quality Assurance and Enhancement. To this end, it has established a sound and transparent system for ensuring and enhancing quality. Further improvements can be made as per the aforementioned recommendations.

4.2 Design, approval, monitoring and evaluation of the study programs and degrees awarded

The design of the programs of study is carried out according to the institution's internal regulations document, which is published at http://www.teipir.gr/images/pdf/kanonismos.pdf and the various rules and regulations published by MODIP (Internal System for Quality Guide – ISQG http://www.teipir.gr/index.php/el/2016-02-18-13-52-29 , OMEA and Departments. The design, monitoring and evaluation of programs entail active participation of all stakeholders (staff, students, alumni, external industry/business stakeholders).

Program and course information (including semester breakdown and semester and course syllabi/outlines – περίγραμμα μαθήματος) are published on the web site as per the ECTS Label requirements. All programs are expressed in terms of Learning Outcomes (LOs). The vast majority of the course syllabi/outlines (from sampling performed) are also expressed in terms of LOs. Assessment methods with regards achievement of LOs are clearly indicated and thus the monitoring of achieving LOs can be safeguarded. The fact that the institution was awarded the Diploma Supplement (DS) label (and not the ECTS label as indicated in II - Section 2.5 of the self-evaluation report) is indicative of its compliance to the European Higher Educational Area Reforms and more specifically to ECTS. The samples of the DS Labels provided indicate also the correct implementation of ECTS.

It is clear however by examining the structure of both the 1st cycle (undergraduate) and 2nd cycle (postgraduate) programs that the implementation of ECTS was carried out in one of the two possible ways, namely using a non-modular approach. Courses are assigned different number of ECTS. For example for the 2nd cycle programs there are courses with 30 ECTS and courses with 4 ECTS (other courses have 5, 6, 7, 7.5, 8, 10, 15 ECTS). To some extent, this is because some programs are joint programs with other universities and as expected in such design, partner institutions have to agree on various aspects, which may not fully comply with their own specific requirements. Another option one could have adopted is the modular design, using a predefined number of ECTS per course (e.g. 5 or 6 for 1st cycle programs and 10 ECTs for 2nd cycle programs). Such an approach would allow, "sharing" of courses between departments leading to both academic and financial benefits (better utilization of human and infrastructure resources, no duplication, etc.).

Feedback is provided through student questionnaires carried out during the 8-10 week every semester and through oral feedback provided by the student representatives in the Department Councils. The distribution of the student questionnaire is done through a manual process and using hard/printed copies. This as explained, is done so that PUAS guarantees that feedback is received. It is indeed the case that in most on-line student questionnaires, student participation is quite limited and thus statistically, this may not lead to concrete and precise conclusions and thus action to be taken. As confirmed by the institution and more specifically by teaching staff, action is taken based on the student feedback.

During the meetings with MODIP and OMEA members, staff, students, alumni and business representatives, as well as through studying the various documents and reports provided, the following areas of improvements were noted:

1. The feedback provided by students, alumni and business representatives (except the student questionnaire conducted by MODIP) takes place primarily in ad-hoc basis and not in regular intervals, rather than according to a well-defined and structured process. The ISQG caters for soliciting feedback from alumni and for the formation of industry/business advisors but lacks a clear and specific process for soliciting and analysing feedback.

2. As pointed out in 4.1, there are no student representatives in MODIP and OMEA.

3. The student questionnaire aims at the specific course and learning resources including the staff and not at the program itself as a whole.

4. The internationalization of the curriculum of 1st cycle programs is not evident form the structure of the programs. For example, there is limited number of foreign language courses offered as electives.

Based on the above areas of improvement noted, it is recommended that:

1. The process for soliciting feedback from the various stakeholders is clearly defined and implemented; the feedback received is analysed and stakeholders are formally informed about the action taken based on their feedback (this seems to be the case only for the student questionnaire).

2. Program questionnaires evaluating the program are developed and annual surveys are conducted by MODIP to solicit feedback from all stakeholders.

3. Joint programs are designed based on the European Approach for Quality Assurance of Joint Programs http://bologna-yerevan2015.ehea.info/files/02_European%20Approach%20QA%20of%20Joint%20Programs_v1_0.pdf

Please decide in respect to the specific evaluation area (&4.2):	Tick
Worthy of merit	
Positive evaluation	V
Partially positive evaluation	
Negative evaluation	

Justify your rating: PUAS is committed to the European Higher Education Area Reforms and this is indicated by the correct implementation of ECTS and the DS Label award. The design, review and quality assurance of study programs is adequately carried out but needs to be more formalized and structured as per the observations and recommendations given above.

4.3 Teaching and learning - Assessment by students

Student generic pathways of studies are well described in the Program Guides and on the institution's website, where one can locate the program's courses and the sequence that students should take them. This semester breakdown (30 ECTS per semester) is very useful for planning the student studies. Detailed course syllabi/outline in the ECTS format are also available on-line providing all relevant information such as Learning Outcomes (LOs), assessment methods, prerequisites, reading material etc. Students are therefore provided with transparent and 24/7 information through the web-site. As reported, students can register courses on-line. Students are well informed about their teaching/learning and assessment methods/process/criteria, both from the on-line course outlines/syllabi but more importantly by their lecturers.

Staff reported that student advising is well developed and offered; it was also reported that staff are very approachable and eager to help students, maintaining an "open door" policy and providing emails and personal telephone numbers to students. Members of staff act as personal tutors to around 7-10 students. Orientation/induction sessions are organized every year to welcome new students and inform them about the institution and the personal tutors.

The institution employees a variety of teaching/learning and assessment methods depending on the subject taught. Furthermore, there is gradual increase in developing Open Educational Resources (OER) and e-learning material. The Institution has adopted a variety of e-learning tools that are used for developing OER. A detailed document entitled "ΜΕΤΡΟ: Τεχνολογίες Πληροφορίας και Επικοινωνίας στη Διδασκαλία και τη Μάθηση" (Information Communication Technologies in Teaching and Learning) describes the Institution's efforts in this very important direction.

Students reported that they have access to all learning material as the vast majority of their lecturers make them available in the electronic platform used. Some students requested that all theoretical lectures are recorded and are available for students who miss some classes and/or for the students who would like to see/listen to the lectures again. Student absences can be excused for theoretical courses. Students are required to attend practical courses.

The exam process is well designed and supported by the Institution's IS. Student petitions with regards grades are dealt with according to the relevant laws and rules and regulations. In replying to relevant questions, students stated that as soon as they petition a grade they are contacted by their lecturer who reviews the exam paper with the student, explains to the student his/her mistakes and justifies the mark/grade given. Finally, students reported that it would be very useful if all lecturers adopt a practice, whereby the lecturer publishes model answers of their exam papers. This ideally should be done through the electronic platform.

The following areas of improvements were noted:

1. Random visits to the class and conversations with students revealed that although first year students are well informed about their personal tutors and do meet with them, students in other years of study were either not informed or were not contacted by their personal tutors.

2. The Departments Registrars' Office (γραμματεία) service hours are very limited 3 days a week (2 hours a day), i.e. only 6 hours a week. Students reported that outside those hours they are not serviced even though there are people in the offices.

It is recommended that:

1. Staff is encouraged to publish electronically model answers/hints for answers of exam papers.

2. The Institution considers the effect of prerequisite courses and provides for a flexible scheduling of courses (where possible and academically sound) so that graduation of students is not unnecessarily delayed.

3. The Departments Registrars' Office (γραμματεία) service hours are substantially increased.

Please decide in respect to the specific evaluation area (&4.3):	Tick
Worthy of merit	
Positive evaluation	V
Partially positive evaluation	
Negative evaluation	

Justify your rating: Students are well informed with regards learning and assessment methods/criteria employed. Such information is provided on-line and through the teaching staff. Students have the right of petitioning marks/grades and there is a process for doing so. The exam process is well designed and there seem not to be too many problems. However,

the institution needs to consider the areas of improvement and recommendations recorded herein.

4.4 Admission of students, progression and recognition of studies

The issue of admissions, progression and recognition of studies is one of the most fundamental and pivotal issues that can determine the financial, strategic and operational performance of the institution. The EEC examined relevant documentation and can ascertain the following facts:

- Admission policy for institutions is determined centrally by government through a demand and supply model which is not always very transparent to all parties.
- Entry tariffs are determined by government and are used on the one hand as a proxy for quality/demand for particular programs of study and on the other adjusted for actual student numbers.
- The number of students entering PUAS every year through examinations (the predominant, if not the only method of admission) is determined by government centrally.
- Any transfers of students from other national units is also determined by government centrally through a formulae which considers societal, economic and other factors without clear evidence of the ability of an institution to absorb such students
- The progression of students' policy is also determined by government centrally and as such PUAS has something like 40% of its students being in the institution for v+2 years who can, at any time, indicate their willingness to participate at a particular exam.
- There was anecdotal evidence from students that they have not been able to undertake particular compulsory lab sessions and exams due to lack of availability of space, which, as a consequence, hindered the student's' progression.
- The EEC has seen evidence of appropriate description of programs of studies, awards made and other procedures, such as student feedback questionnaires and other tools and mechanisms for collecting data and compile information which is used for decision making processes on some occasions.
- The EEC has not seen any evidence of recognition of prior experience as a means of gaining entry to an UG degree.

The EEC was presented by the institution with many examples where the symptoms of the existing admissions and other processes were affecting operational processes, producing strain in financial budgeting and capacity utilisation. Such evidence included:

- PUAS usually receives at least double and in many cases four times as many students as the numbers it indicates as capable of servicing in any particular year.
- PUAS receives a number of students (up to 500 in a particular year) from other institutions (mainly through transfers, including due to closure of other departments e.g. Messologi) which generally have achieved a (much) lower entry tariff, who then struggle to progress their studies. Some indicative figures of up to 70% drop out (failing exams) rates were mentioned. In other words, the transfers did not consider the educational needs of studies.
- In the cases of those students transferring there does not appear to be any evidence that the 'money follows the student' in that PUAS is awarded the respective financial provision for those transferring students.
- Extreme cases of multiple students observing (as opposed to undertaking) practical lab work which undermines the effectiveness of those sessions and is not conducive to attaining specific learning outcomes. In some cases students might not have been able to progress because of this situation.

The EEC would like to make the following observations and recommendations:

- There is a need to model the impact of transferring students to PUAS over the last few (say 5) years to examine if there is any correlation between additional numbers with lower entry tariffs and the progression and attainment of those students as well as others.
- Although determining exact student entry numbers if not an exact science the government, in collaboration with the institution should determine a range of student numbers allowable for entry in any one year.
- It is quite obvious that students with v+2 and above study durations provide an additional efficiency and effectiveness challenge to institutions and should be considered as part of developing a new strategy.
- The 'money follows the student' principle should be adopted (or at least a formula which determined financial compensations) and used consistently as to de-politicise the process and ensure operational effectiveness and efficiency.
- The principle of transferability of students from other institutions and programs should be made, to a large extent, based on academic reasons so that students are not 'set up to fail', which is detrimental to them personally but also to the institution and society as a whole.
- The institution in collaboration with government should develop a system by which prior experience can be taken into account for UG studies as long as PGT and subsequently for PhD studies.

Please decide in respect to the specific evaluation area (&4.4):	Tick
Worthy of merit	
Positive evaluation	V
Partially positive evaluation	
Negative evaluation	

Justify your rating: The rating reflects PUAS's performance rather than the effectiveness of the centrally determined government policy. If that was to be taken into account the EEC has determined that the current admissions and progression model determined by government, including the greater than v+2 students is wholly inadequate and a major barrier for higher education institutions and thus would have been rated as 'negative evaluation'.

4.5 Quality Assurance as regards the teaching staff

Staff hiring and promotion is carried out according to the relevant law and includes external members (including at least one external from a University of another country). As reported, there has been no hiring of new staff since 2009. Full-time members of staff who retire are replaced by part-time/pro-rata university scholars (πανεπιστημιακούς υπότροφους) employed normally on a 20-hours per week contract.

Members of staff complete at regular intervals a template available at MODIP's website (απογραφικό δελτίο διδάσκοντος – staff report) and report on their research output (publications and citations, collaborations), participation in projects, needs in research infrastructure and industry and society co-operations.

It seems that the main tools formally used for improvement are the student questionnaire and the annual Department reports prepared by the Department's OMEA. The reports provide the chance to the Department Councils to take relevant actions.

There are opportunities for professional development such as sabbaticals (1 year paid sabbatical for service of six years and 1 semester paid sabbatical for service of 3 years), conference subsidization and mobility (mainly through the Erasmus+ scheme).

During the meetings with staff as well as through the study of the various documents and reports provided, the following areas of improvements were noted:

1. The gradual reduction of full-time staff can affect the quality of the education offered.

2. Staff self-evaluation is limited to the completion of the staff report (απογραφικό δελτίο διδάσκοντος). There is no coherent self and peer evaluation system that allows/enforces self-evaluation and assignment of personal aims and objectives.

3. Very few members of staff have made use of the sabbatical scheme. The conference subsidization is not adequate.

It is recommended that:

1. A self-evaluation system is introduced through which members of staff can reflect at regular intervals (e.g. every 2-3 years) on the performance, teaching, research, administrative work and service to university and finally, contribution to society; they could report not only their past performance but also provide short and long terms aims and objectives (and associate timeframes), that can be evaluated.

2. A peer evaluation system is introduced, through which peers provide peer evaluation based on the suggested self-evaluation process explained above.

3. In house training seminars pertaining to teaching/learning excellence, new modes of delivery, technology-based education, problem-based learning, etc. are developed and delivered.

4. A Teaching and Learning Unit is possibly created to provide in-house teaching and learning training seminars, including the use of e-learning and the development of open educational resources following a more strategically-oriented approach.

5. Staff is encouraged and funded to obtain formal qualifications in Teaching and Learning in Higher Education.

6. Sabbaticals are further encouraged/funded.

7. Conference subsidization is further supported.

8. 3rd cycle programs (Doctoral Degrees) are offered in Departments that offer 2nd cycle programs (Masters) and which have a strong research record.

Please decide in respect to the specific evaluation area (&4.5):	Tick
Worthy of merit	
Positive evaluation	
Partially positive evaluation	V
Negative evaluation	

Justify your rating: Members of staff are very motivated and well qualified. The evaluation herein refers to the quality assurance and supporting services/funds available to staff for further improving. Furthermore, it is quite clear that many of the suggestions made herein require the allocation of funds, however some of them can be implemented without any additional resources/funds.

4.6 Learning resources and student support

PUAS organizes a number of promotional events (e.g. conferences, information days, competitions, and educational fairs) throughout the year. These events are giving the opportunity for stakeholders, local communities, students and staff to engage with the institution and to network.

Interviews of the EEC with undergraduate and postgraduate students revealed a general and complete satisfaction about the support they receive from professors and the administrative staff. In the case of postgraduates and alumni this support extended for many years after they graduated and it is achieved usually through professional cooperation and in some cases even through consultancy and mentoring. Of course this could be increased even further.

On a less positive note, students felt that the Secretariat offices opening hours are very limited (usually Mon-Wed-Fri 11:00-13:00). Although most of the receptions claim they provide service to students outside this timetable, students' perception is that they do not feel very welcome to seek advice outside the formal hours. Extending opening hours is probably needed in order to allow more access especially for working students.

The institutional role of the Personal Tutor needs to be upgraded and advertised to all students, even with the introduction of some compulsory personal tutorial sessions. Evidence gathered from several students depicts a situation where the role of personal tutor exists but is not fully utilized by students. Many students said they never heard of it, others were only vaguely aware. PUAS could actively support and encourage the smooth implementation and the transformation of the Personal Tutor system.

The EEC fully encourages the adoption of a more student-centric approach for all the support services available. Therefore, the EEC believes that a more concise promotion policy must be utilized in order to attract more students to enjoy the available services and generate the necessary demand for more. Part of the learning infrastructure is of exceptional quality, like the Conference Center and the Library but the facilities they provide - especially those of the Conference Center - seem to be severely underused.

The members of the EEC were impressed by the quality of the students they met and talked to, not only those that the administration had hand-picked for the various scheduled meetings, but also those who happened to be attending the classes EEC visited at random.

Please decide in respect to the specific evaluation area (&4.6):	Tick
Worthy of merit	
Positive evaluation	V
Partially positive evaluation	
Negative evaluation	

Justify your rating: Greater access of students to services (secretariat office hours) and other high quality facilities (conference centre) need to be given some consideration. Wi-Fi coverage across the campus could also be improve and become more reliable.

4.7 Information Systems for Recording and Analysing Data and Indicators

PUAS possesses reliable means for collecting, analysing and utilizing information, although only for a limited set of KPIs and student progression. Student satisfaction is measured in a number of ways through detailed questionnaires in six-month intervals. The Quality IS data collection system is still in pilot use and is not fully interconnected with the rest of the Information Systems. Although this would be desirable, the EEC understands that it is not easy to accomplish taking into account the fragmented approach that has been followed for many years in the past. The vision should be to attain full interconnectivity with the ΑΔΙΠ Information System when this will be operating. Considerable fund savings could be achieved on a long term basis if the centralized government (Ministry of Education) addresses the above issues with concrete, stable and durable plans.

The Institution needs not only to document the most important administrative procedures, but also ensure that all relevant documentation is effectively communicated to students, together with regular reminders of all administrative procedures. Course descriptions, assignments, presentations, exercises and solutions, laboratory guides and other useful material must be available online and coordinated by an appointed course administrator. The same holds for all kinds of useful information like events, important deadlines, lecture cancellations and any changes to timetables.

It would be useful if PUAS adopted the practice to benchmark against competitor establishments, with the aim to increase its self-awareness and improve its operation. In many cases this already happens with the participation in networking activities, but usually thins out when relevant funding ceases.

PUAS intends to apply ISO 9001certification to its educational departments, as it is stated in the Internal Evaluation report, which is a welcome move in the right direction.

Please decide in respect to the specific evaluation area (&4.7):	Tick
Worthy of merit	
Positive evaluation	V
Partially positive evaluation	
Negative evaluation	

Justify your rating: There is room for efficiency improvement in data gathering and processing as well as in communication channels.

4.8 Dissemination of information to stakeholders

The EEC met with a good number of external stakeholders coming from influential sectors of the economy:

- Commercial and Industrial Chamber of Piraeus
- Crafts Chamber of Piraeus

- Neighboring Municipalities

- Development companies

- Industries Federation of Attica and Piraeus

- Association of Engineers of Technological Education

They all provided warm support for PUAS. They also offered interesting feedback while they seemed exceptionally well-informed about both the Institution's current activities and future plans. The EEC was also presented with evidence of activities that demonstrate the connection with the local society which is considered very important taking into account the nature and size of the Institution.

Although the central PUAS web page is new, as it is declared on the welcoming page, important information is missing and is outdated. The web site could benefit greatly from re-design and re-organization. Not all teaching staff's CVs are included in the web site, some only in one language. It is understandable that currently all the Academic Institutions, which undergo a specific reform period may need more time to fix and stabilize their marketing activities.

Some suggestions are:

- Ensure all relevant information is updated and synced in Greek and English versions

- Add links to all services that can be accessed online by students, staff and visitors

- Provide a dedicated section for external stakeholders

- Replace photos of buildings and infrastructure with lively photos of students, staff and real activities

A worth mentioning initiative that demonstrates the sensitive side of the administration is the action that granted KETHEA (the largest Greek rehabilitation and social reintegration network), the harvesting rights of the ancient olive trees of the campus, that remained for years unexploited and neglected.

The implementation of further cooperative and innovative actions that involve external stakeholders would definitely disseminate and establish PUAS even more into the local communities and society.

Please decide in respect to the specific evaluation area (&4.8):	Tick
Worthy of merit	
Positive evaluation	V
Partially positive evaluation	
Negative evaluation	

Justify your rating: An area for improvement is the marketing and the design/updating of the WEB site.

4.9 Continuous monitoring and periodic review of the study programs

The comments made herein supplement the ones made in Section 4.2, namely "Design, approval, monitoring and evaluation of the study programs and degrees awarded". The aforementioned section reports on the assessment of the EEC and outlines the areas of improvements identified, providing relevant recommendations. For consistency reasons and in order to avoid duplication, the assessment and recommendations reported in that Section, are not repeated herein. What follows are some additional comments and recommendations.

Program review is carried out by members of staff who provide recommendations to the Department's Program Committee, which then reports to the Department's Council. Annual reports are prepared by OMEA. Program review is under the responsibility and umbrella of the School of the Department.

The Institution's alumni and the business collaborators provide relevant feedback and suggestions, mainly in an ad-hoc basis. The Liaison Office (LO) carries out surveys and provides the relevant analysis reports. Work placements allow employers to assess the students' compatibility with industry needs and this gives them the chance to provide informally recommendations for improvement.

Members of staff maintain close relationship with industry (mainly through the practicum supervision) and thus are always informed of the state-of-the-art developments and industry needs. All 1st cycle programs require the completion of a practicum (20ECTS) and this gives PUAS programs a significant advantage over theoretical programs offered by other institutions. It has been reported that research work is fed into the curriculum where applicable. To this end, PUAS seems to be committed to implementing to the possible extent the knowledge triangle.

Thus, the program review process takes into consideration the changing needs of society. Recent attempts to strengthen the institutions alumni association and the feedback solicited form alumni, as well as the surveys carried out by the LO help in making PUAS programs further meet industry needs.

It is recommended (further to what is recommended in 4.2) that:

1. PUAS establishes further collaborations with research centres so that 1st cycle students can complete practicums in such organizations; this will enable students who want to continue to 2nd and 3rd cycle studies be better prepared and will help in further developing the research profile of the institution.

2. A formal process for re-evaluating the allocation of the course ECTS taking into account student feedback with regards workload is developed.

3. Specific programs/units undergo phexcel – professional higher education excellence http://phexcel.org evaluation by EURASHE - the European Association of Institutions in Higher Education.

4. Specific programs undergo subject specific professional evaluation/accreditation.

Please decide in respect to the specific evaluation area (&4.9):	Tick
Worthy of merit	
Positive evaluation	V
Partially positive evaluation	
Negative evaluation	

Justify your rating: The continuous review of study programs is adequately carried out, but needs to be more formalized and structured as per the observations and recommendations given in Section 4.2 and herein.

4.10 Periodic external evaluation

This is the first external evaluation at the institutional level. PUAS strongly believes and is committed to both internal and external evaluation. This is evident at the highest level of the hierarchy (President, Vice-Presidents, Deans of Schools) but also at the middle management level (Department Heads), as well as at the level of staff. It seems that the message for external evaluation has been successfully transferred to and cultivated in the teaching and administrative staff. To this end, the institution's top management team needs to be credited with this success. PUAS reported that it will take on board the recommendations made herein and implement them to the possible extent. The main concern is the budget required. As reported, the institution has already implemented many of the recommendations made during the external evaluations of the Departments.

PUAS could proceed and voluntary request and conduct other international external evaluations for specific programs (e.g. AMBA accreditation for the MBA programs). Such accreditations will help the institution improve further. The award of associated labels will also help make its programs more competitive (especially the second-cycle programs) and thus more attractive to prospective students internationally.

Please decide in respect to the specific evaluation area (&4.10):	Tick
Worthy of merit	
Positive evaluation	V
Partially positive evaluation	
Negative evaluation	

Justify your rating: PUAS and its top and middle level management assured us that they will take the recommendations of the EEC into consideration. Al teaching and administrative staff should be credited for embracing both the internal and the external evaluations and continue with the same zeal. Seeking international accreditations for specific programs is an area to consider in the future. International accreditations will increase the external profile of PUAS and its programs.

4.11 Internal System of Quality Assurance – Conclusions and recommendations

Internal System Quality Assurance procedures are in place and work effectively. There are, however, certain areas for improvement, mostly with the gathering, analysing and communication information on a greater range of activities and KPIs. In general, the senior management team, staff and students have embraced the internal and external evaluation processes and they are willing to implement any recommendations to the extent that financial constraints allow. International accreditations of certain degrees is an area of potential improvement, which could have great benefits for the marketability and international reputation of these programs.

5. OPERATION OF THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATION OF THE INSTITUTION

5.1 Central Administration Services of the Institution

The efficient operation of Central Administration Services is essential for the institution to be able to deliver its mission. Following extensive discussions with the General Secretary of PUAS, Dr G. Papadopoulos, and the chief administration officers during our visit on Tuesday, 8 March 2016, it emerged that the relationship between administration services departments, academic departments and the leadership of the institution is a harmonious one. Administration officers are well-qualified, with considerable experience in their area of operation, leading their sections effectively and providing a professional service of a very high standard. This impression is further supported by staff and students testimonials during our visit.

Students were generally satisfied with the level and quality of support services. They commented positively on the library provision and IT services. The library resources and facilities are modern and fit for purpose. The library offers a valuable space, which is conducive to studying and learning. Students are particularly enthusiastic to be using the library as a learning space. The IT department provides a high quality service for staff, students, and the administrative functions of the institution. Students were particularly complimentary about the Moodle system and the level of access to online resources, on campus and remotely. The only main concern regarding IT services related to the hardware provision. Staff and students thought that computing hardware was in some cases out-of-date. This reflects the general pressure on funding and resources, affecting all services in the institution. However, it was clear, and highly commendable, that the IT staff have made every effort to mitigate the effect of the resource constraint on the quality of service and the student learning and experience. The IT department are very instrumental in embracing new technologies and moving many services to become WEB based (cloud) technologies. This is a cost-saving way to provide better access to IT services for students and staff alike. Likewise, IT services support the function of many other administration departments, including Finance and the Special Account for Research Funds (SARF), with most procedures in these department already fully digitised.

Having the chance to talk to eight current ERASMUS students, we got the impression that the quality of service provided by staff in the ERASMUS office was exceptional. The Employment and Career Centre (ECC) and the Public/ International relations department has established in recent years a robust system of supporting Alumni relations. Admittedly, the strong links that Alumni maintain with PUAS is fostered by the strong relationships they build with academic staff during their studies, which have evolved to collaborative career and professional relationships. When we met alumni representatives, during the institutional visit, they repeatedly highlighted the two-way beneficial collaboration with their previous academic mentors and professors.

The Finance department operates efficiently under the leadership of an experienced, professionally qualified director. Financial processes are fully computerised and have operated for many years effectively, without any issues arising to be of any concern. The allocation of budgets is decided by the council. The Director of Finance occasionally makes recommendations for budget item reallocations to be approved by the council. The office of Special Account for Research Funds (SARF) is equally efficient in managing financial aspects of externally funded projects and collecting financial and statistical information for

planning purposes. Such data could be analysed and be reported in more detail, whenever possible (e.g. names of principal investigators, co-investigators, gender, age, ranks of investigators, duration of project, etc.). The department of human resources has been operating with enthusiastic and well-qualified staff who implement processes and regulations with exceptional professionalism.

The students were satisfied with the refectory service, especially the quality and variety of food offered. There was a concern, however, with the overcrowding and the long waiting times to be served in line. There seems to be scope for extending the refectory building to reduce overcrowding. Students commented positively about the sporting facilities and social and cultural activities, which they tend to use and participate in.

Please decide in respect to the specific evaluation area (&5.1):	Tick
Worthy of merit	
Positive evaluation	V
Partially positive evaluation	
Negative evaluation	

Justify your rating: While central services operate efficiently and offer a high quality service, there is room for improvement in prioritizing the allocation of funds towards further improving the student experience. Also, a wider range of high quality international collaborations and networks could be further pursued in the future.

5.2 Operation of the Central Administration of the Institution – *Conclusions and recommendations*

By and large, central administration services are run efficiently by professional, well-qualified staff. Administrative departments have embraced technology and automation, including WEB based technologies, which improve access and reduce operating costs. Enthusiastic and dedicated staff are keen to work harmoniously with academic staff and senior management in order to make a contribution in achieving the vision and mission of the institution. The General Secretary is providing effective leadership with dedication and commitment.

Although resource issues have been addressed to some extent with efficiency costs driven by new technologies (WEB based IT), certain student-focused services have been adversely affected (see, for example, refectory overcrowding). The availability of data for reporting and planning purposes is not always easily available. More detailed information on a greater range of KPIs is something to aim for in the future.

In a climate of budget cuts and austerity measures, it is important for PUAS to pursue cost efficiency targets through innovative solutions by exploiting new technologies. Rewarding dedicated staff and celebrating achievement and success is an important endeavour, which needs to be embedded in the organizational culture of PUAS. There is plenty of potential for further international collaborations and therefore strengthening the international office is a good investment. Finally, capital investment is still needed to improve student services and experience.

6. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

PUAS is a modern and forward looking institution led by a strong senior management team and enthusiastic academic and administrative staff. All stakeholders of PUAS are committed to a process of continuous improvement and have embraced internal and external quality assurance evaluations with a noticeable zeal. Its unique character of combining theoretical knowledge with practical application places PUAS in a position of strength in the market place, with tangible benefits for the employability of its students. The successful expansion of the MSc programmes (second-cycle degrees) in tandem with improvements in the research environment in recent years has strengthen PUAS' case for introducing third-cycle degree programs (PhD). The EEC felt that this is going to be a feasible and desirable development as long as clear criteria for PhD supervision and awards are adopted, which could require supervisors to be active researchers with research of international standing.

The strong links of PUAS with industry and local businesses were noted by the EEC who felt that there is a great enthusiasm from business leaders to further develop these links in the future for the benefit of students, the local economy and society in general. The PUAS engagement with charity and volunteering organizations are particularly welcome and commendable.

Internal System Quality Assurance procedures are in place and work effectively. There are, however, certain areas for improvement, mostly with the gathering, analysing and communication information on a greater range of activities and KPIs. The lack of internal KPIs for various areas of activity (e.g. student progression and achievement, research output targets, income generation etc.) is indeed a shortcoming that needs to be addressed in the future. The introduction of such KPIs is an important tool for a more systematic planning process and benchmarking of performance internally and externally.

By and large, central administration services are run efficiently by professional, well-qualified staff. Administrative departments have embraced technology and automation, including WEB based technologies, which improve access and reduce operating costs. Enthusiastic and dedicated staff are keen to work harmoniously with academic staff and senior management in order to make a contribution in achieving the vision and mission of the institution. The General Secretary is providing effective leadership with dedication and commitment. Although resource issues have been addressed to some extent with efficiency costs driven by new technologies (WEB based IT), certain student-focused services have been adversely affected (see, for example, refectory overcrowding). Capital investment in these areas may still be required.

In a climate of budget cuts and austerity measures, it is important for PUAS to pursue cost efficiency targets through innovative solutions by exploiting new technologies. Rewarding dedicated staff and celebrating achievement and success is an important endeavour, which needs to be embedded in the organizational culture of PUAS. There is potential for further international collaborations and therefore strengthening the international office is likely to be a good investment.

The EEC would like to note and to thank the all PUAS staff, students, alumni, and external stakeholders for their collaboration in helping us to complete the evaluation process and making it a very rewarding and pleasant experience.

6.1 Final decision of the EEC

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

Justify your rating: PUAS is a modern, forwarding looking institution with a clear vision, committed to a process of continuous improvement. Despite budget cuts and a challenging economic climate in recent years, PUAS has managed, through careful financial management and planning, to strengthen its position as a main higher education institution in the region. We recognize that a rapidly changing external environment, both in terms of institutional and regulatory reforms in the Greek higher education system as well as economic and budgetary uncertainty makes it difficult for PUAS to adopt a longer term planning strategy for further development and internationalization. Nevertheless, PUAS have managed to gain a reputation as an external facing institution with an ambitious internationalization agenda. Likewise, recent successes in developing a research culture and running a wide range of MSc programs have paved the way for the potential introduction of third-cycle degree programs. However, there is potential for further improvement in the following areas:

1. The introduction and wider use of <u>internal</u> KPIs as tools for a more systematic planning process and benchmarking of performance internally and externally.

2. Target resources and capital investment for further improvement of students' learning experience and welfare.

3. Further strengthening of the international profile of the Institution.

Finally, it is important to note that improvements in the regulatory environment, reducing red tape, and more certainty about future government funding for higher education are important for allowing PUAS (and all higher education institutions in Greece) to flourish and fulfil their potential.

The Members of the Committee

PIRAEUS UNIVERSITY OF APPLIED SCIENCES

Name and Surname   Signature

Prof. Yannis Georgellis, **(Coordinator)**
University of Kent, U.K.

Prof. Mike Kagioglou,
University of Huddersfield, U.K

Prof. Philippos Pouyioutas,
University of Nicosia, Cyprus

Mr. Manolis Stratakis,
 Innobatics, Greece

Prof. Emer. Ioannis Vlahos,
TEI Crete, Greece