



ΕΛΛΗΝΙΚΗ ΔΗΜΟΚΡΑΤΙΑ  
HELLENIC REPUBLIC



Εθνική Αρχή  
Ανώτατης Εκπαίδευσης  
Hellenic Authority  
for Higher Education

Αριστείδου 1 & Ευριπίδου 2 • 10559 Αθήνα | 1 Aristidou str. & 2 Evripidou str. • 10559 Athens, Greece  
T. +30 210 9220 944 • E. secretariat@ethaae.gr • [www.ethaae.gr](http://www.ethaae.gr)

# Accreditation Report for the Undergraduate Study Programme of:

**Maritime Studies**  
**Institution: University of Piraeus**  
**Date: 4 July 2020**



Επιχειρησιακό Πρόγραμμα  
Ανάπτυξη Ανθρώπινου Δυναμικού,  
Εκπαίδευση και Διά Βίου Μάθηση  
Με τη συγχρηματοδότηση της Ελλάδας και της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης



Report of the Panel appointed by the HAHE to undertake the review of the Undergraduate Study Programme of **Maritime Studies** of the **University of Piraeus** for the purposes of granting accreditation

### Abbreviations used in this report

<b>ΕΕΑΡ</b>	External Evaluation & Accreditation Panel
<b>ΟΜΕΑ</b>	Departmental Team in charge of Quality Control
<b>ΜΟΔΙΡ</b>	Μονάδα Διαχείρισης Ποιότητας
<b>UG</b>	Undergraduate Program of Study
<b>ΔΕΠ</b>	Teaching Faculty (Διδακτικό και Ερευνητικό Προσωπικό)
<b>PfA</b>	Proposal for Accreditation

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>Part A: Background and Context of the Review .....</b>	<b>5</b>
I. The External Evaluation & Accreditation Panel .....	5
II. Review procedure and Documentation.....	6
III. Study Programme Profile.....	11
<b>Part B: Compliance with the Principles .....</b>	<b>12</b>
Principle 1: Academic Unit Policy for Quality Assurance.....	12
Principle 2: Design and Approval of Programmes.....	14
Principle 3: Student- centred Learning, Teaching and Assessment .....	16
Principle 4: Student Admission, Progression, Recognition and Certification .....	18
Principle 5: Teaching Staff .....	20
Principle 6: Learning Resources and Student Support .....	23
Principle 7: Information Management .....	25
Principle 8: Public Information.....	28
Principle 9: On-going Monitoring and Periodic Internal Review of Programmes.....	30
Principle 10: Regular External Evaluation of Undergraduate Programmes.....	32
<b>Part C: Conclusions .....</b>	<b>34</b>
I. Features of Good Practice .....	34
II. Areas of Weakness .....	34
III. Recommendations for Follow-up Actions .....	34
IV. Summary & Overall Assessment .....	35

## **PART A: BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT OF THE REVIEW**

### **The External Evaluation & Accreditation Panel**

The Panel responsible for the Accreditation Review of the Undergraduate Study Programme of **Maritime Studies** of the **University of Piraeus** comprised the following four (4) members, drawn from the HAHE Register, in accordance with Laws 4009/2011 & 4653/2020:

1. **Professor Spyros Economides (Chair)**, California State University, USA
2. **Dr Fragiskos Gonidakis**, Representative of Economic Chamber of Greece, Greece
3. **Professor Hercules Haralambides**, Université Paris 1 - Panthéon-Sorbonne
4. **Professor Nikos Nomikos**, Cass Business School, City, University of London, UK

## Review procedure and Documentation

The External Evaluation and Accreditation Panel (EEAP) received all the material sent by the Department of Maritime Studies (the “Department”) for review during the week of June 22. The EEAP visit was conducted via teleconference.

### Meeting with the Vice-Rector and Chair of the Department

The first meeting started at 11:00 AM (UTC+3) with the 4 EEAP members, the Vice-Rector of the University of Piraeus, Dr. Pantelis Pantelidis, who greeted and welcomed the EEAP members and the Department Chair, Dr. Angelos Pantouvakis.

Dr. Pantelidis spoke briefly, giving some basic facts and statistical information about the University to describe its profile in terms of history, organizational structure, postgraduate programs and characteristics and statistics of the student population.

Dr. Pantouvakis continued the discussion, basically giving an overview and highlights of the presentation to follow by the Departmental Team in charge of Quality Control (OMEA). He mentioned that in recent years, the Department has adopted and pursued an extrovert (εξωστρέφεια) approach, focusing on student concerns and involvement of external partners, “The Stakeholders”. He alluded to recently adopted academic excellence practices, one of them being the requirement of at least two publications in peer-reviewed journals with impact factor for doctoral candidates, before a faculty doctoral committee is formed for their research assessment. He mentioned the adoption of an ISO program approach that has been instituted for departmental administration operations. He said that a substantial grant has been awarded to the Department for the purpose of promoting and enhancing its research activities. He talked about the 30-year anniversary celebration of the Department which was attended by business leaders, representatives from the local business community and the government. Finally, he mentioned the fact that the Department is the first and only one so far, to have been officially designated as a *Center of Excellence*. EEAP remarked that the date of preparation of the Accreditation Proposal document submitted by OMEA for review was one-and-a-half-years old and may not be representative of the status quo of the Department today. Reasonable explanation was given for this fact, relating to constraints and delays attributable to the Hellenic Authority of Higher Education (HAHE).

### Meeting with OMEA and MODIP Representatives

OMEA: Prof Maria-Poulia Boile (Head), Dr Ioannis Lagoudis, Dr Maria Karakasnaki  
MODIP: Dr Christina Siontorou and Mrs Varvara Markou (Secretary)

This meeting was primarily a thorough and very well-prepared presentation by Prof Maria-Poulia Boile, addressing in detail the departmental issues and requirements within each of the 10 Principles upon which the EEAP had to make its recommendation for Accreditation. Because of the wealth of the material in the presentation, only half of the 10 Principles were presented and discussed. However, the document was carefully reviewed by EEAP members for the preparation of their report.

Some interactive discussions were also carried out during this session. EEAP briefly described the need and suggested an approach for initiating a long-term process for identifying and documenting formally all significant procedures or processes of the Department, following the task flow model structure described on Page 61 of the Institutional Quality Control Manual:

<https://www.unipi.gr/unipi/images/various/modip/%CE%95%CE%B3%CF%87%CE%B5%CE%B9%CF%81%CE%AF%CE%B4%CE%B9%CE%BF%CE%A0%CE%BF%CE%B9%CF%8C%CF%84%CE%B7%CF%84%CE%B1%CF%82%CE%95%CE%A3%CE%94%CE%A0%CF%84%CE%B5%CE%BB%CE%B9%CE%BA%CF%8C.pdf>.

A discussion on ECTS alluded to the disparity that exists between the workload requirements of credit units (28 hours/1ECTS) and the actual amount of work required which is caused, among others, by the Greek legislation that does not mandate compulsory lecture class attendance by the students.

The designation of the Department as a Center of Excellence was briefly discussed.

The EEAP inquired about the selection process of the External Business Stakeholders who would meet with the EEAP. The concern was that some essential partners, such as the Piraeus Port Authority or the Union of Greek Shipowners, were not represented. The Department justified this concern. Another discussion involved the outreach approach used by the Department related to the mobility for students and Faculty through the Erasmus Program, as well as the establishment of research or teaching collaboration with foreign institutions.

Finally, a discussion involved the advantages and disadvantages of the interdisciplinary nature of the department, as it pertains to the number of courses of complementary/supportive knowledge areas included in the Maritime Studies Program.

### **Meeting with the Faculty**

The next EEAP meeting was with Teaching Staff Members, Professors Efstratios Papadimitriou, Ioannis Theotokas, Constantinos Chlomoudis and Assistant Professors Dimitrios Tsouknidis, Georgios Daniil, Dionysios Polemis and Alexandros Artikis.

The discussion started with the interdisciplinary nature of the department, primarily as it pertains to the background and knowledge concentration areas of the program Faculty. The argument presented by EEAP (see also various parts below) was that it may affect the research effort cohesion of the Faculty and the financial efficiency of personnel hiring. A recommendation was tabled to the effect that the Faculty knowledge area should mainly be on the core areas of maritime activities and operations, while peripheral knowledge areas could be insourced by Faculty of sister departments/institutions. Dr. Chlomoudis presented his counter arguments and indicated that, in fact, Faculty from other sister departments are indeed involved.

Dr. Polemis next presented some arguments in support of noteworthy Departmental activities and goals. He mentioned that the Department has made great strides and improvements during the last five years, one of which being to maximize the use of faculty from sister departments to cover courses of complementary knowledge areas. He reiterated the accomplishment of the Department designation as a Center of Excellence.

Related to student issues, Dr. Polemis pointed out that there is a high rate of employment retention associated with students who engage in practical training, a very positive indicator of their preparation and performance. In a question regarding the Departmental marketing efforts to attract incoming Freshmen students, he pointed to some activities such as conducting two to five annual visits and career days to high schools, while commenting that the Department naturally attracts students because of its uniqueness, lack of competition in the field of Maritime Studies and its reputation.

### **Meeting with Undergraduate Students**

In the next meeting with the undergraduate students the first question was about the Departmental quality-related commitments and activities. They seemed to associate quality closely with the student evaluations, and that was the only involvement they could identify with. The EEAP encouraged them to get more familiar with the departmental quality improvement efforts, and get actively involved, since they are the beneficiaries of all aspects of it. They were

asked if they see any changes in the Department as a result of its quality improvement efforts and they answered positively citing the recent Undergraduate Studies Program revision that streamlined the number of courses and expanded the pool of elective courses, the adoption of English in the instruction of certain courses, the improved process to handle student complaints, easier access to Faculty and administrators, easier facilitation by the Career Office and facilitation of working students by adopting some flexible rules. They took the opportunity to voice their dissatisfaction with delayed delivery of textbooks but on the other hand they appreciate the fact that their instructors are very diligent in sharing their notes with them on e-class. Some students also expressed their preference for having lectures recorded, as this is helpful for students who work and study at the same time and cannot attend lectures. A number of students indicated that one of the reasons that the Department was their first choice was due to the breadth of the curriculum, offering courses in knowledge areas complementary to shipping, such as environmental or financial areas. Finally, students would like to see increased deployment of industry experts as visiting lecturers and adoption of IT courses applied to the shipping industry.

### **Meeting with Program Graduates**

This group was represented by graduates currently employed with known and reputable companies in the shipping business, including Allied Shipbroking, United Shipbroking, NYK Group Europe, Shipping 360, Navigator Gas, Eletson Corporation UK, Britannia P&I and STARBULK.

They all agreed that their experience and knowledge acquisition in the Program was very relevant and useful to their career development. The variety of courses in the complementary disciplines was also useful. The core courses are relevant, and the variety of elective courses allowed them to gain specialized knowledge. In the question as to what courses they would remove from the program, the answers varied according to their career specialization. There seemed to be a degree of conformity in their suggestions to streamline modules relating to the environment and oceanography, while some of them pointed out their preference for subjects pertinent to Maritime Law. If they had to go back, they would choose again the same path of studies. Most of them claimed to keep in touch with the Department while a number of them have been invited as guest speakers and have informally given feedback relative to Program enhancements. There is a movement for the formation of an alumni association aiming toward a more formalized platform of communication with the Department.

### **On-Line tour of the Facilities**

A virtual tour of the facilities used by the Department was presented next, moderated by Professor Boile via video presentation and pictures. All aspects of academic and social student support facilities, including the dedicated Maritime Studies building, laboratories, classrooms, library, dining and conference facilities were shown and the EEAP found them adequate. A note was made that the building is separate from the Central Campus of the University which may create additional burdens to faculty members and students.

EEAP members were assured that provisions exist to facilitate AMEA students, even though specific provisions for visually impaired students were not mentioned. It is interesting to note that the presentation of facilities and state of the art equipment that has been recently acquired through a substantial grant, triggered a number of questions and a brief discussion which implicitly demonstrated the Department's policy and efforts to integrate research and instructional activities. Finally, a brief video presentation of the 30-year anniversary celebrations demonstrated the support and respect of the national and local political and business leadership to the institution.



## Meeting with Employers and Social Partners

Again, in this meeting there was participation of representatives from prominent organizations such as Blueplanet Shipping, Seenergy Maritime, Evgenides Foundation, Capital Shipmanagement, MaranGas, Piraeus Chamber of Commerce and Industry and Tsakos Energy Navigation. EEAP inquired if this representation was adequate as it did not include the Port Authority of Piraeus, the Municipality of Piraeus, the Union of Greek Shipowners or any Logistics and Transportation companies. The department assured that this was not intentional but due to the constraints of organizing and scheduling this meeting.

The EEAP was impressed by the respect, dedication and commitment that all these representatives expressed for the Department and the quality of their employees that have graduated from it. Interesting to hear that 1/3 of the professional employees in the Tsakos organization are graduates of the Department.

The general perception was that the graduates are well equipped with the core knowledge of the Shipping industry and furthermore they specialize in selected areas of knowledge through the wide range of elective courses. They feel that practical courses, such as on ISM rules, should be incorporated in the program. However, the committee feels that this is more like vocational training that can only be acquired through hands-on experience or professional qualifications. They would like to see that practical training be increased and encouraged, if not made mandatory, ignoring of course some of the constraints that the Department faces on this issue. They acknowledged that there is no formal organization or structure for the placement of graduates in the shipping companies. Helpful to that end would be the increase of seminars and visiting lecturers from the industry and the increase of the number of companies that the Department has in its pool of cooperating partners.

The existence of the “shipping cluster” of companies and organizations that are part of the newly formed “Maritime Hellas” institution was mentioned. The University of Piraeus, via this Department, has been designated as the managing and coordinating agent of its activities.

Finally, on the request from the EEAP to the Partners to provide suggestions for the improvement of the relationship between the Department and the Shipping Industry, there was an immediate response in writing with the following suggestions:

- More field trips to relevant professional areas such as Ports, Shipping companies and Ships.
- Make Practical Training mandatory and increase its duration.
- Make the post graduate courses more focused to specialized professional areas and eliminate courses that repeat knowledge acquired in the undergraduate program.
- Increase the number of visiting lecturers in the classroom.
- Incorporate in some courses, as appropriate, shipping regulations, ISM, ISPS or internal audits.
- Spread the technical courses more evenly in the Program.
- Incorporate class projects/cases relating to actual work environment.
- Keep up with the bibliography relating to the latest developments in the Shipping Industry.

**NOTE:** It is the impression of EEAP that some of these suggestions are already being implemented by the Department.

### **Closure Meeting with OMEA, MODIP, Vice- Rector and Department Chair**

An overview of the comments and highlights of the various meetings was given to the group as well as some of the observations of the EEAP in contrast or in relation to the *Proposal for Accreditation* document. The role and structure of an Advisory Board of Department stakeholders was discussed having in mind that the Department is the only one in the institution that has such an informal body, incorporating a minority of external partners.

Once the podium was given to the Chair of the Department, he utilized most of the meeting time in promoting the Department by stating the progress and improvements that it has made in its Program, structure and operations in the last five years, and as a result he felt that it is mostly compliant with all requirements of each Principle of the Accreditation Process. In response to a comment of EEAP regarding the insufficient and perhaps weak information provided relative to the departmental research efforts, he committed and provided to EEAP more specific and precise information and the Chair of the OMEA referred to the respective section of her presentation for additional information. However, it also appears that the journal metrics that the Department has adopted do not reflect the multidisciplinary nature and diverse research agendas of faculty members.

The meeting concluded with the Chair of the EEAP committee informing all that the Accreditation results look favourable and thanked everyone for their cooperation and congeniality.

## **Study Programme Profile**

The Department was established at the University of Piraeus in 1989. Just recently it celebrated its 30<sup>th</sup> Anniversary and was lauded by noted personalities in the political and Business arenas for its contributions to the Maritime Industry.

Up to 2018, its Undergraduate Program has graduated 5836 students, 10% of whom were from 26 different countries. For the period of 1990 to 2018, 47% of these graduates were male and 53% female. Of the total number of a graduating class, 35% of the graduates are employed in the shipping industry within 6 months of graduation, 60% are employed within one year of graduation and 40% choose to further their studies or are employed in other industries.

The academic staff of the department consists of:

- 13 Professors
- 1 Associate Professor
- 7 Assistant Professors
- 1 Scientific Fellow
- 3 Academic Fellows

The Administrative Staff consists of 5 employees.

## PART B: COMPLIANCE WITH THE PRINCIPLES

### Principle 1: Academic Unit Policy for Quality Assurance

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

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

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

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

- a) the suitability of the structure and organization of the curriculum;*
- b) the pursuit of learning outcomes and qualifications in accordance with the European and the National Qualifications Framework for Higher Education;*
- c) the promotion of the quality and effectiveness of teaching;*
- d) the appropriateness of the qualifications of the teaching staff;*
- e) the enhancement of the quality and quantity of the research output among faculty members of the academic unit;*
- f) ways for linking teaching and research;*
- g) the level of demand for qualifications acquired by graduates, in the labour market;*
- h) the quality of support services such as the administrative services, the Library, and the student welfare office;*
- i) the conduct of an annual review and an internal audit of the quality assurance system of the undergraduate programme(s) offered, as well as the collaboration of the Internal Evaluation Group (IEG) with the Institution's Quality Assurance Unit (QAU).*

### Study Programme Compliance

The programme has a quality assurance policy in place. The policy is comprehensive and covers a wide range of activities. The policy is attuned to the needs and requirements of the University of Piraeus and is in line with comparable policies in Greece and Europe.

The Quality Assurance Policy is communicated to all parties involved (including members of staff, stakeholders as well as students) and is also publicly available on the website of the Department.

There are specific, detailed, measurable and feasible goals pertinent to the program of study, especially with respect to teaching methods, student satisfaction, learning outcomes and research output, links with the maritime industry, as well as continuous improvement and development. For each KPI the average score and the aspirational target are provided.

It must be noted that all the above criteria are addressed and analysed in the discussion of subsequent sections in this report.

### Panel Judgement

<b>Principle 1: Institution Policy for Quality Assurance</b>	
Fully compliant	<b>X</b>
Substantially compliant	
Partially compliant	
Non-compliant	

### Panel Recommendations

None

## Principle 2: Design and Approval of Programmes

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

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

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

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

### Study Programme Compliance

The study programme has been designed considering the state of the art in Maritime Research and the State of the Practice from similar undergraduate study programmes overseas; a comprehensive list of those programmes is provided in the Proposal for Accreditation (PfA). In that respect the curriculum is considered complete having regards to the aims of the UG program as identified in Section 2.1 of the PfA.

As a general observation, we note that the number of credits does not correspond to the true workload of a typical student in the UG degree. One ECTS corresponds to 28 hours of work and the typical annual workload of 60 ECTS / year = 1680 hours, represents a commitment equivalent to full employment. In principle, therefore, a student works full time for his studies and does not have the time to do anything else. We understand though that this is a problem of the Greek university system as Greece is the only one of the 47 countries of the Council of Europe which has not signed Bologna's most important instrument, i.e. the Lisbon Recognition Convention.

Being an UG degree means that not all courses have the same degree of relevance for all the career paths and destinations of the graduates. However, following discussion with faculty members, the EEAP appreciates the importance of including topics that are on the periphery of the core area of the Maritime Studies program (such as Oceanography or topics in Environmental Analysis) as these are important in appreciating the dynamics of key aspects of shipping, such as in Environmental Regulations. It is also recognised that the programme has gone to great lengths in drastically revising the curriculum over the last few years and in removing modules that are less relevant to the core (e.g. sociology and anthropology).

The curriculum is considered appropriate and covers a wide range of topics that are current and relevant for the maritime industry. All elements of the curriculum are relevant and useful and are also in line with the strategy of the UG program (Section 2.3 of PfA). Evidence of flexibility and adaptability of the program is also evidenced through the introduction of modules taught exclusively in English.

Feedback from the Partners and Employers was also useful as it highlighted that the curriculum is attuned to the needs and requirements of market practice. Some concerns were expressed in terms of providing specific training in more specialist aspects of shipping (e.g. ISM regulations). Nevertheless, it is important to distinguish between vocational and academic training in Maritime Studies. It is thought that the latter can be accomplished through practical experience, on-the-job training and professional qualifications, as well as seminars and workshops offered or given by external partners.

There is also an informal procedure in place for incorporating feedback from current students, graduates, employers and other stakeholders. This is noted in the document and a detailed flowchart was provided in the presentation. Although the schematic presentation is accurate, some elements of the process need to be strengthened. In particular, feedback from graduates and market practice seems to be incorporated into the programme through ad-hoc channels (word of mouth, informal contacts etc.). The EEAP feels that this should be done at a formal level.

### Panel Judgement

<b>Principle 2: Design and Approval of Programmes</b>	
Fully compliant	<b>X</b>
Substantially compliant	
Partially compliant	
Non-compliant	

### Panel Recommendations

- Formalize the process for incorporating feedback from graduates, stakeholders and other external partners.

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

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

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

*The student-centred learning and teaching process*

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

*In addition :*

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

#### Study Programme Compliance

Evidence of student-centred approach is provided by the various items in section 3.2 of PfA. These include provisions for non-discrimination based on religion, race and ethnicity as well as allowances for students with disabilities or special educational needs.

There is a clearly described procedure for student appeals, comparable to what is found in other Academic Institutions. The allocation of personal tutors to each student also provides an additional layer of communication between the students and faculty members which facilitates dialogue, enables sharing of good practice and provides an additional tier of information sharing.



There is provision for flexible delivery methods including availability of online lecture resources, flexible methods of assessment - including exams, group courseworks and in-class presentations - as well as online tests. These enable students to develop individual skills and be adaptable and flexible. Currently, modules that are assessed via courseworks or assignments constitute 24% of the curriculum with the aim of raising this to 85% in the long run. This is an extremely ambitious target and there are no further details on how this is going to be effected or achieved.

Currently, there are no provisions for the recording of lectures, as is commonplace in many Universities. Experience from other academic institutions indicates that students find this extremely useful particularly when revising for their exams.

There is an effective system in place for collecting feedback from students. The questionnaires are very detailed, consisting of 38 questions, and their collection and processing takes place automatically without human intervention thus safeguarding impartiality and anonymity. This is good practice that should be maintained going forward. There is also a procedure in place for addressing issues of consistently low teaching scores and, during our discussion, the faculty team provided anecdotal evidence to that effect.

All the above factors corroborate that the programme is delivered in a student-centred learning environment that promotes mutual respect. One particular area that needs to be addressed is the provision of pastoral care to UG students that undertake internships. There must be guidelines in place safeguarding the safety and wellbeing of students. The Panel understands that this is already in place at an informal level but needs to be formalised and worded very explicitly in the guidelines.

### Panel Judgement

<b>Principle 3: Student- centred Learning, Teaching and Assessment</b>	
Fully compliant	
Substantially compliant	<b>X</b>
Partially compliant	
Non-compliant	

### Panel Recommendations

- Provide details on how the planned increase in the number of modules with coursework assignments is going to take place.
- Introduce guidelines for the safety and wellbeing of students working on internships.
- Introduce the practice of recording lectures which can then be made available to students on the e-learning platform.

## **Principle 4: Student Admission, Progression, Recognition and Certification**

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

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

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

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

### **Study Programme Compliance**

There is evidence that all student-related academic and administrative processes and requirements from admission to graduation, are in place and functioning well. The Department administrative office has in place an information processing module as a subsystem of the university Information System to facilitate the processes and the generation of documents as well as providing statistical performance data.

A full day is dedicated to welcoming new students and briefing them on various informational activities to ensure that they are advised on all aspects of academic, administrative and social issues and receive orientation to the Departmental facilities. The departmental information system and the administrative personnel are available to serve all their needs and provide assistance and support during their course of studies. Each student-cohort has a dedicated tutor with whom students can liaise and deal with any issues that may arise.

Information is provided on scholarship opportunities, grants and living subsidies. Students are informed upon their entry and advised during their career progress regarding mobility programs, such as ERASMUS, via a university dedicated office for that purpose. Related to this is the information regarding requirements and possibilities for interchangeable ECTS units between similar cooperating departments at other international universities. They know from the start the graduation requirements for their degree specialty and they are supplied with the Degree Supplement for employment seeking purposes. They are encouraged to participate in research projects whenever possible and are informed about the possibilities of the Practical Exercise and prospects and opportunities in various post graduate programs. Finally, they have access to other support services and facilities such as the Careers Centre, the academic advisor and modern, well equipped laboratories.

The EEAP feels that the student support mechanisms and systems that are available throughout the student's career, starting on the first day of entry, combined with the student-centred philosophy of the department are well designed, regularly upgraded and enhanced to make their university experience a friendly and productive one.

## Panel Judgement

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

## Panel Recommendations

None

## Principle 5: Teaching Staff

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

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

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

### Study Programme Compliance

The profile of the Department is multidisciplinary, comprising such specializations as Oceanography, Marine Environment, Sociology, Technical Aspects of ships, all the way up to the 'core' areas of the program, i.e. the economics and management aspects of shipping; ports; transport; and logistics. This is also reflected in the diversity of resident faculty expertise, as well in the breadth of PhD research subjects, ranging from the ecocodevelopment of the Spinaloga (uninhabited) island, to the social surplus of transport, to the management of coastal ecosystems and tourism.

The Department feels that multidisciplinaryity is an asset for the Department and in a sense it might well be, in view of the importance, these days, of multidisciplinary research. This is particularly desirable in the case of externally funded projects, consisting of consortia of many diverse partners, composed in a certain way according to the demands of the tender. EEAP believes that, notwithstanding how well the faculty is selected initially, the multidisciplinary culture of a department does not necessarily lead to more and better publications, without the existence of a 'research strategy', or research 'orientation'. This is the more so when the faculty does not seem to have developed cooperative research links amongst themselves, as also found out by the 2014 review. EEAP feels that a *laissez faire* approach, whereby each faculty member is doing their own stuff, in this way maximizing the welfare of the Department, is usually not the right strategy, notwithstanding EEAP's appreciation of the importance of democratic, collectively made, decisions in the Department.

One of the ways the Department’s research strategy could be communicated is through a “Journal List”; a requirement to which the Department has not yet complied, six years after the accreditation review of 2014.

The multidisciplinary nature of the Department makes it very expensive too, *vis à vis* a scenario whereby non-core, peripheral, subjects, such as for instance ‘oceanography’, are insourced from elsewhere. These high ‘running costs’ are further pronounced when ‘research synergies’ among the Faculty are absent; in other words, when the benefits of multidisciplinary fall short of its costs. This point is relevant here in view of the Department’s repeated appeals for more Faculty members.

The Department’s research output shows considerable variability, ranging from research with just a few citations to a very respectable H-39. The EEAP did not fail to notice that, with a few exceptions, it is mostly the junior academics, at the assistant professor level, who are the most active and productive. The Chair explained this to the EEAP: “younger academics are strongly encouraged to publish”.

As the Department sees it, senior professors who, for a variety of historical reasons, have not been very active in research are retiring soon, while new recruits look (to this Panel too) very promising. The EEAP would like to see that the Department’s research output in peer-reviewed / impact factor international journals shows a marked increase in the next review, leveraging, to the extent possible, on the diversity of expertise within the Department as well as collaborations with co-authors from foreign Universities, so as to demonstrate the Department’s stated outward-looking nature. The latter characteristic (εξωστρέφεια) was not immediately evident to the EEAP. Along the same lines, only high-level information was provided for two MOUs with foreign organizations.

Faculty members appear to be quite active in externally funded research, national and international. The EEAP considers this fact very important, demonstrating the Department’s ‘societal impact’. However, this research is not always published in ways acceptable for academic advancement (peer-reviewed publications).

### Panel Judgement

Principle 5: Teaching Staff	
Fully compliant	
Substantially compliant	<b>X</b>
Partially compliant	
Non-compliant	

### Panel Recommendations

- The Department research output in peer-reviewed / impact factor international journals shows a marked increase and this should be evidenced in the next program review using a number of metrics. (a) the number of co-authored papers among

Faculty members. (b) the number of co-authorships with international colleagues, so as to also demonstrate the Department's stated outward-looking nature.

- Department research strategy and orientation should become much clearer and documented towards third parties and the implementation of such strategy should be the responsibility of a Research Committee. EEAP recommends that future chairs should come from the 'core' of the program.
- The compilation of a Journal List is given top priority and becomes a responsibility of the Research Committee.
- To the extent possible, new recruitment is made only in the 'core' disciplines, while 'peripheral' expertise, necessary for the delivery of the program, is insourced from sister schools/faculties, as well as external resources (on the basis of service contracts).
- The Department recognises the time and effort required to produce quality research in competitive international peer-review journals and should offer incentives to Faculty members in doing so. These could be for instance in the form of reduced teaching or reduced administrative workload. A condition for this would be that publications appear in the top-rated journals in the Department's Journal List.
- The EEAP recommends, in the next review, that international co-operation is strengthened, and the details of such collaborations are described.
- The management of the Department ensures that 'contract research' activities do not come at the cost of the staff member's principal obligations (teaching and (assessed) research performance). Ideally, contract research should lead to peer-review publications.

## Principle 6: Learning Resources and Student Support

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

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

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

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

### Study Programme Compliance

The department has adequate facilities for the effective delivery of the programme. It has its own dedicated building and shares office space in the main building. The two buildings are within walking distance.

There appears to be an adequate number of classrooms of various capacities; the classrooms are well equipped with up-to-date IT equipment. There is also a large number of Labs, which are used for the effective delivery of specialist modules. These include labs for Maritime Economics, Labs for Oceanography as well as dedicated IT labs for student use and teaching of IT-related subjects.

The department shares the use of the library at the main campus. The library provides access to various databases with shipping and financial data, as well as electronic access to publications, books and academic journals. These facilities appear to be fit for purpose.

Material for all taught modules is uploaded on the electronic learning platform (e-class) which contains useful learning material including lecture notes, articles and other useful sources of information pertinent to the program. This also provides a useful platform for communication between students and faculty for each module.

There is a wide range of student support services available to the students. These include: Accommodation, Medical Facilities, Restaurant, Counselling Services, Careers Office, Erasmus Office and the Office for Practical training, facilitating the administration of Internships. There is

also a plethora of other social and sport clubs and activities that the students can participate. All in all, there is a wide range of business and social activities to keep the students engaged within the academic community.

The students are informed about the available services at the time of joining the university, during their induction.

### Panel Judgement

<b>Principle 6: Learning Resources and Student Support</b>	
Fully compliant	<b>X</b>
Substantially compliant	
Partially compliant	
Non-compliant	

### Panel Recommendations

None



## Principle 7: Information Management

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

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

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

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

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

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

### Study Programme Compliance

The Maritime Studies Undergraduate Program of the University of Piraeus has established and already operates an information system for the management and monitoring of data concerning students, teaching staff, course structure and organization, teaching and provision of services to students as well as to the academic community. Effective procedures for collecting and analysing information on study programmes and other activities are updated in the system by the administrative staff.

There are several methods that may be used for collecting information and it is important that students and staff, involved in providing and analysing information, follow-up the necessary procedures. Information Management requires special attention, because of the General Data Protection Regulation 2016/679, a regulation on data protection and privacy in the European Union. The university should prohibit the free management and collection of personal data without consent. The EEAP was assured that safeguards exist for the protection of private and sensitive data that is processed through the system.

The Institution gathers the following information:

- The percentage of timely completion, suspension, or abandonment of studies.
- The satisfaction of students for the programs they attend, which is a critical both for the expression of the learning dynamics of the department as well as for the internal evaluation of members of faculty.
- The future career paths of graduates, to draw conclusions about the effectiveness of curriculum with respect to market dynamics, through the absorption of its graduates in the labour market.
- The profile of the student body, to draw useful conclusions and information about the characteristics, the needs, and challenges of the student cohort.
- The availability of learning resources and student support, so that they are distributed fairly and equally to all members of the student community, depending on their individual needs.

It must be noted that most of the above data is used to calculate the key performance indicators as mandated by HAHE and as utilised for the Department's goal setting.

Information about the students is collected and curated by the Secretariat department. Information about students admitted through the Panhellenic examinations as well as their other characteristics (nationality, students with special needs, athletes etc.) is provided to the department by the Ministry for Education. Personal Information about members of staff is collected directly in a pre-agreed format by the Human Resources Department, that maintains a file, for all members of the academic and administrative community of the University.

A typical subset of questionnaire types are:

- Graduate satisfaction questionnaires (with comments form)
- Employer questionnaires
- Course-Teaching Assessment Questionnaire (with comments form)

In addition, other qualitative data collection methods such as a) Interviews with students, b) Interviews with employers, are being used.

Teaching Questionnaires are the primary method for collecting information about the modules and their collection and processing takes place electronically using an optical reader that subsequently transfers the information in a summary table in excel. We understand that following the Covid-19 pandemic, the process of collecting and analysing this information has been fully automated online.

The results of the student evaluations are examined at the Department meeting, so that all members of Faculty are informed and participate in the improvement process. Also, all the actions of the Department for the improvement of its quality are announced to all interested parties by the President and the Committees of the Department.

The collected data is analysed to highlight the points of excellence of the Department, in order to maintain them, and identify the points that need improvement, in order to design and launch appropriate improvement actions. The Department recognises that evaluation is an important mechanism for maintaining and improving the quality of the program.

## Panel Judgement

<b>Principle 7: Information Management</b>	
Fully compliant	<b>X</b>
Substantially compliant	
Partially compliant	
Non-compliant	

## Panel Recommendations

- The department must collect and analyse data related to the availability, utilisation and accessibility of resources (equipment, social services, IT facilities, teaching rooms and labs etc.), to better understand and evaluate its needs.

## Principle 8: Public Information

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

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

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

### Study Programme Compliance

The department provides detailed information about its various activities which is disseminated to students, academic staff, shipping companies and members of the shipping cluster as well as other stakeholders.

The Maritime Studies department follows the latest trends relative to the market, relative to comparable undergraduate study programs in Greece and overseas and relative to trends in technology and information management.

The Department has two webpages. One is accessed via the general website of the university of Piraeus (<https://www.unipi.gr/unipi/en/department-mar.html>) and appears to be out-of-date. There is a website under development which contains a lot of useful and interesting information about the program of study. This page is accessed via a separate link (<https://maritime-unipi.gr/en/>) which however is not directly visible on Google. As a result, the new page is accessible only via the old website and is hard to find.

The department also uses social media platforms such as Facebook and LinkedIn, where the activities of the Department are made public. There is direct communication, via e-mail, with companies and employers. In addition, graduate employment information is made available to students.

Following the technological developments and the new ways of education and lifelong learning, the Department has developed e-learning courses. All class-related material is available on the (new) website. Study guides are posted on the department's website, as well as posts announcements about the Department and its personnel.

The dissemination of information is monitored by a committee, which is appointed for this purpose. Any changes are notified to all members of Faculty who have the right to comment, disagree and present their opinions and proposals. Final decisions on directives and regulations are taken by the General Assembly.

## Panel Judgement

<b>Principle 8: Public Information</b>	
Fully compliant	<b>X</b>
Substantially compliant	
Partially compliant	
Non-compliant	

## Panel Recommendations

- The website should be made visible on google and is directly accessible from the main page of the University of Piraeus website.

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

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

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

*The above comprise the evaluation of:*

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

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

### Study Programme Compliance

Both the PfA and the presentation to the EEAP on the compliance of the Departmental Quality Assurance policy and practices provide evidence of the existence of an annual Internal Review of the Undergraduate Studies Program. The submitted PfA was written in February of 2019 but no specific date for the latest revision of the Undergraduate Program of Studies was given. However, from the various discussions it was implied that it has recently undergone a review and revision with some associated outcomes, such as the streamlining of the elective courses.

The PfA as well as the OMEA presentation document discuss well the Program review process itself. The procedure follows the steps mandated by the Internal Evaluation Quality Assurance System and is managed by MODIP according to the ETHAAE guidelines. The documents are incomplete, however, as they address only a subset of requirements of this Principle. For example, there is an abundance of information regarding student evaluations as they relate to “the students’ expectations, needs and satisfaction in relation to the program” but there is absence of information regarding the manner in which “the changing needs of society” are incorporated in a Program revision. The monitoring and evaluation of some of the requirements of this Principle, such as “the learning environment, support services and their fitness for the purpose of the Program” even though are not discussed in here, they are discussed in conjunction with the requirements of other relevant Principles.

In general, one might say that the Proposal for Accreditation and the associated OMEA presentation address the steps and the roadmap of the Program Review Process well but are not complete and fail to provide evidence of implementation on most of the requirements of this Principle. On the other hand, it would be helpful to refer to Principle 2, Design and Approval of

Programs, in the PfA document where implementation of Program of Studies design, revision and approval processes are discussed.

### Panel Judgement

<b>Principle 9: On-going Monitoring and Periodic Internal Review of Programmes</b>	
Fully compliant	
Substantially compliant	<b>X</b>
Partially compliant	
Non-compliant	

### Panel Recommendations

- Establish a formal platform of communication and interaction between the Department and the graduates as well as the employers and the external partners to solicit feedback for the purpose of incorporating new market developments and needs to be used in the modification and/or revision of the Undergraduate Program of Studies. One suggestion to that effect is that the existing information system of the Career Office could be leveraged, probably with additional staff and resources, to undertake this task.

## Principle 10: Regular External Evaluation of Undergraduate Programmes

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

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

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

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

### Study Programme Compliance

The EEAP finds that compliance to the requirements of the 2014 Program Review has been only partially achieved. In particular:

In the 6 years since the 2014 external evaluation, the Department has made significant progress complying, to a considerable degree, to the recommendations of the 2014 Panel. This said, however, a lot of important recommendations are either not dealt with at all, or complied with only to a limited extent.

The Department has taken stock of the recommendations of the 2014 Panel, but the way these are presented in B10.3 (έκθεση προόδου) is somewhat biased towards the things the Department itself would like to see happening (e.g. more staff), rather than what the EEAP would consider as more important (e.g. strengthening research output). For instance, in point C.1. regarding the need for a 'research plan' and research of higher quality, the Department responds by shifting responsibility to the ministry (more staff), while the point the 2014 EEAP was making was on "better utilization of 'existing' resources".

One of the main complaints and requests of the Department is its understaffing, particularly in view of the great number of courses offered. EEAP encourages diversity in curriculum but is against the idea of offering ALL courses from internal resources. Many of the 'peripheral' subjects can be insourced at low cost or offered by faculty of other institutions/schools, alumni, or by industry partners who appear to expect a bigger involvement in the activities of the Department. This would free up considerable departmental resources. On the basis of Table 2 of the progress report (έκθεση προόδου -B10.3), the following observations can be made:



- In a number of important areas substantial progress has been made since the 2014 review; the Department ought to be complimented for this. These areas, always according to the feedback the Department has given in Table 2, as well as information obtained during interactions with staff consist of: A1; B1; B2; E2; E4; E6; E7; E8.
- To this EEAP’s opinion, an equally large number of recommendations leaves considerable room for improvement, until the next Program Review. These include: A2; B3; C1; C2; C3; C4; C5; E1; E3; E5; E9; E13; E14; E15; E16; E18.
- Points / recommendations in Table 2 which this Panel has seen as: falling outside the responsibility of the Department (e.g. belonging to the responsibility of the Institution or Ministry); as less relevant; of minor importance; or finally repetitive - having been answered elsewhere - have not been addressed here and thus are not included in the above two listings.

### Panel Judgement

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

### Panel Recommendations

- The EEAP encourages the Department to spare no effort in complying with the remaining recommendations of the 2014 panel to which it agrees.

## **PART C: CONCLUSIONS**

### **I. Features of Good Practice**

- The delivery of some undergraduate courses in English.
- The activities and support provided to the incoming students.
- The easy access and friendly accommodation extended from Faculty to students.
- The strong links with the Industry and the Piraeus Maritime Cluster.
- The positive spirit and engagement of current students and alumni.
- Recently acquired experimental equipment and software systems which will expand and strengthen the inclusion of research activities and associated results into teaching.

### **II. Areas of Weakness**

- The main weakness is the limited progress toward meeting the recommendations of the 2014 External Evaluation Committee.
- Lack of formal platforms and channels of communication between the Department, the Graduates and External partners to obtain information about market developments and trends for possible adoption in upcoming Undergraduate Program of Studies revisions and or modifications.

### **III. Recommendations for Follow-up Actions**

- The Department must embark on an on-going, long term effort of identifying and documenting all its significant processes (τεκμηρίωση), preferably in the form of an easy to follow flow chart, as is suggested in the Quality Manual of the institution.
- The Department should streamline its communications and interaction with graduates, employers and external partners by establishing formal procedures for obtaining their feedback for the Undergraduate Program revisions and modifications.
- The Department should incentivise research output performance of faculty members by adjusting their teaching and administrative workloads accordingly.
- The student body is the ultimate beneficiary of the Undergraduate Program of Studies. As such, devise ways, beyond and in addition to student class evaluations to get the students to be proactive and more involved in the Continuous Improvement Process of their program.
- Since Quality Assurance in academic departments and institutions is here to stay as a culture and since the tasks involved require a large amount of manhours and effort which is now being carried out at the expense of regular Faculty productive time, ETHAAE must be actively encouraged to propose and seek additional funds from the Ministry of Education so that the Department can hire full time, dedicated personnel for this effort.

- Based on the trend and experience of conducting business via teleconferences, the Department may consider delivering a limited number of courses electronically, thus resolving some issues such as overcrowded classrooms, student commuting time or class scheduling.
- Finally, the EEAP wishes to stress that the Department should give top priority to: i) extraversion (εξωστρέφεια) towards foreign colleagues/institutions to be evidenced with co-authored publications; ii) Journal List; iii) strong and institutionalized links with the 'home' maritime sector, including ports; terminals; transport; logistics; distribution companies and organizations.

#### **IV. Summary & Overall Assessment**

##### **The Principles where full compliance has been achieved are:**

- Principle 1: Academic Unit Policy for Quality Assurance
- Principle 2: Design and Approval of Programmes
- Principle 4: Student Admission, Progression, recognition and Certification
- Principle 6: Learning resources and Student Support
- Principle 7: Information Management
- Principle 8: Public Information

##### **The Principles where substantial compliance has been achieved are:**

- Principle 3: Student-Centred Learning, teaching and Assessment
- Principle 5: Teaching Staff
- Principle 9: On-Going Monitoring and Periodic Interval review of Programmes

##### **The Principles where partial compliance has been achieved are:**

- Principle 10: Regular External Evaluation of Undergraduate Programmes

##### **The Principles where failure of compliance was identified are:**

<b>Overall Judgement</b>	
Fully compliant	
Substantially compliant	<b>X</b>
Partially compliant	
Non-compliant	

## The members of the External Evaluation & Accreditation Panel

Name and Surname

Signature

1. **Professor Spyros Economides (Chair)**, California State University, USA
2. **Dr Fragiskos Gonidakis**, Representative of Economic Chamber of Greece, Greece
3. **Professor Hercules Haralambides**, Université Paris 1 - Panthéon-Sorbonne
4. **Professor Nikos Nomikos**, Cass Business School, City, University of London, UK