



ΕΛΛΗΝΙΚΗ ΔΗΜΟΚΡΑΤΙΑ

Α Δ Ι Π

ΑΡΧΗ ΔΙΑΣΦΑΛΙΣΗΣ ΚΑΙ ΠΙΣΤΟΠΟΙΗΣΗΣ
ΤΗΣ ΠΟΙΟΤΗΤΑΣ ΣΤΗΝ ΑΝΩΤΑΤΗ ΕΚΠΑΙΔΕΥΣΗ

HELLENIC REPUBLIC

H Q A

HELLENIC QUALITY ASSURANCE
AND ACCREDITATION AGENCY

Accreditation Report for the Undergraduate Study Programme of:

Marketing and Communication

Institution: Athens University of Economics and Business

Date: 23 November 2019

ΑΡΙΣΤΕΙΔΟΥ 1 & ΕΥΡΙΠΙΔΟΥ, 105 59 ΑΘΗΝΑ

Τηλ.: +30 210 9220944, FAX: +30 210 9220143

Ηλ. Ταχ.: adipsecretariat@hqa.gr Ιστότοπος: <http://www.hqa.gr>

1, ARISTIDOU ST., 105 59 ATHENS, GREECE

Tel.: +30 210 9220944, Fax: +30 210 9220143

Email: adipsecretariat@hqa.gr Website: www.hqa.gr



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 HQA to undertake the review of the Undergraduate Study Programme of **Marketing and Communication** of the **Athens University of Economics and Business** for the purposes of granting accreditation

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Part A: Background and Context of the Review	4
I. The Accreditation Panel	4
II. Review Procedure and Documentation	5
III. Study Programme Profile	10
Part B: Compliance with the Principles.....	11
Principle 1: Academic Unit Policy for Quality Assurance	11
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	22
Principle 7: Information Management	24
Principle 8: Public Information	27
Principle 9: On-going Monitoring and Periodic Internal Review of Programmes	29
Principle 10: Regular External Evaluation of Undergraduate Programmes.....	31
Part C: Conclusions	33
I. Features of Good Practice	33
II. Areas of Weakness	33
III. Recommendations for Follow-up Actions.....	34
IV. Summary & Overall Assessment	34

PART A: BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT OF THE REVIEW

I. The Accreditation Panel

The Panel responsible for the Accreditation Review of the Undergraduate Study Programme of **Marketing and Communication** of the **Athens University of Economics and Business** comprised the following five (4) members, drawn from the HQA Register, in accordance with the Law 4009/2011:

1. Prof. John Tsalikis (Chair)

Florida International University, Miami, Florida, USA

2. Prof. Emeritus Spyros Economides

California State University, East Bay, Berkeley, California, USA

3. Prof. Alkis Thrassou

University of Nicosia, Nicosia, Cyprus

4. Mr. George Nikolaou

Representative member of Economic Chamber of Greece, Greece

II. Review Procedure and Documentation

In the morning of November 18, 2019, the Accreditation Panel (AP) was greeted at the modern building of the institution on Trias 2 and Spetson streets by the vice Rector for Academic Affairs and President of MODIP, Dimitrios Bourantonis and the Department of Marketing and Communications President, Vlassis Stathakopoulos.

AP Meeting with the Vice Rector and President of the Department

The meeting which commenced at 9:30am was initiated informally by a question of the AP Chair regarding the ERASMUS mobility program. The Department President embarked on a brief synopsis of departmental activity and student/Faculty participation of the program, more details of which are given in the Proposal for Accreditation. He remarked that the Department accepts the highest number of ERASMUS students than any other department of the institution. During this informal discussion, the Vice Rector took the opportunity to comment on the difficulties that the institution is currently facing due to student unrest and occupation of facilities, but also to point out that the institution, in cooperation with ADIP, was a pioneer in the development and adoption of the Quality Assurance system for higher education in Greece. Also, he pointed out that the institution's academic quality is internationally recognized by many respectable evaluation and ranking agencies.

The remainder of the time was devoted to the power point presentation by the Department President on an overview of various facts and aspects of the Department, such as its history, its vision and mission, its Undergraduate Study program, its goals and priorities, available resources, and Departmental Quality Assurance Policy; all of which are discussed in detail in the Proposal for Accreditation. In the informal discussion, and questions and answers that accompanied the presentation, several issues of concern were mentioned and discussed, such as:

- The Department has adopted the practice of research awards to faculty who excel in the publication of articles in journals with high impact factor over a given time period.
- Because there is no provision for release time from teaching in order to be devoted to research, the Department has adopted a policy for providing additional funds to junior Faculty members for research, for funding of research publications that are unique and original, as well as funding research work of post-doctoral personnel that results in a respectable publication.

The above funding, as well as financial support for participation in conferences, are provided from the tuition funds of the post-graduate programs.

The final topic in the informal discussion concerned the advice and assistance given to teaching personnel whose student evaluations indicated a below acceptable performance. A Faculty Committee is appointed to advise and assist on the development and improvement of "instructional skills" for these Faculty members in a collegial way.

AP meeting with the MODIP/OMEA members

In this meeting the two perennial issues of low Faculty/student ratio and inadequate funding were discussed. Both issues are government regulated and controlled, and affect the Quality of the Undergraduate Study Program by imposing an unreasonable workload on the Faculty members of all institutions of higher learning. The MODIP President explained the reasons that the Department ends up with an unreasonable number of incoming students each year.

On the question about the existence of measurable criteria for the setting and attainment of departmental goals, the OMEA members referred to: (a) the goal structure of the department as it is presented in the associated tables of Key Performance Indicators (KPIs), and (b) the accompanying rules, requirements and justification as presented in the corresponding section of the Proposal for Accreditation. They mentioned that the KPIs are relative to the three “pillars” of activity i.e. teaching, research and quality, as defined by the ADIP requirements.

Concerning the evaluation of research quality and output of the Faculty, the OMEA members discussed the departmental process and criteria. The AP further suggested the adoption of benchmarks based on internationally accepted journal ranking/listing organizations such as ABS (UK), ABDC (Australia), SCOPUS Citescore. The department is already using organizations such as these for self-evaluation. Some faculty members serve on editorial boards of journals. In addition, the available sources of research funding were mentioned, most of which are internally generated.

A discussion followed regarding issues related to the Study Program. It was mentioned that there is a formal Review Committee of Undergraduate Studies that meets every year and solicits advice from graduate students, external partner focus groups; as well as examining other similar international programs for the reassessment, modification or updating of the Program of Study. The last major modification of the Program of Study regarding courses and specialization options was conducted in 2016.

Other topics involved an overview of the e-class platform, promotional activities conducted to attract prospective students, activities to promote student involvement in programs of voluntarism and activities related to the connection between the Department and the business community; specifically for the benefit of student learning and job placement, in addition to the ones managed by the University Career Placement Office.

AP meeting with Faculty members

The following day, started with the meeting of the departmental Faculty. The meeting was initiated by the AP posing a question as to what the Faculty would like to change relative to the status quo in the Program of Study or even the Department. The responses included:

- The undergraduate students should be encouraged to enhance their learning by studying original, up-to-date research publications recommended by the course instructor, while recognizing the potential difficulties with any language barriers.

- The undergraduate students should be encouraged to adopt a culture of mutual support by forming teams for the purpose of assisting each other for better understanding of course content and achieving associated learning outcomes.
- The Faculty would like to have more academic assistants to support and/or supplement the activities of the courses, e.g. grading.
- Since doctoral students do not pay tuition because of the existing legal restrictions, Faculty would like to see them assist in the Program of Undergraduate Study through various support activities, possibly with some form of rewards.
- The faculty believes that there is a strong feeling of community within the undergraduate student population which is demonstrated by the “Department Ambassador” volunteer members who are engaging in public relations activities. Similarly, the “Get2knowME” volunteer members assist in activities aimed to recruit prospective students for the Department.

The faculty assured the AP that they employ a wide spectrum of instructional approaches in their teaching, including ‘Simulation and Business Games’ and that they have introduced courses of quantitative and analytic nature in the latest Program of Study modification, based also on the feedback from the job market. The students have embraced this with great interest.

AP meeting with undergraduate students

The meeting, in which most of the students were in their fourth year, started with the AP question to the students as to what was their best or worst experience so far in the Department. Among the best experiences were a presentation to first year students about multimedia platforms available in the Department; the organizing of a one day promotional function to attract prospective students to the Department; and a participation in an interactive marketing conference, which resulted in an internship with an advertising company.

Among the worst experiences cited were the recent student demonstrations that forced the temporary closure of the university and the violent interference of radical students in the event organized to familiarize and orient prospective students to the Department. In general, the students had positive comments about the Program of Study and its value to their learning process. They played down any speculation that they were an elite group recruited to complement the Department or that they were chosen due to their availability.

The remainder of the time was devoted to better familiarize the students with the role of the AP and the Accreditation process, as it relates to the Quality Assurance issues; and to encourage them to get actively involved in the quality maintenance and improvement of the program, as they are the direct beneficiaries if it. Some students agreed with the idea and indicated that one way to do it was for those involved in the volunteering “Department Ambassador” group to initiate such an effort.

AP visit of the facilities

The AP tour of the university facilities, which are utilized by the Department, was somewhat curtailed because of the contemporary events of student demonstrations. The AP visited typical

classrooms, Faculty offices, a modern library depository, and laboratories in the modern building of Trias 2 and Spetson street. A brief visit also took place to the main building, during which the AP visited an amphitheater, more laboratories, the library and a large ceremonial room. The AP regrets that the prevailing conditions of unrest prevented the members from visiting more facilities.

AP meeting with the graduates

The meeting started with the AP question to the ones that were employed about the means or ways they found their employment. The answers included “through employer job announcements on the university website”, “through the practical training program” and by joining a family business. However, they all felt that the program gave them the tools and knowledge to meet the challenges of their work environment with very little or no training. The graduates stated that they were at an advantageous position versus other universities’ graduates in the labor market.

The AP inquired about an alumni association of the Department pointing out the potential mutual benefits to both. Even though the students claim that they maintain contact and communication with a lot of their former classmates, there is no formal networking platform for that purpose. They thought that the idea of creating a more formal alumni association would be a good one, and some indicated that they are willing to undertake such an organizing effort.

AP meeting with employers and social partners

The meeting with the stakeholders was relatively productive, in spite the fact that a number of them were not able to attend due to the turbulent conditions and rumors that the university was closed.

The cooperation they maintain and activities that some of them are involved in, in conjunction with the Department, were mentioned; and included teaching, hiring, research and professional collaborations. They all reported that the level of competence and professional preparation, exhibited by the graduates they hired, was exceptional. They recommend that:

- The interaction between the Department and the business community should be strengthened and formalized
- The Department should enhance the student interview skills by possibly instituting “mock interviews”.
- The practical training exercise should possibly be mandatory instead of optional

AP closure meeting with MODIP, OMEA and Department President

The purpose of the meeting was for the AP to give some feedback to the group related to the discussions held with the various other groups during the day. It was suggested that the Department should seek ways to educate and encourage the active student participation in issues of quality beyond the student course evaluation process. In turn, the MODIP/OMEA members made some general comments regarding their experience with the QA system structure and management such as:

- Even though it is a significant extra work load, the process has been embraced by all and has strengthened the cohesion between Departmental personnel
- The MODIP staff should be increased, the group is understaffed
- As the QA process is here to stay, ADIP should seek ways for more governmental funding
- ADIP should guard against the danger of becoming a bureaucratic agency

The AP thanked everyone in the Department for their cooperation and support in the Accreditation process.

III. Study Programme Profile

The Department of Marketing and Communication is one of the four departments in the School of Business Administration in the Athens University of Economic and Business. The Department was first established in 1989 as a Department of Business Administration and Marketing. In 1992 it was renamed as the Department of Operations Research and Marketing and in 2002 it was renamed again as the Department of Marketing and Communications at which point its Program of Undergraduate Study conformed to these two compatible educational fields. Since 1992 it is the first and only undergraduate program in Greece that focuses on these two disciplines.

The Department has 16 Faculty members, 4 laboratory instructors, 1 Research Fellow and 4 Administrative staff members.

The undergraduate study cycle is four academic years and incorporates 40 courses, out of which 30 are mandatory, 4 are specialization courses and 6 are electives. In addition, all students are required to take courses in one of the 3 foreign languages taught at the university. All courses are equivalent in terms of credit hours awarded, and amount to a total of 240 credit units (ECTS), each being taught 4 hours per week during a 13 week semester. A number of courses require 1 or 2 additional hours per week for laboratory work. In the first 3 years of study the students are exposed to a well-rounded knowledge of all business operations such as management, economics, accounting and finance. In the fourth year of the program, the students must select one of four specializations:

- International Business and Innovation
- Business Administration and Human Resource Management
- Business Analytics
- Digital Marketing

Each one of the above specializations consists of 4 courses. The 6 elective courses could be taken from the Department or other departments of the university, or can be courses from the other 3 specializations. Students have the ability to participate in the ERASMUS+ program and transfer the course credits to the Department. They may optionally undertake a Practical Exercise in a business or organization. A special program of Educational Training for those who wish to go into teaching is also optionally offered without credit awards.

The undergraduate Program of Study is aiming at the principles of Excellence, Innovation, Job Market outreach, Community Service and Student-Centered Approach. It is designed based on Best Practices of other similar International Undergraduate Programs of Study, the Job Market Trends, feedback from student and graduate Focus Groups, feedback from the Advisory Board of employers and social partners, and the Committee of Graduate Studies who are the faculty members in charge of the Program of Undergraduate Study modifications and revisions.

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 Panel is fully satisfied that the Department of Marketing & Communication (DMC) of the Athens University of Economics and Business (AUEB) has developed and is implementing an appropriate Quality Assurance Policy, as part of its strategic management. It is also evident that the department has set for itself quality standards that surpass and extend the quality standards indicated by the Hellenic Quality Assurance and Accreditation Agency (HQA); in terms of key departmental aspects, including research, student services, student inclusion and more. Specifically:

1. DMC has established a Quality Assurance Policy (largely based on the institutional one) for its undergraduate programme that is appropriate for that programme, to which it is committed, of whose standards it applies and meets, and which it constantly monitors and drives to improve and expand.
2. Continuous improvement is driven by the faculty's motivation to sustain and raise standards of research and teaching, and their inclusion in major decisions of key stakeholders, such as the students, the industry/employers and social and academic institutions.
3. The Quality Assurance Policy appears to be communicated to all parties involved, to be respected and its value understood; as are the negative repercussions of non-conformity. Having said that, striving for quality appears to be an inherent purpose of the department, rather than it being a set of rules to follow to avoid repercussions.
4. The goals set are put forward as general guiding principles, that are implicitly and/or explicitly communicated; but which are also defined and stated as a specific, measurable and relevant set of targets, that are evaluated quantitatively (based on a set of KPIs) through various internal data (student, faculty, research output etc.), student evaluations and other means.
5. The goals are properly monitored, regularly updated and the results are appropriately interpreted and communicated.
6. The Quality Assurance Policy is suitable to the structure and organization of the curriculum and the learning outcomes and qualifications it aims for its programme are in accordance with the European and the National Qualifications Framework for Higher Education.
7. The Quality Assurance Policy promotes and ensures quality and effectiveness of teaching, through the standard and the appropriateness of the qualifications of the teaching staff, the quality and quantity of their research output, and the linkage between teaching and research.
8. The Quality Assurance Policy is also student-focused, pursuing a level of student knowledge, competencies and qualifications that are competitive in the labour market.
9. Finally, the department annually undertakes a review and an internal evaluation of its quality assurance system of its undergraduate programme; and its Internal Evaluation Group (IEG) collaborates with the university's Quality Assurance Unit (QAU).

Panel judgement

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

Panel Recommendations

The AP recommends that the department's expectations regarding the research output of the faculty (individually) are more explicitly defined. This requires specifying both the quantitative and the qualitative output of the faculty over specified time periods (e.g. 1-3 years). More importantly, to do so in accordance to specified standards e.g. ABS (UK), ABDC (Australia), Scopus Citescore etc., or department-developed. Other, of course, research criteria could also be included (grants, PhD supervisions/completions etc.). The Panel recognises that this cannot and, perhaps, should not be too imposing or absolute. However more explicit standards would probably be a step forward towards even higher quality, but also fairness and transparency.

The AP recommends that the students are better informed of, and are encouraged to participate in the quality assurance process.

The Panel recommends additional staff and training towards the development and implementation of the quality assurance processes/procedures of the department.

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 Department of Marketing & Communication is the first and only university-level department, in Greece, that specialises in these two fields (M&C); and it offers an undergraduate programme in 'Marketing and Communication' with four separate and distinct options for specialisation:

- *International Management, Innovation and Entrepreneurship*
- *Human Resource Management*
- *Business Analytics*
- *Digital Marketing*

The content, structure and path of the programme is appropriate; and incorporates a large number of focused and apt courses (modules), befitting the aims and purpose of the programme. In this context, the programme compares most favourably with its international counterparts in leading universities, globally.

The programme has been designed, and is constantly being improved upon and/or adapted to contemporary student and industry needs, through a well-defined procedure that is based on the departmental and institutional quality standards and processes. The design and revision of the programme, in terms of content, structure, foci, teaching style and methods, assessment, bibliography, tools, outcomes etc., is based upon a number of key factors and stakeholders and aims for excellence and student-centered learning.

The aforementioned factors and stakeholders include: the institutional and departmental quality standards themselves, industry needs, industry and professional trends, technological developments, the students, professional associations/organisations and leading industry experts. Procedurally, the programme revision takes place through effective internal and external evaluations; the (institutionalised) Undergraduate Program Studies Committee; the (institutionalised) Advisory Board that incorporates the external stakeholders (industry experts and professional associations); and feedback through qualitative research (interviews and focus groups) on students and alumni.

The programme is in fact and in essence student-centered, as it considers their:

- *participation in the formation and implementation of the program*
- *smooth progression throughout the stages of the programme*
- *workload to be transferable (according to the European credit transfer and accumulation system)*
- *need to obtain work experience (internship)*
- *need to be prepared for the present and future realities of the industry*
- *their identity not just as students, but also as members of a vibrant academic community and the society in general*
- *post-graduation employability*
- *implicit need for personal attention (through the ‘Student Advisors’)*

The programme, further, has a strong scientific foundation, and teaching is visibly and strongly linked to research. The teaching material is largely stemming from the faculty’s own research work; courses such as ‘Market Research’ and ‘Project’ (Εκπόνηση Εργασίας) are particularly and by nature research-focused; labs enhance and refine the students’ research skills/tools; and the faculty is encouraged to utilize students in their primary research work.

Panel judgement

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

Panel Recommendations

None

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

Student-centered learning

First and foremost student oriented teaching requires a mutual respect between students and teachers. From conversations with both it was obvious that this respect was both present and mutual. This is not something that can be quantified and measured but can only be glimpsed at from the tone of voice and facial expressions of emotional reactions. The department understands that when students are allowed to learn on a personal level they develop a sense of autonomy that can lead to greater and personalized learning.

The student-centric orientation of the school is, firstly, evident through the choice of elective classes, based on which the students can choose according to their needs and interests. The students are allowed to choose a concentration in the 4th year, and further have the benefit of a student advisor (tutor). Secondly, to achieve this personalized student teaching orientation, the school uses various teaching methodologies such as team learning, lab-work chosen by the students, case studies, internet studies, the Business Communication Laboratory (BCLab), and involvement of students in faculty research.

Teaching and Assessment

A fair and systematic process exists that was designed for the evaluation of students on both written and oral examinations, providing accurate and timely results to each student. Failing students are given opportunities to retake the exams and achieve a passing grade. The e-class platform is a conduit to the teaching deliverables and a functional supporting and facilitating tool towards teaching and towards completing pending works. The students are given the right to appeal, challenge their evaluation and request a retaking of the examination. A departmental process of such appeals is in place.

Students with special needs are given particular consideration, including oral exams, special classroom areas and other forms of flexible arrangements on instruction and testing based on the nature of their special needs.

Finally, the department conducts, on an annual basis, qualitative focus group interviews for freshman, sophomore, juniors and senior students for feedback.

Panel judgement

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

Panel Recommendations

Ensure anonymity of teaching-related student complaints

Specify and document the process and tools (focus groups, interviews etc.) through which student feedback is obtained.

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

The Department has introduced and has implemented a highly structured process for newly admitted students from the point of entry (welcome week - organized by the institution for all departments) where students are welcomed and provided with guidance and activities related to their transition from high school to university.

All the information for the transition is available at the website of the institution (<https://www.aueb.gr/el/content/opa-kalosorizei-toys-neoys-foitites-odigos-hrisimon-symvoylon-gia-tis-protres-meres-sto-opa>). Information is also available on the website regarding admission, progression, recognition and certification. This procedure ensures that new students have a smooth transition from secondary education (high school) to higher education.

Furthermore the M&C through the event "Get2knowMe" gives the opportunity to the high school students to attend presentations given by members of the Department community about the mission, study programme, certification etc. of the university.

The student assessment criteria, methods and the examinations system is clear and fair to the students and publicized on the education portal (e-class). The examinations take place at pre-determined times of the year and there are specific regulations for their assessment. The department also adopts Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) to monitor the progress of students.

The departmental secretarial office is in place to help students in their academic life, accessed either at their offices or electronically by email or through the university website.

The department adopts the concept of the Academic Advisor. The process supports the student in solving academic or administrative issues.

The department actively encourages and supports student mobility, through the Erasmus office. There is a well-defined process for the students to follow in order to optionally secure an Internship. The curriculum does not require a thesis.

Following a University-wide policy a Diploma Supplement is provided to all students upon graduation, which includes achieved learning outcomes, ECTS credits earned and other noteworthy student achievements.

Panel judgement

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

Panel Recommendations

The role of the Academic Advisor needs to be evaluated on a regular basis.

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 Department is comprised of 16 fulltime faculty members and the Panel's overall impression is that they excel both in research and teaching.

Regarding the processes of recruitment and ranking, these are clear and transparent, and according to legislation. It further appears, that beyond the legal and procedural aspects of the processes, the department upholds high standards that are on par with leading universities, globally.

In terms of the physical conditions of employment, the number of weekly teaching hours per faculty member appears to be high (assuming the average of 13.6 hours per member in the department's proposal for accreditation document, p19 is true). This, along with the additional administrative and academic duties of the faculty, and noting as well the large student numbers in each class/course, indicates some considerable pressure on the faculty. In terms of space (offices and classrooms), these appear to be of good quality and conducive to academic work and research.

In terms of teaching skills and methods, the faculty is urged and motivated to incessantly improve upon these, and the best (as evaluated by the students) teachers are awarded annually. The student evaluations themselves are being paid due attention and respect by the faculty, and their results are excellent for the particular department.

The department's research orientation is very strong and with a high tangible research output (publications), by any international standard. The wider attitude, approach and spirit regarding research is evident throughout the faculty ranks and they generate, sustain and motivate research. Additionally, the best researchers are awarded, annually, with funding towards research, and all faculty receives monetary support for conference attendance etc. Moreover, the faculty is encouraged and supported towards international mobility, and reversely,

prominent national and international academics are being invited as guest/visiting lecturers. Having said that, the Panel notes that the above are primarily a result of the dedication of the faculty to their profession and science, and their inherent drive to research. Otherwise there does not appear to be any significant incentives for research.

Regarding the link between teaching and research (referring also to the text above in 'Principle 2'), this is strong and visible; the teaching material itself is largely stemming from the faculty's own research work; and the faculty is encouraged to utilize students in their primary research work.

There are, finally, Quality Assurance processes for all members regarding assessment and monitoring of both teaching and research.

The Panel believes that greater departmental independence/freedom is required in order to adapt its processes, operations and rewards in a manner that will best serve research and teaching in a less bureaucratic manner.

The AP, commends the dedication and spirit of the department regarding teaching and especially research. It is evident that they present excellent results with minimal support and motivation; with the latter being obviously the result of external restrictions and conditions.

Panel judgement

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

Panel Recommendations

The Panel recommends a substantial increase in tangible motives and rewards for research.

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 understands that in order to provide quality education, it needs the necessary human resources, the appropriate infrastructure as well as a variety of other services, such as career counseling and sport and cultural activities.

At this point the department is staffed by qualified professors with terminal degrees (from both Greek and international institutions), significant publications, teaching excellence and service records. In addition, there is adequate administrative staff to facilitate student support. Both professors and staff are doing their best to provide high quality service to the students.

On a tour of the facilities, we observed that the classrooms are clean and well equipped. The computer lab had numerous computer terminals, but some students had to share them, a situation that is not as bad as it sounds because it allows for more sharing and interaction.

The library appeared adequate for the number of students utilizing it. And, as in the internet era almost all library functions are available online, the students do have this access through various national and international electronic means and databases, such as EBSCO.

Regarding computer labs, the students have access to three BCLab (Business Communication Labs) of 160 stations, collectively, in support of their learning experience and needs. In addition

to the BCLab, students have access to both the Athens Laboratory of Research in Marketing (ALaRM) facilitating research in the marketing field, and ΔΑΔ (Εργαστήριο Διοίκησης Ανθρώπινου Δυναμικού) which facilitates research on HR issues.

Student learning is further enhanced by the use of teacher/advisors (tutors). Scholarships are also provided by the department.

Students are also availed to an adequate range of support services including:

- Career support through the university's employment and career service.
- The university's practical experience and business connection office with the labor marketing that has helped 480 students for the last 3 years connect with employment opportunities
- The Unit of Innovation and Entrepreneurship (MoKε) and the Athens Center for Entrepreneurship and Innovation Assistance to Students to develop their entrepreneurial spirit.
- A dining facility where students receive subsidized meals.
- Scholarships
- Foreign language instruction, offered at the student union
- Athletic and cultural events that strengthen university cohesion
- The Office of Social and Psychological Support and Counseling, which offers services to students, supports students with special needs, and promotes volunteerism.

Finally, there is adequate administrative staff to support the student needs.

Panel judgement

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

Panel Recommendations

The AP recommends that more electrical outlets be provided in the classrooms for students to use their computers.

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 department uses multiple sources to collect information, from students, graduates and employers. The segment of the central information system (university) dedicated to the department (portal) collects, organizes, manages and disseminates a wealth of information. Most importantly, the module has the capability of generating Key Performance Indicators (KPI's). This information is utilized for the purpose of serving the academic and administrative needs of the department, as well as to support the Quality Assurance Process for which the Departmental Unit for Quality Assurance (OMEA) and the University Unit for Quality Assurance (MODIP) are responsible.

The collected information contains data on student profiles, academic progress and grades, study programme structure, administrative & teaching staff, building, equipment & other facilities, student surveys, teaching & research activities, etc. The information is maintained on the departmental "portal" and is constantly upgraded, supplemented and enhanced, and is organized in the following submodules with corresponding links of accessibility on the departmental website.

Student Data Information System

Students: the module facilitates student requests to issue certificates, course grading results and student profiles in terms of academic progress, and to choose the courses for the examinations.

Faculty: this module mainly facilitates the posting of grades and provides basic information on course offerings.

Administrative staff: this module tracks and maintains the student profile, automates the issuing of various types of certificates requested by the students, tracks statistical information related to student attendance, and tracks statistical information related to student grades.

A basic component of this system is the **e-class electronic platform** which facilitates the delivery of all types of learning material from faculty to students, and provides the capability of communication between students and faculty.

Administrative Support Information System

This module manages the profiles of academic and administrative personnel and tracks changes. Faculty and staff can submit applications and request certificates relating to their profile, update career progress, and track and update changes in their functions and responsibilities. The module also manages office space assignments.

Quality Assurance Information System

This module is very important because it is maintained and utilized by the members of OMEA and MODIP. It includes statistics and documentation related to all issues of the Quality Assurance for the Department. Based on the statistical information gathered, KPI's are designed, computed and tracked for use as metrics in the evaluation and certification of the undergraduate program's Quality Assurance as dictated by the Hellenic Quality Assurance Agency (ADIP). KPI's included are relative to:

- All levels of academic degrees offered by the department
- Student population
- The Undergraduate study Program
- Human Resource-Based Services and Facilities Infrastructures
- Research Activity
- Financial Data

Student, Graduate and Alumni Evaluation System

The evaluation process by the students in the undergraduate program is considered as a significant feedback mechanism for the measurement of achievements, maintenance and assessment of the program's Quality Assurance. Thus, a very important module of the information system is the one that gathers, analyzes, organizes and presents the student evaluation data. The Department conducts student evaluations manually (hard copies) regarding the course/teacher performance, the course content, the associated learning support mechanisms and learning outcomes in the classroom. The data is entered into the relevant

departmental information system. Statistical reports and KPIs are computed and used to assess the program quality and to suggest ways to improve or identify issues to be corrected. The output is available to the individual evaluators, to the faculty member that is subject of the evaluation, to the appropriate administrators and decision makers and the Members of OMEA or MODIP as it may be appropriate, with associated levels of security access. Results of this module in the form of KPIs, may also serve for benchmarking purposes.

Finally, information is maintained and statistics can be generated about the alumni of the department regarding their professional career progress. Also, information is solicited and kept from the department's graduates for the purpose of assessing the university support services and Programme of Study.

Panel judgement

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

Panel Recommendations

The AP recommends that the collection of alumni data is further enhanced and appropriately utilized.

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 employs comprehensive publicity procedures for disseminating its educational, research and other activities to all its stakeholders and the public in general. The relevant information is communicated to the students and the graduates, the faculty, the Greek and international academic community, the business community and the general public.

A major vehicle for disseminating information related to the department is the departmental website (<https://www.dept.aueb.gr/mbc>), which is a part of the university web site (<https://www.aueb.gr>) and is available in both Greek and English. It contains information on various aspects of the educational and research activity of the department, such as:

- Department profile
- Staff (Teaching by level – Administrative – Labs - other)
- Educational process (Student Study Guide - Examinations – ECTS information - Teaching methods – Teachers – Advisors - Time schedules - other)
- Post Graduate programmes
- PhD programmes
- Research activities
- The Quality Assurance System
- Departmental news and announcements
- Contacts
- Newsletter
- Information related to internships (practical training)
- Information related to the ERASMUS programmes.

Other forms of communication and publicity include:

- The departmental newsletter
- Newspapers and journal articles and announcements
- Leaflets and brochures
- Conferences and lectures

There is a process to safeguard the accuracy of the information that is made publicly available and to comply with data protection legal requirements. The Department chair is overseeing this process.

Panel judgement

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

Panel Recommendations

None.

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

In the Proposal for Accreditation it is documented that the continuous monitoring and periodic evaluation review of the undergraduate Program of Study is conducted in accordance with the guidelines presented and discussed in the Process 4.1, Internal Evaluation, of the institution's Quality Manual (<https://www.aueb.gr/el/content/egheiridio-poiotitas>).

This process requires that the Department collects data on an annual basis to be used in the publishing of an annual Internal Evaluation Report regarding the quality of the Program of Study to identify the need for any modifications, adjustments or updates needed in the program based on the following issues (and as per ADIP directive):

- The content of the Program of Study in the light of the latest research in the given discipline, thus ensuring that it 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 Program of Study
- The learning environment, support services and their fitness for purpose for the Program of Study

To facilitate the task of data collection relevant to these issues, MODIP has put together a questionnaire (document B8.2, ErotimatologioEsoterikisaksiologisis.pdf) to be used by OMEA, the departmental team responsible for this task. In this document the OMEA team is given specific questions relative to which information and data must be collected for ADIP to assess the compliance with the 10 Principle categories relevant to the Accreditation of the

undergraduate Program of Study. To the extent that the data collected is quantifiable, OMEA uses the data to update the KPIs specified by ADIP and the KPIs that the Department has defined for its own self-improvement purposes.

This Internal Evaluation of the Program of Study involves the joint effort and responsibility of OMEA, the president of the Department, the president of MODIP and the MODIP staff, who are responsible for its generation.

Process 4.1 of the institutional Quality Manual also describes the procedural steps to be followed, as well as the parties responsible, at the various stages of the Internal Evaluation Report preparation and generation, from the collection of data to the implementation of findings and actions to be taken, if any. If the need for modification, adjustment or updating of the Program of Study is identified, MODIP has also in place a document that describes the procedural steps to be followed for the implementation of these changes. This document is also followed when the need for changes arises as a result of a proposal from an individual faculty member or from the departmental Committee of the Undergraduate Program of Study.

The latest departmental Internal Evaluation Report was finished on 04/10/18. One finding in that report revealed the need to update the Diploma Supplement, even though this action is not directly related to the Program of Study. It must be noted, however, that the Internal Evaluation Process deals with all 10 Quality Principles dictated by ADIP within the framework of the Internal System of Quality Assurance of the university (ΕΣΔΠ). For example, another finding led to modifications of the departmental website. It must also be noted that the Internal Evaluation Report addresses the compliance with the External Evaluation Report Recommendations.

Overall, AP found that the Proposal for Accreditation (ProtasiAkadimaikisPistop.ProgrammatosProptyhiakSpoydwnM&E.pdf), which, in effect, is the latest annual Internal Evaluation Report for the Department, is well written and organized. The AP recognizes the work effort and dedication exhibited by all involved in the process.

Panel judgement

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

Panel Recommendations

None.

Principle 10: Regular External Evaluation of Undergraduate Programmes

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

HQA is responsible for administrating the programme accreditation process which is realised as an external evaluation procedure, and implemented by a committee of independent experts. HQA 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 last External Evaluation of the Undergraduate Program of Study of the Department was done on 25/06/2010. The Department has submitted a Progress Report (EkthesiProodouSystasewnEkswt.AksiologM&E.pdf) in the form of a Table that includes the description of the External Evaluation Committee recommendations in the areas of Curriculum (8), Teaching (26), and Research (4). For each recommendation the Progress Report discusses the actions that have been taken so far and the actions planned in the future.

The AP finds the report to be comprehensive, but more descriptive in nature rather than concise and quantitative. For example, the report table includes a section on future actions planned corresponding to each recommendation, but no estimated time of completion or percent completion so far, anticipated results, responsible individuals or teams and resources, if any, that would be required.

Panel judgement

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

Panel Recommendations

The AP recommends that the Progress Report is revised to be more concise and be expanded to include additional information of measurable nature.

PART C: CONCLUSIONS

I. Features of Good Practice

1. The programme is well designed; contemporary; including many and apt courses; four industry-relevant and distinct specializations options; and developed according to set quality processes and with input from all primary internal and external stakeholders.
2. The programme is unique and pioneering amongst Greek universities, and is well valued and respected by students, industry and employers alike.
3. The programme is student-centered at the academic, personal and career/employability levels.
4. Teaching standards are very high and reflected in the student evaluations; and are guided by proper quality processes and monitoring.
5. Research is on par with internationally leading universities; the faculty is guided by a shared spirit of high research orientation; the programme courses are enhanced by 'in-house' research; and the students are involved to the degree possible.
6. Research and general very high scholarly standards are achieved despite of and against external constraints, bureaucracy and extremely limited 'hard' motivators; driven principally by the faculty's self-motivation, dedication and commitment.
7. The faculty portrays strong collegiality, mutual support and a shared vision of the department; and their relationship with the students is supportive and collaborative, and mutually respectful.
8. The Department has paid due attention to the recommendations of the last external evaluation and has largely and essentially implemented them accordingly and appropriately (*though did not present them adequately – see Principle 10 comments*).
9. The Department sustains a strong, positive and substantial relationship with its professional, industry and social environments; both through its faculty and its students.
10. The Department, through the event "Get2khowMe", gives the opportunity to the high school students to attend presentations given by members of the Department community about the mission, study programme, certification etc. of the university.

II. Areas of Weakness

The AP understands that the following are not under the control of the Department, but deemed it proper and purposeful to mention them, nonetheless:

1. The restraining external factors and bureaucracy that limit the department's efficiency, effectiveness, independence and decision making (see also relevant recommendation below).

2. The limited resources (money, HR etc.) available towards research and other functions (see also relevant recommendation below).

III. Recommendations for Follow-up Actions

The AP recommends that:

1. The students are better informed and encouraged to become more involved in the quality assurance/control processes.
2. The Department should develop, refine and compile a set of documents on the key and repeatable operating procedures; in an easy to follow graphical form, such as a flow chart. Such a collection of documents would standardize these procedures and serve as a manual for consistency.
3. Student excellence awards are established, sponsored by the stakeholder community.
4. With the support of the Career Development Office, the Department better develops and maintains updated records on alumni (contact data, employment status etc.), strengthens the bond with these, and utilizes them in the interest of both and society at large.
5. The department should request additional human resources and training by ADIP to relieve the work overload related to the quality assurance activities.
6. Courses are developed in English that would enhance the internationalisation of the Programme of Study and increase mobility of students and faculty.

IV. Summary & Overall Assessment

The Principles where full compliance has been achieved are: Principles 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9

The Principles where substantial compliance has been achieved are: Principle 10

The Principles where partial compliance has been achieved are: none

The Principles where failure of compliance was identified are: none

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

The members of the Accreditation Panel

Name and Surname

Signature

1. Prof. John Tsalikis

Florida International University, Miami, Florida, USA

2. Prof. Emeritus Spyros Economides

California State University, East Bay, Berkeley, California, USA

3. Prof. Alkis Thrassou

University of Nicosia, Nicosia, Cyprus

4. Mr. George Nikolaou

Representative member of Economic Chamber of Greece, Greece