



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 • **F.** +30 210 9220 143 • **E.** secretariat@ethaae.gr • www.ethaae.gr

Accreditation Report for the Internal Quality Assurance System (IQAS)

Institution: International Hellenic University

Date: 29 May 2021



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
Internal Quality Assurance System (IQAS) of the **International Hellenic
University** for the purposes of granting accreditation

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Part A: Background and Context of the Review.....	4
I. The External Evaluation & Accreditation Panel.....	4
II. Review Procedure and Documentation	5
III. Institution Profile.....	10
Part B: Compliance with the Principles	11
Principle 1: Institution Policy for Quality Assurance.....	11
Principle 2: Provision and Management of the Necessary Resources	14
Principle 3: Establishing Goals for Quality Assurance.....	18
Principle 4: Structure, Organisation and Operation of the IQAS.....	21
Principle 5: Self-Assessment	24
Principle 6: Collection of Quality Data: Measuring, Analysis and Improvement.....	26
Principle 7: Public Information	29
Principle 8: External Evaluation and Accreditation of the IQAS	31
Part C: Conclusions	33
I. Features of Good Practice	33
II. Areas of Weakness	33
III. Recommendations for Follow-up Actions	33
IV. Summary & Overall Assessment	34

PART A: BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT OF THE REVIEW

I. The External Evaluation & Accreditation Panel

The Panel responsible for the Accreditation Review of the **Internal Quality Assurance System (IQAS)** of the **International Hellenic University** comprised the following five (5) members, drawn from the HAHE Register, in accordance with Laws 4009/2011 & 4653/2020:

- 1. Prof. Konstantinos Salonitis (Chair)**
Cranfield University, Cranfield, United Kingdom

- 2. Prof. Evangelos Dedousis**
The American University in Dubai, Dubai, United Arab Emirates

- 3. Prof. Costas Iliopoulos**
King's College London (KCL), United Kingdom

- 4. Prof. Nicolas Tsapatsoulis**
Technical University of Cyprus, Cyprus

- 5. Prof. Christos Tsinopoulos**
Durham University, Durham, United Kingdom

II. Review Procedure and Documentation

The Evaluation of the Internal Quality Assurance System (IQAS) of the **International Hellenic University** (HUI) was completed remotely over the period of May 24 through May 29, 2021. The review was virtual via the ZOOM platform due to the pandemic travel restrictions. The members of the External Evaluation and Accreditation Panel (EEAP) were Prof. Konstantinos Salonitis (chair), Prof. Evangelos Dedousis, Prof. Christos Tsinopoulos, Prof. Costas Iliopoulos and Prof. Nicolas Tsapatsoulis.

The EEAP received several documents from both the University and the Hellenic Authority for Higher Education (HAHE) in advance. The following documents were reviewed by the Panel prior to the first meeting:

- A. Πρόταση Ακαδημαϊκής Πιστοποίησης του ΕΣΔΠ*
- A2 ΦΕΚ ΕΣΔΠ ΔΙΠΑΕ*
- A3 Εγχειρίδιο Ποιότητας ΕΣΔΠ*
- A4 Εσωτερικός Κανονισμός ΔΙΠΑΕ*
- A5 Πολιτική Ποιότητας του Ιδρύματος*
- A6 Στοχοθεσία Ποιότητας του Ιδρύματος*
- A7 Στρατηγικός Προγραμματισμός του Ιδρύματος*
- A8 Αναφορές δεδομένων*
 - A8.1 Αναφορά Ιδρύματος 2018-2019*
 - A8.2 Αναφορές Τμημάτων 2018-2019*
 - A8.3 Αναφορές ΠΠΣ 2018-2019*
 - A8.4 Αναφορές ΠΜΣ 2018-2019*
 - A8.5 Αναφορές ΠΔΣ 2018-2019*
 - A8.6 Αναφορά π.ΔΙΠΑΕ Ίδρ.-Σχ. 2017-2018*
 - A8.7 Αναφορά π.ΔΙΠΑΕ ΠΣ 2017-2018*
 - A8.8 Αναφορές π. ΔΙΠΑΕ Ίδρ-Σχ 2016-17*
 - A8.9 Αναφορές π. ΔΙΠΑΕ ΠΣ 2016-17*
 - A8.10 Αναφορές π. ΔΙΠΑΕ Ίδρ-Σχ 2015-16*
 - A8.11 Αναφορές π. ΔΙΠΑΕ ΠΣ 2015-16*
- A9.1 Οργανισμός Ιδρύματος.pdf*
- A9.2 Πρότυπο Εσωτερικής Αξιολόγησης Ακαδημαϊκών Τμημάτων.pdf*
- A9.3 Συλλογή δεδομένων μέσω ηλεκτρονικής αξιολόγησης.pdf*
- A9.4 Ερωτηματολόγια Αξιολόγησης.pdf*
- A9.5 Σχεδιασμός Ανάπτυξης Πληροφοριακής Υποδομής Ιδρύματος.pdf*
- A9.6 Παρακολούθηση στοιχείων Scopus.pdf*
- A9.7 Κοινωνικοί Εταίροι ΔΙΠΑΕ.pdf*
- A9.8 Erasmus Συνεργ Ιδρύματα.pdf*
- A9.9 Έκθεση Προόδου Διεθνούς Πανεπιστημίου της Ελλάδος (2017).pdf*
- A9.10 Πιστοποιητικό ISO 27001 (ΜΟΔΙΠ ΔΙΠΑΕ).pdf*

May 24, 2021: EEAP Private Meeting

On Monday, May 24, a virtual ZOOM meeting took place. The Panel met virtually to briefly discuss the documents included in the proposal folder and allocate tasks.

May 25, 2021: Teleconference with the President of the Governing body

On Tuesday May 25, the EEAP had a video teleconference with the President of the Governing Body of the IHU, Prof. A. Kaissis. In the meeting, Prof. Kaissis extended a warm welcome to the EEAP.

May 25, 2021: Teleconference the Rector and the Vice-Rectors

A teleconference with the university's Governing body was held. Present were the Rector, Prof. A. Kaissis, and the vice rectors, Prof. K. Makridou, Vice-President of Academic and Student Affairs (who is also the president of MODIP), Prof. S. Aggelopoulos, Vice-president of Research and Life-Long Learning, Prof. D. Bandekas, Vice-President for Finance, Planning and Development and Prof. I. Karapantzos, Vice-President for Administrative Affairs. In the meeting a short overview of the Institution was presented. The current status, strengths and possible areas of concern were discussed.

May 25, 2021: Teleconference with the Quality Assurance Unit (MODIP)

EEAP afterwards met with the members of the Quality Assurance Unit (MODIP), namely Prof. K. Makridou (President of MODIP and Vice-President of Academic and Student Affairs), Prof. F. Eleftheriou (Dept. of Biomedical Sciences of the School of Health Sciences), Prof. V. Grammatikopoulos (Dept. of Early Childhood Education and Care of the School of Social Sciences), Prof. M. Papageorgiou (Dept. of Food Sciences and Technology of the School of Geosciences), Prof. V. Tsiantos Vasileios (Dept. of Physics of the School of Sciences), Prof. V. Vrana (Dept. of Business Administration of the School of Economics and Business Administration), Ms. Tsantouka Maria (Head of Quality Assurance Unit), Ms. K. Kazaki Kalliopi (Staff of Quality Assurance Unit), Ms. A. Karavasili Aikaterini (Staff of Quality Assurance Unit), Dr. Banos Evaggelos (Information & Communication Systems Engineer). In the meeting the matters related to quality culture, institutional policy on quality assurance, structure and operation of the IQAS, quality management, self-assessment process were discussed. A number of short presentations were delivered to EEAP clarifying the above-mentioned issues. These presentations were available to the EEAP afterwards.

May 25, 2021: Teleconference with faculty members and Internal Evaluation Groups (OMEA) representatives

After a short break, the EEAP met with IHU faculty. In the meeting, Prof. M. Manoledakis (Dean of School of Humanities, Social Sciences and Economics), Prof. P. Samaras (Dean of School of Geosciences), Prof. A. Kazakopoulos (Dean of School of Engineering), Prof. A. Mitropoulos (Dean of School of Sciences), Prof. S. Xanthos (President of the Dept. of Industrial Engineering and Management, of the School of Engineering), Prof. A. Pavludi (President of the Dept. of Agriculture, of the School of Geosciences), Prof. M. Chatzidimitriou Maria (President of the Dept. of Biomedical Sciences of the School of Health Sciences), Prof. K. Kleidis (President of the Dept. of Mechanical Engineering of the School of Engineering), Prof. M. Drakaki (Internal Evaluation Group (OMEA) Representative of the Dept. of Science and Technology of the School of Science and Technology) and Prof. E. Kalogianni (Internal Evaluation Group (OMEA) Representative of the Dept. of Food Science and Technology of the School of Geosciences) were present. The EEAP had the opportunity to discuss with the teaching staff: the self-assessment process; the relationships of OMEA with MODIP, the main strengths, adequacy of resources, possible areas of weakness.

May 25, 2021: EEAP Debriefing

At the end of the meeting with faculty, the EEAP had a debriefing meeting, discussed the initial impressions from the first day of virtual discussions and set the priorities for the following day.

May 26, 2021: Teleconference with students

A teleconference with the students took place. Six (6) students in various phases of their studies attended the meeting. The objective of the meeting was to discuss the students' satisfaction from their study experience and campus facilities; student input in quality assurance; priority issues concerning student life and welfare. The students were in general pleased with their studies and forthcoming with their experiences. The EEAP was able to observe however that the students are not clear about the quality assurance policy of the university, other than their input through the completion of surveys.

May 26, 2021: Teleconference with post graduate students and researchers

A teleconference with the post-graduate students (both MSc and PhD students) and post-doc researchers took place. Seven (7) attended the meetings. The objective of the meeting was on students' views on learning process, progression, assessment; student input in quality assurance; priority issues concerning grants, mobility, research and career opportunities. The students were in general pleased with their studies and the progress of their research.

May 26, 2021: Teleconference with chief administration officers

A teleconference with the chief administration officers was organized afterwards. The aim of the meeting was to discuss the impact of Institutional documents (strategic plan, Quality Assurance manual etc.) in the development of the Institution, the special issues arising from internal evaluation process and/or from talking with Rector & Vice- Rector/President of MODIP. In the meeting, several key staff attended and presented their views. The attendees were Mr. I. Saroglou (Director of Administrative Affairs in Thessaloniki), Mr. M. Bountrakis (Director of Administrative Affairs and Director of Financial Affairs in Serres), Ms. E. Grigoriadou (Director of Library and Information Center), Ms. T. Toptsi (Director of Administrative Affairs in Kavala), Ms. G. Grammenou (Head of European and International Program Dept. in Thessaloniki), Ms. E. Karageorgiou (Head of Secretary of the Dept. of Agriculture), Ms. M. Papdiamanti (Head of Secretary of the Dept. of Early Childhood Education and Care), Ms. M. Agorastou (Head of Internship and Career Office in Thessaloniki), Ms. C. Lazaridou (Head of Secretary of the School of Health Sciences) and Ms. O. Apostolidou (Head of the School of Geosciences).

May 26, 2021: Teleconference with alumni

The following meeting was with graduates to discuss their experience of studying at the school and their career path. The following were present: Ms. F. Chrysanthopoulou (Iseki Food Association, Vienna, Austria) who is an alumna of the Dept. of Food Science and Technology of the School of Geosciences, Mr S. Priftis (Head of Northern Greece Commercial Dept. of Veltia S.A.) who is an alumnus of Executive MBA of the Dept. and School of Humanities, Social Sciences and Economics, Mr. I. Tsamesidis (Postdoctoral Researcher at the Dept. of Dentistry of Aristotle University of Thessaloniki) who is alumnus of the Dept. of Biomedical Sciences of the School of Health Sciences, Mr. E. Iosifidis (Staff Engineer in Intracom – Telecom) who is alumnus of the Dept. of Computer, Informatics and Telecommunications Engineering of the School of

Engineering, Ms. K. Tramvalidou (Secretary in the Master in Public Administration of the Dept. of Business Administration of IHU) who is an alumna of the Dept. of Business Administration of the School of Economics and Business Administration, Ms. V. Kikkidou (Mechanical Engineer MSc. Partner, Skemna Engineer) who is an alumna of MSc. In Energy Building Design of the Dept. and School of Science and Technology, Mr. D. Belevelis (Data Science Director, Braincandy S.A.) who is an alumnus of MSc in Data Science of the Dept. and School of Science and Technology and Mr. O. Nalbantis (Software Engineer, Suse Linux) who is an alumnus of MSc. In Information & Communication Technology Systems, of the Dept. and School of Science and Technology.

May 26, 2021: Teleconference with external stakeholders

A teleconference with the external stakeholders from the private and public sector took place. The following external stakeholders were present: Ms. C. Christodoulou (Senior Officer External Relations & Communications of Black Sea Trade and Development Bank), Mr. E. Koutsochinas (President of Bar Association of Thessaloniki), Mr. A. Kelemis (Managing Director of Greek German Chamber of Industry and Commerce), K. Paschalidis (Colonel, NRDC, NATO Rapid Deployable Corps – Greece), Mr. E. Zagkontinos (Colonel, Office of International and Academic Cooperations Hellenic Supreme Joint War College), Mr. I. Smarnakis (President of Hellenic Association of Food Scientists and Technologists - HeIAFST).

May 26, 2021: EEAP Debriefing

At the end of the meeting with the stakeholders, the EEAP had a debriefing meeting, discussed the initial impressions from the second day of virtual discussions and set the priorities for the following day.

May 27, 2021: On-line tour: overview of the Institution, MODIP and other facilities (classrooms, lecture halls, libraries, laboratories etc.) / Discussion about the facilities presented in the video produced for this purpose

The first meeting for the day was with senior staff members for a discussion and evaluation of facilities and equipment to ascertain that the Institution maintains all the necessary resources to ensure its smooth and proper functioning. The OMEA and MODIP provided pre-recorded videos of the facilities. In the teleconference, the following staff members were present: Prof. K. Makridou (President of MODIP, Vice-President of Academic and Student Affairs), Prof. F. Eleftheriou (Dept. of Biomedical Sciences of the School of Health Sciences), Prof. V. Grammatikopoulos (Dept. of Early Childhood Education and Care of the School of Social Sciences), Prof. M. Papageorgiou (Dept. of Food Sciences and Technology of the School of Geosciences), Prof. V. Tsiantos (Dept. of Physics of the School of Sciences), Prof. V. Vrana (Dept. of Business Administration of the School of Economics and Business Administration), Ms. M. Tsantouka Maria (Head of Quality Assurance Unit), Ms. K. Kazaki (Staff of Quality Assurance Unit), Ms. A. Karavasili (Staff of Quality Assurance Unit), and Prof. S. Leventis (School and Dept. of Humanities, Social Sciences and Economics).

May 27, 2021: EEAP debriefing

The panel then assembled and discussed the key findings as well as highlighted any points that needed to be clarified.

May 27, 2021: Teleconference with Quality Assurance Unit (MODIP)

The EEAP met with the MODIP team. In a short meeting the EEAP had the chance to clarify questions and concerns.

My 27, 2021: Closure with the Rector and Vice-Rector/President of MODIP

The EEAP met for the final meeting of the day with the rector and the vice rector of the university. The Chair of the EEAP had the chance to present informally the EEAP key findings. The EEAP members were positively impressed with the high professionalism and high quality of the presentations made by all the MODIP and faculty members. The presentations were critical in appreciating the high quality of education provided by the department.

May 27 - 31, 2021: Accreditation Report drafting and submission

The EEAP met to discuss the findings, draft the accreditation report, approve in a consensus the content of the report and submit it to HAHE.

III. Institution Profile

The present form of the International Hellenic University (IHU) is the outcome of a major merger that was completed in May 2019. The initial International Hellenic University was established by Law (No 3391/2005) in October 2005 and was based in Thessaloniki, Greece. The IHU was Greece's first public university where programmes were taught exclusively in English comprising three (3) Schools which offered twenty-four (24) master programmes. In 2019, the International Hellenic University was re-established by Law (No 4610/2019); the initial IHU was merged with the Technological Education Institutes of Thessaloniki, Central Macedonia, and East Macedonia and Thrace.

IHU now comprises nine (9) Schools and thirty-three (33) Departments with campuses in Thessaloniki (Thermi and Sindos), Kavala, Serres, Drama, Katerini, Edessa, Kilkis, Didymoteicho. The two Schools (School of Humanities, Social Sciences and Economics and the School of Science and Technology) of the IHU belong to the University Centre of International Programmes of Studies (UCIPS) of the International Hellenic University (IHU) offering programmes that are taught exclusively in English.

The university is governed by a governing body that includes members appointed by the Ministry of Education and representatives of all schools.

At its current state (as of May 2021), the university employs 401 academics in 33 academic departments. This indicates an average number of academics per department of 12. However, there are departments with considerably higher academics (with a maximum of 27) and a department with only one academic. It is clear to EEAP that there is an ongoing restructuring though.

The enrolment to the university takes place every September, and in total 53,887 students are registered. The high number of registered students, results in a considerably high student / academic ratio (134). Thirty (30) undergraduate programmes of study are offered currently. However, the academics need to cater for the legacy programmes that were offered by the technical education institute departments before the 2019 merger. The number of students enrolled in each undergraduate programme is set centrally by the Ministry of Education and ranged from 77 to 317 in the last academic enrolment (2019-20).

PART B: COMPLIANCE WITH THE PRINCIPLES

Principle 1: Institution Policy for Quality Assurance

INSTITUTIONS SHOULD APPLY A QUALITY ASSURANCE POLICY AS PART OF THEIR STRATEGIC MANAGEMENT. THIS POLICY SHOULD BE DEVELOPED AND ADJUSTED ACCORDING TO THE INSTITUTIONS' AREAS OF ACTIVITY. IT SHOULD ALSO BE MADE PUBLIC AND IMPLEMENTED BY ALL PARTIES INVOLVED.

The quality assurance policy is the guiding document which sets the operating principles of the Internal Quality Assurance System (IQAS), the principles for the continuous improvement of the Institution, as well as the Institution's obligation for public accountability. It supports the development of quality culture, according to which, all internal stakeholders assume responsibility for quality and engage in quality assurance. This policy has a formal status and is publicly available.

The policy for quality is implemented through:

- *the commitment for compliance with the laws and regulations that govern the Institution;*
- *the establishment, review, redesign and redefinition of quality assurance objectives, that are fully in line with the institutional strategy.*

This policy mainly supports:

- *the organisation of the internal quality assurance system;*
- *the Institution's leadership, departments and other organisational units, individual staff members and students to take on their responsibilities in quality assurance;*
- *the integrity of academic principles and ethics, guarding against discriminations, and encouragement of external stakeholders to be involved in quality assurance;*
- *the continuous improvement of learning and teaching, research and innovation;*
- *the quality assurance of the programmes and their alignment with the relevant HAHE Standards;*
- *the effective organisation of services and the development and maintenance of infrastructure;*
- *the allocation and effective management of the necessary resources for the operation of the Institution;*
- *the development and rational allocation of human resources.*

The way in which this policy is designed, approved, implemented, monitored and revised constitutes one of the processes of the internal quality assurance system.

Institution compliance

IHU, being the result of a recent integration of four academic institutions, tried to smoothly merge the quality procedures that have been applied in those institutions. In that effort they followed some good practices from the constituting institutions along with the recommendations of HAHE. Overall, IHU established a Quality Assurance Policy (QAP) which is outlined in the Quality Assurance Policy Document [D1.1] and detailed in the Quality Manual. The way in which this policy is designed, approved, implemented, monitored, and revised constitutes one of the processes of the Internal Quality Assurance System (IQAS) and is the Process #1 in the Quality Manual [D2.1].

Both the Quality Assurance Policy Document and the Quality Manual are appropriate for the IHU and sufficiently specialized on its individual characteristics (for instance the difficulties arising from the way IHU was created by merging four different institutions through a top-down process).

The MODIP of IHU is a decentralized unit (having four different components each one being located in the headquarters of each one of the IHU's constituting institutions) that is responsible for the design, application and update of the quality assurance and evaluation processes. The Internal Evaluation Committees (OMEAs) are responsible, in collaboration with MODIP, for overseeing the quality assurance processes at the department level and for evaluating their effectiveness. The MODIP tries to communicate the QAP of the Institution to all relevant stakeholders. There is up-to-date information on the QAU website (<https://www.ihu.gr/modip/>) in Greek but this is not the case for English (<https://www.ihu.gr/modip/en/quality-assurance-unit/>).

The main objectives of Institution's QAP are listed in the Quality Manual (page 17, Process #1, paragraph 1.1). Among them are included:

- the establishment of a quality culture within IHU
- the improvement of IHU's competitiveness compared to similar institutions in Greece and abroad
- the increase of Institution's research volume and quality
- the quality assurance of the programmes of study and their alignment with the relevant HAHE standards

The QAP is assessed based on the following KPIs (Quality Manual, Process #1, paragraph 1.5):

- Number of Institution's academic and admin units that actively participate in the implementation of IQAS
- Number of improvements related to Institution's operation that were achieved through the implementation of QAP
- Number of accredited Study Programmes
- Change in Institution's rankings at international ranking lists

It is unclear, however, what is the process by which the KPIs and objectives related to QAP are reviewed and revised.

In practical means the QAP of IHU has two effective components referring to the evaluation of quality of:

- individual courses (modules) by the students and the self-assessment reports of the faculty with regards the courses they teach, and
- research through the annual reports of the faculty.

The courses are evaluated by students on an annual basis through questionnaires. All academic departments introduced electronic questionnaires, which also allow students to enter free-text comments of qualitative nature.

The AP feels that the Institution's QAP was sufficiently communicated to the faculty, but this is not the case for the a) students, b) external stakeholders and graduates, and c) administrative staff.

Overall, IHU fully complies with the Quality Assurance spirit and the operating principles as per the HAHE guidelines, which is embedded in the Institution's daily operations. It should be noted

however, that this is not reflected adequately in the IHU Strategic Planning when it comes to *quality goals and relevant KPIs*. It also appears that the OMEAs are not fully engaged and, in some cases, aware of the importance of having a properly designed and homogeneous, across all constituting institutions, IQAS. The EEAP understands, though, that this is due, to a large extent, to the difficulties that a new institution encounters when trying to implement a top-down integration policy.

References

[D1.1] Document “A5 Πολιτική Ποιότητας του Ιδρύματος.pdf”: Δήλωση Πολιτικής Ποιότητας Διεθνούς Πανεπιστημίου Ελλάδος

[D2.1] Document “A3 Εγχειρίδιο Ποιότητας ΕΣΔΠ.pdf”: Εγχειρίδιο Ποιότητας ΕΣΔΠ

Panel Judgement

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

Panel Recommendations

- R1.1 The IHU is encouraged to continue trying to homogenize the IQAS across all individual academic departments (“nodes”) by applying the good practices followed so far in those institutions.
- R1.2 The OMEAs should have a clearer view and role in the IQAS design and implementation, especially as far as the quality goals establishment is concerned.
- R1.3 The QAP of IHU should be more effectively communicated to all relevant stakeholders (especially to admin staff, graduates, strategic partners, etc).
- R1.4 The MODIP should further facilitate the engagement with all relevant stakeholders for the design and application of the Institution's QAP.
- R1.5 The MODIP should check and make sure that all goals of the QAP are clearly associated with KPIs.
- R1.6 The majority of current KPIs associated with the QAP are too generic and need to be revised and adapted to Institution’s own strategic goals.
- R1.7 The MODIP should further clarify the process referring to the revision of KPIs and objectives of QAP.
- R1.8 Quality Goals related to the evaluation of the Study Programmes (curricula) as a whole, along with relevant KPIs, should be considered in the QAP and the Quality Manual.

Principle 2: Provision and Management of the Necessary Resources

INSTITUTIONS SHOULD ENSURE APPROPRIATE FUNDING FOR LEARNING AND TEACHING ACTIVITIES, RESEARCH, AND ACADEMIC ACTIVITIES IN GENERAL. RELEVANT REGULATIONS SHOULD BE IN PLACE TO ASSURE THAT ADEQUATE INFRASTRUCTURE AND SERVICES FOR TEACHING AND RESEARCH ARE AVAILABLE AND READILY ACCESSIBLE (E.G. CLASSROOMS, LABORATORIES, LIBRARIES, IT INFRASTRUCTURE, PROVISION OF FREE MEALS, DORMITORIES, CAREER GUIDANCE AND SOCIAL WELFARE SERVICES, ETC.).

Funding

The Institution ensures adequate funding to cover not only the overhead and operational costs (regular budget and public investment budget) but also costs related to research, innovation and development (Special Account for Research Funds, Property Development and Management Company). The financial planning and the operation of an effective financial management system constitute necessary tools for the full exploitation of the resources.

Infrastructure

Based on the requirements and needs arising during its operation, the Institution has determined ways to define, allocate and maintain all the necessary resources to ensure its smooth and proper functioning, i.e. teaching, research and auxiliary facilities, equipment and software, support facilities (cleaning, transportation, communication) etc. The scope of the IQAS should include a suitable managing and monitoring system to safeguard the infrastructure. Compliance to the internal regulations is also necessary.

Working environment

The Institution ensures -as far as possible- that the working environment has a positive effect on the performance of all members of the academic community (students and staff). Factors that are taken into consideration towards the creation of such a favorable environment are, among others, the sanitary facilities, the lighting/heating/ventilation system, the cleanliness and the overall appearance of the premises, etc. The scope of the IQAS should include an appropriate managing and monitoring system to promote a favorable working environment and to ensure compliance with the existing provisions.

Human resources

The Institution and the academic units are responsible for the human resources development.

The subject areas, as well as the competences and tasks of the staff members are defined by the corresponding job descriptions that are established within the operation scope of each academic or administrative unit. These posts are filled following the requirements set by the law, on the basis of transparent, fair and published processes. The continuous training and evaluation of the staff is considered necessary for the enhancement of the performance, which is recorded and monitored as provided in the context of the IQAS.

The Institution should acknowledge and provide the necessary resources for the implementation of the IQAS, its enhancement and the provision of services that assist the satisfaction of the quality assurance requirements. Moreover, the Institution (Quality Assurance Unit-QAU) should properly organise the administrative structure and staffing of the IQAS, with a clear allocation of competences and tasks to its staff members.

Institution compliance

The institution's funding structure is largely determined by the government and associated legislation. The recruitment of faculty and support staff is determined through a process of budgetary negotiation with representatives of the government. The infrastructure of the institution has been affected by the merger of the previous academic entities. This has generated some inconsistencies on the provision of equipment, facilities and such across the

different departments. This has been identified by the management of the institution and, during the visit we were shown several examples where resources were allocated to close any relevant gaps. This focused on both the provision faculty and temporary teaching staff and the justification of capital expenditure. The MODIP has only an advisory role in this process as it has no decision-making authority. Nevertheless, they are responsible for providing the data which is relevant for making decisions and to justify spending. Furthermore, the MODIP does have the right to review these decisions and to provide an overall view of the impact of spending.

During the virtual visit we were shown plenty of evidence of how this worked. The current process is in full operation since the merger of the institution, but as of yet it has not completed several cycles so as to ensure that this is fully effective (the current process has been in operation for about two years. As a result, there are several legacy processes and issues that the new management of the University is trying to address. Although some of these legacy processes allow for continuity between the previous and current structures, they also lead to resistance to change and times inertial forces. We were told (and shown evidence to this extent) that MODIP is central to the decision making of addressing these, e.g. by providing processes, setting targets, and providing data. Some issues related to the location of some of the campuses, the travel between and within these (an issue that was also identified by the student representatives) and the relatively limited number of staff to fully operate these buildings and (where appropriate) pieces of equipment.

In general, the working environment in the University is appropriate for the management of the daily activities of faculty and staff. Although we did not visit the premises of the University in person due to the COVID-19 restrictions, it appears that most buildings are in good operational condition, clean and favourable for a productive academic environment.

Given the above constraints, the principle is fully compliant and the processes that support is regularly reviewed.

Panel judgement

Principle 2: Provision & Management of the Necessary Resources	
2.1 Funding	
Fully compliant	X
Substantially compliant	
Partially compliant	
Non-compliant	
2.2 Infrastructure	
Fully compliant	
Substantially compliant	X
Partially compliant	
Non-compliant	
2.3 Working Environment	
Fully compliant	X
Substantially compliant	
Partially compliant	
Non-compliant	
2.4 Human Resources	
Fully compliant	X
Substantially compliant	
Partially compliant	
Non-compliant	

Principle 2: Provision & Management of the Necessary Resources (overall)	
Fully compliant	X
Substantially compliant	
Partially compliant	
Non-compliant	

Panel Recommendations

R2.1. MODIP could be further integrated into the decision making of the University for budgetary purposes. Although, to a degree this is already happening, there is scope for further integrating some of the processes of managing quality and goal setting with the allocation of resources at all levels. This is likely to have a more immediate effect on the recruitment and retention of faculty but would also affect the justification for capital expenditure.

- R2.2. The university management should consider the efficiency of operations of some of the more remote locations. Such locations may be difficult to run, and they risk affecting the overall quality of the provision, both in terms of research and teaching. Although closing or relocating a campus may not be structurally possible, the University could consider repurposing or gradually changing the case for using several of these locations. The effect of such a recommendation could be evaluated thoroughly with the contribution of data from the QAU.
- R2.3. The effect of the allocation of resources on the wider operation of the institution could be further integrated. The management of the institution could ensure that data on the effectiveness of the institutions covers areas beyond teaching evaluations, e.g. the operation of support services such as libraries, HR and such.

Principle 3: Establishing Goals for Quality Assurance

INSTITUTIONS SHOULD HAVE CLEAR AND EXPLICIT GOALS REGARDING THE ASSURANCE AND CONTINUOUS UPGRADE OF THE QUALITY OF THE OFFERED PROGRAMMES, THE RESEARCH AND INNOVATION ACTIVITIES, AS WELL AS THE SCIENTIFIC AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES. THESE GOALS MAY BE QUALITATIVE OR QUANTITATIVE AND REFLECT THE INSTITUTIONAL STRATEGY.

The Institution's strategy on quality assurance should be translated into time-specific, qualitative and quantitative goals which are regularly monitored, measured and reviewed in the context of the IQAS operation, and following an appropriate procedure.

Examples of quality goals:

- *rise of the average annual graduation rate of the Institution's Undergraduate Programmes to x%;*
- *upgrade of the learning environment through the introduction of digital applications on*;
- *improvement of the ratio of scientific publications to teaching staff members to*;
- *rise of the total research funding to y%*

The goals are accompanied by a specific action plan for their achievement, and entail the participation of all stakeholders.

Institution compliance

The IQAS includes a short-term Strategic Plan (for 2021) [D3.1] which consists of high-level goals that refer to the (1) digitisation of administration processes and services, (2) development of a Green Policy, (3) improvement and modernization of study programmes with special emphasis on innovation and entrepreneurship, (4) university's internationalization, and (5) improvement of university's research performance and innovation activities.

While the strategic goals related to internationalisation, green policy and research performance are associated with relevant quality goals and paired with meaningful and specific KPIs this is not the case for the remaining goals mentioned in the Strategic Plan (i.e., goals referring to digitisation of services and the quality of study programmes).

The Quality Manual, based on the HAHE template, is quite generic and not well-adapted to the particular nature of IHU. Although, benchmarking with similar institutions across the country is facilitated when adopting the generic quality goals and KPIs suggested by HAHE, ownership of the IQAS by key players in the Institution, such as the faculty and the students, is lost.

There is specific provision in the Quality Manual [D3.1] for the establishment and implementation of quality goals (Quality Process #3, pages 40-60). Explicit procedures referring to the setup of quality goals related to: (a) learning process and learning outcomes, (b) research activities and innovation, (c) infrastructure and management systems, and (d) human development, are detailed therein. However, the majority of outputs defined in this process do not reflect the actual Strategic Plan and the associated action plan. For instance, quality goals and KPIs related to the administration services and human development are provisioned in the outputs of Quality Process #3 but are totally missing in the Strategic Plan implementation document [D3.1]. This is also the case for both the process and the quality goals per se referring to the quality assessment of the Study Programmes as a whole. The EAAP feels that quality goals

for the assessment of Study Programmes should be holistic ones and not emphasized on individual modules and/or goals related to the students/personnel ratio. Towards this direction the involvement of graduates, alumni and external stakeholders to the establishment of goals related to the Study Programmes should be clear and specific. The corresponding services of the University, e.g. careers office, should be more actively engaged in that.

The EAAP feels that the involvement of IHU’s academic personnel, as expressed by OMEAs, in the establishment of quality goals (and associated KPIs) is minimal. This, in turn, leads to low engagement with IQAS and lack of “ownership” feeling.

References

[D3.1] Document “A6 Στοχοθεσία Ποιότητας του Ιδρύματος.pdf”: Στοχοθεσία Ποιότητας Διεθνούς Πανεπιστημίου της Ελλάδος για το έτος 2021.

[D3.2] Document “A3 Εγχειρίδιο Ποιότητας ΕΣΔΠ.pdf”: Εγχειρίδιο Ποιότητας ΕΣΔΠ

Panel judgement

Principle 3: Establishing Goals for Quality Assurance	
3.1 Study Programmes/ education activities	
Fully compliant	
Substantially compliant	X
Partially compliant	
Non-compliant	
3.2 Research & Innovation	
Fully compliant	X
Substantially compliant	
Partially compliant	
Non-compliant	
3.3 Administration (funding, human resources, infrastructure management)	
Fully compliant	
Substantially compliant	
Partially compliant	X
Non-compliant	
3.4 Resources (funding, human resources, infrastructure)	
Fully compliant	
Substantially compliant	X
Partially compliant	
Non-compliant	

Principle 3: Establishing Goals for Quality Assurance (overall)	
Fully compliant	
Substantially compliant	X
Partially compliant	
Non-compliant	

Panel Recommendations

- R3.1 In the Quality Manual, Process #3, please add a procedure describing the ways in which the quality goals are reviewed and revised. Furthermore, the outputs defined in this process should be reflected in the Strategic Plan and the associated action plan.
- R3.2 The MODIP should consider developing and adopting tailored KPIs to the uniqueness of IHU further to the ones suggested by HAHE. All goals mentioned in the Strategic Plan should be accompanied by relevant quality goals and paired with appropriate KPIs.
- R3.3 The academic personnel of IHU should be more clearly involved in the establishment of quality goals and relevant KPIs.
- R3.4 Quality Goals related to the evaluation of the Study Programmes (curricula) as a whole, along with relevant KPIs, should be considered in the QAP and the Quality Manual. Involvement of graduates, alumni, and external stakeholders, and especially those offering internships to students and / or work to graduates, is necessary both during the establishment of quality goals as well during the evaluation of those quality goals, i.e., definition of proper and measurable KPIs.

Principle 4: Structure, Organisation and Operation of the IQAS

INSTITUTIONS SET UP AND ESTABLISH AN INTERNAL QUALITY ASSURANCE SYSTEM, WHICH INCLUDES PROCESSES AND PROCEDURES COVERING ALL AREAS OF ACADEMIC ACTIVITIES AND FUNCTIONS. SPECIAL FOCUS IS GIVEN ON THE QUALITY OF TEACHING AND LEARNING, INCLUDING THE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT, RESEARCH, INNOVATION AND GOVERNANCE.

The key goal of the internal quality assurance system (IQAS) is the development, effective operation and continuous improvement of the whole range of the Institution's activities, and particularly, of teaching, research, innovation, governance and relevant services, according to the international practices - especially those of the European Higher Education Area - and the HAHE principles and guidelines described in these Standards.

Structure and organisation

In each Institution, the Quality Assurance Unit (QAU) holds the responsibility for the administration and management of the IQAS. The QAU is set up according to the existing legislative framework and is responsible for:

- *the development of specialised policy, strategy and relevant processes towards the continuous improvement of the quality of the Institution's work and provisions;*
- *the organisation, operation and continuous improvement of the Institution's internal quality assurance system;*
- *the coordination and support of the evaluation process of the Institution's academic units and other services, and;*
- *the support of the external evaluation and accreditation process of the Institution's programmes and internal quality assurance system in the context of the HAHE principles and guidelines.*

The Institution's IQAS and its implementation processes are determined by the decisions of the competent bodies, as provided by the law, and are published in the Government Gazette, as well as on the Institution's website. The above are reviewed every six years, at the latest.

To achieve the above goals, the QAU collaborates with HAHE, develops and maintains a management information system to store the evaluation data, which are periodically submitted to HAHE, according to the latter's instructions. The QAU is responsible for the systematic monitoring of the evaluation process and for the publication of evaluation-related procedures and their results on the Institution's website.

The QAU structure has been approved by the Institution's competent bodies, as provided by the law, while all competences and tasks accruing from this structure are clearly defined.

Operation

The Institution takes action for the design, establishment, implementation, audit and maintenance of the Internal Quality Assurance System (IQAS), taking into account the Standards' requirements, while making any necessary amendments to ensure fitness to achieve its aims.

The above actions include:

- *provision of all necessary processes and procedures for the successful operation of the IQAS, as well as implementation of the above processes and procedures on all of the Institution's parties involved ;the Institution's areas of activity can constitute the IQAS processes, e.g. teaching, research and innovation, governance, services etc. An IQAS process is an area of activity including data input, data processing and outputs. A procedure defines the way an action is implemented and includes a course of stages or steps, e.g. the curriculum design procedure;*
- *determination of how the IQAS procedures / processes are audited, measured and assessed, and how they interact;*
- *provision of all necessary resources to enable the IQAS function.*

Documentation

The IQAS documentation includes, among other things, a series of key documents demonstrating its structure and organisation, such as the Quality Manual, which describes how the Standards' requirements are met.

The Annexes of the Quality Manual include:

- *the Quality Policy and the Quality Assurance Objectives;*
- *the necessary written Procedures, along with the entailed forms;*
- *the necessary Guides, External Documents (e.g. pertinent legislation), as well as any other supporting data;*
- *the standing organisational structure of the QAU, with a detailed description of the competences, the required qualifications and the goals for each post. The organisational chart is structured in a manner that ensures that the IQAS organisational requirements are fully and properly met.*

Institution compliance

The institution has recently established the process for quality evaluation and assurance; this is achieved via MODIP at the University level, OMEA at the faculty/department level and EOA for the Various programmes of study. The MODIP was established by the merger of the 4 MODIPs following the merger of 4 Institutions. Data and input collection are gathering pace and faculty and students seem to become accustomed to the process. The evaluation and assurance processes were published in ΦΕΚ 4451, Τεύχος Β'/3-12/19 outlining the structure, the procedures and targets for the International Hellenic University.

The University, following the merger, seems to need time to adjust the procedures and they are in progress of adapting to them. At the moment, when an issue arises, it is first addressed at the Departments meeting, then the departmental chair, then the Dean and finally the president. They have taken steps to create a culture of compliance and continuous improvement, and they seem to attempt updating the processes and data collections. The merger has created the need for unification of the processes. For example, the student records are still split in 4 systems corresponding to the founding 4 Institutions. The IQAS is anticipated to reach full compliance as soon as the system is checked and validated.

Research and PhD studies are in their infancy, as most of the founding Institutions had no PhD studies programmes established by law prior to the merge. The research monitoring system was adopted from the respective system set up by Aristoteleio University of Thessaloniki. But the data are minimal and too early to give meaningful indices. EEAP feels however that the university is on the right track.

The Quality manual although is comprehensive and well written, it reads as the amalgamation of the quality manuals from the four founding institutions. As a result, it does not reflect the character or the culture of the institution that is still formed after the merger. The MODIP is advised to revisit the quality manual once the merge has settled.

The web pages of MODIP are quite descriptive, outlining procedures, structures, questionnaires etc. An English version is a work in progress.

Panel judgement

Principle 4: Structure, Organization and Operation of the IQAS	
Fully compliant	
Substantially compliant	X
Partially compliant	
Non-compliant	

Panel Recommendations

- R4.1 The MODIP is in need of additional IT and Admin support for processing and analysing the data.
- R4.2 The quality manual should be tailored to reflect the character of the institution
- R4.3 An English version of the web pages should be implemented as a matter of urgency
- R4.4 The MODIP should further work in integrating the legacy systems of the four founding institutions

Principle 5: Self-Assessment

THE INTERNAL QUALITY ASSURANCE SYSTEM COMPRISES PROCEDURES PROVIDING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE ANNUAL SELF-ASSESSMENT OF THE INSTITUTION'S ACADEMIC AND ADMINISTRATIVE UNITS, ADDRESSING AREAS OF OVERSIGHTS OR SHORTCOMINGS, AND DEFINING REMEDIAL ACTIONS TOWARDS THE ACHIEVEMENT OF THE SET GOALS, AND EVENTUAL IMPROVEMENT.

The QAU conducts, on an annual basis, a self-assessment of the IQAS, following the written procedure provided for each area of activity, which is implemented by a certain academic or administrative unit, as appropriate. The procedure determines the timing, the participants, the data under consideration, and the expected outcomes. The self-assessment aims at a final estimation of the suitability of the IQAS in force, as well as at basing decisions concerning the necessary remedial or precautionary actions for improvement.

The data considered in the context of the self-assessment of a programme may, for example, include:

- *students performance;*
- *feedback from students / teaching staff;*
- *assessment of learning outcomes;*
- *graduation rates;*
- *feedback from the evaluation of the facilities / learning environment;*
- *report of any remedial or precautionary actions undertaken;*
- *suggestions for improvement.*

The outcomes of the self-assessment are recorded in internal reports drawn up by the QAU. The reports identify any areas of deviation or non-compliance with the Standards, and are communicated to the interested parties (if appropriate). The Institution's resolutions concerning any modification, compliance, or enhancement of the IQAS operation might include actions related to:

- *the upgrade of the IQAS and the pertinent processes;*
- *the upgrade of the services offered to the students;*
- *the reallocation of resources;*
- *the introduction of new quality goals, etc.*

The outcomes of the self-assessment are recorded and, along with the source data, are archived as quality files.

A special procedure is followed for the compliance check of newly launched programmes (of all three cycles), or programmes that are to be reviewed shortly, prior to the institutional approval of the programme.

Institution compliance

The MODIP administers the Institution's internal quality assurance system. The MODIP follows the procedures outlined in the Institution's quality assurance manual. MODIP works closely with the OMEA and EOA committees at the departmental level. The IHU's self-evaluation procedure examines performance in the areas of teaching, research, administration, and infrastructure. In these sectors, there are numerous indicators, such as the proportion of active registered students who are active, the percent of students who graduate on time, graduation rates,

students' performance, feedback from students, evaluation of teaching and research of academic teaching staff; evaluation of the facilities & the learning environment etc. The goals are quantitatively described, and a schedule for their achievement is established.

The data collected by OMEA and EOA are discussed at a Departmental meeting that students participate in; remedial or precautionary actions undertaken are then taken, where necessary. Then the self-assessment data are passed to MODIP for further reviewing; then action for improvements and revision of targets takes place at Departmental and Institution level.

The merger of the four institutions into the International Hellenic University, created a new unified MODIP with a new set of procedures and goals. Members of the MODIP and OMEA committees are coming to terms with the functioning of the new unified quality assurance system and are keen to maintain and enhance the quality of teaching, research, student experience, and overall quality.

It is important to review the quality assurance system, adapting in a way that is suitable for the enlarged institutional structure. We recommend that the targets are continuously reviewed to ensure that they are reasonable and appropriate for the staff, students and the institution.

Panel judgement

Principle 5: Self-Assessment	
Fully compliant	X
Substantially compliant	
Partially compliant	
Non-compliant	

Panel Recommendations

R5.1 Review the quality assurance system at a regular basis

Principle 6: Collection of Quality Data: Measuring, Analysis and Improvement

INSTITUTIONS ARE FULLY RESPONSIBLE FOR THE COLLECTION, ANALYSIS AND USE OF INFORMATION IN AN INTEGRATED, FUNCTIONAL AND READILY ACCESSIBLE MANNER, AIMING AT THE EFFECTIVE MANAGEMENT OF THE QUALITY DATA RELATED TO TEACHING, RESEARCH AND OTHER ACADEMIC ACTIVITIES, AS WELL AS OF THOSE RELATED TO THE ADMINISTRATION.

The QAU should establish and operate an information system to manage the data required for the implementation of the Internal Quality Assurance System.

The QAU measures and monitors the performance of the various activities of the Institution, through appropriate procedures established in the context of the IQAS structure, and assesses their level of effectiveness. The measuring and monitoring is conducted on a basis of indices and data provided by HAHE in the pertinent guidelines and forms, which are part of the National Information System for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (NISQA). These measurements may concern: the size of the student body, the size of the teaching and administrative staff, the infrastructure, the structural components of the curricula, students' performance, research activity performance, financial data, feedback on student and faculty satisfaction surveys, data related to the teaching and research activity, services, infrastructure, etc.

The QAU makes use of the figures and presents the results for consideration using statistical analysis. Outcomes are displayed through histograms and charts. This sort of information is used by the Institution for decision making, at all levels, pursuing improvement, as well as for setting, monitoring, assessing and reviewing the Institution's strategic and operational goals.

Institution compliance

The University has established a system for managing the IQAS. This is in line with the standards set by the NISQA in Higher Education. During the visit, we were shown evidence of its operation. On the education side, it captures significant amounts of data from all stakeholders primarily focusing on the student body. This can provide some clear monitoring of the progress of the relevant activities, particularly student satisfaction. It is also conducted at regular intervals and is owned largely by the departmental teams.

We were shown plenty of evidence of how this system works at the educational front. This included the provision of graphs that provided comparisons across years and departments. This was included in the information we were sent in advance of the visit and during the visit itself. More specifically, during the visit were shown evidence of graphs and data that could be used for supporting decision making. The staff we spoke to were fully transparent and willing to share all relevant information. We were also given the opportunity to discuss this with current students across all levels, including PhD.

We were also shown how the quality assurance scheme works at the research and innovation fronts. In the presentation we were shown evidence of monitoring of research metrics, such as number of publications, citations and research income. Staff, for the most part, were able to articulate the organisation's strategy and how this translates to metrics, e.g. publications and research funding. We were also informed that there was an impact on these from COVID 19 where admittedly there has been a slowdown of research activity.

There was relatively less discussion on the final two areas (6.3 and 6.4). However, scrutiny of the documentation provided, including the quality manual, provides evidence that these two

areas are also captured. During the visit, staff explained to us the reliance on the government for the provision for funding of new academic staff. As such, the degree of flexibility of implementing actions in these two areas may be relatively limited. Yet, and judging from the enthusiasm, engagement and awareness of everyone we met, it is apparent that the current structures and systems provide the support needed to achieve the ambitious targets set by the institution and indeed the government.

Panel judgement

Principle 6: Collection of Data: Measuring, Analysis & Improvement	
6.1 Study Programmes / education activities	
Fully compliant	X
Substantially compliant	
Partially compliant	
Non-compliant	
6.2 Research & Innovation	
Fully compliant	X
Substantially compliant	
Partially compliant	
Non-compliant	
6.3 Activities related to the administration (funding, human resources, infrastructure management)	
Fully compliant	X
Substantially compliant	
Partially compliant	
Non-compliant	
6.4 Human Resources	
Fully compliant	X
Substantially compliant	
Partially compliant	
Non-compliant	

Principle 6: Collection of Data: Measuring, Analysis & Improvement (overall)	
Fully compliant	X
Substantially compliant	
Partially compliant	
Non-compliant	

Panel Recommendations

- R6.1 The university should aim to increase the response rate in the quality related surveys. This is a key challenge across most such systems. However, a response rate of 20-30% is relatively low especially when these may have implications for individuals' performance. EEAP thinks that this may have to do the number of questions in the relevant questionnaires.
- R6.2 Ensure that the system and its outcome is embedded across all areas of the institution including support services.

Principle 7: Public Information

INSTITUTIONS SHOULD PUBLISH INFORMATION ABOUT THEIR TEACHING AND ACADEMIC ACTIVITIES IN A DIRECT AND ACCESSIBLE MANNER. ALL PERTINENT INFORMATION SHOULD BE UP-TO-DATE, CLEAR AND OBJECTIVE.

The QAU publishes data related to IQAS structure, organisation and operation. Furthermore, the QAU publishes data pertinent to the institutional quality policy and objectives, as well as information and data relevant to the Institution's internal and external evaluation. In the context of the self-assessment process, the QAU verifies that adequate information regarding the teaching activities and, particularly, the programmes' profile and the overall institutional activity is publicly available. QAU makes recommendations for improvement, where appropriate.

Institution compliance

The information publicly available on the website of the QAU of the IHU is both extensive and properly updated covering the structure of the MODIP, its purpose, quality assurance policies, and other aspects of its operations. Further, detailed information on internal quality assurance is provided in the 93-page long quality assurance manual produced by the QAU. Similarly, on the IHU's website one can easily find extensive and updated information on teaching, research, administration, recent news, and upcoming events as they relate to the Institution and its stakeholders. It may, however, be noted that, while the information found in IHU's Greek webpages is extensive covering most queries a visitor may have, what is available in the English language website is far more restricted as it focuses almost exclusively on academic studies and the teaching function of the Institution. This suggests that, while the website in English has been developed with questions foreign prospective students are likely to have in mind, the Greek version targets a far wider audience.

From the viewpoint of prospective students, especially those interested in post-graduate studies, IHU's webpages are very informative as they include details regarding programmes of study, sequence and contents of individual courses, study guides, assessment methods, bibliography, timetables, faculty credentials and research work, and other details of interest to students. However, a noticeable discrepancy exists by looking at the websites of the original IHU and the several schools and institutes that have now become part of the Institution. That is, while there is practically very little that might be considered missing on the website of the former, the websites of the latter, that is some schools and institutes located outside Thessaloniki, are characterised by scarcity of information notifying the viewer that information will be available shortly. In this connection it may also be noted that, while prospective students will certainly examine details of programmes of study offered, they will also be seriously interested in the quality of the faculty, their research and other achievements.

In line with its strategic goals including outward orientation linking studies with the job market and entrepreneurship, internationalization, and institutional social responsibility IHU's webpages provide regular updates on various events such as seminars and lectures that aim at bringing together the academic community and outside stakeholders.

Panel judgement

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

Panel Recommendations

- R7.1 Update and enrich IHU's English language website to include a similar amount of information as that available on the website in Greek. This is important given IHU's strategic goals of internationalization and outward orientation. It is also important as it could enhance the possibility for schools/departments that have recently become part of IHU of attracting students from outside their own respective locality in line with the aspirations of several participants as expressed during the discussions with the Panel.
- R7.2 Update and enrich the websites of several schools/institutes following a standardized template if possible.
- R7.3 Give prominence to faculty research and other activities. This could be done by means of relevant announcements on the website, press releases, etc. Strengthening research and innovation by means of attracting new researchers is one of IHU's strategic goals and a noble aspiration. However, top researchers and talented students tend to go to places where they will meet peers of an equal calibre. Hence the need for IHU to promote and advertise the achievements of its own faculty and students.

Principle 8: External Evaluation and Accreditation of the IQAS

INSTITUTIONS SHOULD BE PERIODICALLY EVALUATED BY COMMITTEES OF EXTERNAL EXPERTS SET BY HAHE, FOR THE PURPOSE OF ACCREDITATION OF THEIR INTERNAL QUALITY ASSURANCE SYSTEMS (IQAS). THE PERIODICITY OF THE EXTERNAL EVALUATION IS DETERMINED BY HAHE.

External quality assurance, in the case in point external evaluation aiming at accreditation, may act as a means of verification of the effectiveness of the Institution's internal quality assurance, and as a catalyst for improvement, while opening new perspectives. Additionally, it can provide information with a view to public acknowledgement of the positive course of the Institution's activities.

The Higher Education Institutions engage in periodic external quality assurance which is conducted taking into consideration any special requirements set by the legislation governing the operation of the Institutions and their academic units.

Quality assurance, in this case 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 ensure that the progress made since the last external quality assurance activity is taken into consideration when preparing for the next one.

Institution compliance

IHU in its present form, following the merger of several institutions of higher education, has been in operation since May 2019. Given the short period of its existence IHU had not previously initiated procedures of external evaluation of its IQAS. Nevertheless, all the constituent institutions that are now part of IHU had previously (that is, before the merger) undergone an external evaluation though it is unclear whether and to what extent any recommendations made in previous external evaluations had been subsequently implemented with the view to improve IQAS.

In the course of presentations by faculty and administrative staff and in the discussions that followed it became clear to the EEAP that IHU's personnel are well aware of the role and importance of the IQAS and its contribution towards improving quality in all aspects of the University's operations. However, two remarks are due. One, is the challenge of implementing a uniform IQAS across constituent institutions characterized by a diversity of backgrounds, *raison d' être*, and orientation. The second remark refers to the lack of awareness of and involvement in IQAS of students, alumni, and stakeholders in industry. In the minds of students and alumni IQAS appears to be restricted to course evaluation surveys and filling the occasional questionnaire while awareness is even more limited among industry stakeholders.

The Panel's judgement recorded below is based on the existence of external evaluation reports as they refer to the pre-merger period.

Panel judgement

Principle 8: External Evaluation & Accreditation of the IQAS	
Fully compliant	X
Substantially compliant	
Partially compliant	
Non-compliant	

Panel Recommendations

- R8.1 IHU should seek to promote a uniform IQAS across all schools and institutes that make up the Institution.
- R8.2 IHU should actively seek to engage students, alumni, and industry stakeholders in procedures related to IQAS.

PART C: CONCLUSIONS

I. Features of Good Practice

- Practices from the initial IHU should be considered from other “nodes” as well
- Internationalization and established processes for facilitating this
- Highly skilled, committed and motivated members of MODIP
- Highly enthusiastic, committed and outward looking governing body

II. Areas of Weakness

- There is lack of integration and cohesion, although EEAP understand that IHU is still in a transition phase
- Focus more on the collection of data and not so much on the analysis, as well as how these are considered in the decision making
- High level targets and KPIs that are not fully mapped to the schools and departments
- IQAS aims and purposes are not uniformly communicated to stakeholders

III. Recommendations for Follow-up Actions

- The IHU is encouraged to continue trying to homogenize the IQAS across all individual academic departments
- The IQAS design and implementation should be revised considering the input of all stakeholders in a structured and clearly prescribed way
- The IHU should further facilitate the communication of the QAP to all relevant external and internal stakeholders
- IHU senior management is advised to revisit the goals of the QAP, associate them clearly with the KPIs and consult MODIP in the process
- MODIP is advised to develop institution specific KPIs and map them to the IHU’s strategic plan. This should be the outcome of the engagement with all related stakeholders
- The IQAS and policies should be available in full in English as well
- The university should aim to increase the response rate in the quality related surveys

IV. Summary & Overall Assessment

The Principles where full compliance has been achieved are: **1, 2, 5, 6, 7, and 8.**

The Principles where substantial compliance has been achieved are: **3 and 4.**

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

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

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

The members of the External Evaluation & Accreditation Panel

Name and Surname

Signature

- 1. Prof. Konstantinos Salonitis (Chair)**
Cranfield University, Cranfield, United Kingdom
- 2. Prof. Evangelos Dedousis**
The American University in Dubai, Dubai, United Arab Emirates
- 3. Prof. Costas Iliopoulos**
King's College London (KCL), United Kingdom
- 4. Prof. Nicolas Tsapatsoulis**
Technical University of Cyprus, Cyprus
- 5. Prof. Christos Tsinopoulos**
Durham University, Durham, United Kingdom