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. +30 211 1903 400 • E. secretariat@ethaae.gr • www.ethaae.gr

Accreditation Report
for the Internal Quality Assurance System
(IQAS)

Institution : Aristotle University of Thessaloniki

Date: 16/12/2025

Με τη συγχρηματοδότηση της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης
ΕΣΠΑ 2021-2027
Πρόγραμμα
Ανθρώπινο Δυναμικό και Κοινωνική Συνοχή
enqa.

Report of the Panel appointed by the HAHE to undertake the review of the **Internal Quality Assurance System** (IQAS) of the Aristotle University of Thessaloniki 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 7

Part B: Compliance with the Principles 8

Principle 1: STRATEGY, QUALITY POLICY AND TARGET SETTING OF THE INSTITUTION 8

Principle 2: PROGRAMMING AND ALLOCATION OF RESOURCES 12

Principle 3: STRUCTURE, ORGANISATION AND OPERATION OF THE IQAS 17

Principle 4: SELF-ASSESSMENT 21

Principle 5: COLLECTION OF QUALITY DATA: MEASURING, ANALYSIS, AND IMPROVEMENT 25

Principle 6: PUBLIC INFORMATION 28

Principle 7: EXTERNAL EVALUATION AND ACCREDITATION OF THE IQAS 31

Part C: Conclusions 32

I. Features of Good Practice 33

II. Areas of Weakness 33

III. Recommendations for Follow-up Actions 33

IV. Summary & Overall Assessment 35

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 Aristotle University of Thessaloniki comprised the following five (5) members, drawn from the HAHE Register, in accordance with Law 4653/2020:

1. PIMENIDIS ELIAS (Chair)
(Title, Name, Surname)
University of the West of England (UWE)
(Institution of origin)

2. Michiotis Ioannis
(Title, Name, Surname)
CEN (European Committee for Standardization)
(Institution of origin)

3. SPYRATOS NICOLAS
(Title, Name, Surname)
Université Paris-Saclay & CNRS
(Institution of origin)

4. VALAVANIDOU-IOANNITOU GEORGIA (GINA)
(Title, Name, Surname)
Le Mans Université
(Institution of origin)

5. ΜΑΤΙΚΑ ΒΑΣΙΛΙΚΗ
(Title, Name, Surname)
University of Patras
(Institution of origin)

II. Review Procedure and Documentation

Brief reference to the Panel preparation for the IQAS review, as well as to the documentation provided and considered by the Panel. Dates and of the site visit, visit schedule, meetings held and any additional information regarding the procedure.

The Accreditation of the Internal Quality Assurance System (IQAS) of the Aristotle University of Thessaloniki (AUTH) took place 1-2 December 2025, in an in-person visit by the External Evaluation and Accreditation Panel (EEAP) at the University's city centre campus.
The EEAP had previously discussed the planning of the visit and had agreed a share of the responsibility in drafting the post visit report.
On Monday 1 December 2025 the EEAP were originally received by the Rector of AUTH Professor Kyriakos Anastasiadis and the three Vice Rectors of Research and Innovation, Academic Affairs and Development, and International Relations and Outreach, Lifelong Learning and Student Care. In the meeting that followed the Rector presented the institution, its history and present status, while the focus was on the institution's strategic plan for 2024-2028.
This meeting was followed up by a meeting with the Quality Assurance Committee (QAC/MODIP). This was led by its director and Vice Rector Professor Nikolaos Maghioros. The meeting focused on matters relating to quality culture, institutional policy on quality assurance, structure and operation of the IQAS, quality management, self-assessment process.
Subsequently the EEAP met with Meeting with the Quality Assurance Unit (QAU/MODIP) and discussed issues relating to, internal procedures of MODIP, training of staff, responsibilities, cooperation, problems and results.
The following meeting was with Internal Evaluation Groups (IEG/ OMEA) members. These were academic leaders of the groups in the academic schools of the university. Emphasis here was on the working relationship between the IEGs/OMEA and the QAU/MODIP.
The last meeting of the first day was that with faculty staff representing different schools. Here the discussion was centred on two areas. One being that of teaching staff recruitment & promotion procedures, while the other focused on teaching staff -student relationship. In particular, the EEAP discussed with faculty staff the concept of evaluation by students, opportunities for professional development, and opportunities for mobility.
The first day ended with a tour of facilities. The EEAP had the opportunity to visit, and discuss with staff locally, many teaching and laboratory facilities, some of which conduct state-of-the- art research and yield world leading results. The EEAP also had the opportunity to visit the library and the impressive reading rooms and discuss the large-scale digitization project that aims to make available to staff, students, and eventually the wider public the institution historic and very rare and valuable archives.
The second day began with meeting a representative selection of undergraduate students. Discussion explored the following: Students' satisfaction from their study experience and campus facilities; student input in quality assurance; priority issues concerning student life and welfare.
The following meeting was with postgraduate students at various levels of studies and

stages of completion, representing different schools. The EEAP had the opportunity to discuss their views on learning process, progression, assessment; input in quality assurance; priority issues concerning grants, mobility, research and career opportunities.
The meeting with the Heads of administrative units offered insights into the impact of Institutional documentation (strategic plan, QA manual, etc) on individual units and special issues arising from the internal evaluation process.
The following meeting offered the EEAP the opportunity to discuss the graduate - alumni experience of studying at the institution and their career path, having met some of the most illustrious recent and older graduates.
A group of external stakeholders offered a very interesting and informative discussion that provided a portrayal of the University's relationships with the public and private sector in the region and across the country.
The last two meetings were brief ones that allowed the EEAP to discuss and clarify a few points that arose in the earlier meetings. The last one offered the EEAP an opportunity to present an early summary of their findings and impressions to the Rector and the three Vice Rectors of the University.
The EEAP would like to thank all participants as to the openness and willingness to engage in helpful and informative discussions. Also to extend its appreciation to the institution's leadership and the MODIP for the arrangements and hospitality during the visit.

III. Institution Profile

Brief overview of the Institution, with reference to the following: history, academic remit, student population, campus, orientation challenges or any other key background information.

Aristotle University of Thessaloniki is one of the two largest universities in Greece. It was inaugurated in 1925 and received its first students in 1926.

It comprises 11 schools, 41 departments, 78840 undergraduate students, 11105 postgraduate students and 4681 PhD candidates. It has many campuses spread across many locations in the prefecture of Thessaloniki and wider in the region of Macedonia. Its main campus is in the city centre of Thessaloniki.

The institution offers the widest selection of areas of study and research in the country. The fields of study range from Medicine to Engineering, Theology to Agriculture, Forestry to Mathematics and Computing, Agriculture to Sports Science, Natural Sciences to Veterinary Science, Arts to Dentistry, Law, Politics, and Economics.

The institution's vision is to be a centre of excellence, innovation, and contribution to society. Its mission is to offer high-level education, excellence in research, and effective contribution to society. It aims to do this based on values such academic freedom, innovation, equality, and sustainable development.

The University offers at total of 43 undergraduate programmes, 225 postgraduate programmes and 41 pathways leading to the award of a Doctorate. In addition, the institution offers collaborative Doctorate programmes and a range of programmes of study delivered assessed in the English language.

To serve this diverse and multicultural community (with more that 5000 international students) the University employ's 1599 academic staff, 378 staff involved in laboratory teaching activities, 90 specialist teaching staff, 117 laboratory technical staff, while the 278 permanent members of administrative staff are joined by a further 271 that are employed long term but on non-permanent contract.

PART B: COMPLIANCE WITH THE PRINCIPLES

Principle 1: STRATEGY, QUALITY POLICY AND TARGET SETTING OF THE INSTITUTION

INSTITUTIONS SHOULD DEVELOP A FOUR-YEAR STRATEGY, WITHIN WHICH THE QUALITY ASSURANCE STRATEGY IS INCLUDED. THE QUALITY ASSURANCE STRATEGY IS SPECIFIED THROUGH THE QUALITY ASSURANCE POLICY, WHICH SETS OUT THE PRINCIPLES OF THE OPERATION OF THE IQAS AND AIMS AT THE CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT OF THE SYSTEM. THE QUALITY ASSURANCE POLICY IS SPECIFIED THROUGH THE ANNUAL QUALITY TARGET SETTING WHICH EXTENDS TO ALL ASPECTS AND DIMENSIONS OF THE INSTITUTION'S OPERATION AND ACTIVITIES.

The Institution's strategy provides the general guidelines for the actions to be implemented within the specific forthcoming period. The strategic goals for quality assurance constitute one of the main pillars of the Institution's strategy. These goals are set out and specified following to analysis of relevant parameters and quality indicators. The quality assurance strategy includes the quality assurance policy as a specific document.

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 a 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 quality assurance policy 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 organization of the internal quality assurance system;*
- *the Institution's leadership, departments and other organizational 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.

For the implementation of the quality assurance policy, an annual quality target-setting (using the SMART methodology) and a specific action plan for the achievement of the targets are drafted. The quality targeting includes all annual goals required for addressing weaknesses and improving the parameters of the Institution's teaching, research, and administrative work, according to the

strategic guidelines set as part of the Institution's strategy.

Documentation/Annexes

E1.1 Strategic planning of the Institution (including the quality assurance strategy)

E1.2 Quality assurance policy of the Institution in liaison with the strategy

E1.3 Quality Targeting of the Institution (SMART), as implementation of the strategy and policy

Institution compliance

I. Findings

The University has developed an elaborate strategic plan that includes all the required and expected elements for an institution of its size, complexity, reputation, and ambition. The strategic plan for 2024-2028 was officially approved in November 2024. It builds on current experience, challenges that arise from the internal environment and the needs for its day-to-day operations, the requirements for achieving its vision for excellence, innovation, and significant and effective contribution to society. In doing its mission is shaped through a triangle of excellence in education, innovative research, and contributing towards a fair, inclusive, and sustainable society.

The strategic plan aims at addressing the key challenges and meeting the targets towards its Key Performance Indicators (KPIs). A SWOT analysis has indicated the areas that need further attention and development, while it has identified the areas where further investments and focus are required to explore opportunities for growth.

Geopolitical changes in the region and across Europe offer many opportunities for pursuing some of the institutions long standing ambitions, such as internationalization and its opportunity to raise its standing among the elite universities worldwide.

Funding challenges are a major issue as for most of the Universities in the country, since funding in the public sector is restricted and controlled tightly. Digitization of the processes across the University has been identified as one of they key objectives that could improve efficiency of operations, allow the institution to operate within the tightly controlled public financing and address the requirements towards the KPIs set by the Hellenic Authority for Higher Education (HAHE).

II. Analysis

The challenges due to tightly controlled funding by the state are further worsened by the large student body and the slow progression and low completion rates of studies by many students in many academic schools and departments. This affects negatively the staff / student ratios in most academic schools and there is huge variety

of such ratios across schools, departments, and programmes of study. It is expected that the new law defining the maximum allowable years of study per programme will lead to the withdrawal of students whose progression has stagnated over many years and make human, technical, and financial resources available to be utilised more effectively for the tuition and support of those students that remain active and engaging with their studies. This outcome could offer some relief on suppressed financial flexibility and will improve the qualitative indicators relating to the educational achievements of the institution.
Financing flexibility could be further enhanced where the institution is able to manage funds are accrued from external sources, such as funding for research programmes, consultancy projects, sponsorship by external organisations, and income from programmes offered in languages other than Greek. The finance department of the university that handles these external finances (ΕΛΚΕ/ELKE) is currently the focus of an intensive redevelopment supported by extensive digitalisation of processes and procedures. These fall under the auspices of the holistic digitalisation project that aims to transform the institution into a fully digital enable organisation. Evidence of such progress is provided by testimonies of improved experiences with dealing with ELKE coming from students and staff alike.
All such efforts are enhanced by an overall strong appreciation for a spirit favouring quality that appears to be considered as vital by all internal stakeholders (academic staff, students, administrative staff, and the institutions management). Quality monitoring and management depends on data though, and this is harder to capture where the core activity of teaching is concerned. Low attendance at non-compulsory taught sessions, timing of quality auditing of teaching and learning activities and often differences on the emphasis on such data collection across academic schools, yields different levels of data capture regarding student feedback on their learning experience.
Sponsored academic chairs appears to be growing in importance and could be a source of more financial independence to support the institutions ambitious plans for further internationalisation and enhancing its world ranking.

III. Conclusions

The institution has a very robust strategic plan that has identified targeted plans and activities to achieving its overall vision and enhancing its outcomes where it might be lagging in some of its KPIs.
Financial flexibility can offer more independence in pursuing its objectives in the national and international scene more effectively. A fully digitally enabled institution will be conducting its operations more consistently, efficiently, and effectively, achieving all its quality targets.
Efforts towards engagement with external entities can enhance the opportunities offered in a rapidly changing geopolitical scene.

Panel Judgement

Principle 1: STRATEGY, QUALITY POLICY AND TARGET SETTING OF THE INSTITUTION	
Compliance	**X**
Partial compliance	
Non-compliance	

Panel Recommendations

R1.1 Complete digitization institution wide, to improve efficiency of operations and effectiveness of investments.
R1.2 Explore the effective utilisation of funds to support external activities but also strengthen internal operations to reduce disparity of staff / student ratios and progression and completion rates among students in different schools and departments.
R1.3 Continue to engage with the external environment in a dynamic fashion.

Principle 2: PROGRAMMING AND ALLOCATION OF RESOURCES

INSTITUTIONS SHOULD ENSURE ADEQUATE FUNDING, HUMAN RESOURCES, INFRASTRUCTURE, SERVICES AND SYSTEMS FOR TEACHING, RESEARCH, AND INNOVATION, AS WELL AS FOR THE WHOLE RANGE OF THEIR ACADEMIC ACTIVITIES, FOR THE PURPOSE OF FULFILLING THEIR MISSION AND STRATEGIC GOALS. THE ABOVE RESOURCES ARE PLANNED OVER A FOUR-YEAR HORIZON, ARE LINKED WITH THE STRATEGY AND ARE ALLOCATED IN A RATIONAL MANNER, IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE PERTINENT PROCEDURES. THEIR MANAGEMENT AND MONITORING IS IMPLEMENTED BY MEANS OF INFORMATION SYSTEMS.

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 by exploiting external sources of financing. The financial planning and the operation of an effective financial management system constitute necessary tools for the full exploitation of the resources.

The annual public funding of the Institution follow the procedures set out in article 16 of Law 4653/2020 and the relevant ministerial decisions.

The annual budgets for the past five years, the absorption and the main categories of expenditure as well as the amount and sources of the external funding are key elements for the assessment of the principle.

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 with 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 favourable 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 favourable working environment and to ensure compliance with the existing provisions.

Human resources

The Institution and the academic units bear the responsibility for the allocation and development of the human resources. The rational allocation of human resources is based on a system of criteria, in line with the mission and the strategic options of the Institution.

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 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 provides the necessary resources for the organization and staffing of the QAU, with a clear allocation of competences and tasks to its staff members.

Documentation/Annexes

E2.1 Annual planning and allocation of funding from all available sources for the next 4 years, or Programme Agreement of the Institution, if applicable

E2.2 Internal rules for the allocation and distribution of the financial and human resources to the academic units and the central services of the Institution

E2.3 Internal evaluation by the QAU of the resources, according to the relevant NISQA indicators and the performance indicators of the Institution

E2.4 Overview of the information systems for the management and monitoring of the financial and human resources of the Institution

Institution compliance

I. Findings

Aristotle University is widely recognized for its academic excellence, innovative research, and strong international presence. The University emphasizes critical thinking, analytical skills, and adaptability in order to prepare students for leadership roles in both the Greek and international economy, with a focus on the fields of health sciences, engineering, law, economics and political sciences, philosophy, education, fine arts, theology, natural sciences, agriculture, physical education, and military medicine.

To maintain a productive learning environment, the University has significant requirements in its daily operation. It has become evident through discussions that Aristotle University has a clearly defined procedure for identifying and planning the necessary resources that support its academic activities. The University annually plans funding, human resources, infrastructure, services, and systems over a four-year horizon.

Moving a step further, a new administrative services organizational structure has been established, which modernizes operations and revisits all administrative positions from scratch. At the same time, emphasis is placed on the continuous training and evaluation of staff.

Based on the new organizational structure of administrative services, the total number of permanent administrative positions has increased. However, the

current reality is that filling these positions remains a distant goal, without a defined timeline. This issue lies beyond the control of the University, as it depends on decisions made at the Ministry level.
Given the limitations on hiring permanent administrative staff—due to limited available resources and extremely lengthy and rigid procedures—the University covers part of its needs through contract employees. At the time of the EEAP visit, the number of contract employees had approached the number of permanent administrative staff, yet still fell short of the required staffing levels.
Regarding teaching needs, the University hires instructors who are compensated through internally pre-allocated funds or externally funded programs. Despite the constraints, all teams are well organized, resulting in mitigating the lack of available funding.
At the academic level, increased financial support is foreseen for early-career faculty members, enabling them to expand their research and develop their networks. However, financial support for faculty may be considered relatively limited, yet immediate, since the Research Committee (ELKE) has helped overcome complex and time-consuming procedures for securing funds for participation in international events, as well as for publishing in high-quality open-access journals that require timely payment of fees and invoices. Resources for doctoral and/or postdoctoral researchers are also limited, resulting in their needs being met through personal or external financial means.

II. Analysis

Undeniably, the University relies heavily on public funding. Taking into account the limitations of such funding, the institution faces significant challenges in ensuring effective operational management and maintaining its long-term sustainability. However, Aristotle University stands out for its highly specialized and well-trained administrative staff, who manage all aspects of university life effectively.
At the same time, the University has succeeded in increasing its external funding, for example through an improved ERASMUS+ budget, as a result of a successful overall internationalization strategy. Through ELKE, the Institution has participated in approximately 4,000 funded projects with a total annual budget of 95 million euros. In fact, the University now operates an extensive Erasmus and internationalization program, which includes a large number of international universities, the operation of English-taught postgraduate programs, an already established English-taught undergraduate program in Medicine, as well as the introduction of an additional 14 foreign-language undergraduate programs in the academic years 2026/28. It also has a research centre (KEDEK), which hosts high-quality research conducted by numerous research teams.
The central location of the University in the heart of Thessaloniki—with additional facilities in the broader Thessaloniki area and in Serres—offers significant advantages in attracting high-quality students (and staff members).

Despite the limited resources, the University has succeeded in maintaining an appropriate learning environment where students can study, socialize, learn, and ultimately flourish.
The library, located in the main building, is staffed by a team of dedicated and highly specialized administrative employees. It provides access to an extensive repository of knowledge, covering all levels of study, including undergraduate, postgraduate, and doctoral programs. In addition, it has a special high-resolution machine for capturing maps, diagrams, etc., which adds significant value at both national and international levels. It is also accessible to students with special needs (as are most areas of the institution).
Emphasis has also been placed on ensuring higher levels of security, as the University is vulnerable to external interference due to its central location.
The institution has a range of essential auxiliary facilities that contribute to student well-being and overall student experience, such as adequate common/social areas for interaction and sports facilities that promote health and well-being through physical activity for the wider student community.
Finally, the infrastructure and its overall operation help the Institution develop a clear and forward-looking strategy that prioritizes issues such as energy efficiency, environmentally sustainable practices, and pathways toward achieving carbon neutrality. By committing to these efforts, the Institution can reduce its ecological footprint and at the same time serve as a model for sustainable higher education.

III. Conclusions

The external evaluation of the University's resources by the EEAP reveals that, despite the limited available resources and the heavy reliance on public funding, the University manages to operate successfully and, in many cases, to thrive and take a leading role in a particularly demanding domestic and international environment. The implemented four- to five-year strategic plan must be developed in alignment with a holistic strategic vision, which defines the strategic position the University aims to hold (both educationally and geo-strategically) within the specified timeframe.

Panel judgement

Principle 2: PROGRAMMING AND ALLOCATION OF RESOURCES	
2.1 Funding	
Compliance	**X**
Partial compliance	

Non-compliance	
2.2 Infrastructure	
Compliance	**X**
Partial compliance	
Non-compliance	
2.3 Working Environment	
Compliance	**X**
Partial compliance	
Non-compliance	
2.4 Human Resources	
Compliance	**X**
Partial compliance	
Non-compliance	

Principle 2: PROGRAMMING AND ALLOCATION OF RESOURCES (overall)	
Compliance	**X**
Partial compliance	
Non-compliance	

Panel Recommendations

R2.1 Continue strengthening its network, outward orientation and engagement with the domestic and international market through further collaborations (such as industry, companies, etc.)

R2.2 Recruit more permanent specialist staff to support the improvement of the continuously expanding internal and external activities

R2.3 Expand ISO certifications to all laboratories that could offer consultancy and other services to the external market.

Principle 3: STRUCTURE, ORGANISATION AND OPERATION OF THE IQAS

THE IQAS INCLUDES ALL NECESSARY PROCESSES AND PROCEDURES FOR THE COMPLIANCE OF ALL THE INSTITUTION'S ACADEMIC STRUCTURES, ACTIVITIES AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES WITH THE QUALITY STANDARDS. THE QAU IS THE COMPETENT UNIT FOR THE ORGANISATION AND OPERATION OF THE IQAS AND HAS THE REQUIRED FUNCTIONAL INDEPENDENCE AND OPERATIONAL CAPACITY FOR THE EFFECTIVE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE IQAS, AS WELL AS FOR ITS COMPLIANCE WITH THE PRESENT STANDARDS.

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 organization

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 Institutions' 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's Gazette, as well as on the Institution's website. The above are reviewed every five years, at the latest.

To achieve the above goals, the QAU collaborates with the HAHE, develops and maintains a management information system to store the quality data, which are periodically submitted to the 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 Institutions' competent bodies, as provided by the law, while all competences accruing from this structure are clearly defined.

The QAU is staffed by a sufficient number of permanent personnel, so as that the operational needs of the IQAS are completely met. The administrative officer of the QAU has comprehensive updating and knowledge about the implementation of its operations and activities.

Operation

The institution takes action for the design, establishment, implementation, audit and

maintenance of the Internal Quality Assurance System (IQAS), taking into account the requirements of the Standards, while making any necessary amendments to ensure fitness to achieve its aims.
The above actions include:

- the provision of all necessary processes and procedures for the successful operation of the IQAS, as well as the participation of all parties involved, across the Institution. 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;
- the 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 implementation.

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

Documentation

E3.1 Government Gazette for the approval, structure, and operation of the IQAS and the QAU

E3.2 Updated IQAS Quality Manual (including the QAU organisational structure- job descriptions, tasks, skills)

E3.3 QAU Internal Regulation

Institution compliance

I. Findings

The Aristotle University of Thessaloniki (AUTH) has established a policy and set goals for quality assurance and improvement, as described in the Quality Policy of the Foundation (E1.2) following the Aristotle University of Thessaloniki Senate Meeting 3151/23.10.2024 (Ref. No. 17327/30.10.2024) and the publication in the

government's journal FEK 17327/30.10.24. The procedures for this policy are available on the Quality Assurance Unit (MODIP) website ΜΟΔΙΠ - Αριστοτέλειο Πανεπιστήμιο Θεσσαλονίκης | ΜΟΔΙΠ ΑΠΘ .

The Aristotle University of Thessaloniki's quality assurance policies and procedures follow the HQA guidelines. Each academic unit, through its Internal Evaluation Group (OMEA), is tasked with collecting data and submitting annual reports to the QAU. The QAU reviews these reports, provides feedback and suggestions for improvement, and ensures that departments align with AUTH academic mission. The AUTH has made available to the EEAP several academic unit reports and external evaluation reports, as well as follow-up actions. The EEAP believes that these data have been carefully collected and analysed. Furthermore, the Quality Manual of the Internal Quality Assurance System, which was approved by the Senate, comprehensively outlines all processes followed for the University's activities and structures, including internal evaluation procedures. It serves to ensure the University's full compliance with the applicable quality assurance requirements. MODIP defines 8 processes of the quality assurance system of AUTH that include:

Process 1 – Strategy, Policy & Quality Objectives
Process 2 – Planning and Resource Allocation
Process 3 – Operation of the IQAS
Process 4 – Internal Evaluation
Process 5 – Quality Data Collection: Measurement, Analysis, and Improvement
Process 6 – Information and Communication Management
Process 7 – Design, Establishment, and Reform of Study Programs
Process 8 – Certification

II. Analysis

The documents presented to the EEAP describe in detail the institutional structure and regulations governing the operation of MODIP, including: the mission of MODIP, the establishment of the MODIP Department, its internal organizational makeup and applicable regulations for its operations, the purpose and scope of the Internal Quality Assurance System of the AUTH, the structure of the IQAS, and the Quality Manual of the IQAS.

The MODIP is organized in accordance with Law 4957/2022, Article 215, and operates with functional independence. As emphasized by the Rector, the MODIP constitutes one of the key strategic structures of the University, exerting significant influence on institutional operations, strategic planning, and academic programme development.

The MODIP personnel possess the necessary skills, competencies, and expertise necessary for carrying out their duties and execute their clearly defined responsibilities. The organisational chart is structured in a manner that ensures that the IQAS organisational requirements are fully and properly met.

The Unit has contributed substantially to the streamlining of course offerings and the external evaluation procedures, helping all departments and faculty. In addition, MODIP collaborates closely with all faculty and administrative members to further enhance the formulation and achievement of learning outcomes across academic programmes.
Although MODIP appears to be adequately staffed, when the EEAP considered the number of tasks MODIP is responsible for and the number of Academic Departments and Programs at the AUTH, it concluded that additional staff support for MODIP maybe advisable.

III. Conclusions

Based on the documents provided and the ensuing discussions during the EEAP's visit to the AUTH, we find that there is full compliance with Principle 3 of HAHE.

Panel judgement

Principle 3: STRUCTURE, ORGANISATION AND OPERATION OF THE IQAS	
Compliance	**X**
Partial compliance	
Non-compliance	

Panel Recommendations

R3.1 The QAU should establish processes to enhance the quality of AUTH’s interactions with both internal and external stakeholders.
R3.2 Because of its critical role, MODIP needs more staff members to address its workload.

Principle 4: SELF-ASSESSMENT

THE INTERNAL QUALITY ASSURANCE SYSTEM CONDUCTS INTERNAL EVALUATION OF THE WHOLE RANGE OF ACADEMIC AND ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIVITIES OF THE INSTITUTION, AS WELL AS ANNUAL REVIEW OF THE SYSTEM, TO IDENTIFY ANY OVERSIGHTS, DEFICIENCIES OR DISCREPANCIES. CORRECTIVE ACTIONS AND IMPROVEMENTS ARE PROPOSED TOWARDS THE ACHIEVEMENT OF THE QUALITY AND STRATEGIC GOALS. DURING THE SELF-ASSESSMENT, THE EFFECTIVE INTERNAL COMMUNICATION WITH THE INTERNAL AS WELL AS THE EXTERNAL STAKEHOLDERS IS ENSURED.

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 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 are made in the context of the annual IQAS review and 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 revised shortly, prior to the institutional approval of the programmes.

Documentation

E4.1 Minutes and other documents and relevant correspondence regarding the annual internal evaluation of the IQAS by the QAU

E4.2 Results of the last annual internal evaluation of the IQAS by the QAU, and the relevant minutes and documentation

E4.3 Correspondence and other actions (workshops, meetings) for collecting feedback from the external stakeholders

Institution compliance

I. Findings

Quality assurance is part of the overall strategic planning of the University of Thessaloniki (hereafter referred to as The University). The quality assurance team met by the Panel is very well organized and its members have long experience with quality assurance processes. Their duty consists mainly in collecting and managing all information relevant to the quality assurance process, analysing it using appropriate KPIs and recommending corrective actions when and where it's needed by:
- evaluating the experience of students related to teaching (mainly through questionnaires); - evaluating the quality of the educational programs;
- and proposing changes to the program in agreement with the academic advisors. Furthermore, the quality assurance process also uses valuable input coming from the numerous external industrial stakeholders and social partners of the University, as well as from a great number of international collaborations and other outreach activities.
Two recent activities of high impact by the quality assurance unit of the University are the implementation of digital governance (under way) and the development of a well-designed software system for the efficient management of all ELKE activities. It is important to note here that this software system has been adopted by most universities across the country.
Given the size of the University (over 40 departments) and the short time available for visits, the Panel was given a tour of available facilities in only three places: the University library, the department of medicine and the department of seismology, all three equipped with modern high-quality technical infrastructure.
During the meetings with students, the Panel heard that several aspects related to quality assurance need to be improved, more specifically:
-the functioning of the academic advisor concept varies from one department to another,
and in some departments the concept simply doesn't exist;
-financing student research is quite difficult, especially at doctoral level;
-internships are rather difficult to find, and in some departments no internships are
proposed;
-a course on research methodology would be welcome in some departments;
-entrance to the University space should be controlled by cameras to ensure safety;
- links between the University and the city of Thessaloniki should (and could) be

improved;
- participation in answering questionnaires is low but could be improved if questionnaires
were asked to be completed at the end of the year and/or before graduation.
During the meeting with faculty the Panel heard that one solution to ensure student financing for research is the creation of paying anglophone post-graduate programs.
During the meetings with external stakeholders, the Panel heard that they would be ready to participate in an advisory board to inform the University of current trends in the labour market and give feedback for updating the curricula.

II. Analysis

There seems to be an excellent collaboration between the MODIP of the University and the OMEAs of the various departments, as well as a real effort to promote the culture of quality in a country that resists such a culture.
During the meeting with the students, both undergraduates and graduates, the Panel heard that students were generally satisfied by their life on the campus and the knowledge they receive from their teachers. They nevertheless expressed a number of concerns during the meeting, some of which need to be addressed rather urgently, and actions be taken where necessary.

III. Conclusions

Even though the overall quality assurance procedures and framework is robust and supported by sufficient infrastructure there are several concerns that need to be addressed. The University should examine and address the many concerns expressed by the students and take appropriate actions.
The EEAP judgement for this Principle as Compliance is marginal and comes with Strong Recommendations as shown in the panel below.

Panel judgement

Principle 4: SELF-ASSESSMENT	
Compliance	**X**
Partial compliance	
Non-compliance	

Panel Recommendations

R4.1 Enforce the student advisor concept uniformly across all departments of the University.

R4.2 Find ways to increase the level of resources for financing student research, for example by creating paying anglophone post-graduate programs and/or programs supported by industry.
R4.3 Establish “targeted” external advisory boards. Such a board is associated with a specific undergraduate program, a specific postgraduate program or a specific department. It meets regularly (once or twice a year) to inform the corresponding University entity of current trends in the labour market, also giving feedback for updating the curricula. Such a targeted advisory board could comprise external industrial stakeholders, social partners, faculty members and Alumni.

Principle 5: 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, THROUGH INFORMATION SYSTEMS, AIMING AT THE EFFECTIVE MANAGEMENT OF THE QUALITY DATA RELATED TO TEACHING, RESEARCH AND OTHER ACADEMIC ACTIVITIES, AS WELL AS THOSE RELATED TO THEIR ADMINISTRATIVE OPERATION.

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 indicators and data provided by the 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.

Institutions are under an obligation to provide or transfer data (through the QAU) to the HAHE, for the purposes of quality assurance, and monitoring of their strategy and funding.

Documentation

E5.1 Reports from the National Information System for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (NISQA) and accompanying assessment report by the QAU

E5.2 Description of the functions of the QAU information system

E5.3 Sample of fully completed questionnaire of satisfaction surveys addressed to the teaching and the administrative staff

E5.4 QAU report on the utilisation of the data collected from the QAU information system (internal evaluation, quality targeting, etc.)

Institution compliance

I. Findings

The University places particular emphasis on data-driven (evidence-based) decision making in order to enhance quality assurance and improve its day-to-day operations. Special attention is given to the collection, processing, and

presentation of information in a meaningful and comprehensible manner. MODIP, although understaffed, produces all the necessary analyses to support change and to inform academic staff and OMEA. The filtered data are presented at Department meetings, where official decisions are made. The flow of information among the various teams functions smoothly, and all processes are well organized.

Information regarding the Institution's infrastructure, as well as development and maintenance activities, is also collected through the relevant information systems. The Institution has already integrated Digital Transformation into its daily operations, and many systems facilitating the submission, monitoring, and management of contracts, facility maintenance requests, and financial information are already in place—pioneering compared to other institutions. MODIP consists of three permanent administrative staff members and four contract employees, a composition that significantly reduces understaffing risks, although understaffing remains an issue for this particular unit.

II. Analysis

Data for each course offered within a Department, along with information about the corresponding instructor, are systematically collected, processed, and analysed by MODIP. However, student participation in completing these surveys remains relatively low, indicating the need for greater engagement. Increasing student involvement in this feedback process could provide more comprehensive insights into course effectiveness, teaching quality, and areas requiring improvement. Implementing strategies such as raising awareness about the importance of these surveys, integrating them into the course structure, or offering incentives for participation may help improve response rates and enhance the overall usefulness of the collected data.

Greater emphasis should be placed on allocating time during lectures or seminars for students to complete their feedback. Consistency across the academic community regarding participation in this type of feedback should be promoted and potentially made mandatory across the Institution. At present, there is no evidence indicating the percentage of academic staff who engage in this important process, making it impossible to evaluate the outcomes and their impact.

According to the documented evidence, the establishment of quality objectives takes place at the beginning of each calendar year and is a recurring process. However, this process may need to be synchronised with the academic year rather than the calendar year, as such an adjustment in the timing of decision-making could better align with academic changes, such as the introduction of new courses or new programmes.

III. Conclusions

One of the University's key strengths is the excellent professional administrative MODIP team, which provides an outstanding interface with the Institution's management, the academics participating in MODIP and OMEA, as well as the Heads of Departments (and the other administrative units of the University). The EEAP concludes that, despite insufficient funding from the Ministry, the University demonstrates excellence in data collection and management and has clearly defined objectives aimed at further enhancing the quality and effectiveness of these functions.

Panel judgement

Principle 5: COLLECTION OF QUALITY DATA: MEASURING, ANALYSIS, AND IMPROVEMENT	
Compliance	**X**
Partial compliance	
Non-compliance	

Panel Recommendations

R5.1 Make the student satisfaction survey more transparent and more systematically organised, in order to enhance its effectiveness in improving the quality of studies.
R5.2 Allocate sufficient time during lectures or tutorials for students to complete the questionnaires for each course.

Principle 6: PUBLIC INFORMATION

INSTITUTIONS SHOULD PUBLISH INFORMATION ABOUT THEIR TEACHING AND ACADEMIC ACTIVITIES IN A DIRECT AND ACCESSIBLE MANNER. ALL PERTINENT INFORMATION THAT APPEARS IN THE INSTITUTION'S WEBSITE 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.

The public information available via the internet should appear in Greek and in English, the webpages should have uniform architecture, structure and content across all academic units of the Institution, so that the users can easily identify the information of their interest.

Documentation

E6.1 Results of the assessment of the functionality and the content, as well as of the maintenance and update of the Institution's webpage

E6.2 List of the links included in the Institution's and QAU webpage, and of the special personalized internet applications

Institution compliance

I. Findings

The Institution maintains an official website in both Greek and English language, as well as social media profiles, such as Facebook and You tube channel. Essential information regarding teaching and academic activities is readily available online and is presented clearly.

Course descriptions for undergraduate and postgraduate programs are effectively communicated with an objective approach. Each department's website provides access to curricula, course outlines, and schedules. Additionally, faculty curriculum vitae are accessible on their respective pages.

Key details for each study program, including attendance modes, assessment criteria, course outlines, degrees awarded, fees, and faculty CVs, are available online, Information about the structure and operation of the Institution's Internal Quality Assurance System (IQAS) is also provided.

The Institution's Mission Statement and Quality Assurance Policy can be found online, along with Internal and External Evaluation Reports for both the Institution and its Departments. These reports are clearly articulated, easily accessible, and regularly updated.

All published information is current, clear, and easily navigable, presented in a

consistent architecture, structure, and format across all academic units in both Greek and English. Additionally, the Institution offers various electronic services for students, as well as information through the e-class and progress systems. According to the administrative staff the website is under maintenance and is currently being upgraded.
Finally, students emphasize the importance of online updating information regarding the teaching staff visiting hours.

II. Analysis

The findings regarding the Aristotle University of Thessaloniki' s website reveal a well-structured and user-friendly online presence that effectively supports the institution's academic and administrative functions. Especially:
Bilingual Accessibility: The availability of content in both Greek and English broadens access for a diverse student body and international visitors.
Comprehensive Information: The website serves as a central hub for all critical information related to teaching and academic activities. The presence of detailed course descriptions, curricula, course outlines, schedules present an organized and transparent academic environment.
Enhanced User Experience: By ensuring that all important academic information is clearly displayed and easily navigable, the university enhances user experience significantly, without neglecting to provide all the necessary contact details of departments and administrative authorities (telephone numbers and e mails).
Quality Assurance Transparency: The availability of the Institution's Mission Statement, Quality Assurance Policy, and evaluation reports on the website underscores a commitment to transparency and accountability. This openness instils confidence among stakeholders, including students, parents, and faculty.
Regular Updates: The practice of keeping information up-to-date and regularly articulating changes is crucial in a dynamic academic landscape, in both languages (Greek and English) . This responsiveness to change reflects the institution's proactive approach to maintaining relevance and ensuring that stakeholders have access to the latest information.
Uniform Structure Across Departments: The consistent architecture and structure across all academic units create a cohesive browsing experience, allowing users to navigate seamlessly between departments. This uniformity reinforces the university's branding and makes it easier for users to find information across different programs.
Supportive Digital Services: The inclusion of electronic services and information delivery through platforms like e-class and progress systems promotes a modern educational experience, facilitating communication and engagement between students and faculty.
Improvement of teaching staff visit hours Information: There is an acknowledgment that the current communication approach policy should be

improved.

III. Conclusions

In conclusion, the Institution’s website effectively fulfils its role as an informative and supportive resource for students and faculty alike. By maintaining clear, accessible, and bilingual online content, as well as ensuring regular updates and comprehensive information, the university positions itself as a forward-thinking institution committed to supporting its academic community. Effective communication and a well-defined policy are essential for ensuring transparency and enhancing the Institution's outreach and engagement.

Panel judgement

Principle 6: PUBLIC INFORMATION	
Compliance	**X**
Partial compliance	
Non-compliance	

Panel Recommendations

R6.1 The university should ensure that the English version of its website is updated more promptly with news and announcements, reflecting its strong commitment to internationalization.
R6.2 The Institution should complete the reconstruction and upgrade of it’ s website as soon as possible, to provide quality information.
R6.3 The institution should provide more information about teaching staff visit hours.

Principle 7: EXTERNAL EVALUATION AND ACCREDITATION OF THE IQAS

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

Documentation

E7.1 Five-year Progress Report, on the response to the recommendations included in the most recent IQAS Accreditation Report

Institution compliance

I. Findings

The Aristotle University of Thessaloniki underwent an institutional evaluation in August 2019, securing accreditation for the period from August 10th, 2019 to August 9th, 2023, which was subsequently extended to September 9th, 2024. The University's MODIP communicated the IQAS Report to the Management and publicised it via the relevant website. The AUTH received the highest overall rating of 'Fully Compliant,' having received the 'Substantially Compliant' rating in the Quality Principles:
3. Establishing Goals for Quality Assurance,
6. Collection of Quality Data: Measuring, Analysis, and Improvement, and
8. External Evaluation and Accreditation of the IQAS.
An Action Plan was drafted highlighting the accreditation conclusions and recommendations, with specific objectives and actions towards their achievement.

II. Analysis

Although some of the Recommendations are harder to quantify than others, the Progress Report (E7.1) demonstrates a level of engagement with the IQAS accreditation procedure and full awareness of the importance of the IQAS external review. The Progress Report and relevant documentation also argues that during the period of drafting the Action Plan, the consequences of the pandemic were still unfolding, and significantly affected the operation and planning of AUTH. The MODIP Committee of AUTH faced an increased workload due to multiple challenges that arose, such as the adaption to teleworking, which became necessary during the pandemic period, and the establishment of new guidelines and procedures necessary for the assessment of remote courses.
The MODIP states that to meet the requirements of HQA for the preparation and submission of the Progress Report, continued cooperating with appropriate institutional bodies, and revised and updated the Action Plan. The EEAP, after careful review of the Progress Report, questions the assignment of percentage completion estimates to each of the Recommendations offered by the 2019 External Evaluation Panel.

III. Conclusions

During the five-year period since the previous IQAS accreditation, the University MODIP has made unfinished progress toward meeting the Recommendations offered by the 2019 External Evaluation Panel. The present Panel recognises the difficulties encountered by MODIP during that period, but recommends that every effort should be made to complete this process.
The EEAP judgement for this Principle as Compliance is marginal and comes with a very Strong Recommendation as shown in the panel below.

Panel judgement

Principle 7: EXTERNAL EVALUATION AND ACCREDITATION OF THE IQAS	
Compliance	**X**
Partial compliance	
Non-compliance	

Panel Recommendations

R7.1 The EEAP strongly recommends that MODIP should complete addressing all recommendations of the 2019 report, as well as those made by the 2025 EEAP.

PART C: CONCLUSIONS

I. Features of Good Practice

Strong Digital Governance commitment

Widespread quality culture across the institution

Strong interactivity between MODIP and academic schools, administrative departments, and services

II. Areas of Weakness

Lag in addressing some issues pending since the previous IQAS accreditation

Tight financing may impact quality features such as weak staff / student ratios in some academic schools

Low student participation in courses and teaching staff evaluation.

Understaffed MODIP when considering the size and complexity of the institution.

III. Recommendations for Follow-up Actions

The EEAP strongly recommends that MODIP should complete addressing all recommendations of the 2019 report, as well as those made by the 2025 EEAP.

Enforce the student advisor concept uniformly across all departments of the University.

Complete digitization institution wide, to improve efficiency of operations and effectiveness of investments.

Explore the effective utilisation of funds to support external activities but also strengthen internal operations to reduce disparity of staff / student ratios and progression and completion rates among students in different schools and departments.

The university should ensure that the English version of its website is updated more promptly with news and announcements, reflecting its strong commitment to internationalization.

The Institution should complete the reconstruction and upgrade of it' s website as soon as possible, to provide quality information.

The institution should provide more information about teaching staff visit hours.

Continue strengthening its network, outward orientation and engagement with the domestic and international market through further collaborations (such as industry, companies, etc.)

Recruit more permanent specialist staff to support the improvement of the continuously expanding internal and external activities

Expand ISO certifications to all laboratories that could offer consultancy and other

services to the external market.

Make the student satisfaction survey more transparent and more systematically organised, in order to enhance its effectiveness in improving the quality of studies.

Allocate sufficient time during lectures or tutorials for students to complete the questionnaires for each course.

The QAU should establish processes to enhance the quality of AUTH's interactions with both internal and external stakeholders.

Because of its critical role, MODIP needs more staff members to address its workload.

IV. Summary & Overall Assessment

The Principles where compliance has been achieved are:

1,2,3,4,5,6,7

The Principles where partial compliance has been achieved are:

None

The Principles where failure of compliance was identified are:

None

Overall Judgement	
Compliance	**X**
Partial compliance	
Non-compliance	

The members of the External Evaluation & Accreditation Panel

Name and Surname		Signature
PIMENIDIS ELIAS		Signed by PIMENIDIS ELIAS - 16/12/2025 14:51:57 +02:00
Michiotis Ioannis		Signed by Michiotis Ioannis - 16/12/2025 14:51:57 +02:00
SPYRATOS NICOLAS		Signed by SPYRATOS NICOLAS - 16/12/2025 14:51:57 +02:00
VALAVANIDOU-IOANNITOU (GINA)	GEORGIA	Signed by VALAVANIDOU-IOANNITOU GEORGIA (GINA) - 16/12/2025 14:51:57 +02:00
ΜΑΤΙΚΑ ΒΑΣΙΛΙΚΗ		Signed by ΜΑΤΙΚΑ ΒΑΣΙΛΙΚΗ - 16/12/2025 14:51:57 +02:00