



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 Undergraduate Study Programme of:

Architecture

Institution: University of Ioannina

Date: 05 June 2021



Επιχειρησιακό Πρόγραμμα
Ανάπτυξη Ανθρώπινου Δυναμικού,
Εκπαίδευση και Διά Βίου Μάθηση

Με τη συγχρηματοδότηση της Ελλάδας και της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης



2014-2020



Report of the Panel appointed by the HAHE to undertake the review of the Undergraduate Study Programme of **Architecture** of the **University of Ioannina** 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. Study Programme Profile	7
Part B: Compliance with the Principles	9
Principle 1: Academic Unit Policy for Quality Assurance.....	9
Principle 2: Design and Approval of Programmes	12
Principle 3: Student- centred Learning, Teaching and Assessment.....	15
Principle 4: Student Admission, Progression, Recognition and Certification	18
Principle 5: Teaching Staff	20
Principle 6: Learning Resources and Student Support	23
Principle 7: Information Management	26
Principle 8: Public Information	28
Principle 9: On-going Monitoring and Periodic Internal Review of Programmes	30
Principle 10: Regular External Evaluation of Undergraduate Programmes.....	33
Part C: Conclusions	34
I. Features of Good Practice	34
II. Areas of Weakness	34
III. Recommendations for Follow-up Actions	34
IV. Summary & Overall Assessment	36

PART A: BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT OF THE REVIEW

I. The External Evaluation & Accreditation Panel

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

- 1. Professor Marios C. Phocas (Chair)**
University of Cyprus, Nicosia, Cyprus

- 2. Professor Loukas Kalisperis**
Pennsylvania State University, Pennsylvania, USA

- 3. Professor Petros Petsimeris**
Université Paris 1, Panthéon-Sorbonne, Paris, France

- 4. Professor John Peponis**
Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, USA

II. Review Procedure and Documentation

The External Evaluation & Accreditation Panel (EEAP) reviewed the material submitted by the Department of Architecture (ARCH) of the University of Ioannina (UOI) in advance of its virtual visit (via tele-conference) and virtual briefing. The Director and staff of HAHE briefed the members of the Panel on its mission and standards, as well as the guidelines for the review process and the national framework of the higher education institution in Greece. The Panel met, in private, to discuss the programme review report for the Department of Architecture of the University of Ioannina, allocate tasks and list the issues for the site virtual visit.

The visit was conducted via online conference meetings (Zoom) due to COVID-19 travel restrictions and took place on 31 May, 1, and 2 June 2021. The Panel wrote the report in the following days (3-5 June 2021) through collaborative meetings, held via the Zoom platform. The Panel would like to express its deep appreciation for the efforts undertaken by the department's academic and administrative staff, students, alumni and HAHE, in order for the virtual visit to be productive and effective. Although the Panel was able to collect enough information for an understanding of the programme, the virtual visit was not as efficient and rewarding as an in-person evaluation. It is advised that HAHE resumes in-situ visits as soon as the conditions permit.

The Panel met initially with the Vice-Rector of the University of Ioannina and the Chair of the Department of Architecture, on 31 May 2021, for an in-depth introductory meeting where initial presentations of the University of Ioannina and the Department of Architecture took place. The Vice-Rector and the Department's Chair gave an overview of the University of Ioannina and the Department of Architecture, regarding its history, vision, mission, current status, strengths, and academic profile. Further presentations provided useful information about the Department of Architecture strengths and areas of concern. The evening meetings continued with an in-depth presentation by representatives of the Quality Assurance Unit (MODIP) and the Internal Evaluation Group (OMEA), followed by comprehensive discussion with all MODIP & OMEA members, during which the Panel received additional information about the programme, the various activities of the department regarding the curriculum, academic and administrative/support staff, student body and research activities. During this meeting, the Panel was given the opportunity to ask detailed questions, in order to better facilitate the Panel's understanding of the curriculum, internal evaluation review process, adequacy of resources and possible areas of strengths and weaknesses. The Panel received further documentation and supporting material related to the presentations given by MODIP & OMEA that facilitated our discussions. The Panel reflected on the discussions and prepared for the next day's sessions of the 'virtual visit', during which it met with faculty members and student representatives. The first day of the virtual visit was concluded with a brief meeting of the Panel, in order to evaluate the accomplishments of the day and plan the activities and meetings of the following day.

The second day, 1 June 2021, started with meetings with faculty members and representatives from the student body and programme graduates. During the meeting with the tenured and tenure-track faculty, the Panel was given the opportunity to ask further detailed questions with regard to the programme of studies so as to identify possible areas of strengths and weaknesses. Additionally, all students with whom we spoke, and the programme graduate provided the members of the Panel with valuable information about their studies experience, curriculum, and

campus facilities. They also discussed issues concerning student life, mobility, research, and career opportunities. The students were very hospitable, enthusiastic and helpful. They conducted themselves admirably and were excellent ambassadors of a good educational Institution. The final year students and the graduate of the programme highly appreciated the value of their educational experience, gained throughout their studies, and the close working relationship that they had with the faculty.

The second day continued with a video tour of the facilities (among others, classrooms, lecture halls, libraries, laboratories) and a discussion followed, in order to address Panel members' questions. Following the brief virtual tour of the facilities, the virtual visit concluded with an extensive discussion between the Panel and the department's staff and faculty, in order to further elucidate some of the concerns and points that the Panel was interested in pursuing in their subsequent discussions.

The third day of the virtual visit, 2 June 2021, continued with a meeting with employers, social partners, and external stakeholders, representing very impressive professional offices and organizations, businesses, national and local authorities. During the meetings, the Panel was able to hear about their relation with the department, as well as their support and readiness to identify areas of common interest and potential cooperation. All participants spoke very positively of the faculty of the Department of Architecture and the prospects for its further development.

Concluding the third day meetings, the Panel met with the academic and administrative staff working on the Programme Review Report, MODIP & OMEA, and the Vice-Rector, and a quick summary of the visit was provided. During the meeting, the Panel was able to further clarify several key points and engage in a detailed discussion on the curriculum and facilities. The Panel received additional information about the programme of studies, academic staff profiles, buildings and resources.

We would like to make two additional observations: First, the visit programme did not include a meeting with non-tenure-track faculty, even though they cover a significant portion of the curriculum. Second, the administrative staff, while present at the meeting, did not make an independent presentation.

The Panel met via tele-conference, for the remainder of the virtual visit, in order to complete the report and submit it to HAHE on Saturday, 5 June 2021. We note that this report in its entirety and all of its parts is unanimous.

In closing, the Panel would like to express our sincere gratitude for the support, hospitality, and openness that we encountered during our virtual visit, particularly from the faculty.

III. Study Programme Profile

The Department of Architecture (ARCH) of the University of Ioannina (UOI) was established in 2009 and constitutes one of the three Departments of the School of Engineering. The department started its operation in the academic year 2015-16.

The undergraduate programme of studies of the department has a duration of five years with an equivalency of 300 ECTS. As stated by the faculty, the mission of the department is to cultivate and promote the discipline of Architecture through academic and applied research and to provide students with the necessary knowledge and skills that ensure their thorough training for their scientific and professional career, as well as development.

In the programme of studies, students are required to complete 44 core courses (9 of which are required design studios), 2 elective courses, a Research Project (Ερευνητική Εργασία) and the final Diploma Design Thesis (Διπλωματική). Most students also complete an internship (Practicum) that is not included in the 300 ECTS required for successful completion of the programme of studies. Students are not asked to identify any concentration areas within which they select their elective courses and complete their Diploma Design Thesis. The selection of electives and the identification of the topics of the Research Project and the Design Thesis are independent decisions taken according to evolving interests and faculty guidance.

More particularly, the structure of curriculum is as follows: The first two semesters include 12 courses that introduce fundamental knowledge and skills for architectural design. The subsequent four semesters include 20 core courses on all aspects of the discipline of architecture. The three remaining semesters include 13 courses and the research project to enable deepening and consolidation of advanced knowledge regarding architecture as a discipline and a field of professional practice. The diploma design thesis in the final semester reflects the range and depth of the knowledge and skills acquired throughout the studies. It is evaluated by a three-member committee. Thus, the structure of the curriculum encourages students to proceed from an understanding of prescribed material to a self-motivated definition of the thematic focus of the research project and the diploma thesis. Course syllabi are available online on the web-page of the department, for all courses taught. Students are regularly asked to evaluate each course they attend through surveys.

Graduates of the programme obtain the title of Architectural Engineer and can become members of the Technical Chamber of Greece (TEE). Graduates can be employed in both the private and public sector. So far, the department has one graduate, who is currently employed in a professional practice abroad. In addition, 16 final year students are expected to graduate within 2021. Throughout the academic year, seminars and lectures are held with professionals working in the field that provide additional information and insights, exposing students to different work environments. While not required, the internship is strongly encouraged as a means to providing graduates with an opportunity to explore job prospects, gain work experience and make contacts. The department supports diverse student educational experiences through the *Erasmus+* programme, with a number of students participating in this programme over the last few years.

Currently there are 7 academic tenured or tenure-track faculty members (4 Associate Professors and 3 Assistant Professors) with notable and strong qualifications and activities in architecture.

Some hold doctoral degrees from Institutions abroad or in Greece. Additionally, there are one (1) faculty member from another department, eleven (11) non-tenure-track faculty members (ΠΔ 407/80) with autonomous teaching and four (4) Ph.D. candidates acting as instructors. The secretariat of the department consists of two (2) members of the administrative staff. Within 2021, the faculty will expand with four (4) new faculty members in the areas of architectural design and its cultural framework, structures, integrated design and management, as well as art. Additionally, one (1) special non-tenure-track faculty member (ΕΔΙΠ) will support the digital laboratories of the department and related courses. The faculty have a record of publications and research activities, mainly in applied projects. We were not able to review this record in exhaustive detailed because we were not provided with consistently formatted faculty CVs. As the department is new, there has been no prior evaluation by an External Evaluation Committee.

The department is a relatively small academic unit, with 272 undergraduate students, 5 doctoral candidates, and a ratio of students to faculty of around 27. The proportion of tenure or tenure-track faculty relative to the faculty as a whole is low. Also, the number of students per studio teaching faculty is relatively high at around 17, as compared to 12-14, which is more frequent in the U.S.A. and in Europe. Currently, the number of academic staff is relatively low given the full operation of the programme of studies and the development of the department. The planned increase of the faculty members (five new positions) within 2021 will act positively on the balance between permanent and temporary faculty members.

All current students spoke very highly about the close contact with the faculty members and the devotion of time and energy invested by their instructors, which safeguards the high level of the quality of education. It is imperative that the central University administration continues to understand and support the teaching requirements that are embedded in architectural education and the resources that are needed in order to successfully complete it. The Panel highly appreciates the devotion of all academic stakeholders to growing the program but notes that further increases in the number of tenure-track faculty are essential for the development of the department and the strengthening of research and creative activities that will help define the department's identity.

PART B: COMPLIANCE WITH THE PRINCIPLES

Principle 1: Academic Unit Policy for Quality Assurance

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

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

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

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

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

Study Programme Compliance

The Department of Architecture has instituted a quality assurance body of faculty members that is responsible for reviewing the quality of the structure and organization of the programme of studies, internationalization issues, teaching and research activities, supporting services, students' participation in evaluation procedures and the operation of the department, the

transparency of activities and decisions, and the public presence of the programme and the department.

The curriculum is design-based and geared towards the professional preparation of the future architects with appropriate cross links to theory and history, new technologies and environmental aspects of the profession and the interdisciplinary nature of architectural education and research. The quality assurance body monitors the operation of the programme on a regular basis. Revisions in the programme of studies were made, during the academic year 2019/20 in order to increase the number of required courses from 38 to 47 in 5 areas of knowledge. Since the programme is very new and although discussions take place among the faculty on the development of the programme's identity and orientation, there are no formal mechanisms for the regular review of the curriculum, especially with the formal inclusion of the students, and other stakeholders. Regular reviews of the programme of studies need to be further institutionalized by the department, as well as external evaluations, organized by the department itself at appropriate intervals. This will help to constantly revise and improve the profile and mission of the department, as well as to set up long-term development aims and policies at multiple levels of operation.

Although the quality assurance body and the faculty, as a whole, seem to support the existing identity of the programme as formulated, the Panel believes that this identity is presently not adequately and convincingly reflected in the description of the structure of the programme of studies. The lack of clearly defined directions, especially in the later years of studies, with regard to the thematic and structured learning outcomes of the individual semesters, and a lack of a clearly defined comprehensive design studio at the end of the third year, may weaken the implementation of a general and balanced education in Architecture, and stop short of enhancing the programme's identity.

The Panel is not aware of a formal mechanism for renewal and development of the faculty body through hiring new colleagues or external collaborators. The structure of the department, the programme of studies and the teaching and research activities by the faculty are documented on the web sites of the department. It is not clear if the quality assurance body has succeeded in extending and adapting the evaluation criteria for promotion of the faculty members to include accomplishments in multifaceted creative activities beyond research and measures of public recognition of creative work in architecture.

Panel Judgement

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

Panel Recommendations

- R1.1** Retrospective examination and assessment of the programme's identity / branding, vision and goals, through an independent advisory board, ad-hoc expert Panels and/or a dedicated international workshop, to be organized within the next three to five years.
- R1.2** The linking of teaching and research should be strengthened through specific synergies between thematic areas that should be formulated in the programme of studies, and collaborative design-based or interdisciplinary research. Design-based research may be initiated by the faculty and the students already at the Diploma level, whereas inter/multi-disciplinary research, through stronger collaborative actions by the faculty members and networking of the research labs.
- R1.3** The current emphasis on curriculum monitoring, evaluation and updating should be maintained.

Principle 2: Design and Approval of Programmes

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

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

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

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

Study Programme Compliance

- *Original curriculum development.* The decision to create a Department of Architecture at the University of Ioannina was taken in 2008 and the first intake of students at the Department of Architecture pursued first year studies during academic year 2015-2016. The five-year curriculum was originally created after consultation with professors from the Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, the University of Patras and the University of Thessaly, who made decisions as members of the transitional faculty assembly. The regional representatives of the Technical Chamber of Greece, the Architects' Association and selected professional practices. The curriculum complied with the professional licensing requirements established by the Technical Chamber of Greece. Indeed, the Technical Chamber of Greece recently approved that the first graduates of the department be registered as architects – we got the relevant announcement on June 2nd.
- *Subsequent curriculum development and curatorship.* The curriculum is now owned, developed, and approved by the faculty assembly. The systematic monitoring of the implementation of the curriculum, the analysis of course evaluation surveys, recommendations for improvements in response to such evaluations, and the assessment

of faculty proposals for changes in the syllabus of individual courses or in portions of the curriculum as a whole, rests with the Curriculum Committee that makes relevant recommendations to the faculty assembly after consultation of the department's Chair.

- *Structure of curriculum.* Particular learning outcomes as well as the overall structure of the curriculum are clearly defined and described in the department's Handbook and Guide. In a nutshell, the first year serves as an introduction to architecture, the second and third years cover the fundamental requirements of professional education and licensing, and the fourth and fifth years allow students to get a deeper understanding of the foundations of the discipline and practice of architecture. More specifically, in the final year students are asked to develop individual programmes of design and research, with appropriate faculty advice and guidance. In essence, students' progress from an introduction to elementary principles and the learning of basic skills, to confronting increasingly complex but well-defined problems and programmes, to finally learning how to formulate problems and appropriate responses based on their own ability to analyse particular contexts and to approach requirements creatively from first principles.
- *Internships and the link between curriculum and practice.* Students are encouraged to work as interns in architectural practices. Based on our interviews with students this has very positive effects and provides them with both confidence and perspective. The department monitors the performance of student interns. Based on our interviews, practitioners find students well prepared for internships.
- *The link between curriculum and creative work.* Multiple faculty link their teaching to the pursuit of extra-curricular creative work, in research, design, exhibitions or other public fora for the discussion and dissemination of architectural inquiry, design and scholarship. Based on our interviews, students enjoy the broader exposure and opportunities they are offered and the enhanced perspective upon the potential paths of professional development that they are able to glimpse. The department is new and the relationship between funded research and research laboratories or centers on the one hand, and teaching on the other, is not yet fully formalized. However, the present cross linkages between research and teaching while vivid, productive and exciting rely on individual initiative.
- *Electives.* At present the elective offerings are very limited and do not promote sufficiently the Departmental ambition that students should be able to pursue their own interests.
- *Synergies at School level.* The Department is cognisant of potential synergies at the School level but we have found no tangible evidence that these synergies enrich the curriculum to full potential.

Panel Judgement

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

Panel Recommendations

- R2.1** Faculty are well aware of the richness and complexities involved in architectural education. They are systematically forging individual as well as coordinated paths towards the development, enrichment and updating of curriculum. It would seem to us, however, that greater attention should be given to clearly establishing one or more comprehensive studios aimed at demonstrating the ability of every student to integrate programmatic, formal, material, constructional, and other considerations into their response to a given project. Such studio should occur at the end of the third year. Based on our review of samples of student work the requirements of a comprehensive approach to architectural design are presently satisfied at several different stages of student progress. A more explicit reference to where in the course of studies comprehensive design abilities are demonstrated by every student, prior to the pursuit of individual and diverse paths of design and research inquiry, may help future monitoring and development of the curriculum.
- R2.2** The relationship between individual faculty research and research originating in labs to the curriculum needs to be formalized.
- R2.3** As the Department grows, attention should be given to enriching elective offerings, to help the students develop individual interests and to create better links between electives and research.
- R2.4** In addition, synergies with all the Departments in the School of Engineering should be leveraged to enrich the electives and to foster common research.

Principle 3: Student- centred Learning, Teaching and Assessment

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

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

The student-centred learning and teaching process

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

In addition :

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

Study Programme Compliance

The Department of Architecture indicates that the teaching methods used in the undergraduate (3+2) programme are strongly linked to the department's overall educational strategy, which has three interlinked educational objectives (analytical, theoretical and laboratories). These involve both architectural education (enabling the accumulation of knowledge and theoretical understanding) and the provision of professionally-oriented (practical) skills in terms of design from the small scale to the large scale and practical knowledge and skills to enhance students' chances of employability in the field of architecture upon graduation.

Several courses include various combinations of teaching methods. For example, in addition to traditional lectures there are in-class exercises and labs, presentations and/or field work. Students are regularly required to complete both individual and group assignments. Groups are usually composed by two students and there are 10 groups per studio for a total of 20 students. These approaches are fully compliant with methods utilized in undergraduate teaching in other countries of the EU and further afield that also emphasize student-centred learning. The students who were interviewed (both current students and one who has graduated and works for an architectural practice based in Milan) expressed their enthusiasm concerning the manner of teaching in the Department of Architecture, and the excellent relations between the students and the teaching staff. On frequent occasions they used the term ‘community’ to describe the relationship. They pointed out that the relatively small size of classes is a very positive factor since it encourages a high degree of student-faculty interaction, particularly in terms of accessibility to faculty either in person or via email or other digital platforms.

Students also expressed high appreciation of the flexibility of the department and the very satisfactory adaptation of teaching to the circumstances associated with the pandemic crisis. A number of students expressed their preference for the Zoom environment instead of the one adopted by the University. Many students in the final year stated that the teachers are extremely supportive and care about the students, and the role this plays in enabling students to develop their skills as future architects. The same appreciation was expressed by an impressive variety of committed social partners. Students emphasized the degree of freedom and autonomy they progressively acquire during the course time and the opportunities they are offered from some of their teachers to participate in national and international events through field trips or participation in exhibitions such as the Biennale of Venice.

Despite the small number of the teaching staff, the course objectives, expected outcomes and methods of assessment are clearly listed in the syllabi, which appear on the department’s website. Furthermore, students are encouraged upon completion of each class to fill in a course/faculty evaluation form. Students participated more actively in this evaluation when it was presented as a questionnaire at the end of a course rather than when it was conducted online in 2019. Students also expressed their satisfaction with the way their verbal opinions about what they liked or disliked about course content, assignments, teaching style, and suggested improvements have been implemented.

Panel Judgement

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

Panel Recommendations

- R3.1** The Panel encourages the department to seek ways to maintain its present culture over the following years. This will have to be achieved within the context of a doubling in the number of tenured and tenure-track faculty and students, and further changes in the organisation of the curriculum.
- R3.2** The department should further develop the good practice of field work and the participation of students in national and international architectural events. This can be promoted by allocating more resources to international activities that can have a positive feedback for the development of the department.

Principle 4: Student Admission, Progression, Recognition and Certification

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

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

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

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

Study Programme Compliance

- *Orientation.* Special efforts are made, and processes are in place to provide full orientation to the programme, departmental routines, facilities and broader University environment to all new incoming students.
- *Advising.* Upon admission and throughout their studies all students are assigned to a faculty member who acts as academic advisor. In addition, significant help is provided by the department's office. During interviews students affectionately remarked that the two staff members of the department's office fulfil a "motherly role" providing additional orientation and advice beyond the call of duty.
- *Student records.* Student records are integrated into the Integrated National Data Base and provide full information on student progress, performance and assessment relative to all requirements. This facilitates monitoring individual student progress as well as the overall success of the programme in getting students through each important milestone all the way to graduation.
- *Grievances.* Appropriate processes are in place for dealing with potential student grievances, including grade-related disputes.
- *Mobility and transferability.* Students are encouraged to participate in Erasmus programmes, standards for the transferability of credits are established and relations are under development with a number of universities abroad. However, as the programme is new and as Covid-related restrictions have affected mobility over the last two academic years, there is no sufficient evidence to allow an assessment of student mobility.
- *Graduation rates.* Over 20 students should have been able to graduate in the summer semester of 2020, after 10 semesters of studies. As of Spring 2021, the programme has one graduate who graduated after 11 semesters of studies. Sixteen students are close to graduation indicating that at least 12 semesters of studies are found to be necessary in order

to satisfy all curricular requirements. In Schools of Architecture in Greece it is common for students to complete a five-year programme after six or more years of studies. However, the great start at the University of Ioannina would suggest that the aim of having a good proportion of students graduate within five years is within reach.

Panel Judgement

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

Panel Recommendations

R4.1 The 8th and 9th semesters present the students with multiple challenging and exciting projects, in design and in research. Ambitious students who wish to take full advantage of educational opportunities choose to extend the length of their studies. A revision of the studio curriculum could alleviate the otherwise positive pressures during these semesters. Their aim should be to enable a greater proportion of students to graduate within five years.

Principle 5: Teaching Staff

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

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

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

Study Programme Compliance

The department comprises a significant number of high-quality teaching staff with varied profiles. Their activities and publications are not well presented at the department's website.

The department currently has seven permanent faculty members (0 Professors, 4 Associate Professors and 3 Assistant Professors). Additional there are five pending positions, in different stages of approval/selection. One additional faculty member from a sister department also contributes to the teaching requirements. There are 11 non-tenure-track faculty members (ΠΔ407/80) with autonomous teaching, resulting in a high ratio of permanent to adjunct teaching staff, which contributes to the fundamental problem of the future development of the department. Under these problematic conditions, the faculty members respond with great flexibility and availability. The commitment and collective spirit of the teaching staff contribute to the positive atmosphere of the learning environment although their teaching workload, coupled with many responsibilities for committee and administrative work has been fairly high.

Both the current students and the social and professional partners spoke very highly about the devotion of time and energy invested by the instructors, with them extending the teaching hours long after the official completion of the meeting period for each course, which safeguards the high level of the course quality. It is imperative that the central University administration understands the different teaching requirements that are embedded in architectural education and the increased resources that are needed in order to successfully complete an architectural education. The Panel highly appreciates this devotion, but it notes that this can be detrimental in the development of the research and/or creative accomplishments which will further help in the definition of the department's identity and the professional development of the faculty.

Recruitments and promotions of the academic staff follow the criteria and the procedures established by the Greek Ministry and appropriate legislation. Currently, the enlargement of the faculty is slow.

Some of the faculty members are involved in research programmes but the number of the faculty members who are related to the research laboratories is limited and more generally the relationship between research and undergraduate teaching remains undefined.

The department promotes faculty mobility, unfortunately, and due to the issue of the understaffing of the department, in reality, faculty do not have the opportunity of sabbatical or Erasmus leaves.

Panel Judgement

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

Panel Recommendations

R5.1 A clear strategic plan of hiring in the next years to fill the gaps is necessary. The new positions should be defined per subject area of focus appropriate for contemporary architectural discourse and adjusted to the current programme of studies and the stated aims of future and desirable programme of studies.

R5.2 The Panel recommends that the department articulates a succinct policy and funding incentives for faculty development.

R5.3 The Panel recommends that the faculty members strengthen the research-teaching nexus in the undergraduate programme while more members of the faculty should become involved into the research labs.

R5.4 The Panel encourages the department to further promote and make visible the evolving diversity of the research and areas of the interest within the department. At the same time, it is advisable to further link and embed the research areas within the curriculum.

R5.5 The department is encouraged to establish periodic self-assessment procedures for its faculty and develop a global strategy for future necessary renewal of the teaching staff.

Principle 6: Learning Resources and Student Support

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

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

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

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

Study Programme Compliance

The on-site visit to the campus of the University of Ioannina could not take place due to the pandemic crisis and the social distancing. The evaluation of the quality and functionality of the facilities of the Department of Architecture of Ioannina relied on distance-based means to gain information concerning the facilities as well as the overall university and the new location in the city centre.

The Department of Architecture is currently in a transition phase. It has to move from the suburban campus, situated on the south-eastern part of the agglomeration of Ioannina to a more central location in the historic centre of the city. In its new location it will have its own dedicated building. The building was built in 1908 and is currently under refurbishment in order to meet the needs of the department. This new location has a positive symbolic value and accessibility to the city centre services, but the work is still in progress (due to the pandemic) and can impact on the everyday practices of students and teaching and administrative staff. This leads to fragmentation and separation (7 km from the campus and its basic facilities such as library, medical centre, sport facilities, residences and university restaurants). University authorities and local authorities are actively searching to find solutions. The two-storey building of approximately 1,000 sq. m's. has several classrooms: one large and four smaller (no student capacity indications from the virtual tour and the interviews). It will, however, be difficult to house all the previous activities of the department and solve the problem of the offices of the

staff. On the underground level of the building there could be assigned space for the research activities of the undergraduate students.

The university library is of high standards in terms of facilities, accessibility and resources. It was easily accessible from the previous location of the Department of Architecture but is in a considerable distance from the new location. Despite this problem, the library offers online access to most, if not all, journals in the fields of architecture, design, planning and related subjects.

The question remains open concerning from where students can access online library resources in the new location and from where to study between lectures. It is highly probable that a hybrid use will occur between the old campus and the new location. It will be important that new space constraints will not challenge the community-based relations that are highly valued by students and teaching staff. Further questions concern the new location's compliance with building regulations for persons with disabilities. It has been pointed out by the students that access to the campus and the new central building itself - even if the distance is short - is not easy in part because of the (in)frequency of the buses that link the two places and the inadequate supply of pedestrian and/or bicycle friendly infrastructures.

The computer facilities and network access are to the satisfaction of students and the lecturers. A downside is that currently there is no designated space for students to sit and work on their course work when they are in-between classes, although some of them use the labs, if these are not taken for other reasons.

The secretariat offers support to the students and participates and promotes the spirit of community in the everyday life of the department. Students also have access to a student liaison office that offers advice relating to matters such as housing, which represents an important issue for some students. The students expressed no concerns about restaurant facilities and the price of meals. Eligible students are entitled to subsidised housing and limited accommodation is offered in student housing in Ioannina on one of the five university residences. The university also offers sporting facilities near to the campus and health services for students in the university hospital of Ioannina (situated on the main campus).

Panel Judgement

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

Panel Recommendations

- R6.1** The Panel recommends that the department pays attention to the changes that may occur due to the relocation of the department. The new organization of space may affect the community relations and the smooth everyday activities in terms of lecturing and research. The pattern of subdivision and allocation of space in the new premises may not support the present strongly interactive and egalitarian culture. Furthermore, the spatial dispersion of the department may weaken the departmental identity and coherence.
- R.6.2** The Panel recommends that special attention is given to proximity and accessibility of the old campus facilities and the Παπαζόγλειος building during the transition period.
- R.6.3** Consequent on the relocation, there should be a qualitative improvement in the working and studying environment for lecturers, students and administrators.

Principle 7: Information Management

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

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

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

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

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

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

Study Programme Compliance

- *Formal evaluation instruments.* Student course evaluation surveys are well structured, provide detailed multidimensional of courses and instructors and are taken into account in syllabus development and curriculum development. Quality indicators seem out of sink with reality and are not fully integrated into the programme development or in the department's self-evaluation. For example, the department emphatically encourages students to participate in the practicum as interns in architectural firms. The students we met had all taken advantage of this opportunity. However, the relevant indicator suggested only 6.75 % participation in the practicum, either because the data it was based on was out of date or because the rate was calculated based on the wrong student population.
- *Informal evaluation practices.* At this early stage of the history of the department, the enthusiasm, ambition and dedication of the faculty combines with the ambition of students to take advantage of the positive ratio of faculty to students. In the ensuing collaborative atmosphere, evaluation and adjustment seem ingrained into the department's culture.
- *Career paths.* Students are assisted in developing a good grasp of potential career paths in three ways: First, they have the option of taking the practicum, thus acquiring hands-on experience of practice. Second, they often have the opportunity to collaborate in faculty creative initiatives, including participation in exhibitions, symposia, research programmes or

events of different kinds that bring them into contact with different facets of the profession and the discipline, nationally and internationally. Third, they have the opportunity to engage in research and design projects closely linked to their interests and character.

- *Student satisfaction.* The pride and commitment with which students spoke of their programme, and the way they celebrated their relationship with the faculty indicate a rare level of satisfaction with the programme. How the department will maintain this unusual level of student satisfaction and fervour for good work is an open question, since future students will not necessarily adopt the pioneering spirit of the first student intakes. However, if faculty maintain the present level of engagement and the present ability to link teaching and their own creative work, it is likely that students will continue to feel that they participate in something special.

Panel Judgement

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

Panel Recommendations

- R7.1** As the department grows, the informal culture of continuous evaluation must be supplemented by a more deliberate development of critical indicators and the constructive incorporation of these indicators in the department’s self-assessments of all kinds.
- R7.2** If the number of students is kept to reasonable levels relative to the number of faculty and the capacity of the infrastructure, the department may succeed in maintaining the present level of student enthusiasm, commitment and pride.

Principle 8: Public Information

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

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

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

Study Programme Compliance

The main communication forum between the faculty and students is the individual and personal relationships that the faculty have established with the students. Due to the small size of the department, such interpersonal activities work well. The Panel did see some evidence of other forms of publications, such as periodicals, leaflets, or posters by the individual faculty members and in the departmental presentation. The website is limited, and some information is not clearly presented. For example, the site does not highlight student work, which can serve as a very strong indicator of the department's achievements. Also the precise description of the activities of the faculty is incomplete and no faculty CVs are available.

The Panel would like to express our enormous appreciation for the hard voluntary work that faculty members and the department's administration undertook during the *virtual visit* to collect and display past and current student work, which highly influenced our positive evaluation of the programme. The Panel strongly recommends that the University provides permanent and departmental-based support for the department's presence on the web. This should be done in the department's own web-page as well as social media and other outlets. Regular newsletters should be considered. Students and faculty produced excellent work that should be easily available to the architecture community and public.

Additionally, there does not seem to be any departmental sanctioned virtual and physical space managed by the students themselves for the presentation of their activities.

Panel Judgement

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

Panel Recommendations

- R8.1** The Panel would recommend that the department establishes a strong web-based presence with the documentation of student and faculty work, special events such as invited lectures or exhibitions, as well as departmental facilities and infrastructure. This should be done in the department's own web-page as well as social media and other outlets. Regular newsletters should be considered.
- R8.2** Student's research projects and design theses should selectively be presented online as a way of promoting the department's identity.

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

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

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

The above comprise the evaluation of:

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

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

Study Programme Compliance

The department has in place a process for periodic evaluation of the curriculum through support by the University mechanisms for Quality Assurance, the interdepartmental internal evaluation committee (OM.E.A.), the programme of studies committee and the General Assembly meetings. There is a periodic evaluation process of faculty and course content by the students and an evaluation of the support services and learning environment by the faculty. The statistical data are collected through a series of questionnaires developed by the Quality Assurance Unit (QAU) of the University. The results of these questionnaires are summarized and discussed with the faculty and they are submitted to the QAU. The results for each course evaluated are shared with the faculty member(s) who taught the course and appropriate actions are initiated to address any issues raised as part of the evaluation.

A revision of the programme of studies has been made in 2019 and a further revision is planned in near future, following the new five hires of academic staff. In the revision made in 2019, a formerly single course on architecture and arts taught by two instructors was divided into two respective courses, a number of courses on digital representations and elective courses in landscape architecture and bioclimatic design were introduced, and the course of restoration and reuse of cultural heritage was adjusted to comprise the main design studio of the eighth semester. However, it is not clear, whether the revision made in 2019 was aimed at an improvement of the initial programme of studies or reflected an adjustment to the expertise and the teaching and research interests of the newly hired faculty members.

The department engages in continued communication with its students and sole graduate. A database and formal, through social media, connections to the department's student body are

in place. This allows for close relationships with the courses they are working and provides an opportunity for the department to engage further with its alumni, future employers and establish collaborative activities to address professional aspects, community needs, or common projects.

Panel Judgement

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

Panel Recommendations

- R9.1** In the short-term, the ratio of tenure-track faculty members to students needs to be improved, the duration of studies, controlled according to international standards for the Schools of Architecture, and the programme needs to be enriched with visiting faculty.

Principle 10: Regular External Evaluation of Undergraduate Programmes

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

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

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

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

Study Programme Compliance

The department was established in 2015 and has a very short history and only one graduate. As such it has never been evaluated by an international or national external evaluation committee. Additionally, there have been no other evaluation efforts outside of the current review sponsored by HAHE. However, the department implements the procedures set forth by the University Quality Assurance Unit, collects and analyses the required data periodically, and provides their results to the QAU.

All faculty and staff recognize the importance of the external evaluation and value external recommendations. They all believe this helps the department achieve its goals and purpose, help them improve, and engage in meaningful discussions about the future of the programme and the changing educational demands placed by a diverse set of professional issues. Unfortunately, the department does not have the financial means to implement their own external evaluations process. A possible solution might be the establishment of an advisory professional board whose members volunteer their services for the benefit of the department.

The Panel had the opportunity to interact not only with almost all faculty and staff members but also with current students of the department as well as graduates. All showed a great level of enthusiasm and professionalism as well as commitment in supporting and aiding the Panel in any manner and request made.

We would like to make three additional observations: First, the visit programme did not include a meeting with non-tenure-track faculty, even though they cover a significant portion of the curriculum. Second, the administrative staff, while present at the meeting, did not make an independent presentation. Third, we were not offered a complete set of faculty CVs.

Panel Judgement

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

Panel Recommendations

R10.1 The department should implement their own external evaluation process. One option is the establishment of an advisory board whose members volunteer their services for the benefit of the department.

PART C: CONCLUSIONS

I. Features of Good Practice

- The programme of studies reflects the interests and specializations of its faculty and is comparable with professional programmes internationally.
- The faculty are highly committed individually and demonstrate a spirit of dialogue and collaboration, thus contributing to a most positive atmosphere of learning.
- Student-faculty interaction is frequent and cordial, with all instructors investing significant time and energy in their teaching activities, thus ensuring high quality in the delivery of all courses.
- Faculty, staff and students should be praised for their resilience and commitment. They have managed to maintain the quality and momentum of the programme and create an environment, both human and physical, which is remarkably positive despite financial and other limitations.
- The substantial participation in student mobility programmes (ERASMUS) is worthwhile.
- External stakeholders, representing very impressive professional offices and organizations, enterprises, national and local authorities, have already developed strong relations with the department and support further common areas of cooperation.

II. Areas of Weakness

- The department is a small academic unit in terms of students and the number of tenure and tenure-track faculty is low. Furthermore, the proportion of tenure or tenure-track faculty relative to the faculty as a whole, is also low. By implication, the character of the program has not yet reached an adequate level of maturity and stability.
- The identity of the programme of studies is presently not adequately and convincingly reflected in the description of its structure.
- The expected learning outcomes of the individual semesters, especially in the last years of studies, should be more explicitly stated. A comprehensive design studio at the end of the third year should be created to ensure that all students have reached a common strong level of professional education before engaging in the more advanced and focused studies of the fourth year and the more diversified individual inquiries encouraged in the final year.
- The studio curriculum could be revised to alleviate the otherwise positive intensity of the curriculum during the 8th and 9th semesters. The aim should be to enable a greater proportion of students to graduate within five years.
- The department should organize databases of publications, reports and creative outcomes as well as keep up to date CVs for all faculty using a standardized format.

III. Recommendations for Follow-up Actions

- The linking of teaching and research should be strengthened through specific synergies between thematic areas that should be identified in the programme of studies.
- If the network of connections to architectural practices grows to a sufficient level, the department should consider integrating the period of internship/practical training into the curriculum.

- A clear strategic plan for the new faculty searches in the next years is necessary. These should be defined so as to strengthen the current programme of studies and the stated aims of future and desirable programmes of studies.
- The faculty should continue seeking external funding to further increase research and creative work productivity. The department should also consider external funding to enhance its infrastructure and equip its research labs. This outreach activity should be coordinated with the institution and the department's strategic plan.
- The department should articulate a succinct policy and funding incentives for faculty development.
- Further mobility and collaborations should be encouraged, in order to create stronger links nationally and internationally.
- The department needs to establish a strong presence on the web with the documentation of the student and faculty work, departmental facilities, and infrastructure. In addition the department should seek opportunities to present the work of students and faculty in public fora.
- Although the relocation of the department has a positive symbolic value and enhances accessibility to the city centre services, the departmental identity and coherence should be maintained and further improved through the new organization and allocation of space. Attention should be paid to mitigating the adverse effects of spatial dispersion.
- As the department grows, the informal culture of continuous evaluation must be supplemented by a more deliberate development of critical indicators and the constructive incorporation of these indicators in the department's self-assessments of all kinds.
- The department should implement their own external evaluation process. One option is the establishment of an advisory board whose members volunteer their services for the benefit of the department.

IV. Summary & Overall Assessment

The Principles where full compliance has been achieved are: **1, 3, 4, 7, and 9.**

The Principles where substantial compliance has been achieved are: **2, 5, 6, 8, and 10.**

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

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

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

The members of the External Evaluation & Accreditation Panel

Name and Surname

Signature

- 1. Professor Marios C. Phocas (Chair)**
University of Cyprus, Nicosia, Cyprus
- 2. Professor Loukas Kalisperis**
Pennsylvania State University, Pennsylvania, USA
- 3. Professor Petros Petsimeris**
Université Paris 1, Panthéon-Sorbonne, Paris, France
- 4. Professor John Peponis**
Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, USA