



ΕΛΛΗΝΙΚΗ ΔΗΜΟΚΡΑΤΙΑ  
Α . Δ Ι . Π .  
ΑΡΧΗ ΔΙΑΣΦΑΛΙΣΗΣ ΚΑΙ  
ΠΙΣΤΟΠΟΙΗΣΗΣ ΤΗΣ ΠΟΙΟΤΗΤΑΣ  
ΣΤΗΝ ΑΝΩΤΑΤΗ ΕΚΠΑΙΔΕΥΣΗ

HELLENIC REPUBLIC  
H . Q . A .  
HELLENIC QUALITY ASSURANCE  
AND ACCREDITATION AGENCY

## EXTERNAL EVALUATION REPORT

**ΤΕΙ ΑΘΗΝΑΣ**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>1</b>	<b>EXTERNAL EVALUATION COMMITTEE .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>4</b>
2.1	The External Evaluation Procedure.....	4
2.2	The Self-Evaluation Procedure .....	5
<b>3</b>	<b>PROFILE OF THE INSTITUTION UNDER EVALUATION .....</b>	<b>7</b>
3.1	Institutional Governance, Leadership & Strategy .....	7
3.2	Strategy for Study Programmes.....	14
3.3	Profile of the Institution under evaluation - Conclusions and recommendations .....	16
<b>4</b>	<b>INTERNAL SYSTEM OF QUALITY ASSURANCE .....</b>	<b>18</b>
4.1	Quality Assurance (QA) Policy and Strategy .....	18
4.2	Design, approval, monitoring and evaluation of the study programmes and degrees awarded.....	19
4.3	Teaching and learning - Assessment by students .....	20
4.4	Admission of students, progression and recognition of studies .....	21
4.5	Quality Assurance as regards the teaching staff.....	22
4.6	Learning resources and student support .....	23
4.7	Information Systems for Recording and Analysing Data and Indicators.....	23
4.8	Dissemination of information to stakeholders .....	24
4.9	Continuous monitoring and periodic review of the study programmes.....	25
4.10	Periodic external evaluation.....	26
4.11	Internal System of Quality Assurance – Conclusions and recommendations .....	26
<b>5</b>	<b>OPERATION OF THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATION OF THE INSTITUTION .....</b>	<b>27</b>
5.1	Central Administration Services of the Institution .....	27
5.2	Operation of the Central Administration of the Institution – Conclusions and recommendations.....	28
<b>6</b>	<b>CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS .....</b>	<b>29</b>
6.1	Final decision of the EEC .....	31

**1 EXTERNAL EVALUATION COMMITTEE**

The Committee responsible for the External Evaluation of the University/Technological Education Institution named: Technological Education Institution of Athens comprised the following five (5) expert evaluators drawn from the Registry kept by the HQA in accordance with Law 3374/2005 and the Law 4009/2011:

Professor Dr. Nikolaos Psarros\_\_ (Chairman)

(Title) (Name and Surname)

University of Leipzig, Germany

(Institution of origin)

Professor Dr. Stephanos Efthymiadis

(Title) (Name and Surname)

Open University of Cyprus, Cyprus

(Institution of origin)

Professor Dr. Dr. Thimios Mitsiadis

(Title) (Name and Surname)

University of Zurich, Switzerland

(Institution of origin)

Dr. Anastassis Perrakis

(Title) (Name and Surname)

Netherlands Cancer Institute, Netherlands

(Institution of origin)

Professor Dr. Sotirios Skevoulis

(Title) (Name and Surname)

Pace University, U.S.A.

(Institution of origin)

**N.B.** The length of text in each box is free. Questions included in each box are not exclusive nor should they always be answered separately; the Committee's reply to those questions is meant to provide a general outline of issues that need to be addressed.

## **2 INTRODUCTION**

### **2.1 The External Evaluation Procedure**

- Dates and brief account of the site visit

14-16 December 2015, site visit. EEC visited all Faculties and Departments. The entire committee visited the Faculty of Health and Caring Professions (FHCP, the largest school of the Institution); two or three members visited all other schools in parallel sessions. The meetings with the Rector, Deans, administrative staff, and the visits of the general facilities (library, gym, infirmary, restaurants) were conducted in the presence of the entire committee.

- Whom did the Committee meet?

The President and members of the Council, the members of the HQA unit, most members of the faculty (varying by faculty, some were better represented), representative members of administrative staff, student representatives selected by the faculty, a few elected student representatives, a few hand-picked alumni, society representatives that maintain a relationship with the Institution, including the mayor of the City of Aigaleo, the head of the National Library of Greece, the head of the Conservation Directorate of the National Gallery of Athens, and others.

- List of Reports, documents, other data examined by the EEC

1. Full evaluation report, in Greek.
2. Summary evaluation report, in English
3. A summary for the activities of some departments, in Greek
4. Books published by several departments
5. A list of selected publications

- Groups of teaching and administrative staff and students interviewed

Groups by faculty for all faculties for teaching staff, all administrative staff in a single session, undergraduate students by faculty, post-graduate students of alumni in a single group.

- Facilities visited by the EEC

Library, infirmary, gym, staff restaurant, student restaurant, student parking, main Auditorium, e-teaching facilities, teleconference rooms, and representative laboratories: medical analysis, computing, renewable energy sources, dental laboratories, food technology and wine, art conservation, graphic arts, film arts.

<i>Please decide in respect to the specific evaluation area (&amp;2.1):</i>	Tick
<b>Worthy of merit</b>	
<b>Positive evaluation</b>	X
<b>Partially positive evaluation</b>	
<b>Negative evaluation</b>	

*Justify your rating (optional):*

Together with HQA, TEI-A should fine-tune the site visit schedule to better serve the purpose of evaluation especially with respect to the current report.

## **2.2 The Self-Evaluation Procedure**

*Please comment on:*

- Appropriateness of sources and documentation used

The detailed report in Greek (370 pages) was very detailed; perhaps too detailed. Despite minor discrepancies and some approximated data provided (e.g. 700 requests to informatics services per month, and 700 requests to administrative services per month consistently for five years, cf. page 201 of the main report), the quality and quantity of the data provided were in general appropriate and comprehensive.

- Quality and completeness of evidence provided and reviewed

The evidence provided was consistent with the information contained in the evaluation documents.

- The extent to which the objectives of the internal evaluation procedure have been met by the Institution

To the extent to which the set objectives could be met with own efforts, there was significant progress towards completion of the aims: internal restructuring of the curriculum, allocation of resources, successful completion of merging of Departments, installation of the Student Ombudsman, maintenance of the general environment quality (very clean installations), good practice in library rules.

A major objective of the Faculty was to establish quality post-graduate educational programmes at the Masters level, which has been met with success.

There are additional objectives that the faculty has set, and the EEC supports, but cannot be met without ministerial support. These include:

1. Less students admitted per year to facilitate the quality of practical teaching
2. More faculty members and contract academic staff
3. More administrative staff

The Faculty aspires to establish post-graduate Doctorate programmes. The EEC finds that a number of the Departments meet academic and scientific requirements for the implementation of such programmes. However, the EEC does not support an Institute-wide implementation, but endorses a targeted strategy with associated accreditation at the National level. The EEC recommends considering the introduction of a degree analogous to the DPS (Doctor of Professional Studies).

- Description and Analysis of the Self-Evaluation Procedure in the Institution

A hard copy of a power-point presentation was given to the EEC and is included in the documents accompanying this report.

- Analysis of the positive elements and difficulties which arose during the self-evaluation procedure

There were no difficulties reported. Some complaints about contradicting instructions from HQAA were voiced in an informal but professional manner. The EEC recommends discussing these difficulties directly with the faculty in an open and self-critical fashion.

Although significant efforts were taken for all students to complete evaluation questionnaires, the response was estimated to be only a minor fraction of the total number of students (less than 5%), although this was more encouraging when compared to the “truly active” students that follow lectures (estimated to 30-60% depending on the Department).

- Whether the self-evaluation procedure was comprehensive and interactive

The EEC finds that the procedure was comprehensive and interactive; however, we recommend that representative members of the administrative staff and student representatives should be included in every level of the evaluation procedures.

*Please decide in respect to the specific evaluation area (&2.2):*

	Tick
<b>Worthy of merit</b>	X
<b>Positive evaluation</b>	
<b>Partially positive evaluation</b>	
<b>Negative evaluation</b>	

Justify your rating (optional):

*The attitude towards the self-evaluation procedure and the necessity for recurrent self-evaluation was shared between the faculty we met and the rectorate.*

### **3 PROFILE OF THE INSTITUTION UNDER EVALUATION**

#### **3.1 Institutional Governance, Leadership & Strategy**

*Please comment on:*

##### **3.1.1 Vision, mission and goals of the Institution**

- What are the Institution's mission and goals  
 The central mission is the education of skilled professionals with an emphasis on a solid scientific understanding of their profession.  
 There is an increasing emphasis for conducting original research.
- Priorities set by goals  
 The goals presented were two-fold:  
 First, to achieve scientific excellence through research and national and international recognition.  
 Second, to achieve student satisfaction by providing high-level professional training.  
 There is an emphasis in scientific achievement (evident from the way that the faculty members introduce themselves with an emphasis in their academic rather than their professional credentials, with few exceptions).
- How are the goals achieved  
 The research goals are achieved by applying for competitive research funding, recently establishing thirty five Research Laboratories, and by external collaborations with industry and academia at a national and international level.  
 The educational goals are achieved by providing comprehensive theoretical and practical training. The Institution is trying to achieve equilibrium between theoretical and practical training, by undergoing an effort to establish higher standards in theoretical training without neglecting practical aspects. Additionally, 438 bilateral agreements within the framework of the various phases of the ERASMUS programme contribute to the improvement of student mobility, facilitating thus the education process.
- Procedures established by the Institution to monitor the achievement of goals  
 There is an effort in collecting data from students. An informatics system has been implemented. Although this is of excellent quality and guarantees transparency, this has decreased student participation. There are considerations to use portable electronic devices (smartphones or tablets) to achieve higher responsiveness.
- What is your assessment of the Institution's ability to improve  
 The human resources are of high quality. Faculty members are high-spirited, dedicated to education and research goals, and committed. Thus, there is a high potential for improvement.  
 However, improvement cannot be foreseen without additional human and monetary resources. The current level matches the resources. We cannot assess the academic level of all Departments in a comprehensive manner. Thus, perhaps it is necessary to take specific actions that are beyond the brief of the EEC.

Please decide in respect to the specific evaluation area (&3.1.1):

	Tick
<b>Worthy of merit</b>	X
<b>Positive evaluation</b>	
<b>Partially positive evaluation</b>	
<b>Negative evaluation</b>	

Justify your rating (optional):

TEI-A has been aiming to supersede the limitations of a typically technical academic institution with respect to the relationship between research and teaching without trying, however, to identify itself with a classical research University. The EEC believes that this is a very original and commendable vision with high chances of realization, provided that the state authorities adequately support it.

### **3.1.2 Organizational Development Strategy**

- Effectiveness of administrative officials

Notwithstanding some specific issues, the administration has generally shown to be very effective.

- Existence of effective operation regulations

EEC realized that regulations exist, are respected and applied at all different levels and by all members of the academic community. A critical cause of difficulties in the strict observation and implementation of the rules is chiefly due to the severe reduction of financial resources.

- Specific goals and timetables

1. Further rationalization of administration and services offered to students
2. Creation of a friendly working atmosphere and willingness of the personnel to find workable and realistic solutions.
3. Common efforts to achieve set goals.

- Measures taken to reach goals

There are several internal projects currently running aiming at the implementation of the above mentioned goals

Please decide in respect to the specific evaluation area (&3.1.2):

	Tick
<b>Worthy of merit</b>	X
<b>Positive evaluation</b>	
<b>Partially positive evaluation</b>	
<b>Negative evaluation</b>	

Justify your rating (optional):

EEC believes that TEI-A has set high standards, which other Greek TEI should follow.



### 3.1.3 Academic Development Strategy

- Response of the Institution to Faculties and Departments

The rectorate endorses the academic goals set by Faculties and Departments without any exceptions and endeavours to communicate their needs to the higher authorities of the Greek state.

- Goals and timetables
  1. Improvement of the internal consistency of the Faculties
  2. Creation of a doctoral programme of studies, technically oriented.
- Measures taken to reach goals
  1. Creation of appropriate space in order to bring together related faculties
  2. Establishment of fifteen official Research Laboratories

Please decide in respect to the specific evaluation area (&3.1.3):

	Tick
<b>Worthy of merit</b>	
<b>Positive evaluation</b>	X
<b>Partially positive evaluation</b>	
<b>Negative evaluation</b>	

Justify your rating (optional):

There is a clear strife for development of excellence but the differentiation between scientific and technological educational and research activities needs a more innovative strategy.

### 3.1.4 Research Strategy

- Key points in research strategy

TEI-A aims at developing a competitive research programme of international standard.

There is a strong tendency in Academia to associate research with doctoral programmes. In TEI-A there is a significant amount of research conducted by post-graduate students. Nonetheless, the EEC finds that the insistence on the ability to award doctoral diplomas at the institutional level should be met with clear definitions of research objectives that can lead to a better professional placement rather than contributing to fundamental research.

- Research strategy objectives and timetables for achieving them

It is hard to set up objectives and timetables without dedicated research funding at the national level. Such objectives could be attainable by regular participation in the HORIZON 2020 programme, which is extremely competitive.

- Laboratory research support network

Centralized facilities are provided for the administration of already acquired research grants. However, there is no pro-active support at the stage of their conception and submission.

- Research excellence network

Several Departments are networked internationally and nationally with similar institutions (academic or otherwise). Owing to the different specialization of each Department, this cannot be evaluated as a whole, but on a topic dependent

basis.

- Existence of research assistance mechanisms (for preparing proposals, capitalising on patents and innovations, finding partners for research programmes, etc.)  
There are no such mechanisms existing for the time being.

*Please decide in respect to the specific evaluation area (&3.1.4):*

	Tick
<b>Worthy of merit</b>	
<b>Positive evaluation</b>	
<b>Partially positive evaluation</b>	X
<b>Negative evaluation</b>	

*Justify your rating (optional):*

At the institutional level there is rather no central coordination. However, there are isolated efforts to be accredited to some particular Departments. EEC strongly recommends the development of a clear strategy towards improving the opportunities to attract external (and alternative) resources of funding.

### **3.1.5 Financial Strategy**

- General financial strategy and management of national and international funds  
Since 2012 there have been overwhelming budget-cuts, which have greatly affected and will further affect the number of faculty members and contract academic staff as well as general resources. The rectorate is handling this new situation with pragmatic realism.  
According to attached hard copies provided to EEC, the per-student cost at TEI-A is about half of the lesser funded Universities in the country.
- Regular budget management strategy  
The strategy for managing the severely limited funds is fair and transparent.
- Public investment management strategy  
Not applicable.
- Organisation and strategy of the Special Account for Research Funds (SARF)  
Adequate.
- Organisation and strategy of the University Property Development and Management Company  
For the time being there is no University Property Development and Management Company. EEC recommends strongly the implementation of such a facility.
- Existence of a Quality System for Financial Management (e.g. ISO), computerisation management and Budget monitoring (Regular Budget, Public Investments Programme, SARF Budget, etc.)  
There are ISO certifications available and efforts to obtain further accreditation.

*Please decide in respect to the specific evaluation area (&3.1.5):*

	Tick
<b>Worthy of merit</b>	
<b>Positive evaluation</b>	X
<b>Partially positive evaluation</b>	
<b>Negative evaluation</b>	

*Justify your rating (optional):*

There is a strong effort and actual achievement in management. However, the lack of University Property Development and Management Company is a major obstacle to the qualitative improvement of the bundling of the various efforts in this particular sector.

### **3.1.6 Building and Grounds Infrastructure Strategy**

- Strategy key points

Consolidation of the scattered physical spaces, which currently host some Departments.

- Objectives and timetables

Construction of a building at a separate estate near the School of Fine Arts in Athens to house the Faculty of Fine Arts and Design.

Construction of an auditorium building within the main campus.

Both projects are scheduled for completion in 2016.

- Measures taken to reach goals

Acquisition of real estate and appropriation of funding.

- Deviations from model 1 campus/HEI

There are deviations from model 1 campus, an issue, which is pro-actively addressed following proper planning. However, due to objective territory planning restrictions, a full compliance to the model 1 campus is for the time being not achievable.

*Please decide in respect to the specific evaluation area (&3.1.6):*

	Tick
<b>Worthy of merit</b>	X
<b>Positive evaluation</b>	
<b>Partially positive evaluation</b>	
<b>Negative evaluation</b>	

*Justify your rating (optional):*

The infrastructure strategy is consistent and dynamic. It will improve the internal and external synergies of the affected Faculties.

### 3.1.7 Environmental Strategy

- Recycling strategy and measures taken to reach goal  
Thanks to the good infrastructure and the assistance of laboratories, there is a clear pro-active attitude towards recycling.
- Hazardous waste management and measures taken to reach goals  
Hazardous waste is collected and dispatched for out-of-site management.
- Urban waste management and measures taken to reach goals  
Excellent infrastructure is in place.
- Green energy strategy and measures taken to reach goals  
Natural gas is used for heating. Solar panels are installed for laboratory use, but also connected to the electricity network. A plan to cover all roofs with solar panels has been reconsidered due to financial reductions.

Please decide in respect to the specific evaluation area (&3.1.7):

	Tick
<b>Worthy of merit</b>	X
<b>Positive evaluation</b>	
<b>Partially positive evaluation</b>	
<b>Negative evaluation</b>	

Justify your rating (optional):

TEI-A meets all requirements and stands out compared to other institutions known to or visited by EEC members.

### 3.1.8 Social Strategy

- Exploitation and dissemination of the Institution's Research Activities for the benefit of society and economy  
There are no specific actions promoting wider understanding and implications of research activity.
- Promotion of interaction between the Institution and the Labour Market  
There are strong ties between individual staff members and Departments, on the one hand, and companies and alumni, on the other. However, at the institutional level, there is no centralized service to manage and promote such interactions on a systematic basis.
- Sustained relationships with key local and regional bodies  
There are good relations maintained between TEI-A and local bodies (e.g., Aigaleo City municip.), but no relations with regional bodies (e.g., Attica region).
- Contribution to the cultural development of society, the city and the region  
TEI-A offers free-courses for the public and participates in various kinds of charity actions, most of which take place on the premises.
- Reciprocal and long-lasting relationship with the alumni community  
There is no formalized alumni management at the institutional level. However, there exist several alumni associations created by the students with very positive impact.

Please decide in respect to the specific evaluation area (&3.1.8):

	Tick
<b>Worthy of merit</b>	
<b>Positive evaluation</b>	X
<b>Partially positive evaluation</b>	
<b>Negative evaluation</b>	

*Justify your rating (optional):*

Despite the fact that there is a strong will to be visible in society, the efforts so far made are partially consistent and lacking in focus.

### 3.1.9 Internationalization Strategy

- Integration of the international dimension in the curricula

The international integration of the curricula takes place only in form of cooperation at the level of post-graduate MA/MSc programmes and within the framework of Erasmus-plus programme. This does not include converging with the norms of the so-called Bologna process.

- Integration of the international dimension in research

There are no systematic efforts towards obtaining European collaborative funding. A notable exception constitutes the award of a HORIZON-2020 grant to the Department of Library Science and Information Systems.

- Integration of the intercultural dimension within the campus

Not applicable.

- Participation in international HEI networks

There are ten participations in international networks listed. Some of these listed collaborative agreements qualify as international HEI networks.

- Collaboration with HEIs in other countries (with a specific collaboration agreement) - measures taken to reach goals

There are limited collaborations mostly within the framework of postgraduate studies. There is a continuous effort towards establishing new collaborations. A good awareness of setting up such collaborations has been noted.

Please decide in respect to the specific evaluation area (&3.1.9):

	Tick
<b>Worthy of merit</b>	
<b>Positive evaluation</b>	
<b>Partially positive evaluation</b>	X
<b>Negative evaluation</b>	

*Justify your rating (optional):*

Besides good individual efforts, there is need of a global strategy on furthering the international educational character of TEI-A.

### **3.1.10 Student Welfare Strategy**

- Student hostel operation and development strategy  
TEI-A does not offer hostel service
- Student refectory development strategy  
There is a high quality refectory. In addition, the restaurant serving the staff is available for students after 2 pm.
- Scholarships and prizes strategy  
Not available at the moment.
- Sports facilities operation and development strategy  
There is a good-quality gym.
- Cultural activities strategy  
There are targeted sport activities and theatrical initiatives.
- Strategy for people with special needs  
There are ramps and dedicated elevators for persons with special needs. Additionally there is an Institute Social Service unit that is also concerned with the problems related to persons with special needs.

*Please decide in respect to the specific evaluation area (&3.1.10):*

	Tick
<b>Worthy of merit</b>	
<b>Positive evaluation</b>	X
<b>Partially positive evaluation</b>	
<b>Negative evaluation</b>	

*Justify your rating (optional):*

## **3.2 Strategy for Study Programmes**

### **3.2.1 Programmes of Undergraduate Studies (first cycle)**

*Please comment on:*

- the main strengths and weaknesses of the Programmes  
The main strengths of all undergraduate programmes are: the broad theoretical foundation that is offered to all students is a positive trait; and early access to practical training in the fields of future professional involvement is a plus.  
Laboratory practical training supports the theoretical courses, as it was evident by the various facilities visited by the EEC.  
The educational programme is targeted towards the fields of employment.  
Concurrently, the theoretical foundation is not always targeted to professional development, and it is unclear if it addresses the level and the aspirations of many of the students in the various Schools.  
There is an inherent inability (enforced by the current legislation) to ensure the continuous attendance of the offered theoretical courses by all students. This re-

sults in a prolongation of the study time that exceeds by far the four-year limit.

- the way the Central Administration of the Institution deals with any remarks and recommendations that the external experts pointed out in the External Evaluation of Academic Units

There was a remarkably positive attitude towards the remarks of the EEC. However, any mention towards convergence towards adoption of the Bologna process was met with a certain scepticism.

*Please decide in respect to the specific evaluation area (&3.2.1):*

	Tick
<b>Worthy of merit</b>	
<b>Positive evaluation</b>	X
<b>Partially positive evaluation</b>	
<b>Negative evaluation</b>	

*Justify your rating (optional):*

There are numerous positive aspects and the overall impression is that the TEI-A strives to offer consistent and targeted undergraduate study programmes.

### **3.2.2 Programmes of Postgraduate Studies (second cycle)**

*Please comment on:*

- the main strengths and weaknesses of the Programmes

Most Masters programmes, and specifically the ones that are offered by TEI-A on its own, are relatively new, reflecting the recent changes in legislation. They are very well targeted towards the field of studies and the specialisations of the Institute. All have reasonable tuition fees and are in good demand (positions on offer are filled, and some are over-subscribed). It is of note that the TEI-A post-graduate programmes are attracting also university graduates. The fact that several Master programmes are organised in cooperation with universities, e.g. the Medical School of Athens University, is certainly commendable.

- the basic obligations of students, e.g. attendance of lectures, course requirements, etc.

Post-graduate students attend in a dedicated fashion, and the course requirements are clear and strict.

- the way the Central Administration of the Institution deals with any remarks and recommendations that the external experts pointed out in the External Evaluation of Academic Units

The Central Administration was very positively predisposed on all ideas and criticism and had a positive attitude towards the EEC. However, recommendations to reconsider how TEI-A can materialize their aspirations towards an autonomous Doctoral program, were met with a certain reluctance.

<i>Please decide in respect to the specific evaluation area (&amp; 3.2.2):</i>	Tick
<b>Worthy of merit</b>	X
<b>Positive evaluation</b>	
<b>Partially positive evaluation</b>	
<b>Negative evaluation</b>	

*Justify your rating (optional):*  
The post-graduate programme is an excellent start, the quality of the syllabus meets high international standards, and the prospects of succeeding also in the long term are strong.

---

**3.2.3 Programmes of Doctoral Studies (third cycle)**

There is no Doctoral program, for the time being. The Institute strongly aspires the implementation of doctoral programmes in all Faculties in the near future. They feel ready for the challenge. EEC agrees that a number of Departments have the scientific and academic credentials to offer Doctoral degrees, but remains sceptical if a Doctoral programme should be deployed on an Institute-wide basis. EEC recommends that, as soon as a central accreditation system for Doctoral studies, common between university and TEI, is in place, the TEI-A proposals should seriously be considered for immediate implementation.

<i>Please decide in respect to the specific evaluation area (&amp; 3.2.3):</i>	Tick
<b>Worthy of merit</b>	-
<b>Positive evaluation</b>	-
<b>Partially positive evaluation</b>	-
<b>Negative evaluation</b>	-

*Justify your rating (optional):* N/A

---

**3.3 Profile of the Institution under evaluation - Conclusions and recommendations**

*Please complete the following sections regarding the overall **profile of the Institution under evaluation**:*

- *Underline specific positive points:*
  1. There was a widespread impression of a genuine presentation: the evaluation documents, the presentations and the reality observed were in harmony.
  2. Positive attitude towards the Institute, from academic and administrative staff, and the students.
  3. There is an effort to obtain the targets set by the Institute by positive actions.
  4. The cleanness of all public facilities, including restaurants, the library, lavatories, etc., was beyond reproach.



<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5. The laboratories are fully functional and well equipped, considering financial strains.</li> <li>6. The implementation of the Office of a Student Ombudsman is commendable.</li> <li>7. Several Volunteering actions are implemented.</li> </ol>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Underline specific negative points:</i> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Not all possibilities for increasing internal coherence between faculties are fully exploited.</li> <li>2. The lack of space available for teaching, especially a large lecturing auditorium of 150+ people that would allow more efficient teaching to early undergraduates, is obvious.</li> <li>3. There is a no office that would support applications for research grants in on Institution-wide basis.</li> <li>4. There is no commercial use of some high-quality facilities, such as the main Auditorium.</li> <li>5. There is no central office to coordinate technology transfer actions.</li> <li>6. There is no central office for consolidating and disseminating to the students all available collaborative efforts with professional bodies, both public and private.</li> <li>7. There is no central alumni management.</li> <li>8. Visibility to local society is not obvious.</li> </ol> </li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Make your suggestions for further development of the positive points:</i> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Establishing an award system to e.g. the highest ranked teacher in student questionnaires, or the best graduate theses.</li> <li>2. There is a need for public investment towards maintaining all laboratories at the current state-of-the-art.</li> <li>3. Formalised participation to International Humanitarian actions (for example Médecins sans Frontières) would increase the profile of volunteering actions.</li> </ol> </li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Make your suggestions on needed steps for improvement:</i> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Develop a large auditorium on the ground currently occupied by the student parking – the site is adequately served by public transport and only AMEA parking is necessary.</li> <li>2. Establishing a grant office, would allow actions like participation in the European Joint Doctorates or other Horizon2020 actions.</li> <li>3. Establish a company to develop commercial use of some high-quality facilities, such as the main Auditorium for e.g. Congresses.</li> <li>4. Establishing of a Technology Transfer Office, that would be centrally responsible to develop and apply rules for contract research, transfer of intellectual property, consultancy actions towards the public and private sectors, would be highly desirable.</li> <li>5. Establish a central office for consolidating and disseminating to the students all available collaborative efforts with professional bodies, both public and private.</li> <li>6. Establish central alumni management.</li> <li>7. Open-day actions like parent-student site visits for first year, or even an open-day for last-year secondary educations students.</li> </ol> </li> </ul>

## 4 INTERNAL SYSTEM OF QUALITY ASSURANCE

### 4.1 Quality Assurance (QA) Policy and Strategy

- the Institution's policy and goals regarding QA and Improvement  
TEI-A has developed a culture of QA and Improvement long before such practices were legally implemented in the country. This tradition has been continued and improved in the last years and embraces the Institute as a whole.
- whether the Institution has developed a specific system of QA  
The current QA policy relies on the European framework and Greek legislation. The QA procedures follow the norms of ISO 9001.
- how the Institution's internal QA system has been organized  
There is a central unit of QA (MODIP) and at the Department level QA groups (OMEA).
- how the students and staff of the Institution are protected from biased interventions and discriminations  
There is no evidence of such practices.
- whether a detailed implementation guide has been put together, containing an analysis of the QA system's operating procedures  
Such a guide, perhaps too detailed, is contained in the report provided.
- the involvement of students in QA  
The students were passively involved by means of having to fill up questionnaires concerning specific lectures. There was no active involvement of students in the internal QA groups and units of the Departments as well as in the central QA unit.  
All the students we talked to were handpicked by their professors, based on good attendance records. A notable exception were two elected students representatives of one Department, that asked to attend on their own initiative, and after identifying themselves both personally and in their representative capacity, they made constructive remarks.
- how the Institution evaluates the effectiveness of its QA system regarding the achievement of its goals  
The Institution and specifically some Departments are justifiably proud of their internal evaluation system, and take pride in their dedication for QA and improvement.

<i>Please decide in respect to the specific evaluation area (&amp;4.1):</i>	Tick
<b>Worthy of merit</b>	
<b>Positive evaluation</b>	X
<b>Partially positive evaluation</b>	
<b>Negative evaluation</b>	

*Justify your rating (optional):*

If there were students and administrative staff involved in all steps of QA process, the QA procedure would have been worthy of merit.

#### 4.2 Design, approval, monitoring and evaluation of the study programmes and degrees awarded

*Please comment on:*

- whether the learning outcomes have been clearly formulated and whether they have been published

All departments have detailed study guides.

- whether the programmes are designed in such a way as to involve students and other stakeholders in the work

There are measures involving students in the decision making progress. Private stakeholders are consulted.

- how the achievement of learning outcomes is monitored

There is no centralised and systematic monitoring; monitoring takes place at the single course level and is performed by the lecturer responsible.

- whether there is a published Guide regarding the organization of programmes of study

The programmes of study are clear, but sometimes limited to explain the legal framework. The EEC suggests that programmes of study should transcend towards inspiring the students to their professional and scientific career.

- whether the ECTS system is taken into consideration and implemented

The ECTS system is fully and correctly implemented.

- whether there is a periodic evaluation of the programmes according to set procedures and criteria aimed at safeguarding their consistency and regular updating

A specific procedural protocol exists.

- the student participation in the QA procedure of the study programmes

Students are consulted and vote for the evaluation and evolution of the study programme.

- whether the programmes include well-structured international mobility and - where appropriate- placement opportunities.

The Erasmus programme is well implemented, albeit limited by budgetary restrictions.

*Please decide in respect to the specific evaluation area (&4.2):*

	Tick
<b>Worthy of merit</b>	
<b>Positive evaluation</b>	X
<b>Partially positive evaluation</b>	
<b>Negative evaluation</b>	

*Justify your rating (optional):*

Everything is well in place and consistent with legislation. Specific Departments might be worthy of merit, but centralized and homogenous guidance could help to further diffuse excellence across the Institute.

### 4.3 Teaching and learning - Assessment by students

Please comment on:

- whether multiple and coherent learning paths are provided according to the needs of students in the Institution's Departments / Faculties

The students were pleased with the learning paths. However, judging from the reactions of students we feel that different career paths and opportunities could be further exploited. The undergraduates we met all aspired to post-graduate studies, with one exception in the undergraduates (a young student who decided to attend the school specifically to learn how to further develop his small business in the Greek province). Perhaps there are more students that exploit such career paths, but that should be further exploited by the Institute.

- how proper guidance and support is offered to students by the Departments / Faculties' teaching staff

Student we met were extremely positive about the staff. We do note however, that based on the selection procedure of student representatives that is to be expected.

Many students claimed that although they were disappointed that they "ended up in a TEI after the PanHellenic exams" they are now extremely happy with the academic and professional level and facilities of the Institution.

- whether students are informed clearly and in detail regarding the strategy of evaluation that is implemented for their programme of study, the exams or other methods of assessment they will be subjected to, what is expected of them and which criteria will be applied for the evaluation of their performance

The EEC could not form an objective view on these issues, under the time constraints.

- whether there is a formal procedure for addressing complaints and objections by students in the Departments / Faculties of the Institution

There is the office of the Student Ombudsman, which is functional.

Please decide in respect to the specific evaluation area (&4.3):

	Tick
<b>Worthy of merit</b>	
<b>Positive evaluation</b>	X
<b>Partially positive evaluation</b>	
<b>Negative evaluation</b>	

Justify your rating (optional):

All aspects are positive; should the sample of students interviewed have been more representative, the EEC could have decided if the TEI-A is worthy of merit.

#### 4.4 Admission of students, progression and recognition of studies

*Please comment on:*

- whether the procedures and criteria for admission to the second and third cycle of studies are implemented with consistency and transparency

Criteria for admission to the second cycle of studies are depending on the programme of study, but they are published, appropriate and transparent. These are available to the public in the corresponding web sites.

- whether there are clear and distinct procedures within the Departments/Faculties, as regards recognition of higher education degrees, periods of study and knowledge acquired at an earlier stage.

There are existing procedures.

- whether there are clear and distinct procedures of recognition of study periods and prior learning (including the recognition of non-formal and informal learning).

Recognition of prior studies is formalised.

- whether there are clear procedures in place regarding the cooperation of other Institutions with national ENIC/NARIC centres for ensuring coherent recognition and mobility among programmes within / among Institution (s)

The Greek legislation limits such mobility.

- whether students are provided with detailed information (e.g. DiploThSupplement) regarding the degrees conferred to them, the achieved learning outcomes as well as the framework, the level and the content of studies they successfully completed.

Students can acquire detailed information concerning their studies, as they wish.

- whether the Institution has in place processes and tools to collect, monitor and use information regarding student progression

Tools for collecting such information centrally are in place, but there is no clear procedure to use that information in a proactive manner.

*Please decide in respect to the specific evaluation area (&4.4):*

	Tick
<b>Worthy of merit</b>	
<b>Positive evaluation</b>	X
<b>Partially positive evaluation</b>	
<b>Negative evaluation</b>	

*Justify your rating (optional):*

#### 4.5 Quality Assurance as regards the teaching staff

*Please comment on:*

- how it is guaranteed that the vacancy notices and recruitment of teaching staff include procedures which provide assurance that all new teaching staff members have at least the basic teaching skills

This is according to current state legislation.

- opportunities offered to the teaching staff for their professional/scientific advancement

There are no formal procedures for such opportunities, at the level of the Greek state.

- how potential weaknesses of the teaching staff are identified as regards the delivery of their teaching courses

Negative evaluations by students are handled on a departmental basis. Some Departments have very clear procedures.

- the Institution's procedures for the support of new teaching staff as regards the teaching and evaluation methods

There is no apparent centralised support; but notably there is no state support to implement such procedures.

- how scientific activity is assessed and encouraged among the teaching staff in order to strengthen the connection between education and research

Teaching duties are overwhelming, as all staff members are teaching more hours than formally required. We also note, that the teaching requirements for TEI are higher than for Universities. Thus, and despite staff efforts, the connection between research and teaching is not fully developed.

- the procedures in place so that the teaching staff members receive the necessary feedback on their personal performance as well as on the opinion of students

There are procedures to receive feedback, but limited participation of students hampers such initiatives. There are proactive measures to acquire feedback, but the teaching staff is inherently limited in receiving feedback from the student community that is dedicated to their studies. The students that "fall through" the system and neglect their studies, cannot be monitored.

- whether a regulatory framework is in place for the investigation of disciplinary and academic misconduct of the teaching staff

The regulatory framework for such issues is set by the current state legislation, and the institutes have limited influence. A central office for collecting complaints in a formalised and confidential basis is desirable.

*Please decide in respect to the specific evaluation area (&4.5):*

	Tick
<b>Worthy of merit</b>	
<b>Positive evaluation</b>	X
<b>Partially positive evaluation</b>	
<b>Negative evaluation</b>	

*Justify your rating (optional):*

#### 4.6 Learning resources and student support

We have already commented on resources and student support, which we find of very high quality.

<i>Please decide in respect to the specific evaluation area (&amp;4.6):</i>	Tick
<b>Worthy of merit</b>	X
<b>Positive evaluation</b>	
<b>Partially positive evaluation</b>	
<b>Negative evaluation</b>	

*Justify your rating (optional):*

#### 4.7 Information Systems for Recording and Analysing Data and Indicators

*Please comment on:*

- whether the Institution possesses reliable means for collecting, analysing and utilizing valid information in respect to key performance indicators, the profile of the student population and student progression, success and drop-out rates

The Institute has taken serious efforts in collecting information for the academic staff performance, and the student evaluations. There is currently no possibility to monitor student progression and the concept of the drop-out student is not supported by current state legislation.

- whether the Institution possesses reliable means for collecting, analysing and utilizing valid information regarding its other functions and activities

Financial performance is monitored by appropriate control mechanisms. Use of library services is monitored by an automated system.

- whether the Institution collects information about student satisfaction with their programmes of study and the career paths offered to graduates

The Liaison Office collects some data from students during the graduation ceremony. Attempts have also been made to follow the career developments of students after their graduation. EEC believes that this must be done in a more systematic way. An immediate measure would be to create a LinkedIn group to keep continuous contact with as many graduate students as possible.

- whether the Institution seeks comparison with other similar establishments within and beyond the European Higher Education Area, with a view to developing self-awareness and finding ways to improve its operation

TEI-A regards itself comparable to both national Universities and European academic institutions of Higher Education. The impression is that this is being done for purposes of self-assurance rather than out of an intention to adapt to the European practice in accordance to the Bologna process, for comparable accreditation.

<i>Please decide in respect to the specific evaluation area (&amp;4.7):</i>	Tick
<b>Worthy of merit</b>	
<b>Positive evaluation</b>	
<b>Partially positive evaluation</b>	X
<b>Negative evaluation</b>	

*Justify your rating (optional):*

**4.8 Dissemination of information to stakeholders**

*Please comment on:*

- how the Institution sees to the pollicisation of information on the programmes offered, the expected learning outcomes, the degrees awarded, the teaching, learning and assessment procedures it uses and the learning opportunities it offers to students

Through their Internet site arranged according to Faculties and Departments/Programmes of Studies. EEC was informed that a new site, to replace the old-fashioned and rather obsolete now in use, is under construction. EEC was given access to the new site, which it also finds that it must be redesigned also in the light of the target group of stakeholders.

- whether the information regarding the Institution's offered programmes of study is available in English or in other languages

Only the internet sites of some programmes are available in English.

- whether the teaching staff's CVs are included in the publicized information, both in Greek and in English

CVs of academic staff members are not easy to find on the extant internet site and, if so, they are available mostly in Greek.

<i>Please decide in respect to the specific evaluation area (&amp;4.8):</i>	Tick
<b>Worthy of merit</b>	
<b>Positive evaluation</b>	
<b>Partially positive evaluation</b>	X
<b>Negative evaluation</b>	

*Justify your rating (optional):*

TEI-A authorities have recognized the problem of low quality of their extant site. EEC recommends that they redesign their new site following the example of other Universities in Greece and abroad.



#### 4.9 Continuous monitoring and periodic review of the study programmes

*Please comment on:*

- the procedure followed with regard to assessment and periodic review of the contents of study programmes

Study programmes are reviewed and revised on a frequent basis with current testing time the period of three years.

- whether this procedure takes into account the changing needs of society

Reconsiderations are prompted by changes on the professional domain (new needs in the market and developments in science).

- whether this procedure takes into consideration the findings emanating from monitoring the graduates' career paths

TEI-A has not developed a record or a system that would monitor the career paths of its graduates. However, connections are for long maintained between graduates and academic staff to the effect that the lack of formal records is counterbalanced, at least partially.

- the procedure with which the reviews take into account the students' work load, the progress rate and completion of studies

According to the information given by the Institution, reviews take into account the students' workload as well as other parameters within the normative framework established by the current legislation. The Institute tries to assess the reasons that lead to a prolongation of the time of studies by questioning students who significantly exceed the median duration of studies. Given that the amount of courses (40 to 44) is imposed externally by the Ministry of Education, TEI-A has limited capabilities to improve the study parameters autonomously.

- whether this procedure takes into account the cutting edge research activities in that particular discipline

TEI-A reassured the EEC that this procedure takes into account the cutting edge research activities in each discipline. As such actions are by definition left to the discretion of the academic staff, EEC is unable to make fair judgements. However, interviews with alumni and with representatives of potential employers revealed the state and level of current research is taken significantly into account.

- whether the involvement of students and other stakeholders is secured in the revision of the programmes

There are affirmative actions in this direction.

*Please decide in respect to the specific evaluation area (&4.9):*

	Tick
<b>Worthy of merit</b>	
<b>Positive evaluation</b>	X
<b>Partially positive evaluation</b>	
<b>Negative evaluation</b>	

*Justify your rating (optional):*

#### 4.10 Periodic external evaluation

Please comment on:

- the procedure already planned by the Institution in order to deal with the observations of the Institutional External evaluation

EEC got the positive impression that TEI-A is willing to implement the procedure with specific and targeted actions.

- how the anticipated implementation of plans by Departments / Faculties is monitored in response to any comments included in their external evaluation and in the accreditation of their programmes

EEC was assured that all external evaluations of Departments were seriously taken into account and changes recommended were largely adopted.

Please decide in respect to the specific evaluation area (&4.10):

	Tick
<b>Worthy of merit</b>	X
<b>Positive evaluation</b>	
<b>Partially positive evaluation</b>	
<b>Negative evaluation</b>	

Justify your rating (optional):

TEI-A is a Greek academic institution that takes seriously and endorses continuous quality assessment.

#### 4.11 Internal System of Quality Assurance – Conclusions and recommendations

Please complete the following sections regarding the **internal system of quality assurance**:

- Underline specific positive points:*

At the general, Faculty and Department levels, the procedure is uninterrupted and takes place frequently. The results are implemented in the planning of future actions.

- Underline specific negative points:*

In the assessment groups only members of the teaching staff do participate.

- Make your suggestions for further development of the positive points:*

There are still opportunities to go beyond the standards set up by the framework of HQAA and actively seek for further actions.

- Make your suggestions on needed steps for improvement:*

EEC recommends that students and non-academic staff be included in the evaluation assessment system. A central authority that monitors the professional development of alumni would be very helpful.

## **5 OPERATION OF THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATION OF THE INSTITUTION**

### **5.1 Central Administration Services of the Institution**

Please comment on:

- The operation of the central administration services of the Institution in regard to the:

Special Account for Research Funds (SARF)

The impression is that this fund functions appropriately. Nevertheless, the implementation of the liaison office would further improve this function.

Financial services

Adequate.

Supplies department

Adequate.

Technical services

Adequate.

IT services

Adequate.

Student support services

Adequate.

Employment and Career Centre (ECC)

Activity restricted to the placement of students in practicum/internships

Public/ International relations department

Adequate.

Foreign language services

Not existing as a separate unit. Establishment of a centre of foreign languages is recommended.

Social and cultural activities

Limited to sport events, festivities and humanitarian acts. There is strong need of more proactive presentation of education and scientific work produced in the Institution in the form of 'open-day' events.

Halls of residence and refectory services

There are no halls of residence. The refectory services are of excellent quality.

Institution's library

Excellent. The use of e-books is strongly recommended.

<i>Please decide in respect to the specific evaluation area (&amp;5.1):</i>	Tick
<b>Worthy of merit</b>	
<b>Positive evaluation</b>	X
<b>Partially positive evaluation</b>	
<b>Negative evaluation</b>	

*Justify your rating (optional):*

**5.2 Operation of the Central Administration of the Institution – Conclusions and recommendations**

*Please complete the following sections regarding the **operation of the Institution’s central administration** :*

- *Underline specific positive points:*  
TEI-A follows the guidelines of Good Administration Practice with an emphasis on obtaining official accreditation and enhancing the good reputation of the Institution in society.
- *Underline specific negative points:*  
A general negative trait of almost all Greek HEI is that the administration of the students and the exams is not centrally organized at the institutional level (notwithstanding the fact that at the level of data processing such IT-routines are well implemented). This fact allows a non-intended variation in the quality of the treatment of the student demands in each separate academic unit, and burdens also the staff with not very well defined fields of duty.
- *Make your suggestions for further development of the positive points:*  
The TEI-A should initiate a debate about the establishment and implementation of a formal Good Administration Practice protocol for the Greek HEI.
- *Make your suggestions on needed steps for improvement:*
  1. Creation of a central office for the management of the acquisition of research funding
  2. Creation of a central office for the management of the enrolment of the students and the administration of the exams.
  3. Creation of a central office to capitalize on the Institute’s properties (halls, amphitheatres and real estates).
  4. Centralization of the efforts to attract external sponsors
  5. Creation of central alumni managerial office
  6. Creation of a publishing centre

## 6 CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

*In connection with the*

- general operation of the Institution
- development of the Institution to this date and its present situation
- Institution's readiness and capability to change/improve
- Internal system of Quality Assurance of the Institution

*please complete the following sections:*

- *Underline specific positive points:*

The TEI-A is an Institution that is leading in the sector of Higher Technological Education in Greece. The impression the EEC had, after visiting the premises and discussing with the academic and non-academic staff, and with the students, was of an authentic and self-confident institution that aspires to become competitive with academic universities and technical universities.

Between the central academic administration, the academic faculty administrations, the students and the non-academic staff exists a synergistic, harmonious and very good climate of co-operation and mutual understanding that is capable to withstand and to overcome problems and situations that arise from the current political, economic and political situation in Greece.

The Institution strives continuously at improving study programmes, teaching methods, research output and co-operation with industry and market by implementing quality assessment procedures, frequent revision of the study programmes, participating in international academic exchange programmes, and the co-operation with related Institutions abroad.

This strong will for excellence is reflected also in the desire to implement more MA/MSc programmes and to obtain the right to establish doctoral study programmes and to award doctoral degrees. Despite this strong wish for academic excellence the Institution does not neglect, however, its equally important task of providing good employment perspectives for its student in the industrial, public health and care, arts and design and business administration sector.

A unique feature of the TEI-A is the department of artefact conservation that can be regarded as an independent research and development unit of high-end technology and scientific knowledge in this field.

The TEI-A provides for its employees and students a very good environment that endorses their academic interests and enables good teaching and study conditions.

- *Underline specific negative points:*

A major obstacle in the full unfolding of the research and teaching potential of the TEI-A is the fact that its premises, especially the space for teaching and laboratory practice is limited and not sufficient for the optimal teaching of the students. This situation is worsened by the fact that the admission procedure and the number of the students that are admitted to the Institution are dictated by the Greek Ministry of Education, on the decisions of which the Institution has a very limited to non-existent influence.

Apart from such external obstacles, the removal of which partially lies beyond the power of the Institution itself, the EEC has spotted several points in the internal organization of the Institution that bear still a great potential of further optimization.

A point that has still a great potential of optimization is the management and support of the research fund acquisition procedures. At the time being there is

no central office or department of the central administration that focuses on supporting and consulting grant applicants through the application process.

Also missing are a facility, either in the form of an administration department or of a self-governed corporation that will help to exploit financially the Institution premises, e.g. by renting them for the organisation of conferences etc., as well as a facility that will act as a kind of interface between the various departments and potential research or application partners from the non-academic sector.

At the academic level the fixation on the demand of the right to award a PhD degree without specification of the importance of such a degree for the enhancement of the employability of the students, or the better positioning of the Institution in the research field, constitutes the major reason for the stalemate of the debate.

In an analogous manner the fixation on a general four-year curriculum for the undergraduate programmes that is in partly opposition to the directives of the so called “Bologna process” without making explicit the specific reasons for this deviation, appears as arbitrary.

- *Make your suggestions for further development of the positive points:*

The unique position of the TEI-A in the Greek academic landscape and its eminent contribution to the education of scientifically and practically well-skilled professional specialists who are nevertheless capable of pursuing careers also in “classical” basic research academic fields could be enhanced by increasing the visibility of this fundamental aspect of the Institution both locally and nation wide by organizing “open day” events, during which the public in general and especially students of the secondary education would have the opportunity to become acquainted with the subjects and the methods that are taught at the Institution.

- *Make your suggestions on needed steps for improvement:*

The problem of limited space availability could be addressed in a short term by a more efficient use of the available space, by reducing, for example, the number of conference and e-conference rooms to the absolute minimum required. In the medium and the long term the construction of larger lecture halls as well as the relocation and concentration of related departments is inevitable. The EEC has noted that the administration has undergone serious efforts to address this problem that will be realized in the near future.

Regarding the structure of the curricula, the EEC understands the specific problems that urge the implementation of four-year undergraduate curricula instead of the three-year curricula that are common in the rest of the EU and as well as in other countries. However, in order to increase the transparency and compatibility of the curricula, the EEC encourages the TEI-A to consider the introduction of a one-year basic general study programme that will enable the students to overcome the gap between the secondary education knowledge level and the level required by the Institution’s demanding study programmes and that will be followed by the specific subject centred study programmes that could then have the common three-year structure, which will render them commensurable and compatible with the international standard.

The nagging problem of underfunding, which will be aggravated in the next future can be partially counterbalanced by encouraging the private sector to sponsor the Institution.

### 6.1 Final decision of the EEC

<i>Please decide in respect to the overall Institutional evaluation:</i>	Tick
<b>Worthy of merit</b>	X
<b>Positive evaluation</b>	
<b>Partially positive evaluation</b>	
<b>Negative evaluation</b>	

*Justify your rating (optional):*

The EEC has reached the conclusion that TEI-A is operating at a level of excellence that transcends expectations, with great enthusiasm and commitment. However, there are specific points of criticism that have been specifically addressed in this report. The EEC believes that by considering our suggestions TEI-A has an opportunity to set a national or even European standard in the field of higher technological education.

**The Members of the External Evaluation Committee****Name and Surname****Signature**

1. \_\_\_\_\_  
—
2. \_\_\_\_\_  
—
3. \_\_\_\_\_  
—
4. \_\_\_\_\_  
—
5. \_\_\_\_\_  
—