



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:

Law

Institution: Democritus University of Thrace

Date: 27 June 2020

Report of the Panel appointed by the HAHE to undertake the review of the Undergraduate Study Programme of **Law** of the **Democritus University of Thrace** 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	6
Part B: Compliance with the Principles	7
Principle 1: Academic Unit Policy for Quality Assurance.....	7
Principle 2: Design and Approval of Programmes	10
Principle 3: Student- centred Learning, Teaching and Assessment.....	13
Principle 4: Student Admission, Progression, Recognition and Certification	16
Principle 5: Teaching Staff	19
Principle 6: Learning Resources and Student Support	22
Principle 7: Information Management	25
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.....	32
Part C: Conclusions	34
I. Features of Good Practice	34
II. Areas of Weakness	34
III. Recommendations for Follow-up Actions	35
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 **Law** of the **Democritus University of Thrace** comprised the following three members, drawn from the HAHE Register, in accordance with Laws 4009/2011 & 4653/2020:

1. **Dr. Stathis Banakas (Chair)**, Reader in Law, University of East Anglia, England
2. **Dr. Thomas Skouteris**, Associate Professor, Chair of the Law Department, The American University in Cairo
3. **Dr. Nikitas Hatzimihail**, Associate Professor, University of Cyprus

II. Review Procedure and Documentation

The External Evaluation and Accreditation Panel (EEAP) was constituted by HAHE a few weeks before the review process was scheduled. The EEAP was provided with a dossier in advance of the process, which included the Accreditation Proposal and addressed each of the 10 principles of accreditation. The Proposal was useful but the EEAP found that more detailed information was needed with regard to certain aspects of the review. As a consequence, additional information was provided by the Unit after the online meetings took place. There was no on-site visit due to the COVID-19 contingency. The EEAP conducted instead online interviews via Zoom with the authorities of DUTH, MODIP and OMEA, members of Law Teaching Staff, students and external stakeholders such as Bar association officers and representatives of Trade and Industry, including the Director of the legal department of the National Bank of Greece. The online interviews run quite smoothly over the period of two full working days. Conversations were collegial and were very useful, although it is to be regretted that a visit on location and meetings in person were not possible.

III. Study Programme Profile

The Faculty of Law was a founding Unit of Democritus University of Thrace. It was created in 1974 and operated for the first time in AY 1974-1975. Since 2002 the Faculty was relocated to its current premises in the campus of Democritus University of Thrace, which is located in the outskirts of the city of Komotini. The Faculty offers a four-year undergraduate Program in Law, postgraduate degrees (LLM) in Law, joint postgraduate degrees in cooperation with other academic institutions, and doctoral degrees. The Faculty of Law admits roughly 470 new students each year, the vast majority of which come from areas throughout Greece and Cyprus and not from the local area. The Unit has a high turnover both of DUTH law students transferring into the other Greek law schools, as well as of incoming students via special admissions and transfers from abroad into the undergraduate program. Four years (eight semesters) is the minimum duration of the undergraduate program, with students having significant liberty to structure their own schedule of courses and most students graduating after nine or more semesters of study. The Teaching Staff consists of roughly 62 Faculty. According to the data provided by the Law Faculty, the student-to-Faculty ratio is currently at 62:1, which is unfavorable when compared to the national average (38:1) as provided by HAHE.

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 Unit has established a Quality Assurance Policy Statement (QAPS) for its undergraduate Program. The QAPS is available on the Unit's website and it is otherwise sufficiently communicated to students, Faculty, social partners and the professional community. The Unit is supported by active MODIP and OMEA Committees which, according to the data provided

by the Unit, hold regular meetings, are duly constituted, and their membership is representative of the University (in the case of MODIP) and the Unit (in the case of OMEA) Faculty composition. Continuous improvement appears to be a central preoccupation of MODIP, OMEA and the Unit’s administration. Based on the data received, there is evidence that the process of quality assurance assessment and control occurs with sufficient regularity, good faith, and in a constructive manner.

With regard to the content of the QAPS, the EEAP finds that while the QAPS identifies useful and valid institutional goals, the QAPS might benefit from a more comprehensive and robust orientation. The EEAP does not suggest that there is no continuous process of improvement at the Unit; nor that the Unit’s institutional action is not goal-driven. What the EEAP does suggest though is that the culture and practice of setting specific, measurable, achievable, relevant and timely goals across the entire spectrum of the Unit’s activities deserves to become strengthened, more decisive, and reflective of a broader range of institutional priorities.

The list of institutional/strategic goals provided by the Unit includes five goals: a) better connectivity of the institution with Alumni; b) Reform of the Study Program; c) development of cooperation agreements with foreign institutions; d) increased Faculty mobility. It is not for this EEAP to decide whether a certain goal not mentioned in this list ought to be more pressing, urgent, or significant than those listed. The EEAP is neither competent nor mandated to assess actual institutional priorities. The EEAP notes however that several important issues are not included in the list. This EEAP could imagine potential future goals related to, e.g. increasing the percentage of Faculty publications per annum; the gender balance in Faculty composition; better integration for incoming students; the number of students actively involved in student-oriented learning activities; the number of students involved in practical training; the amount of student’s using library resources; the amount of Faculty publishing in peer-review journals; the amount of Faculty participating in mobility programs; the number of courses using e-class; the number of courses with published syllabi; the number of students participating in practical training programs; the improvement of IT infrastructure; the number of students participating in Faculty evaluations; and so on.

Panel Judgement

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

Panel Recommendations

- The Quality Assurance Policy Statement, and the list of strategic goals of the Unit, are expanded to include a broader range of issues, spanning the 10 Principles of accreditation;
- The range of Indicators, values, and actions connected to the strategic goals are amplified to help monitor the said goals more effectively;

- The culture of goal-setting becomes further embedded on all levels of institutional practice.

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

With regard to the Program of Studies, the EEAP perceives its role as limited to ensuring that the Unit develops a Program of Study based on well-defined procedures; that the Program of Studies compares favorably with appropriate and universally accepted standards; that the structure of the Program of Studies is rational and clearly articulated; that there is a procedure for periodic revision; and that the Program of Studies is properly communicated to the various stakeholders. Submitting substantive recommendations for the reform of the Program of Studies is therefore not part of its role.

The EEAP finds that the Unit's Program of Studies is properly published and disseminated to the various stakeholders; and that the Student Guide is complete, concise and appropriate. The EEAP further finds that the Program of Studies has been designed, developed and constructed on the basis of a clear and comprehensive approach that was clearly outlined to the EEAP by the Unit administration and members of the Curriculum Committee. The EEAP finds that the Program of Studies reflects, represents, and consistently serves this approach. Further, the Program of Studies meets peer review standards and compares favorably to contemporary standards in Greece and abroad. The EEAP has noticed certain specific aspects

in the structure of the Program of Studies that, in the opinion of the EEAP, could merit further attention and reconsideration. These include, for example, the offering of Public International Law in Semester 1; Collective Labor Law in Semester 2; Employment Law in Semester 4; an unusually large course (Introduction to Law and the Science of Law) in Semester 1; and so forth.

The EEAP, however, wishes to draw the Unit's attention to a potentially problematic aspect of the Program of Studies, namely the discrepancy between course credits («διδασκτικές μονάδες») on the one hand, and course contribution to the degree («συντελεστής») on the other. The EEAP finds it unusual that courses so disparate in terms of credit hours (such as Public International Law (8 credits); Introduction to Law and the Science of Law (15 credits); or Criminal Law I (7 credits), all contribute to the final degree by the same factor of 2 ("συντελεστής 2"). The EEAP notes with gratitude the explanatory note provided by the School Dean on 25 June 2020 explaining the distinctiveness of the two categories, i.e. credits and degree factor, and clarifying that the allocation of degree factors is regulated by Greek law. This being the case, the EEAP finds it unusual that 15-, 8-, 7-, or 6-credit courses are equally factored in the final degree.

The EEAP finds that a procedure for the revision of the curriculum of the Program of Studies has been put in place. Based on the data provided by the Unit, the Unit has instituted a Curriculum Committee that consists of Faculty members representative of the 5 main subdivisions of the Unit (Sections). The Curriculum Committee, according to the personal statements of the members of the Committee, does meet regularly. The EEAP has not, however, been provided with further data of the work of the curriculum committee (agendas or meetings, minutes of meetings, annual report of activities and so on). The revision process of the Program of Studies does not appear to formally take into account the views of students, social partners, and other stakeholders. Members of the Curriculum Committee have reported that the views of students are in fact taken into account through the regular channels of communication between students and Faculty. The students have corroborated this assertion during interviews. While the EEAP finds that there is evidence of substantive and meaningful feedback received by students, a certain formalization and routinization of this exchange would increase the participation of students in curriculum revision.

Panel Judgement

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

Panel Recommendations

- The Unit maintains a clear and transparent record of the work (agendas, summary minutes, annual report) of the Curriculum Committee.
- The Unit increases the level of participation of students, social partners, and the professional community in the revision of the curriculum. This could take the form of an anonymous

questionnaire, the results of which are kept on file and discussed by the Curriculum Committee; or any other technique chosen by the Unit.

- The Unit finds ways to increase Faculty participation in the revision of the curriculum. This could take the form an anonymous questionnaire, the results of which are kept on file and discussed by the Curriculum Committee; or any other technique chosen by the Unit.
- The Unit revisits the discrepancy between course credits and degree factor, possibly by breaking down large courses (courses above 8 credits) to smaller courses.

Principle 3: Student- centred Learning, Teaching and Assessment

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

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

The student-centred learning and teaching process

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

In addition :

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

Study Programme Compliance

Student-centered learning typically refers to forms of instruction that provide students with opportunities to lead learning activities, participate more actively in discussions, design their own learning projects, explore topics that interest them, and generally contribute to the design of their own course of study.

At first sight, the Program of Studies and the teaching practices of the Unit do not fully comply with this goal. Teaching at the Law Faculty habitually takes place in large auditoria, with limited possibility of interaction with the populous student body. The modes of assessment

(exams) are habitually limited to proctored exams (and as opposed to more student-centered forms of assessment, such as research papers). In addition, limited library resources (see relevant section) curtail the possibility of a systematic practice of student learning based on individual research.

The EEAP finds, however, that the above practice is mostly attributable to the prohibitive student-to-Faculty ratio (62:1, per the data received) of the Unit and not to institutional resistance. The student-to-Faculty ratio renders the mainstreaming of student-centered practices (e.g. small-group seminars as opposed to lecturing to 400 students; student research papers or oral exams as opposed to proctored exams; and so on) materially impossible. On the contrary, the EEAP finds that the Unit as a whole, the Sections, and individual Faculty members undertake a lot of activities that foster student-centered learning, even if on a voluntary basis for students, and even if this practice is not mandatory for all students.

The bottom line is that students who are interested in student-centered learning are afforded the possibility to do so. While it is not ideal that such activities are not mandatory for all students; and while the institution should strive to mainstream student-centered learning; it is noted that the large majority of students who have the interest to become engaged have access and opportunity to do so. Such activities include the nine law clinics (εργαστήρια); moot court competitions; oral exams and research papers upon request; small group seminars in specific courses when Faculty resources permit; and so on. The above evidence militates in favor of the view that, generally, students are seen as active partners in the learning process.

Student satisfaction surveys are regularly conducted, and there is evidence that student feedback leads to changes in teaching practices. There is a formal procedure for student appeals, which is defined by institutional rules. The above conclusions are strongly corroborated by the interviews conducted with Alumni, members of the professional community, and social partners. The general and overwhelming view was that the Unit provided active students with realistic and productive opportunities to engage with student-centered learning, leading to graduates who are valued by the market equally, or even in some cases higher, than graduates of other Law Faculties in Greece.

Panel Judgement

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

Panel Recommendations

- The Unit collects data concerning the number of students involved in student-centered learning activities (e.g. law clinics (εργαστήρια), moot courts, etc.)

- The Unit adds a new institutional goal that sets a measurable target (e.g. 40%) regarding the number of students involved actively in projects of student-centered learning (clinics, moots, other).

Principle 4: Student Admission, Progression, Recognition and Certification

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

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

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

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

Study Programme Compliance

The Unit has developed and published regulations covering the main aspects and phases of studies (admission, progression, recognition, and certification).

The Unit does not provide a comprehensive process for the smooth integration of newly admitted students. Scarcity of financial and human resources may be part of the problem. The EEAP, however, understands that such processes are underdeveloped across most Greek academic institutions. A change of culture must begin by recognizing the significance, and the dividends, of ensuring that new students are fully and smoothly integrated in the academic community. The Unit does provide new students with a brief document containing formal information about the institution, courses, the structure of the semesters and exams, and so forth. This is however barely sufficient to ensure and guarantee that the transition to academic life takes place smoothly. While it is not part of the role of the EEAP to decide the appropriate strategies for the Unit to achieve this goal, the EEAP finds that working in this direction could be a useful idea and the study of good practices in other institutions outside Greece could provide a useful starting point.

The EEAP notes that encouragement and further development of student mobility are already listed as strategic goals. The number of students visiting other institutions is currently small when compared to other equal sized institutions in Europe. It is the opinion of the EEAP, however, that the Unit does explore and take advantage of available opportunities, encourages students to participate, and actively searches for further mobility opportunities.

The EEAP finds that the ECTS system has been applied across the curriculum. It is to be mentioned that the Unit was decisive and efficient in the transition to the ECTS system and can boast of a modern undergraduate program of study. While this decisiveness was productive on some level, it might also be opportune that during the next few years the Unit

takes a fresh look at ECTS allocation and makes necessary adjustments to produce more consistency.

The Diploma Supplement appears to be issued without request to all graduates, in full compliance with the relevant rules and regulations. The graduation oath is published and sensitive to cultural and religious diversity.

The Unit does not offer a mandatory training program for students. This however is not uncommon to Faculties of Law, Social Sciences, or Humanities in Greece. The University has created an Office of Practical Training for Students (<http://praktiki.duth.gr/>) which, according to the materials received appears to be offering to interested students a range of resources in the direction of identifying suitable practical training opportunities. While the EEAP has not been able to corroborate the extent to which this Office is used by students and/or has been successful in its mandate, the EEAP lauds this effort and encourages the University to devote further resources to assist students in this direction. Cooperation with the local Bar Associations and other regional authorities would also help in this regard. The Unit could also conceivably rely on its geographically very broad network of supporting alumni.

A word needs to be added with regard to the numerous moot court activities offered by different Sections of the Unit. While, traditionally, moot courts only benefit a small number of interested students, it is an ideal way of exposing the said students to the vicissitudes of professional practice in the controlled and guided environment of the classroom. The EEAP finds that there is a conscious effort to spill over the effects of moot participation even to students not participating in international competitions, but the Unit could consider extending its moot activities – for example, intramural competitions – to cover broader groups of students.

The organization of events by the Unit itself, or in conjunction with the School of the Judiciary, the local Bar, or even student organizations is also used as an educational opportunity benefiting broader groups of students: even though it cannot operate as a – limited – substitute to mobility, such exposure to diverse perspectives and advanced discussions of subjects and fields certainly constitutes an experience for participating students and motivates them in considering specialization and research. The Unit would benefit in this regard by pursuing more international events, as well as more regular ones. The regular holding of the Greek legal historians' meeting in Komotini is a good example.

Panel Judgement

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

Panel Recommendations

- The Unit sets a new strategic goal to calibrate ECTS allocation before the next evaluation.
- The Unit intensifies its efforts to assist students to acquire practical experience.
- The Unit retains student mobility as a long-term goal and intensifies efforts to increase the percentage of in-coming and out-going students through student mobility programs.
- The Unit explores cost-effective ways of fostering integration of incoming students.

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

On the whole, the Teaching Staff of the Unit are academically well-qualified for their respective positions and many of them could have obtained respective or superior positions in internationally acknowledged institutions. Specialization in their respective object of study is often linked to a broader understanding of law and the needs of legal practice. The organization of the Unit into five Sectors fosters academic synergies within the basic areas of law and the fact that legal history or legal theory are joined with doctrinal subjects (and do not constitute a separate sector) seems to foster synergies in that regard as well.

Opportunities for professional development and mobility are a matter of concern. Given the data we possess for 2015-2018, faculty mobility is extremely limited, if not non-existent. Whereas this must be partly ascribed to the unavailability of funds, the fact remains that the Teaching Staff are not beneficiaries of appropriate professional development opportunities. Sabbatical or other leaves of absence are also statistically low compared to similar institutions in Europe or globally. It is not within the mandate of the EEAP to recommend ways to improve the above situation. The EEAP must nevertheless register this fact and strongly note that the well-being, morale, productivity, innovation, and overall work-satisfaction of Teaching Staff is closely connected to the availability of resources for professional development. Implementation of technological and teaching innovations would also benefit from strategically planned mobility.

The EEAP notes the existence of the Office for Teaching Support, provided centrally by the University. The EEAP has not been able to corroborate the extent to which the said office has been utilized by Faculty and/or has been able to fulfil its mandate. Whereas such an Office could

provide useful remedial support to new Faculty, it does not adequately resolve the issue of professional development.

Based on the data received, the Unit appears to have a very unfavorable student-to-faculty ratio (62:1). This is nearly double the national average (38:1, per HAHE). In the years to come, some 25 or so members of the Faculty are further expected to retire. According to the data received in the dossier, the average teaching load of Faculty members is just over 7 hours per week. On the face of it, the teaching load is consonant with international practices for undergraduate university teaching. This being said, in the course of the visit, and during interviews with Faculty and University administration, it has become apparent to the EEAP that this number under-represents the actual amount of teaching (especially when taking into account post-graduate teaching, law clinics, seminars, moot courts, and the like). The EEAP was not provided with a full list of teaching loads for the past years.

During the visit and interviews with Faculty, University administrators, and students, it has become plain that many of the Teaching Staff teach beyond the regular call of duty. In some cases, Faculty teach as many as 14 hours per week. On most occasions this appears to be done on a voluntary basis and/or out of a sense of responsibility. The EEAP could not fail to notice a strong sense of commitment to the Unit by the Teaching Staff. This conclusion is strongly corroborated by students and alumni. The Unit is also making use of existing legislation and funding opportunities to attract Adjunct Faculty, and in order to remedy the low numbers of permanent Faculty. The EEAP feels compelled to register the current situation as both laudable and problematic. Laudable, because the sense of commitment of the Teaching Staff single-handedly ensures that the Unit retains a high quality of education on the face of dramatically insufficient human resources. Problematic, because this is an irrational model for the sustainable existence and growth of an academic institution. This model fails to compensate teaching staff for their work; poses risks to their well-being; it may leave certain Faculty vulnerable to being over-worked; and it comes at the cost of the research and professional development (e.g. promotion and tenure) of all Faculty. It also does not help international recognition of the Unit and thus does not serve its students and graduates.

The Teaching Staff is regularly evaluated by students through surveys. The EEAP has received the data. The results are overall favorable. While the response rate by students is small (below 20%) the EEAP found that the Unit exerts efforts to encourage students to participate more broadly: the percentage has markedly increased, in difficult conditions. There is also evidence that the results of student surveys are put in good use, even if mostly on the level of Sectors. The EEAP finds that the Unit might wish to consider further techniques of evaluation of teaching staff, such as peer-review practices which are being extensively used across European and other institutions of higher education. This is consonant with good practices in Europe and globally.

The Unit does not have a defined research strategy focusing on a specific scientific area. This is actually good practice in most academic institutions and, therefore, the absence of a defined research strategy of the Unit as a whole is not problematic.

Panel Judgement

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

Panel Recommendations

- The Unit is in dire need of new Faculty members in the direction of aligning the student- to-Faculty ratio to the national average of 38:1.
- The Unit establishes and enforces a cap of teaching hours per week, to be applied to all Faculty, and to include all teaching activities (including post-graduate teaching).
- The Unit collects and retains data itemizing in a clear and transparent manner the actual teaching loads of all Faculty.

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 EEAP has been unable to visit the facilities in person. It nevertheless that believe it has obtained an accurate impression of the facilities and living spaces for faculty and students, thanks to interviews, discussions, common experience, and the material provided to it.

The seat of the Unit is in a new building that seems to serve very well its present needs and makes its University proud. What should be a reason for even further pride, especially by Unit members, is that the building is well maintained. It cannot be stressed how important this is, both for purposes of health and safety and also for the sense of academic purpose it conveys on its users. Classrooms appear to be adequate in number and in capacity for the present needs of the Unit. The partnership with the Judiciary School appears beneficial for the Unit in this regard as well. The EEAP was unable to truly evaluate the adequacy of office and administrative space, which is important in order to foster more effective interaction between faculty and students (and administration and students, respectively), but no complaints were registered in this regard.

The EEAP has been unable to form an opinion as to the quality of student housing: this should include both university dormitories, such as they exist and private accommodations available for rent. The same holds as to student meals facilities. The EEAP has been assured that students enjoy free transportation between city and campus, with buses available regularly and frequently.

The EEAP understands that more needs to be done in terms of building infrastructure (lighting, road connections etc.) surrounding the building.

A serious problem is registered with regard to library and research facilities. The present situation appears to create problems of adequate access to the library, which require significant improvements in building and material infrastructure. It would also appear to have reduced the emotional connection of undergraduate law students with their library. The EEAP understands that a new Library building is being constructed/planned. The EEAP cannot stress seriously enough how necessary adequate library facilities are. The EEAP notes that the Unit has announced significant improvements (the construction of a new building) during the next years.

The EEAP notes that the Unit's library is woefully underfunded and has been so for the past several years. This has certainly severely impacted its print collections, with the international coverage having been significantly reduced. The Unit's digital collections cover the basic needs (subscriptions to Hein online, Beck and Kluwer arbitration have been noted, as well as the fact that the Unit has obtained free of charge access to the Greek case law databases – NOMOS and Isocrates) but also leave much to be desired. National coverage is satisfactory and international coverage is problematic. The EEAP would encourage the University and the Unit to explore further synergies and participation in academic libraries ventures: DUTH must be at the forefront of such efforts, not just a participant. Having stated this, the EEAP firmly believes that significant and persistent financial and administrative support of the Library is necessary and constitutes the single largest problem for the Unit.

The COVID-19 pandemic led the University to take most of its classroom activity online. The Unit appears to have effectively managed this transition to online learning, with the use of asynchronous and synchronous means and a modestly increased participation of students compared to classroom lessons. The EEAP believes that the Unit would benefit from further support of IT infrastructure in this regard.

Support of students involves both ensuring access to teaching and learning and facilitating the whole student experience. The EEAP finds that a lot of work has been done in both regards by the University and the Unit. As to the latter, the EEAP notes especially the creation of an Office of Student Ombudsman and the enhancement of a Consultation and Accessibility Structure, which aims to provide professional-quality psychological support to students concerning academic and learning difficulties and social integration, as well as the function of a Career Office. International students are supported by an Erasmus office. As to the former, the EEAP was able to hear from a group of active students that was relative diverse, in the sense of including at least one mature student and working mother as well as students from different years of study. According to our discussions, the Unit appears to strive in order to accommodate the special needs of groups of students, such as students with visibility problems, by helping them obtain appropriate material. It must be noted however that all evidence obtained by the EEAP as to support of blind, deaf and mobility-impaired students was anecdotal. The EEAP would recommend that a faculty member be appointed as coordinator for students with special needs, for the Unit, in order to ensure a coherent policy can be widely communicated and efficiently implemented at Unit level.

Similar to faculty members, the Unit’s administrative staff appear to be engaged in a herculean task in order to make it all work. The University must be encouraged to provide opportunities for further professional development and mobility of staff, in order to strengthen job satisfaction and to encourage innovation and a more open spirit, which takes into account the latest ideas in student welfare and teaching/research support.

Panel Judgement

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

Panel Recommendations

- The Unit receives, and actively pursues, adequate funding to cover teaching and learning needs.
- The Unit’s library collection must be significantly and durably expanded; building infrastructure must be significantly improved with regard to the library; further, lasting synergies should be explored with other Greek academic libraries.
- The Unit creates a comprehensive, communicable policy for students with special needs and appointment at Unit level of a faculty coordinator for such students.
- The Unit encourages administrative staff to further their academic and professional qualifications by fostering their development and mobility.

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

Democritus University, like all Greek Universities is a State-run (Public) Higher Education Institution. There is centralized control of Staff appointments and student admissions by the Ministry of Education. Greek State Universities have little control over their mission and their identity, as these are defined in the legislation and delegated legislative acts and administrative acts of the Minister of Education. In terms of external Information management, the Institution can only play a secondary role in assembling primary data on Staff, students and more generally activates, both internal and extra-mural. Having only limited independence in terms of controlling the curriculum, teaching and other activities, the University cannot market itself in competition with other Institutions, and cannot engage in any form of recruitment of students and Staff, both of these matters being in the hands of the Ministry of Education. In the case of academic staff, the University has independence in the actual appointment process, subject to a candidate's recourse to Administrative justice and final control of appointments by the Council of State. However, the release of posts requires approval by the Ministry, and the advertisement of posts is strictly official in the Journal of Government, and is not in the hands of the Institution, which cannot advertise Staff positions in a competitive manner with regard to other institutions.

As far as students are concerned, the metalized system of Higher education entry exams is based on an effective classification of different Institutions in a pecking order, in which the Unit, being the most recent of the only three University law Schools in the country, comes officially third. This means that rarely is student choice affected by information about the Institution and the quality of its programmed, Staff or activities, and candidates tend to choose their preferred place of study mostly on a geographical basis. In Greece the practice of University prospectuses being used in the market for student information in order to attract the best candidates does not exist. Officially, all three law Schools in the country are given equal ranking. This absence of real relevance in respect of quality of recruited Staff and students of good information management, deprives this activity of any concrete significant external impact and, therefore, does not incentivize the Institution to dedicate resources in external information management. All this applies mainly to undergraduate studies; in the area of post graduate study, Greek institutions have more freedom in advertising postgraduate degree programs and marketing for recruitment of students, and, to a certain extent Staff who are paid extra for postgraduate work, but this is outside the scope of this accreditation report concerned only with undergraduate programs.

The Institutional and Departmental websites are overall of good quality, comparable to that of websites of well-established foreign Institutions. Information on specific qualitative data such as key performance indicators, student population profile, student progression, success and drop- out rates, student satisfaction with their programs, availability of learning resources and student support or career paths of graduates, does not seem to be collected and published all in one single source, but is available from the Administrative offices of the Institution and detailed reports to the HAHE are made annually. Internally, the Institution has put in place an elaborate system of information management, analysis, evaluation, as well internal dissemination.

The School makes use of the extensive information applications available through the University Computer Service. It is a series of Information Systems, which are used by both students and Staff, serving the collection and elaboration of both Institutional and Departmental information. These applications ensure the necessary confidentiality during the use of the information, but also during the extraction and processing of the information, so that Data Protection rules are not compromised.

Through the Information System of the University, data which are related to the evaluation of the educational system by the students (complete electronic questionnaires) are stored. The Integral Information System draws data from the Information Technology Secretariat of the Electronic Secretariat (ClassWeb-Cardisoft) of the Law Department, in which the Study Programs (Graduate and Postgraduate) of the Law Department, information about students, and student marks are registered.

The School collects for each academic year quantitative data concerning the profile of the student population, the performance of students, the percentages of completion of their studies, from the system of the Electronic Secretariat, the information system of Quality Assurance of the University, as well as from the National Information Platform of the Ministry of Education. From the Information Center of the University, the School also collects collective data on the ratings in the evaluations made by the students. These data are published in the

Internal Report of the Law Department, which is submitted on an annual basis to the University and kept in departmental files. The Annual Internal Report includes, in the form of Tables, centralized data on study programs, educational and research skills, and other services offered in each academic year, and it is distributed to all Academic Staff, approved by the General Faculty meeting of the Department and posted on the Institutional website.

Academic Staff are given access to the results of the evaluation of the courses that include: the number of students who participated in the evaluation of the course, the course evaluation grade (with a maximum score of 5), the median value and formal deviation of each answer, the percentage of answers (on a five-point scale) of students in all questions and student comments. Access of teaching staff to the results of the evaluation is allowed after the registration of the marks in the mark registers. Presumably, student evaluations are done before the publication of the marks, but this is not clear from the information supplied by the Institution.

Democritus University uses its own Integrated Information System, comprising five sub-systems, the sub-system of electronic questionnaires, the sub-system of census data on teaching staff and courses taught, the sub-system of Reports by Departments, the sub-system of Reports by the University Services and the sub-system of Institutional Reports. For the smooth operation of the subsystems, the University computer service draws data from the ClassWeb-Cardisoft Information System of the Electronic Secretariat. The data obtained are on the Curriculum of the School, data of teaching staff, data of students and in the student declarations on the courses that they attend.

The extraction and analysis of information is done by certified users (members of academic staff and Section Directors). The analysis and use of the information is done at three levels: (a) at the individual level by each member of teaching staff regarding information in the modules that they teach; (b) at the level of Sections regarding all modules offered in the Semester; and (c) at the level of the Dean’s Executive committee, when necessary interventions are considered, for example on the Program Study or the Infrastructure of the School.

In our view, the system described above for Information Management is overall fully compliant and no major changes or improvements are necessary.

Panel Judgement

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

Panel Recommendations

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

According to the information supplied by the Unit, the basic source of information for both students and third parties (home and foreign Institutions, and cooperating institutions) is the bi-lingual (Greek-English) School website, offering continuous information on: School structures and personnel, Undergraduate, Postgraduate and Doctoral Studies, Announcements, Research Structures and Programs, and the Jean Monnet Chair.

The School website also allows student access to the following electronic services: Electronic Secretariat, academic Identity, non-synchronized virtual education, synchronized virtual education, Supply of Books-Textbooks, electronic Mail, digital storing location, Free processing, Greek electronic Textbooks and Aids. There are also a number of other ways by which students can be advised: Staff post student hours for students to visit them for academic advice and information. Students may also contact Staff by the academic email, which is provided on the School's website. The Departmental Sections also post on bulletin boards in printed form Announcements also issued on the School's website. Information on emergencies (change or postponement of a class due to a personal problem of the teacher, etc.) is posted on the electronic application e-class (Announcements) of each module with the responsibility of the teacher. The Department of Law publishes in Electronic and Standard Form the School's Academic Prospectus, which is updated regularly. A member of the Department's Secretariat is in charge of updating the School website after the relevant approval of the administration.

The view of the EEAP is that the above arrangements are satisfactory and fully compliant with the accreditation standards. The design and functionality of the webpage of the Law Department is very good, and compares well with International best practice examples.

Panel Judgement

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

Panel Recommendations

The Unit publishes information on graduate employment opportunities and options for Law Graduates, especially International (European) employment opportunities.

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 Unit follows the system of Quality Assurance of the DUTH approved in 2018. This system (Article 10 of the Regulation) describes and sets as a target the "Annual Internal Report of the Academic and Administrative Units of the Institution", which includes, in the form of tables, centralized data of programs of study, teaching and research, as well as other services offered by the academic and administrative units during one academic year". In the same article are addressed the way the material is collected by the information system, the period and the way it is carried out, but also the ways on which personnel and students take part in the evaluation exercise, the way and time-frame of collecting and processing the material, and time and place of completion of the annual evaluation. Every three academic years the General Assembly of the Faculty on the recommendation of the Dean appoints an Internal Evaluation Committee composed of a Chair and four members of academic staff. A separate committee on the Program of Study reviews the study program and presents any changes or additions, as a result of internal or external evaluation or individual proposals of members of academic staff, to the General Assembly for approval.

The Curriculum Committee, after meeting with the competent members of the relevant study receive proposals, introduces properly documented proposed amendments to the Study program, to the School's General Assembly. The main objectives of the Committee's work are: 1) To assure always the correct and logical distribution of modules in each semester; 2) To update the literature and the bibliography of modules and modernize the teaching; 3) Allocate teaching of modules according to educational and other leaves of absence of Staff, retirements and or departures; 4) Enrich the program with the recruitment of doctoral

assistants, according to the legal requirement that doctoral assistants are given opportunity to acquire teaching experience.

Electronic student evaluations of academic staff play an important role in the evaluation of the study program and its individual elements. Students are encouraged to submit an evaluation electronically, and the process has been simplified to allow quick submissions, even with a smartphone. However, the submission rate remains low, at around 18%, but this is no different from submission rates of student evaluations internationally remain low.

Panel Judgement

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

Panel Recommendations

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 Unit underwent external evaluation in 2014. The Report of the External Evaluation Committee was included in the dossier. The EEAP found that the Unit engaged deliberately and meaningfully with the 2014 Evaluation. Further, that the Unit has undertaken a broad range of initiatives to materialize the recommendations of the said report. The Unit Dean and the OMEA reported during interviews that the Unit has materialized at least 60% of the recommendations of the 2014. The EEAP finds that this assessment is fair and, if anything, errs on the side of under-representing the transformation that the Unit has undergone during the past quinquennium. The introduction of the ECTS system; the reform of the Program of Studies; the consolidation of the function of MODIP and OMEA in institutional life; the generalization of the practice of published course syllabi; the extensive use of e-class; the establishment of a range of remedial offices by the University; the offering of extra-curricular student-learning activities; actions with regard to a new library building and computer facilities; are few among many initiatives that clearly demonstrate a deliberate and active process of institutional improvement.

Keeping in mind externally conditioned structural limitations, from financial to human resources limitations, the EEAP finds that the Unit has benefited, and continues to benefit, from the HAHE accreditation process. The culture of internal quality assessment may however be further strengthened, especially by means of a) expanding the range of strategic goals of the institution and b) by making the work of the Curriculum Committee, OMEA and MODIP more central to institutional life. Further areas of improvement are included in the recommendations corresponding to principles 1-9 above and are summarized at the end of the report.

Panel Judgement

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

Panel Recommendations

PART C: CONCLUSIONS

I. Features of Good Practice

- Commitment to following the principles of HAHE policy and to improving the quality and services of the Study Program.
- Significant efforts to establish a student-centered learning environment.
- Curriculum is now characterized by global coverage of legal fields and combines rigor and flexibility.
- Understanding of the strengths and weaknesses of undergraduate law students and determination to overcome the arising difficulties.
- Harmonious relationship among administration, faculty, and students.
- Excellent cooperation between the School and MODIP.
- Willingness to draw from university-wide experience with quality control and best practices.
- Partnership with local stakeholders and society, as well as with other institutions of legal education (Judiciary School).
- Willingness to organize and build upon a very broad alumni network that can provide support for the School and its student.
- Public activities addressed to the regional, national and international level (conferences, seminars, summer schools, etc.).
- Remarkable use of law clinics (Εργαστήρια) in order to promote integrated learning and research skills.
- Significant use of mootings activities with spillover effects beyond students participating.
- Fostering of a sense of institutional pride among faculty and students.

II. Areas of Weakness

- Very high student-to- teacher ratio, which has a negative impact on learning procedures and outcomes and incurs high transaction costs on faculty and administration.
- Faculty members, though highly motivated, are often overworked and have limited options for professional development and mobility (sabbaticals, research visits, etc.).
- Library needs an overhaul in infrastructure and significant expansion of resources devoted to it.
- Work done in articulating, communicating and implementing policies on quality

assurance and student welfare, though significant, is not complete.

III. Recommendations for Follow-up Actions

- The Quality Assurance Policy Statement, and the list of strategic goals of the Unit, are expanded to include a broader range of issues, spanning the 10 Principles of accreditation.
- The range of Indicators, values, and actions connected to the strategic goals are amplified to help monitor the said goals more effectively.
- The culture of goal setting becomes further embedded on all levels of institutional practice.
- The Unit maintains a clear and transparent record of the work (agendas, summary minutes, annual report) of the Curriculum Committee.
- The Unit increases the level of participation of students, social partners, and the professional community in the revision of the curriculum in the form. This could take the form an anonymous questionnaire, the results of which are kept on file and discussed by the Curriculum Committee; or any other technique chosen by the Unit.
- The Unit finds ways to increase Faculty participation in the revision of the curriculum. This could take the form an anonymous questionnaire, the results of which are kept on file and discussed by the Curriculum Committee; or any other technique chosen by the Unit.
- The Unit revisits the discrepancy between course credits and degree factor, possibly by breaking down large courses (courses above 8 credits) to smaller courses.
- The Unit collects data concerning the number of students involved in student-centered learning activities (e.g. law clinics (εργαστήρια), moot courts, etc.).
- The Unit adds a new institutional goal that sets a measurable target (e.g. 40%) regarding the number of students involved actively in projects of student-centered learning (clinics, moots, other).
- The Unit sets a new strategic goal to calibrate ECTS allocation before the next evaluation.
- The Unit intensifies its efforts to assist students to acquire practical experience.
- The Unit retains student mobility as a long-term goal and intensifies efforts to increase the percentage of incoming and outgoing students through student mobility programs.
- The Unit explores cost-effective ways of fostering integration of incoming students.
- The Unit is in dire need of new Faculty members in the direction of aligning the student-to-Faculty ratio to the national average of 38:1.
- The Unit establishes and enforces a cap of teaching hours per week, to be applied to all Faculty, and to include all teaching activities (including post-graduate teaching).
- The Unit collects and retains data itemizing in a clear and transparent manner the actual

teaching loads of all Faculty.

- The Unit receives, and actively pursues, adequate funding to cover teaching and learning needs.
- The Unit's library collection must be significantly and durably expanded. Building infrastructure must be significantly improved with regard to the library. Further, lasting synergies should be explored with other Greek academic libraries.
- The Unit creates a comprehensive, communicable policy for students with special needs and appointment at Unit level of a faculty coordinator for such students.
- The Unit encourages administrative staff to further their academic and professional qualifications by fostering their development and mobility.
- The Unit publishes information on graduate employment opportunities and options for Law Graduates.

IV. Summary & Overall Assessment

The Principles where full compliance has been achieved are:

- Principle 2
- Principle 3
- Principle 4
- Principle 7
- Principle 8
- Principle 9
- Principle 10

The Principles where substantial compliance has been achieved are:

- Principle 1
- Principle 5
- Principle 6

The Principles where partial compliance has been achieved are:

- N/A

The Principles where failure of compliance was identified are:

- N/A

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

The members of the External Evaluation & Accreditation Panel

Name and Surname

Signature

1. **Dr. Stathis Banakas (Chair)**, Reader in Law, University of East Anglia, England
2. **Dr. Thomas Skouteris**, Associate Professor, Chair of the Law Department, The American University in Cairo
3. **Dr. Nikitas Hatzimihail**, Associate Professor, University of Cyprus