



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:

Military Sciences

Institution: Hellenic Army Academy

Date: 4 December 2021

Report of the Panel appointed by the HAHE to undertake the review of the Undergraduate Study Programme of **Military Sciences** of the **Hellenic Army Academy** for the purposes of granting accreditation

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Part A: Background and Context of the Review	4
I. The External Evaluation & Accreditation Panel.....	4
II. Review Procedure and Documentation	5
III. Study Programme Profile	7
Part B: Compliance with the Principles	8
Principle 1: Academic Unit Policy for Quality Assurance.....	8
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	18
Principle 6: Learning Resources and Student Support	20
Principle 7: Information Management	22
Principle 8: Public Information	25
Principle 9: On-going Monitoring and Periodic Internal Review of Programmes	27
Principle 10: Regular External Evaluation of Undergraduate Programmes.....	29
Part C: Conclusions	31
I. Features of Good Practice	31
II. Areas of Weakness	31
III. Recommendations for Follow-up Actions	31
IV. Summary & Overall Assessment	32

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 **Military Sciences** of the **Hellenic Army Academy** comprised the following five (4) members, drawn from the HAHE Register, in accordance with Laws 4009/2011 & 4653/2020:

- 1. Professor Fragkiskos Filippaios (Chair)**
University of East Anglia, Norwich, United Kingdom

- 2. Professor Costas Iliopoulos**
King's College London, London, United Kingdom

- 3. Professor Konstantinos Kontis**
University of Glasgow, Glasgow, United Kingdom

- 4. Dr Konstantinos Kopsidas**
The University of Manchester, Manchester, United Kingdom

II. Review Procedure and Documentation

The Hellenic Army Academy (HAA) assessment took place virtually (29/11/2021 – 04/12/2021) due to the Covid-19 pandemic. All the meetings between the External Evaluation and Accreditation Panel (EEAP) and HAA representatives took place by teleconference using Zoom. From a technical point of view, everything worked well, and all the attendees were able to participate in the discussions without any interruption. Despite the difficulties of an online visit, the EEAP was satisfied by the way the visit was managed and supported by HAA and HAHE. All meetings took place between 4PM and 10PM (Greek time) to accommodate the time difference with the four members of the EEAP located in the United Kingdom. All four members of the EEAP have been experienced assessors and therefore an official briefing from HAHE was not required.

On the afternoon of Monday 29th of November, the EEAP had an initial private meeting to discuss the submitted documentation, allocate individual tasks and raise any questions on additional documentation necessary for the visit. In the afternoon, the EEAP had its first meeting with the HAA Superintendent, Major General Kostidis, the President of HAA MODIP, Brigadier Mpantimaroudis, and the HAA Dean, Professor Kaimakamis. Brigadier Mpantimaroudis introduced HAA and welcomed the EEAP members, who also introduced themselves. The Chair of the EEAP provided an overview of the process and thanked HAA for preparing all documentation. The introductory meeting was followed by a meeting with Brigadier Mpantimaroudis, Dean Kaimakamis and members of the HAA MODIP and HAA OMEA. During the meeting, a brief presentation was given focusing on the strengths and challenges of the Military Sciences Undergraduate Programme (MSUGP). The presentation was focused and allowed plenty of time for useful discussions between HAA representatives and the EEAP.

On the afternoon of Tuesday 30th of November, the EEAP met with academic staff. The meeting covered various teaching and research issues related to the programme as well as other issues and on-goings of HAA. In late afternoon of the same day, the EEAP met with HAA cadets, without the presence of HAA representatives. Cadets revealed their experiences and the discussion with the EEAP was very informative. Cadets were open and frank about their experiences and views, and overall, extremely positive. Afterward, the EEAP was offered a virtual tour of the facilities. HAA had prepared an excellent video using a drone and a rich presentation with photographs of the various facilities. The EEAP got a very detailed picture of the size and quality of all physical infrastructure. The EEAP feels that this session can be presented as best practice on virtual visits. A presentation of the Virtual Learning Environment (Moodle) was also given that covered all aspects of the information that cadets can access. In the evening, the EEAP also met with former cadets as representatives of HAA alumni. Next, the Panel met with external stakeholders and partners. They similarly provided useful insights and discussed their relationship with HAA.

On the afternoon of Wednesday 1st of December, the EEAP concluded the visit with a meeting with Brigadier Mpantimaroudis, Dean Kaimakamis and members of the HAA MODIP and HAA OMEA. The Panel offered preliminary feedback on their findings.

All meetings with teaching, technical and administrative staff, cadets, alumni and external stakeholders, were very useful and informative. They were conducted in a very open and constructive manner, and all EEAP questions were answered sincerely and with transparency. All attendees were very helpful and have understood and accepted the requirements, the principles and objectives of the external accreditation process.

The EEAP wishes to make the following comments on the review procedure and documentation:

1. Several important documents for the purpose of the accreditation were not available for the EEAP as they have been labelled as confidential/classified and not available electronically. This is an important consideration for any future visits. Visits of this nature should take place preferably on a face-to-face basis with at least some members of the EEAP physically visiting HAA.
2. During the visit, the EEAP was unable to access the HAA website. The Chair of the EEAP accessed the website through a Virtual Private Network (VPN) and shared the information with the remaining EEAP members over a Zoom call. Again, this is an important consideration for future visits.
3. The online tour with the use of a drone and photographs worked very well and effectively facilitated the assessment of HAA teaching and training facilities. It can be considered as one of the best practices for virtual visits.

III. Study Programme Profile

The Hellenic Army Academy (HAA) was founded in June 1828 by Ioannis Kapodistrias, the first Governor of Greece. It is the oldest Higher Education Institution in Greece, with a number of high-profile achievements over the last three centuries. Since 1982, it has been based in Vari, Attika, covering an area of 4000 acres with accommodation, educational and military facilities on campus.

HAA's mission is to provide the Hellenic Army with leaders versed in the military sciences through living in a military environment and undergoing the many-sided military and academic education. Admission to HAA is through the Pan-Hellenic University Entrance Examinations with high-grade placement. HAA was awarded University status in 2003 and is organized in a single department with five divisions: Humanities & Social Sciences, Mathematics and Engineering Science, Physical Sciences & Applications, Physical and Cultural Education, War Studies.

The Undergraduate Educational Programme lasts four years. Each academic year is divided into two semesters. The Winter Semester starts in September and ends in February, while the Spring Semester starts in March and ends in August. Each Semester includes both Military and Academic Education, theoretical as well as practical. Each Academic Year consists of 39 weeks, 26 of which are of academic nature and 13 are of military. Four of these weeks are devoted to the Final Written Exams, while for 8 weeks cadets are on leave. HAA provides cadets with broad academic education which both complements and broadens military education and training.

The Undergraduate Educational Programme includes courses from a broad field of sciences, ranging from Humanities and Social Studies to Applied Sciences, from Chemistry to History, and from Psychology to Engineering. The first two years cover compulsory modules, while years three and four cadets are allowed to specialise in 12 different areas ranging from leadership to international relations and cyberwar. This approach allows cadets to specialise in areas useful for their future career development. HAA has also integrated into the curriculum the teaching of foreign languages.

It is worth highlighting two strong elements of the undergraduate programme. First, there is a compulsory final year project (Ptychiaki) for final year cadets. The topics are proposed in collaboration with academic staff but also units where graduates serve. Second, there is an international semester. This allows cadets to study abroad in one of the 23 different Erasmus+ partners of HAA. This initiative has enabled HAA to build a strong network of cooperation with other academic and military institutes in Europe and worldwide.

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

Findings

The quality policy of Military Sciences Undergraduate Programme (MSUGP) is harmonized with the QA policy of HAA and KPIs. It strives to provide high quality academic and military education and to improve student performance. It includes the commitment of the Command for the

implementation of a quality policy that supports the military-academic attributes and orientation of the programme of studies, implements its strategic objectives and determines the best approaches of achieving them. The Quality Policy includes specific QA actions and mechanisms, with the aim of creating a regulatory framework within which its academic and administrative units must operate to meet its high expectations through continuous improvement.

Analysis of judgement

Despite the current challenges, an emphasis is placed on extroversion and internationalization with a continuous improvement of the curriculum, infrastructure and services provision, in order to adapt to the current and future military-academic ambitions, research directions and national needs. The quality policy of the HAA specifies its strategic objectives and aims at achieving the quality objectives, which concern its operation in general and, in particular, the organization and operation of the Undergraduate Programme. The QA Policy of the HAA is communicated to its stakeholders through its website and an internal distribution network.

HAA conducts its annual review and internal audit of the quality assurance system of the MSUGP (having collected and processed the data and other information on all issues related to the operation and targets) through the collaboration of the OMEA and MODIP, plans and suggests the appropriate actions and the ways through which the objectives can be achieved. The implementation of the quality policy and the achievement of the quality objectives support the evolution of the academic culture and ambitions, and the direction of its MSUGP. These are made possible thanks to the determination and dedication of the staff and the active participation of cadets in its activities. The informal academic division meetings recommend to the Educational Council, through the Dean, on issues that relate to the academic development strategy of the HAA and the MSUGP. The academic programme includes contemporary subjects which meet the requirements of the officer's profession, and takes into consideration international practices and new doctrines. This is enhanced by the international cooperation with overseas Military Academies and universities within the framework of the Military ERASMUS, ERASMUS+, European Security and Defence College (ESDC) as well as other domestic collaborations.

Conclusions

MSUGP fully complies with Principle 1 as the current quality assurance policy covers all areas identified by the underlying principle.

Panel Judgement

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

Panel Recommendations

- R1.1. HAA should make use of the quality assurance policy and processes to strive for continuous improvements.
- R1.2. HAA should consider ways to improve the accessibility of the website from abroad.

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

Findings

The HAA plans MSUGP in the framework of the pertinent legislation. The procedure for approving or revising the curriculum complies to the standards imposed by MODIP with the approval of the Hellenic Army Command. In addition, the design of curriculum takes into account the active participation of the cadets through internal evaluation that takes place at the end of each Semester.

The academic attributes of MSUGP are based on the generation and transmission of knowledge to the cadets, with the teaching of Military Sciences as well as relevant theoretical, social, physical, technological and applied sciences. The curriculum's strategy is directly linked to the strategy of the HAA through the adoption and implementation of innovative actions targeting the provision of high level of education.

The learning outcomes of each course are described in detail in the annual Study Guide. Indication of the achievement of the defined learning targets is the completion of each course with a defined threshold following the completion of the written examinations.

The first two years of study are offering general education. Each Semester, the students attend 5 to 8 courses. The courses consist either of a theoretical part only or of a theoretical and practical part (laboratories). The attendance of courses is compulsory. Cadets have enthusiastically described the efforts of staff to engage them in their classes. The military training is the backbone of education in HAA and embedded to the curriculum offering the cadets many opportunities to develop their interests.

The HAA has organised its academic education in accordance to the requirements of the European Credit Transfer System (ECTS), setting as a minimum number of credits of 240 corresponding to four years of studies, of which 180 concern academic education. A detailed information is included to the annual Study Guide.

EEAP had a discussion with the invited stakeholders; these covered representatives from the local community. All of them, with no exception, have outspoken the high quality and in-depth knowledge and integrity of the cadets. Stakeholders have praised the collaboration they have with the staff and HAA.

Analysis of Judgement

The objective of HAA is to produce the future officers and leaders of the army. For this reason, the military training is progressing through the several levels of command (fighter, group leader, platoon leader, trainer) depending on the year of study of the cadets, so that the latter can obtain the corresponding valuable "working" experience to the maximum extent possible. This is a necessary asset for their immediate and smooth transition to the work environment. In addition, there are actions at national and international levels that increase the cadets' experiences (international conferences, bespoke training, reviews etc.) providing them valuable skills for a successful professional career.

The cadets choose one of the offered specialization pathways in the 5th Semester as described in detail in the annual Study Guide, which are also aligned to the research interests of the teaching staff. The cadets have the opportunity to prepare a UG Project dissertation based on the available international literature.

The process of shaping the curriculum begins with the General Army Command, which determines the requirements of training of all officers based on the evolution of Military Sciences and operational requirements. It should be emphasized that the training of an officer is a continuous process, which is implemented with various schools during his/her career. The HAA is the first and most basic school.

Conclusions

Through the Directorate of Education, which belongs to the General Army Command, the educational objectives are provided to the HAA, which on the basis of these, forms or adapts the cadets' programme and curriculum. The process follows consultation with all staff members as well as with MODIP, following an established protocol. The MSUGP fully complies with Principle 2.

Panel Judgement

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

Panel Recommendations

- R2.1. HAA should establish structured and more transparent review procedures that can be assessed against key performance indicators.
- R2.2. Several taught modules should be further modernized to reflect the state of the art in the relevant discipline.

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

Findings

The cadets are at the center of the learning and teaching implementation, focusing on their motivation, self-assessment and active participation in the learning process. This implies the continuous monitoring of the implementation of the curriculum and evaluation of its results by the Administration, Deanship and Directorate of Military Training. The implementation of learning and teaching utilises a range of delivery approaches and pedagogical methods. There is a regular evaluation of the quality and effectiveness of teaching especially by the cadets

ensuring adequate guidance and support. There is also an embedded procedure to handle student grievances.

The evaluation criteria and method are published in advance. The evaluation of the cadets reflects the degree of achievement of the expected learning outcomes. Their evaluation is carried out by more than one examiner, where this is possible. The evaluation of the cadets is coherent, applied fairly to all and carried out in accordance with the pertinent procedures.

The HAA accepts several foreigners per year, both because of its international recognition and the quality of the offered curriculum. To effectively integrate these cadets in its academic programme, HAA offers a foundation year with subjects covering Greek language and basic mathematics and physics. The foundation year starts at the beginning of October and is completed at the end of June of the following year. The performance of foundation cadets is continuously monitored, and feedback is provided to them and their countries.

Analysis of Judgement

The HAA uses all modern teaching methods, while pivotal role in the organization of teaching, plays the Virtual Learning Environment (Moodle) through which all courses are organized and the corresponding teaching materials are provided. The HAA provides the possibility of e-learning which is carried out through the open-source platform Jitsi meet. This platform provides the possibility of creating virtual interactive classes. In addition, the two modern amphitheatres are equipped with state-of-the-art technology in audio-visual media and allow teaching with interactive learning techniques. There is also a shooting range simulator and a war field simulator that increases the variety of pedagogical tools and methods. The workshops of the HAA operate and support laboratory courses as provided by the MSUGP.

The programme evaluation by the cadets is done electronically and anonymously. There is a detailed field of questions on the programme's delivery and content as well as adequate space for any additional comment or complaint they would like to express. Anonymity is ensured, since all evaluations are made anonymously with random codes on the electronic platform.

The final grade of each course considers the written and oral exams, while encourages the active participation of cadets in the course with their daily evaluation by the teacher. The grade resulting from the participation in the class and coursework offers the cadets the opportunity to improve their overall performance. The assessment methods are known in advance and typically at the start of each academic year. These are also readily available to the cadets. The vast majority of courses rely on written unseen examinations for the summative assessment of students. The assessment diet lacks variety and focuses only on written forms of examination. There is, also, only a small number of opportunities for formative feedback during the academic year and therefore opportunities for cadets to improve their academic performance before the final exams are limited.

There is constant communication between the cadets and academic staff on top of the predetermined office hours. All cadets interviewed have enthusiastically commented on the availability and informal/friendly attitude of all staff to discuss with them and provide guidance whenever needed.

There is transparency in the final exams of each course and the grading is done with the names of the cadets covered. The grades are delivered to the competent department and the

disclosure of the names and registration of the final score is made in the presence of the corresponding teachers. In case of objection to the final written grade by the cadets, there is an established procedure, which gives cadets the opportunity to request a review of the exam paper by the teacher. In addition, the cadets have the opportunity to regularly evaluate the quality and effectiveness of teaching, as documented especially through student surveys.

Conclusions

MSUGP substantially complies with Principle 3. A number of improvements can be made to enhance student-centered learning. Formal cadet representation should be established to provide additional input to the development of MSUGP. Additional opportunities for formative feedback should be created throughout the year that will allow cadets to improve their academic performance. Finally, consideration should be given to increase the variety of assessment diet with the inclusion of other forms of assessments (reports, presentations, group work assignments).

Panel Judgement

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

Panel Recommendations

- R3.1. The procedure for addressing student academic complaints and appeals should be further formalized and better articulated.
- R3.2. To consider making the findings of the student surveys easily available to all relevant stakeholders.
- R3.3. To establish a formal student representative body to provide input to the continuous improvement process of the programme and the courses.
- R3.4. To increase the opportunities for formative feedback throughout the academic year and offer cadets the opportunity to discuss their progress in a formalized way with academic staff.
- R3.5. To consider enriching the assessment diet of the programme with other forms of assessment that will enable academic staff to assess soft skills (presentation, group/team work).

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

Findings

Admission to all Greek institutions is governed by the Ministry of Education guidelines, which are based on a variety of factors such as Pan-Hellenic exam results, health reasons, nationality (Cypriots, foreigners) and physical condition. HAA does not have any input in the criteria used to admit new cadets.

MSUGP, overall, is a very well organized and structured programme that consists of compulsory courses and optional streams. The study guide provides a comprehensive and clear description of the courses. MSUGP provides cadets with the flexibility to take courses from various disciplines, allowing them to pick 2-3 courses of their choice that will balance and complete their degree; for example, courses in history, philosophy etc. Additionally, the programme also includes a plethora of foreign language courses and physical activities (as expected for a military school).

The student progression monitoring and graduation are well organized. HAA uses a software system called "EVELPIS", which is used to monitor the cadet progression, their course marks, as well as their degree classification. Overall, the procedures are well designed and followed by the HAA.

Cadets undertake a final year project (Ptychiaki) during their 4th year of MSUGP. HAA provides them with a pool of topics during September each year to choose from. Cadets work on the project between September and May. The project is then marked by three academics. This is a very good practice.

The ERASMUS cadets visit other European Military Universities (Chechia, Poland, Portugal, Romania etc.). The visit duration is for one Semester and their timings are identical to the HAA.

The structure of the European courses is almost identical to that of the HAA, thus making the transfer of credits (ECTS) straightforward. The procedures are clear and followed.

Analysis of Judgement

The above-mentioned processes and procedures are all clear, efficient and well-articulated. In all stages of the cadet learning cycle there are clear processes for monitoring admission, retention, progression and recognition of credits leading to certification.

Conclusions

MSUGP fully complies with Principle 4 and EEAP has no further recommendations on the future development of MSUGP on this principle.

Panel Judgement

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

Panel Recommendations

No recommendations

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

Findings

Academic staff hiring is centralised and regulated by the Greek government legislation; they use clear, transparent methods for hiring sufficiently qualified staff who understand the value of education and research.

Academic staff's curriculum vitae, which can be seen on the HAA's website, show that they have relevant experience in their teaching areas, but their Vitae are not extensive or detailed enough, and there is no mention of their publications and other research activities.

HAA provides sabbaticals to its academic staff on a regular basis, which are important for their professional growth; it appears that few of the academic staff took advantage of this opportunity. Similarly, promotion procedures are followed to the letter of the law, (6 months sabbatical, every 3 years) and the academic staff appears to be satisfied with the HAA's overall management.

HAA has signed a considerable number (23) of ERASMUS+ agreements, and the academic staff has taken advantage of a variety of ERASMUS+ trip opportunities for their development. HAA makes good use of the ERASMUS+ programme.

Analysis of Judgement

Based on the evidence provided and meetings with HAA's academic staff, the EEAP believes that HAA has insufficient funds to facilitate conference attendance and other academic/research activity.

The EEAP did not find any written procedure for the annual assessment of the academic staff linked with their personal and professional development. The matter seems to be handled in an ad hoc manner, with informal discussions, with no minutes recorded.

Conclusions

The MSUGP is substantially compliant with Principle 5. Additional emphasis should be given to academic staff's professional development through the creation of an independent research account managed directly by HAA.

Panel Judgement

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

Panel Recommendations

- R5.1. Written procedures for the development and annual review of the academic staff should be established.
- R5.2. HAA should consider ways/procedures to receive funds for conference attendance and research activities.

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

Findings

Most of the buildings are in good condition. Most have ramps for disabled access. HAA has two amphitheatres, which are both modern, with state-of-the-art equipment. There are several teaching rooms: some of them are modern - they were renovated recently but several others are in urgent need to be revamped. They have a modern library, but they do not have access to digital resources (journals, papers, e-books and digital databases).

The cadet accommodation consists of rooms with 4 people occupancy. They were recently renovated at high standard. The toilets/showers are also modern and recently renovated. Housing and dining options overall are acceptable, modern, and smart. The restaurant and the lodgings appear to be well-run. WIFI network is available that allows cadets to work from home.

There is no cadet advisor assigned to each student. There is a psychologist that offers support to the cadets. There is also a dentist, a barber, laundry facilities, a swimming pool and various gyms.

The labs (PC, Physics, Shooting simulation, Printing, Electronics, War field simulation etc.) are mostly functional and just about cover the needs of the courses to a basic degree. The PC labs seem to be up to date but the rest of the labs seem to require modernization and new state-of-the-art equipment.

Teaching is compulsory and cadet attendance is recorded. The daily schedule is fully structured including lecture time, meal times, relaxation/entertainment time and study time.

Many cadets take advantage of ERASMUS+ possibilities to expand their knowledge and be exposed to different ideas and perspectives. Several agreements (23) have been put in place by HAA, expanding the number of sites to travel and topics to study.

Analysis of Judgement

The compliance of MSUGP with this principle is characterized by extremes. While in some areas there is substantial use of modern technologies and a clear emphasis on cadets' learning and teaching experience there are significant gaps in areas such as access to online journals and databases. These gaps, together with the modernization of laboratories should be urgent priorities for HAA.

Conclusions

MSUGP substantially complies with Principle 6.

Panel Judgement

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

Panel Recommendations

- R6.1. A cadet advisor should be assigned to each cadet to provide additional support through their studies.
- R6.2. A clear plan for the modernization of all labs should be created.
- R6.3. Cadets and academic staff should get immediate access to digital resources (Journals, papers, books and digital databases).

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

Findings

Internal Unit Evaluation: Information associated with evaluating individual undergraduate courses is collected from the cadets using the “Internal Course Assessment” questionnaires. There were 36 Likert scale type questions and one open question inviting further comments where cadets could assess the adequacy/quality of every UG unit in three main areas: (1) Provided learning material and resources, (2) Academic delivery and teaching methods, (3) Student Self-assessment on timely engagement. From the provided graphs and corresponding summaries¹, it is evident that the data are recorded and interpreted. From the presented (during the assessment) minutes of the annual meeting of the Educational Council, it has been found that there is a discussion and list of actions for the improvement of courses delivery and quality.

Key Performance Indicators: HAA has a plethora of KPIs evidenced via the provided documents². These are divided into four areas that cover (among others) cadet retention/progression, academic performance, and research excellence and collaboration with other institutions.

No surveys are performed for the non-academic part of the programme and the internships (military part of training). However, this information is still available through the well-established HAA's training practice.

¹ Document B7_Cadets Questionnaires 2020 - “B7_Ερωτηματολογία_Ευελπιδων.pdf”

² Document B6_Quality Targets 2019-2020 - “B6_Στοχοθεσια_Ποιοτητας_ΠΠΣ.pdf”

Data processing is performed through MS Excel, allowing informative graphs and charts that facilitate the overall assessment of the MSUGP, including comparisons and trends among the different semesters.

Administration: The monitoring of all assets (buildings, equipment etc.) is closely performed by legacy methods. However, it is unclear how this information is integrated within the IQAS of the UG programme and what (systematic) methods were used to collect relevant data.

Analysis of judgement

Based on the provided evidence and following up discussion with several different groups of Stakeholders (Cadets, Academics, MODIP, Local Authorities, and some - outside of the Academy - Associations and Charities), it was identified that only basic Information Management methods were in place to ensure the monitoring of data concerning cadets, teaching staff, course structure and organisation. The data seemed to be used to improve the teaching and provision of other services to cadets and the academic community.

However, there are many key areas that have been identified to require further procedures to ensure the reporting of measurable actions on individual courses and dates of their implementation in a manner that one can identify past actions, when those have been implemented, and their impact on each course's delivery. Furthermore, the assessment of each course was not effectively done to include the scores of the current year against previous years. This significantly reduces the management efficiency of MSUGP and minimizes the effectiveness towards a continuous improvement based on good/poor previous year practices.

Conclusions

The EEAP has found the capacity of HAA for Information Management to be partially compliant. Several areas of data collation and management are present and deliver a high quality of graduates (as was evidenced from the interviews during the visit). However, few areas lack a systematic recording of information and the corresponding follow-up activities (dates and persons involved).

Panel Judgement

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

Panel Recommendations

- R7.1. Improve the analysis of Unit Questionnaires to facilitate longitudinal data analysis, to identify trends and patterns over time.
- R7.2. Develop questionnaires for academic staff and data analysis for teaching facilities to assist the management of available resources. For example, the importance of books against updating a lab infrastructure.

- R7.3. Develop a robust process for systematic recording and planning follow-up activities (as a result of the analyses of the questionnaires) and feeding back such information to cadets and other staff.
- R7.4. Systematically include feedback/data from its graduates pertaining to their studying experiences in HAA and their career development.
- R7.5. Consider quality goals, relevant KPIs, and feedback collection mechanisms for evaluating human resources (i.e., adequacy of Laboratory Teaching Assistants).

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

Findings

Website and Access to Information: HAA has its own website. Overall, the website is well structured and easy to navigate. Published information relevant to the academic programmes and teaching activities is not up-to-date, although it is presented in a clear manner. Essential information related to the teaching and research activities of HAA is concealed within the web pages along with details about athletic (and other) events and social service activities. Most entries exist in both Greek and English languages. However, the part of the website dedicated to Quality Assurance (MODIP) seemed to lack detail and structure and was outdated.

Analysis of judgement

Many pages within HAA's website were found to be updated and continuously monitored. The HAA website was acceptably structured, with a plethora of audio-visual material associated with curriculum (and not only) activities. However, the information is often presented in the form of pdf documents. This makes the website less attractive with poor structure and challenging to maneuver between its webpages, particularly when a pdf article/document is opened. Some pages seemed to lack details (e.g., "Κοσμητεία") and provide outdated information.

Conclusions

HAA website is found to effectively present information about their activities, including the programmes they offer, the qualifications awarded, the teaching, learning and assessment procedures of their graduate, the pass rates and the learning opportunities available to the cadets, as well as graduate employment information. However, there are several occasions that the information provided on the webpages is not kept up to date (e.g., MODIP pages, Graduate Pages) and they lack structure (e.g., UGP structure is in pdf document instead of semesters with their units and intended learning outcomes presented on different pages).

Panel Judgement

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

Panel Recommendations

- R8.1. Develop formal procedures and set up a working group to ensure periodic and systematic updating of HAA Webpages. Therefore, HAA should have appropriate resources and flexibility to manage its own website.
- R8.2. Improve HAA's Undergraduate programme study webpages structure to include semesters with their units and learning outcomes.
- R8.3. Include some graduate statements regarding their student experience and teaching quality.

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

Findings

From an internal point of view, there is a bottom-up approach to the review of the programme. The annual review process takes place within the sections responsible for teaching. These discussions take into consideration the student feedback on each course, the latest research in each discipline but also the feedback of graduates.

From an external point of view, the annual review is aligned with the European Security and Defence College recommendations regarding new content within courses but also regarding the introduction of new courses.

These two, internal and external processes, are jointed at the School's Educational Council that makes the final decision regarding changes to the curriculum and workload. These processes are complemented by an internal monitoring process that follows the military and not educational route where daily reports are produced to assist the monitoring of performance of the programme.

Analysis of Judgement

Overall, there is an effective and efficient process for the on-going monitoring and internal review of the programme. Perhaps the involvement of graduates can be further formalized in the overall process. Moreover, the involvement of external stakeholders such as high technology companies or other defense and security companies can be strengthened, although we appreciate that this can be limited due to the nature of the degree and the level of confidentiality necessary.

Conclusions

The programme fully complies with Principle 9. There is scope for improvement on the basis of the above analysis of judgement that can further enhance the monitoring and review processes (inclusion of external stakeholders' recommendations).

Panel Judgement

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

Panel Recommendations

- R9.1. Formalise from an educational perspective the involvement of graduates and collect their feedback and input in the review of the programme on an annual basis.
- R9.2. Increase the engagement with external stakeholders and develop a mechanism that enable them to provide, periodically and systematically, direct input in the programme's future development.

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

Findings

HAA has undergone two recent evaluation and accreditation exercises. In 2015 an external Panel visited HAA to conduct an overall evaluation exercise and in 2019 another external Panel visited HAA to conduct an accreditation of the Internal Quality Assurance System. The 2019 visit is more relevant for the purposes of this report and the key findings of the visit can be summarized as follows:

1. The quality assurance policy of the institution should be better reported, both internally and externally. MODIP should have dedicated personnel and its own office with allocated responsibilities.
2. HAA should gain independence in the administration of research and innovation activities.
3. The modernization of laboratories should be prioritized.
4. The salaries of academic staff should be brought in line with those in other public Higher Education Institutions.
5. Research culture should be improved.
6. HAA should better communicate its role to external audiences especially in English.

Analysis of Judgement

The EEAP appreciates the external constraints created by the legal framework that governs the function of HAA. Some efforts have been made to address the recommendations of the previous Panel but there is still substantial ground to be covered.

The report of the 2019 accreditation visit has been discussed in HAA's Educational Council in early 2020 but we could not see evidence that a clear plan was created to address the above recommendations. While the quality assurance policy is better reported there is still no dedicated personnel to support MODIP's functionality. Additionally, the president of MODIP changes frequently creating some form of a discontinuity/difficulty for establishing long-term quality assurance policy KPIs. HAA has yet to achieve independence in the administration of research and innovation with a detrimental effect on academic staff development. While some modernization of laboratories and other facilities has taken place there are still significant areas requiring improvement.

The salaries of academic staff are still 10% below equivalent grades at public Higher Education Institutions. The appointment of several new academic staff has improved the research culture and while the main focus of our visit was the quality assurance process of the UG programme this became evident in discussions with them. HAA has significant ground to cover in communicating its role. The website in English contains a significantly smaller amount of information compared to the Greek version.

Conclusions

The programme substantially complies with principle 10. While progress has been made, several recommendations have not been addressed and there is no clear plan on how these will be addressed in the future.

Panel Judgement

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

Panel Recommendations

R10.1. HAA should establish a clear plan for addressing the recommendations of external evaluation and accreditation Panels and establish clear mechanisms towards continuous improvement.

PART C: CONCLUSIONS

I. Features of Good Practice

- HAA has excellent relations with external stakeholders. Through close collaboration with them, HAA has achieved a clear social responsibility agenda and has contributed significantly to the local community and broader society.
- There is an excellent use of Virtual Learning Environment (Moodle) to address any potential lack of resources elsewhere (online journals and electronic databases).
- HAA has excellent accommodation facilities.
- The EEAP, based on interviews and discussions with current cadets and graduates, has established that they have high satisfaction levels with the overall MSUGP experience.

II. Areas of Weakness

- The EEAP has identified a lack of evidence to support the variety of quality assurance processes. Some of the evidence might exist but has been classified/confidential and therefore not at the EEAP perusal for evaluation.
- The information management system is judged as inadequate and there is no evidence of a holistic approach to integrate various data sources to inform quality assurance decisions.
- Lack of continuous engagement with alumni and other external stakeholders in the process of on-going monitoring and periodic internal review of courses and programme.
- Access to online journals and research funds or other opportunities for academic staff development.
- Inadequate public information communication mechanisms for overseas visitors (website).

III. Recommendations for Follow-up Actions

1. HAA should further refine its strategic goals and associated KPIs to align them better with the overall mission statement.
2. MSUGP curriculum and its implementation need to undergo continuous review and improvement by striking a balance between traditional and emerging topics.
3. HAA should relax the bureaucratic obstacles for academic staff development and create mechanisms through which they can access research and development funds.
4. HAA should strongly consider the development of an information management system to support decision making in the quality assurance process.
5. The EEAP recommends the development of an alumni and stakeholder engagement strategy and the associated structures to implement it.
6. HAA should take urgent action to improve the quality of laboratories and access to online resources.

7. MODIP's membership should be aligned with the long-term nature of the quality assurance process.

IV. Summary & Overall Assessment

The Principles where full compliance has been achieved are: **1, 2, 4 and 9**

The Principles where substantial compliance has been achieved are: **3, 5, 6 and 10**

The Principles where partial compliance has been achieved are: **7 and 8**

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

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

The members of the External Evaluation & Accreditation Panel

Name and Surname

Signature

1. **Professor Fragkiskos Filippaios** (Chair)
University of East Anglia, Norwich, United Kingdom

2. **Professor Costas Iliopoulos**
King's College London, London, United Kingdom

3. **Professor Konstantinos Kontis**
University of Glasgow, Glasgow, United Kingdom

4. **Dr Konstantinos Kopsidas**
The University of Manchester, Manchester, United Kingdom