



ΕΛΛΗΝΙΚΗ ΔΗΜΟΚΡΑΤΙΑ

Α.ΔΙ.Π.

ΑΡΧΗ ΔΙΑΣΦΑΛΙΣΗΣ ΚΑΙ
ΠΙΣΤΟΠΟΙΗΣΗΣ ΤΗΣ ΠΟΙΟΤΗΤΑΣ
ΣΤΗΝ ΑΝΩΤΑΤΗ ΕΚΠΑΙΔΕΥΣΗ

HELLENIC REPUBLIC

H.Q.A.

HELLENIC QUALITY ASSURANCE AND
ACCREDITATION AGENCY

EXTERNAL EVALUATION REPORT

DEPARTMENT: **SHIPPING, TRADE & TRANSPORT**
UNIVERSITY OF THE AEGEAN

February 2014



European Union
European Social Fund



MINISTRY OF EDUCATION & RELIGIOUS AFFAIRS, CULTURE & SPORTS
MANAGING AUTHORITY

Co-financed by Greece and the European Union



External Evaluation Committee

The Committee responsible for the External Evaluation of the Department of Shipping, Trade and Transport of the University of the Aegean consisted of the following four (4) expert evaluators drawn from the Registry constituted by the HQAA in accordance with Law 3374/2005:

1. Professor Hercules Haralambides, Professor of Maritime Economics and Logistics, (Coordinator), Department of Econometrics, Erasmus School of Economics, Erasmus University Rotterdam, The Netherlands.
2. Dr. Alexander D. Coutroubis, Principal Lecturer/Teaching Fellow, Faculty of Engineering and Science, School of Engineering, University of Greenwich, UK.
3. Professor Eleni Hadjiconstantinou, Professor of Management Science, School of Economic Sciences & Administration, Frederick University, Cyprus (Imperial College Business School, Imperial College London, UK, till 2012).
4. Professor George Vairaktarakis, Professor of Operations, Case Western Reserve University, USA.

Introduction

The External Evaluation Committee received the Department's Internal Evaluation Report (IER), dated July 2013, before the visit to the Department. In addition, the Committee was given access to the Department's intranet where all supporting information and other documentation had been uploaded, for the facilitation of the Committee. The Committee was satisfied with the thoroughness and professionalism with which the OMEA (Internal Evaluation Committee, *Ομάδα Εσωτερικής Αξιολόγησης*) prepared the IER and with the presentations of the information contained therein.

I. The External Evaluation Procedure

- *Dates and brief account of the site visit:*
 - 10-12 February 2014

- *Whom did the Committee meet?*
 - 1. Pro-Vice Rector, Professor Nikos Soulakellis
 - 2. Dean of the School of Business, Professor Dimitrios Lagos
 - 3. Head of the Department of Shipping, Trade & Transport, Professor. Amalia Polydoropoulou
 - 4. Head of the Department's OMEA Group
 - 5. Department's OMEA Group
 - 6. Faculty and administrative staff of the Department
 - 7. Undergraduate students
 - 8. Postgraduate students
 - 9. PhD students
 - 10. PhD holders
 - 11. Graduates (of postgraduate and undergraduate programmes)
 - 12. Local community stakeholders

- *List of Reports, documents, other data examined by the Committee*
 - 1. Brief description of the Department and its Internal Evaluation Document 2009/10
 - 2. Updated Programme Handbooks 2008-9, 2009-2010, 2010-11, 2011-12, 2012-13, 2013-14
 - 3. Tables for 2012-2013 evaluation report (Tables 15, 16, 17 of last reports): Research grants, publications, citations, international recognition and awards
 - 4. Programme of Studies for undergraduate and postgraduate taught programmes
 - 5. Undergraduate and postgraduate course specifications
 - 6. Samples of undergraduate and postgraduate dissertations
 - 7. Calls for PhD submissions
 - 8. List of PhDs awarded
 - 9. List of PhD subjects/supervisors
 - 10. Honorary PhDs

11. International collaborations/networks
12. Student progression and final destination / employment statistics
13. Individual awards and recognitions
14. Scholarship sponsorships
15. Statistics of industry placements/internships
16. Participation of staff in conferences/workshops etc.
17. Summer courses organised
18. Journals of the Department

- *Groups of teaching and administrative staff and students interviewed:*

1. Teaching & support staff of the Department
2. Undergraduate students
3. Postgraduate students
4. PhD students
5. PhD holders
6. Graduates (undergraduates and postgraduates)
7. Local community stakeholders

- *Facilities visited by the External Evaluation Committee*

Department's facilities and venues as permissible under the strict time constraints of the visit. The Committee did not visit laboratory facilities but it was provided with detailed overviews of their functions and purpose.

II. The Internal Evaluation Procedure

- *Appropriateness of sources and documentation used in advance of the visit*

The Committee was provided with detailed documentation at the departmental website; a well prepared IER 2011-2012; programs of study; research activities; and administrative services for the academic year 2012-2013.

- *Quality and completeness of evidence reviewed and provided*

Quality was satisfactory. The information provided could have been organized and presented in a more user-friendly fashion, given its volume and diversity of content.

- *To what extent have the objectives of the internal evaluation process been met by the Department?*

The Committee concurs that the objectives of the internal evaluation process have been largely met by the Department. However, the Committee identified a number of areas that have not been addressed. Comments regarding these are highlighted subsequently in this

report.

A. Curriculum (Programme)

Preamble

Considering that, in essence, there is only one undergraduate (with options), one postgraduate, (with variants) and a unified PhD programme, largely taught, supervised and/or otherwise supported by the same academic team, the comments / recommendations below reflect the Committee's views on the overall approach to curriculum development and delivery.

(Recommendations are made in section A&B below. These should be considered in parallel to the responses to questions raised in the report template. See: Sections A & B: Programme Design and Delivery: Summary and further commentary)

APPROACH

- *What are the goals and objectives of the Curriculum? What is the plan for achieving them?*

The objectives of the Department are stated in the Programme Specification document (**Odigos Spoudon**) as follows:

1. Provision of high quality scientific education in the specialist area of Corporate Management, Shipping, Transport and Trade.
2. Carrying out of research through research programmes.
3. Linking of education and research with practical applications through collaborations with private enterprises and public organisations.

- *Departmental planning for achieving these objectives*

1. The first objective is achieved through the provision of the undergraduate and postgraduate degrees.
2. The second objective relates to the research activities of the faculty and PhD candidates and therefore achievement is reached through the Department's research output.
3. The third objective is part of the programme of studies and materialises through the activities of the Committee of Relations with Industry (*Epitropi Syndesis me tis Epixeiriseis*) and the Programme of Industrial Placements (*Programma Praktikis Askisis*).

- *How were the objectives (of the Programme) decided? Which factors were taken into*

account? Were they set against appropriate standards? Did the unit consult other stakeholders?

Greece is a major player in the global maritime industry and its shipping industry is a major contributor to the national economy. Furthermore the industry is an important employer of graduate students offering well remunerated career opportunities and is largely insulated from the current challenging situation of the Greek economy. The committee did not come across to evidence to the effect that either the objectives of the programme or the programme itself has ever subjected to consultation with other stakeholders. Having said this though, the Department's strong links, both industrial and academic, is enough evidence that the programme and its objectives are validated on a continuous basis. **The Committee recommends the establishment of an (informal) departmental Advisory Board of industry executives and external academics that would offer structure; validation; and documented follow-up to future programme development efforts.**

- *Is the curriculum consistent with the objectives of the Curriculum (Programme) and the requirements of the society (industry expectations)?*

The undergraduate programme meets industry requirements, as evidenced by the employment statistics the Department provided to the Committee. The Committee further commends the Department for its *Work Placement Programme*, with a multitude of benefits for students, the Department, and the university by and large. Core subjects are structured and planned well, and options are available at an appropriate quantity and variety. The intensive teaching of English at all levels is also a commendable part of Programme design.

The same can be said for the postgraduate programme and the plans for its future delivery in English. The Committee noted that there are four degree specialisations, although, not surprisingly, there is a considerable degree of commonality between them. It appears that one specialisation is recruiting the majority of students (evidence of industry expectations, see above) and, therefore, **the Department is encouraged to review provision, vis-à-vis societal demand, and consider rationalisation.**

- *Has the unit set a procedure for the revision of the curriculum?*

The Committee did not find any formal evidence of alterations to the programmes since their inception, nor any formal procedures for eventual reviews. Relevant recommendations are made in the A&B Summary Section below.

RESULTS

- *How well is programme implementation achieving the Department's predefined goals and objectives?*

Success outcomes can primarily be measured by student destination statistics (on the taught programmes), and they can also be evidenced by the final degree grade achieved by the students. On both counts, the Committee is fairly reassured although destination statistics are relatively thin and the Department is addressing this challenge. This said, there is strong indication that graduates are in employment within reasonable time after graduation.

With regard to achieving the Department's first objective, quote: "...provision of high quality scientific education in the specialist area of Corporate Management, Shipping, Transport and Trade..." the Committee has noted a conscientious effort of the Department to strike a balance between *scientific education*, as dictated by the requirements of a university Decree belonging to a Business School, and the coverage of the *practical aspects* of the industry (e.g. visits onboard ships or classes by ex-seafarers) that society deems indispensable for the employability of graduates of a specialisation as applied as this of shipping and transport. **In this sense, the Committee feels that the first objective may need to be rephrased to better reflect both programme contents and achieved outcomes. Moreover, the Committee encourages the Department to give higher priority to the completion of its alumni database.**

IMPROVEMENT

- *Does the Department know how the Curriculum (Programme) should be improved?*

The Department, albeit informally, recognises and values the feed-back from society and it is prepared to take it onboard. **In the view of this Committee, this needs to be done in a more structural way, allowing for the follow-up and implementation of any past consultations. The establishment of an informal Advisory Board would be of great value in this regard.**

- *Which improvements does the Department plan to introduce?*

The Department is fully aware of national and international best practice but it has not suggested any improvements or changes in the current curriculum other than a possible provision of the current postgraduate degree(s) in the English language. The Committee recognises that this is a worthwhile internationalisation effort in need of thorough planning and justification through market research. The Committee also feels that potential changes in the curriculum are constrained by the specialisations of the existing faculty (see section E below).

B. Teaching (Delivery)

Preamble

Considering that, in essence, there is only one undergraduate (with options), one postgraduate, (with variants) and a unified PhD programme, largely taught, supervised and/or otherwise supported by the same academic team, the comments / recommendations below reflect the Committee's views on the overall approach to curriculum development and delivery.

(Recommendations are made in section A&B below. These should be considered in parallel to the responses to questions raised in the report template. See: Sections A & B: Programme Design and Delivery: Summary and further commentary)

APPROACH

Does the Department have a defined pedagogic policy with regard to teaching approach and methodology?

- *Teaching methods used:*
Teaching is primarily delivered via lectures, individual assignments and seminars.
- *Teaching staff/ student ratio:*
2012-2013: 1/29
2013-2014: 1/35
- *Teacher/student collaboration:*
Through the meeting sessions with staff and students, the Committee confirmed the close ties and open door policy to student / staff relations.
- *Adequacy of means and resources:*
Teaching space capacity and suitability of available venues has been raised as an issue by both staff and students. The Department uses historic buildings in the centre of town not originally built for modern educational purposes. The University owns (through donations or otherwise) land where modern facilities could be constructed when the financial resources permit such a venture.
- *Use of information technologies:*
Basic IT infrastructure is available and includes IT labs, Intranet with access to library resources etc., as outlined in the IER. The periodic renewal of hardware was raised as a challenge facing the Department, while students reported the extensive use of personal laptops as common practice in response to this. Laptops are also used by students during lectures, for research and note-taking purposes.
- *Examination system:*
The Committee noted the lack of standardisation in the examination and assessment activities (both written and oral) which tend to vary from lecturer to lecturer and appear inconsistent over time.

IMPLEMENTATION

- *Quality of teaching procedures (delivery):*
Assessment of teaching quality is based on student responses via questionnaires. Lecturers at all levels, including PhD candidates in contact with students, are not required to have any teaching qualifications or training, and teaching observations do not form part of the evaluation process.
- *Quality and adequacy of teaching materials and resources:*
Teaching material and resources appear adequate given the general constraints. Students highlighted that in many cases handouts and other materials are given after rather than before lectures and that the use of depository platform like e-Class is not consistent. **The Committee recommends that all teaching materials are made available to students well in advance and definitely before classes.**

- *Quality of course material. Is it brought up to date?*
Quality of course material is considered adequate.
- *Linking of research with teaching:*
In a number of courses, particularly those of the 'core', teaching is research-informed.
- *Mobility of academic staff and students:*
Mobility of staff appears to succeed in making use of both international mobility opportunities as well as entitlements (sabbatical leave). The Committee did not come across to evidence regarding the existence of an "End Report" describing the activity in question and its benefits for the staff member or Department. **If such reports are not as yet institutionalized, the Committee strongly advises on their necessity.**
- *Evaluation by the students of (a) the teaching and (b) the course content and study material/resources:*
As already mentioned, evaluation is largely dependent on student questionnaires, revealing very positive results, deriving, however, from a relatively small number of respondents. **The Committee would like to see in place a system of incentives/penalties enabling a greater part of the student body to timely respond to evaluation questionnaires.**

RESULTS

- *Efficacy of teaching:*
Judged by the student pass rates on courses, teaching appears to be delivering the desired results. Indicative comment from students: 'anyone that attends lectures, follows instructions and studies, will pass'.
- *Discrepancies in the success/failure percentage between courses and how they are justified:*
The Committee did not sight detailed comparative statistics of student performance in different courses. However, anecdotal evidence obtained through discussions with staff and students suggests that there is a good degree of consistency of positive performance across courses.
- *Differences between students in (a) the time to graduation, and (b) final degree grades:*
Again, the Committee did not sight detailed statistics relating to length of study vs. degree classification. The average grade of 6,83 and the average completion of 5,09 years (instead of 4) is blurred by the method by which statistics are presented in the first place, i.e. calendar years rather than student cohorts. The distribution of marks around the 6,83 average is fairly normal. In the case of the postgraduate programme, the average grade is 7,08 and completion time far closer to the target of 1 – 1,5 years.

The Committee strongly feels that until concrete action is taken to enforce the 'v + 2' rule, combined with setting limits on the number of deferred and referred decisions, any efforts in attempting to draw conclusions on progression and completion statistics will be massively skewed and therefore meaningless as a measure of teaching / learning quality.

- *The Department understands the reasons of such positive or negative results?*
The Department fully understands the limitations as described above.

IMPROVEMENT

- *Does the Department propose methods and ways for improvement?*
In the absence of formal periodic monitoring and recording of programmes' development, it is very difficult to assess proposals for improvement as expected in the context of a quality circle audit.
- *What initiatives does it take in this direction?*
(See comments above)

Sections A & B: Programmes' Design and Delivery: Summary and further commentary

Having responded to the questions as required in the report template, the Committee wishes to expand further on the Programmes' and Courses' planning, structure and management adding the following comments and recommendations:

Programme(s) Specifications

The University does provide individual programme specifications documents (*Odigos Spoudon*) and annual updates, including general information to students with regard to studying under specific programme(s), which is recognised as good practice.

Whilst some of the items listed below might be present in the current document, it would be beneficial, for Quality Assurance purposes, if the Programme Specification Document also contained and observed the following very important topics and processes.

1. Programme Rationale

- 1.1 *Target market:* A more detailed target market analysis, considering internationalisation and competition should be considered. Short and Summer Courses should also be included as part of the Department's overall strategy.
- 1.2 *Consultation with employers:* Current engagement with employers and industry is commendable. The Committee recommends the creation of an *Advisory Board* that will further benefit curriculum design and enhance employability of graduates in all programmes. Furthermore, it will provide additional consistent interaction between industry and department, opportunities for recommendations regarding changes in market needs and further facilitate student placements.
- 1.3 *Recruitment strategy:* The Department might aim at recruiting students of higher academic potential, particularly in the postgraduate programme.

2. Curriculum Content, Design and Delivery

- 2.1 *Rationale for the programme and its structure:* The Committee recommends that future reviews of the programmes should reflect the strategic direction of the Department as a whole and the balance between teaching / learning and research activities.
- 2.2 *Support for University policies and strategies:* Once the University's / Department's Strategy is finally agreed upon and published, the Committee recommends that the

Programme Specification Document should map how it strategically fits in the strategy's framework.

- 2.3 *Work-Based Learning Opportunities*: The Committee highly commends the current excellent practice of work placements and reiterates that the formation of an *Advisory Board* will further enhance this particularly important effort.

3. *Teaching, Learning and Assessment*

- 3.1 *Overall aims of the teaching, learning and assessment strategy*: The Committee identified course content overlaps which should be addressed. Differentiation between similar undergraduate and postgraduate courses should be made more distinct for the benefit of those undergraduates that wish to proceed with the post graduate degree in the Department. Assessments should include both written assignments and presentations, throughout the programme. It is recommended that the assessment strategy should include relatively brief assessments and short presentations.
- 3.2 *Expected contact and Personal Study Hours*: The Committee strongly recommends that contact and study time on all courses should be reviewed making sure that the overall workload of the students remains balanced and within the expectations of the Bologna Agreement. It should further take into consideration that many students subsidise their studies with part time work, a reality that has to be recognised and accounted for in their daily hourly commitments.
- 3.3 *Assessment Feedback*: The Committee strongly recommends that a feedback policy should be created whereby students are provided with feedback to work submitted within 2 maximum 3 weeks from the day of submission / examination.

4. *Student Support and Learning Resources*

- 4.1 *Induction programme for new students (first week activities)*: The Committee highly commends the current good practice of a one day Induction for new students (combined with the publication of the 'student survival guide' and further recommends that Induction activities extend to a week-long series of events enabling new students to assimilate in their new community.
- 4.2 *Teaching Accommodation and venues*: The Committee agrees with Department staff that current teaching accommodation is insufficient and recommends that the University addresses this issue as a matter of urgency.
- 4.3 *Library Facilities*: The Committee fully shares the Department's concerns as regards potential interruptions of electronic access to Journals and Publications due to late payments to service providers and recommends that the University addresses this issue as a matter of urgency.
- 4.4 *IT Facilities*: Whilst the IER describes the IT infrastructure as more or less acceptable, the Committee identified inadequacies in both numbers and age of PC's, with students regularly having to depend on their own equipment in order to complete their work. Adequate IT support is essential and therefore the Committee recommends that the University addresses this issue as a matter of urgency.
- 4.5 *Personal Tutoring*: The Committee highly commends the current excellent practices of 'open door' 24/7 staff availability and passion of care for student needs, creating a 'family' atmosphere in the Department. The Committee however suggests that staff availability to students is somehow regularised, in order to achieve a better work /private life balance for staff members.
- 4.6 *Staff Availability*: Building on the above, the Committee recommends that Secretarial / Admin support for students should consider rescheduling the 10:00 – 12:00 opening

time slots, in line with the 3 hrs teaching sessions that normally run at the same time, so that students can benefit from the services provided without having to miss lectures.

- 4.7 *Project Supervision and Management*: The Committee did not sight a final project handbook, which might well be available. Through discussion with staff members however it became evident that student projects are examined and marked at the end of the cycle, after submission and public presentation. The Committee highly recommends that a new approach is employed where progress is monitored and marked in stages (such as Project Proposal, Literature Review, Progress Report, Final Report and Presentation) and that the concept of a second supervisor is introduced for moderation purposes.
- 4.8 *Pastoral Support*: The Committee has already highly praised members of staff for their commitment to pastoral support for students. It has however identified areas that need improvement, in particular with regard to students with special needs. It is recommended that the Department formulates a policy, formally addressing, among others, extra time allocation for dyslexic students etc. Access for students, staff and visitors with special mobility needs should also be addressed as a matter of urgency.
- 4.9 *Extenuating Circumstances*: The Committee recommends that a policy regarding extenuating circumstances should be considered.

5. Quality Management

- 5.1 *Staff Roles*: Students should be provided with a clear description of the roles of the academic staff they are likely to be in contact with and the channels of flow of responsibility and decision making in matters relating to the programme provision. The Committee has identified the following key roles and strongly encourages that their functions are documented and explained to students: *Head of Department; Programme Leader; Course Coordinators*.
- 5.2 *Programme Committees*: It is recommended that each programme of study has a Programme Committee comprising of the Head of the Department, Lecturers and student representatives that meets at regular intervals (at least once per year) to discuss good practices, challenges and practical issues relating to programme delivery. Meeting minutes should be formally kept and action points followed up.
- 5.3 *Setting Exams and Assessments*: Whilst fully respecting academic freedom, the Committee highly recommends that draft exam papers, together with model answers be submitted, prior to the examination date, to the Programme co-ordinator or Head of Department for moderation purposes. Moderation is purely intended to ensure avoidance of human errors such as spelling or numerical mistakes, clarity of phrasing of questions and instructions, question weightings etc. without however questioning in any form or shape the academic integrity of the examiner.
- 5.4 *Marking and Moderation Arrangements*: as per above, marking moderation is intended to ensure avoidance of human errors (such as adding mistakes) without however questioning in any form or shape the academic judgement of the examiner / first marker.
- 5.5 *Annual Monitoring*: The Programme Leader should prepare a Programme Review at the end of each academic year which should include student performance, lecturer's comments and actions arising from Programme Committee meetings. The aim of this recommendation is to establish a continuous improvement process with the necessary paper trail for future scrutiny.
- 5.6 *Programme Specific Regulations*: The Committee identified the issue of low class attendance and participation. It therefore recommends that consideration is given to ways of developing overall student engagement. Examples could be 'Clubs' with specific interest groups, initiatives such organising conferences on specific themes, competitions, prizes and other incentives.

- 5.7 *Plagiarism and Academic Offences Procedures*: The Committee recommends the establishment of a rigid policy regarding plagiarism and the consequences for offenders. Where possible, electronic submissions should be tested by specialized software, such as Turn-it-in, although it is recognised this can be challenging due to the use of the Greek language. Alternatively the use of question and answer sessions, when plagiarism is suspected, might confirm or defend the ownership of the work presented.

Course(s) Specifications

The University does provide individual courses specifications, which is recognised as good practice. However, the format and information provided therein appears somehow inconsistent across courses. It is highly recommended that the format and presentation of individual course specifications is standardised and always include the following (an example of a course specifications document appears in the Appendix):

1. *Aims*: clearly stating what the course intends to provide to the student.
2. *Learning Outcomes*: clearly stipulating that ‘upon successful completion this course the student will be able to’....
The learning outcomes’ descriptors should always be the appropriate for the specific level of studies.
3. *Indicative Content*: generally outlining the lectures, tutorials and workshop topics that are considered necessary in order to achieve the learning outcomes.
4. *Learning and Teaching Activities*: practically outlining how the teaching and learning material will be delivered through for example a mix of lectures, tutorials, workshops, industrial visits, guru lectures, seminars etc.
5. *Learning Time (1 ECTS = 28 hours)*, providing a detailed time allocation between the various activities relating to the completion of the course, such as direct contact time (lectures, tutorials, seminars etc.), self-study, preparation of course work, assessment and exams etc. The sum of the time allocated in the various activities should not exceed the weight (number of ECTS credits multiplied by 28hrs per credit) allocated to the course.
6. *Assessment Details*: specifying the mix of formative and summative assessments through which the achievement of each and every learning outcome will be measured and confirmed as met.
It is highly recommended that assessment comprises of more than just one ‘single point’ examination, is transparent and consistent over time capable and of capturing the attainment of the learning outcomes. Students should be reminded that class participation is an essential prerequisite and when possible a small % of marks should be allocated to this. A sample of past exam papers and course work should be accessible by the students. Furthermore, in the case of examinations, model answers and marking criteria should be provided so that second markers / moderators can be guided accordingly. The Committee strongly recommends that, to the extent possible, methods of examination / evaluation that may be interpreted as subjective by the students (e.g. verbal examination) should not be used in the assessment process.
7. *Indicative Course Materials and Reading*: listing the supportive resources required such as text books, lecture notes, general references etc.

C. Research

APPROACH

As stated by the Department, their mission is “to promote high quality teaching and research, excelling in the international academic community, while inspired by the values and tradition of the world-leading maritime Aegean environment and Europe”. In line with their mission statement and building on strong links with the industry, the current research policy of the Department is to conduct both fundamental and applied research in the three main academic domains, namely, shipping, (maritime) transport and trade. To this end, its members are actively involved in academic and contract research promoting their international presence through research collaborations and striving for academic excellence. The research policy and orientation of the Department is evident through the activities, publications and projects undertaken by its members.

The research output of the Department suggests that faculty tend to conduct research in their own area of scientific training and specialisation. As such, the range of research specialisations within the Department is quite broad compared to similar departments abroad. During discussions with faculty, a shared understanding of the need to maintain an active research profile and a good research record were clearly evident.

Based on discussions with the junior faculty, it was noted that collaborative research with *some* senior members works well and this is already evident by the joint publications produced as well as the participation in a number of joint research projects. The Committee considers this to be good practice. The Committee further recommends that a *Research Coordinator* may be appointed next to the Department head, to develop research strategy and provide focus ensuring that the Department’s research output reflects the “research core” and exploits synergies that may exist within and between the various thematic research groups. It is also proposed that a formal review process be established to (i) provide each staff member with guidance and research direction consonant with the Department’s overall research strategy and (ii) review each faculty member, say on an annual basis, regarding their goals, methods and aspirations with regard to research. These discussions can be aligned with the internal standards already in place for assessing research in the context of tenure and promotion of individual faculty.

IMPLEMENTATION

Five thematic research groups - the “research laboratories”- currently operate within the Department, carrying out both theoretical and applied research. These are:

- Laboratory of Research in Shipping and Port Management- ReShip
- Laboratory of Geographic Information Systems, Geo-Economy and Geopolitics- GEOPOL
- Laboratory of Informatics and New Technologies in Shipping, Transport and Insular Development – LINTSTID
- Laboratory of Research on Transport and Decision-Making - TRANSDM
- Laboratory of Applied Economics and Finance- LabAEF

Apart from faculty, research staff comprises PhD students, a limited number of post-docs and research associates. Occasionally, students from the taught postgraduate programme contribute to the work of a research lab. The Department has been running a doctoral program since it was established in 1998. The Committee is informed that PhD students that are not self-funded are supported either by the Greek State's Scholarship Foundation (IKY), Scholarships ΗΠΑΚΑΕΙΤΟΣ, Scholarships ΥΠΑΤΙΑ or by Department funds generated through research projects and/or the postgraduate degree programme. This model of funding PhD research is generally in line with what can be found in other research led universities.

The Doctoral program offers the choice for the PhD theses to be written either in the English or Greek language. Over the recent years, more PhD students opt to write their doctoral theses in English facilitating the wider dissemination of research findings and publications in international journals.

Since its inception in 1998, the Department has produced 17 PhD holders and, currently, 60 PhD students are registered on the PhD Program. The Department strongly encourages and supports its PhD students to publish papers in reputable journals. The Committee commends this practice and would like to see this continued and enhanced. It is worth noting that, upon graduation, these individuals may further contribute to the Department or University in different ways through their connections to the Greek or overseas maritime industry and other academic appointments.

The research infrastructure, largely amounting to computer hardware and software, does not necessarily fully support the research needs of the Department. However, it is generally commendable that the existing resources supporting research are used effectively and efficiently. The equipment of the research labs was acquired through funds from research projects. Furthermore, research space capacity and suitability of available venues has been identified as an issue. The Department hopes that more space can be made available to it through the development of new proposed university facilities in a large plot already purchased for this purpose in the area of "Ταμπάκικα". **It is noted that the Committee was not provided with a specific strategy or timeline of how this can be achieved, however, it is recommended that this issue is addressed by the University as a matter of urgency.**

According to the faculty, library resources are satisfactory and the availability of fully operating online access facilitates the faculty's research productivity and flexibility of working off-site. However, the Department expressed major concerns with regard to potential interruptions of electronic access to journals due to late payments to service providers. Furthermore, there are limited funds for online access to a wide range of research journals. The Committee recognises the financial constraints but **recommends that (i) the University addresses this issue as a matter of urgency and (ii) the Department explores other financial means to expand the range of journals supporting the multidisciplinary research undertaken by the five research labs.**

The research output of the Department is significant and spans a wide spectrum of specialisations. It is disseminated through the production of books and publications in peer-reviewed scientific journals and international conferences in the faculty's respective academic disciplines.

Faculty members have collaborated successfully with colleagues from academic institutions elsewhere in Europe and the US (e.g. MIT, University of California in Santa Barbara, Cardiff and Leeds Universities in the UK, Technion University in Israel, etc.). The Committee encourages this good practice contributing to the promotion of the Department's research worldwide.

It must be noted that the faculty has limited options for financial support in conducting academic research beyond the participation in competitive research projects. Faculty members are active in securing research funding from European, national and limited private sources.

An important activity of the Department is the wide dissemination of the research produced by faculty and research staff to the national and international community. This includes the electronic newsletter of the University and the Department's website which reports on a continuous basis information on research, publications, conferences and service activities of its members.

Finally, the Department organises a series of regular research seminars where research collaborators are invited to present their research work to the faculty and Ph.D. students. Part of the research output undertaken in the research labs is also disseminated via these research seminars.

RESULTS

The Committee acknowledges the team-work efforts and cooperation that generally prevails in the Department, but it would nevertheless like to see such efforts intensified further across specialisations, in order to better exploit synergies, particularly between labs, which hopefully should find their way into a research-driven curriculum.

Evidence of the quality of the research work produced by the faculty is reflected in the Departmental research output as described in the IER for the years 2011-13. A careful examination shows that, during this period, there are notable achievements, both in terms of quality and quantity, relative to the size of the faculty. Members of the faculty have made a high number of contributions in peer-reviewed journals and received a high number of citations. Furthermore, faculty disseminates its research through conference proceedings. A large number of papers have been presented with multiple co-authors from the Department during 2010-12 at refereed internationally recognised conferences, such as, the International Association of Maritime Economists, Transport Research Board, European Transport Conference, World Conference of Transport Research Society.

Based on the above, the Committee understands that the Department has clearly placed more emphasis on publications in refereed conference proceedings rather than journal peer-reviewed publications. **The Committee feels that the adoption of a journal list (including high impact factor journals relevant to the main research domains of the Department) can contribute towards providing focus and improving the quality of the research output.** To this end, the Department should prioritize research assessment based on journal publications placing less emphasis on conference proceedings.

Further significant indicators of the impact of the research produced by the Department include the joint industry-academia research initiatives, the links with the local maritime community and the advantages that the long maritime tradition of Chios island offers to the Department, the academic recognition of the faculty, international collaborations, external visibility, rewards and awards. International networking and recognition of the research staff is evidenced from the research partnerships with well-known institutions/organizations in Shipping and Transport, memberships in the Editorial Boards of respectable journals, prizes for scientific work and academic contributions, patents (faculty hold 2 patents), presentation of papers at national and international conferences. A few examples are worth mentioning. One of the research labs, RESHIP, continues to be elected Council membership of IAME (International Association of Maritime Economists) since 2008. Recently, RESHIP assumed responsibility to act as the Secretariat of IAME. The Department is one of the founding members of TRANSPORTNET, the European University Network of eight well established universities, aiming to create a European centre of excellence in the field of maritime and transport, promoting teaching and research collaborations in the above areas. Benefits of joining TRANSPORTNET include the participation of the Department in collaborative EU research projects

jointly with the member universities. Furthermore, TRANSPORTNET offers a European PhD Program in which PhD students of each host University benefit from the close research links with the other member universities. For example, PhD students currently registered on the European PhD Program, which started operating in 2010, are given the opportunity to attend PhD courses at any one of the other university members of TRANSPORTNET.

Faculty members and PhD students of the Department have received awards for “Best Paper” at conferences, such as, the International Congress of Coastal and Marine Tourism, the International Choice Modelling Conference, IAME and Transportation Research Board. It is worth noting two specific awards received by the Department, namely, (i) the 2013 Lloyd's List, Greek Shipping Awards 2013, "Piraeus International Centre Award 2013" for the outstanding contribution of the Department to the emergence of Greece as a Maritime Centre, and (ii) the 2006 Lloyd's List Award for Maritime Innovation.

Faculty members are actively involved in editorial positions of international journals, including the Journal in Shipping and Transport, Build Environment Project and Management (Emerald Journals). Furthermore, Guest Editorships are noted for the Journal of Intelligent Transport Systems, Research and Transportation Economics, Transport Reviews and the Int. Journal of Managing Projects in Business. It is also noted that Ph.D. students have presented their work at internationally recognized conferences, which is a notable achievement by international standards.

Faculty members have been involved in sponsored research projects either as coordinators or partners. As it was reported during the Committee's on-site visit, the total research project funding generated by the Department over the last 16 years has been 8.7m Euro. A significant amount of funding comes from EU research projects (such as, FP7) and other national research funds.

Finally, Department members have been involved in research activities of practical relevance and have developed close links with local industry in Greece. Noteworthy is the fact that, in Sept 2013, the island of Chios has been acknowledged by OECD as a leading global-city in port related research.

IMPROVEMENT

The Committee recognises that the flexibility and autonomy of the Department in the implementation of their strategic goals for research is limited by the requirements imposed by the Greek State on minimum teaching hours by course and by member of staff, and by limited financial support from the State. To this end, any initiatives for improvements in research undertaken by the Department, such as, recruitment policy, financial planning and resourcing, can only be viewed within this restrictive framework. Nevertheless, the Committee proposes the following:

Recommendation C.1

It would be beneficial for the Department to establish a position of *Research Coordinator* to formally define its strategic research direction, in line with the Departmental mission statement, and provide research focus and guidance for future research priorities in the Department. Also the Committee recommends that a formal staff mentoring process is established for assessing the research work of faculty members. The latter will provide a more formal link between good quality research output and promotions. For example, as a first step in terms of setting research standards, the Department may create its own list of academic journals, reflecting the “research core” of the Department, ranked by quality/ impact factor. There are many internationally used journal rankings that can be deployed to assess the quality of various publication outlets.

Recommendation C.2

The Committee encourages the Department to strengthen the PhD Programme and promote links with Universities abroad. In this direction, it is recommended that the Department exploits the benefits and opportunities offered by the Department's participation in the European PhD Program which is jointly delivered with 7 other universities of the TRANSPORTNET. Building a significant body of high quality doctoral students can make a substantial contribution to the departmental research output. The Committee suggests that this can be achieved if the Department allocates additional financial resources to attract researchers with high potential, such as offering a number of PhD scholarships to the most promising candidates.

Recommendation C.3

Despite the relatively small size of the Department, the research output is significant and commendable. The Committee encourages intensification of the already good collaboration between faculty, PhD students and post docs, in order to enhance productivity, and support to the junior faculty. Furthermore, the Department is strongly encouraged to build on the positive picture created by its graduates in the market place, and further relate to its alumni network.

Recommendation C.4

Currently, the limited suitable research space poses a challenge for the Department. New proposed university facilities in a large plot already purchased for this purpose in the area of "Ταμπάκινα" will allow the Department to increase its space for postgraduate education and PhD students, create additional capacity for research staff, modernise the research labs and infrastructure and generate more research income. The Committee recommends that this issue is addressed by the University as a matter of urgency.

D. All Other Services**APPROACH**

- *How does the Department view the various services provided to the members of the academic community (teaching staff, students)?*

The department provides to students PC labs, labs for funded research, administrative services to faculty and students, student counseling, and electronic and physical libraries. Within the existing financial constraints, the department feels that faculty and students receive reasonable support.

The single most important concern raised by the Department was with the quality and availability of classroom space. Increased enrollments have rendered existing space marginally sufficient. The Department rents (at a considerable cost) additional space near the main building, and uses it primarily for Master-level classes. That building houses only 2 classrooms which limits potential growth. In general, the Department is rather concerned about the availability of appropriate classroom facilities, especially as the number of enrolled students continues to increase every year.

- *Does the Department have a policy to simplify administrative procedures? Are most procedures processed electronically?*

According to the Department, management progress has been made towards simplification of processes and this is still in ongoing although there are regulatory constraints which require the generation of a series of administrative documents. However the Committee was not

provided with any documentation as evidence of this process being in place. Most of the student related procedures are now provided electronically and this was confirmed to the Committee during the meeting with student and the head of administration.

- *Does the Department have a policy to increase student presence on Campus?*

Faculty and staff in the department have conscientiously and laboriously cultivated a close relationship with students over the years. This was made clear by both parties during the visit. Most faculty and staff view students as friends and make themselves widely available to them. The presence of students on Campus depends on two factors: i) the willingness of students to work full-time and avoid employment away from Chios, and ii) the degree to which lectures seem engaging to the students.

There is very little the department can do to affect factor i). However, the students indicated that a significant number of courses run 85% attendance rate, while others run as low as 15%. Therefore, there is strong evidence that suggests that instructors' performance in class heavily affects student participation. Other than the close relationship between faculty and students, we were not presented with concrete strategies to increase student presence on Campus. However, parts A and B of this evaluation provide ideas towards standardizing (and hence improving) student experience across courses.

IMPLEMENTATION

- *Organization and infrastructure of the Department's administration (e.g. secretariat of the Department)*
 - Head of the Dept. of Administration
 - Academic Secretariat, HoD Secretary and Secretariat PhD / Quality Evaluation (2 total)
 - Undergraduate Students Secretariat (1 person)
 - Postgraduate Students Secretariat (1 person)
 - Technical Administration Support (1 person)
- *Form and function of academic services and infrastructure for students (e.g. library, PCs and free internet access, student counseling, athletic- cultural activity, etc.).*

Students spoke very positively about access to electronic library, but pointed to sudden service interruptions due to subscription problems for the University. We did not visit the library due to lack of time. Internet service appears to work well for students, faculty, and staff. As visitors, we were provided accounts but were not able to gain access through them.

We did not visit the computer lab but were told that it is well equipped with PCs and additional units are due to arrive soon – units that were procured in 2008... The students did not mention problems with technology. Instead, they praised the fact that they could gain access to most of their courses online through eClass. Students also mentioned that lecture materials are posted on eClass after the lecture. Therefore they cannot benefit from receiving notes ahead or at the time of the lecture so as to keep notes more easily.

Regarding counseling, faculty made us aware of a student support person – a psychologist – available to all the students on location. In our conversations with students however, it was not clear that students are aware of this service. Instead, several students mentioned that various faculty have acted with compassion and have supported students at time that they experienced

personal difficulties. The Committee was not briefed on athletic and cultural activities by neither faculty nor students.

RESULTS

- *Are administrative and other services adequate and functional?*

In our conversations with administrative personnel, we became aware of staff reductions that took place in recent years. These reductions resulted to reduced activity in seeking student internships and outsourcing to the central University some of the activities that were taking place within the Department. The remaining staff commented that they often work on unpaid overtime, as needs arise. Our committee found the services provided to be adequate and functional, however, both faculty and staff in the department aspire to expanding these services to better serve the students.

In our conversation with students, they commented positively on the willingness of administrative staff to help them. However, we found that the official office hours for administrative services are limited to 10-12 daily, which makes it impossible for students who attend classes at that time.

- *How does the Department view the particular results?*

The Department understands the financial constraints in supporting additional staff and adjusts its services to the students accordingly. However, as the number of students increases every year, student services are expected to suffer.

IMPROVEMENTS

- *Has the Department identified ways and methods to improve the services provided?*

Our Committee was made aware that the Department seeks funding for the development of new facilities in a large plot already purchased for this purpose in the area of “Ταμπάκις”. We were not provided with concrete steps of how to reach this objective. Also, we were not exposed to strategies for improving administrative services, library support, computer support, or for other services. In this report, however, our Committee makes a number of cost-free suggestions that can significantly improve the student experience.

Collaboration with social, cultural and production organizations

Our Committee was impressed by the level of involvement of the faculty in the student learning experience. Also, the close interaction of the Department with the industry, both in Chios and the greater Attiki region. A large amount of effort goes towards student placement services. We cannot underestimate the significance of these efforts. The Department has cultivated close relationships with numerous large shipping organisations, as well as banks and Coast Guards and have earned their respect. Further, the Department provides for a lifeline in the island of Chios. Joint events are often organised with the local community. Indicative is the fact that one of our meetings was with the Vice Mayor of the city. We would like to commend the Department for all these initiatives. We also felt that the curriculum serves *shipping* well - the backbone of the Greek economy. We believe that the quality of the programs offered by the Department is high for its intended purpose, and propose (throughout this report) a number of improvements.

E&F. Strategic Planning, Perspectives for Improvement and Dealing with Potential Inhibiting Factors. General Conclusions.

*(Many of the comments that follow in this section do not pertain only to the department under assessment but derive from characteristics of the Greek tertiary educational system of which the department is a part. Apart from section A&B, consisting mostly of recommendations, recommendations appear in **boldface** throughout this document, often more than once)*

The discussions with senior faculty did not result in concrete evidence that there is indeed some strategic planning in place, clearly shared by all staff (benchmarking with peers; staff recruitment; journals the department publishes in; etc.). Legitimate statements were of course made to the effect that “we want to be the best”, or “we have a job to do, according to the Law, which we do to the best of our abilities”. It was however reported to the Committee that work on the production of a *strategic document* is underway.

Inhibiting factors to the development of a clear strategic, plan are: a) the relatively wide range of research specializations among faculty; b) the particular hierarchical structure of the faculty; c) the ‘family-type’ of ‘communal’ decision-making; d) the lack of a research coordinator; e) the academic ‘autonomy’ of staff members; f) the lack of a *journal list*.

Research specialisations

The range of research specializations within the Department is quite wide compared to similar departments internationally. This could be a strength, in view of the current developments in the maritime industry which take a holistic ‘network’ approach to the door-to-door production-transport-distribution of goods traded internationally. To realize this *strength* however, faculty members not belonging to the ‘research core’ of the Department’s stated area of expertise should focus better their admittedly strong methodological skills to shipping (all of its various facets); (international) transport; ports; global supply chain management; and trade. Ideally, the same research focus ought to be achieved also in the competitive (contract) research projects the Department is soliciting. Admittedly, in the competitive world of contract research, this is easier said than done, but both of the above two aspects of research focus could be facilitated by the **appointment of a research coordinator**, belonging to the ‘core’, who, in close coordination with the department head, should ensure that the Department’s research output dovetails with the skills and competences to be provided to students according to market demands and to the requirements of the economic sectors that employ Department graduates. In this respect, the Department’s statement that “our research finds its way to the classroom” could not be clearly established by the committee.

Hierarchical structure of the faculty

The majority of the faculty belongs to the higher echelons (full and associate professor) and, according to plans, the overwhelming majority will soon belong there too. This, although common in many academic departments of Greek universities, as a result of the past university law and the ‘entitlements’ it offered for faculty promotion, is at considerable variance to international best practice where key areas of ‘core’ expertise are entrusted to full professors, who lead a group of associate professors; assistant professors; lecturers; postdocs; PhD students, etc. The current departmental structure, combined with the infamous *academic autonomy*, at least the way this concept is perceived by part of the faculty of Greek universities, are not conducive to research synergies or to the economies of scale which are particularly important for a department as small as

the one under assessment, and one geographically rather isolated, thus not benefitting of the large academic community of an urban university.

The issue of the absence of a research focus –which, in the eyes of this Committee, is the key element of a departmental strategy- is also evidenced by the existence of 5 different labs, each with its own director. **In a 19-strong faculty, this number is rather excessive**, not so much in terms of costs involved, if any, but in terms of cultivating centrifugal tendencies rather than focusing effort. This is particularly so, as the relation between a lab director and the department head is not well defined. In this and other respects, this Committee would like to see a stronger managerial role of the Department head and one which shifts from administering an existing situation to one of strategic change management. To effectuate this, **the Committee recommends that future department heads, to the extent possible, are coming from the ‘core’ of the department’s stated spearheading areas** (see above).

‘family-type’, communal decision-making

Interpersonal relations among faculty members are very strong. This, a.o., can be attributed both to the relative geographical isolation of the Department, as well as to the small, closed community of the island of Chios. Similar relations have been observed also between staff and students. The latter have strongly praised the care with which their various problems and challenges have been dealt with by the faculty. Clearly, a “family” spirit prevails in and around the Department and this is one of its strongest points. When it comes to decision-making, eg with regard to curriculum development, or research focus, or staff promotions, the same *communal* or *family* consensus spirit seems to apply. The committee felt that a general consensus appears to exist according to which “here we are; we are who we are; we teach what we teach; and we research those things that we like”. In the evaluation process, the committee did not come across to a well argued document explaining, for instance -and just to carry a point across- why, in a department of “shipping, transport and trade”, 70% of whose graduates are employed by Greek shipping companies, the department head is not a professor of *Shipping Management*. Or, again as an example and to carry the point across, why in such an orientation, there aren’t any full professors of shipping management; port management; logistics management and, instead, the top echelons are occupied by ‘generic’ or base curriculum professors who, albeit extremely important for the completion of the Department’s curriculum, could offer their input from lower rather than top echelons. Looking at it from a different perspective, one might want to establish the degree to which subjects such as econometrics, or geopolitics –just to use two examples- find their way into the improvement and strengthening of the ‘core curriculum’, as dictated by markets; international best practice; and employer requirements.

Research coordinator

To somewhat ameliorate the relative lack of research focus, this Committee recommends the creation of the function of *research coordinator*, entrusted to a faculty member belonging to the ‘core’ (see above) who, in closest cooperation with the department head (responsible for implementing strategy) should ensure that: a) the limited human resources of the department are not wasted on theoretical or contract research, which is irrelevant to the strategy of the department or the latter’s curriculum; b) maximum synergies (for contract research) and co-authorships (fundamental research) are developed among staff; c) mundane administrative work is centralised so as to free up researchers, allowing them to focus only on scientific work.

Academic autonomy

The concept of ‘academic autonomy’, or *academic liberty*, as it is often called, is often taken to mean that, once a faculty member is elected –particularly in tenured positions- s/he is at full liberty to decide what to teach and how to teach it; what to publish and where to publish it; and how to share one’s time among teaching; research; administration; and community service.

Peer review was present (student evaluations) as regards *quality of teaching*, but the committee did not see evidence that the curriculum itself has ever been subjected to stakeholder assessment. **The committee recommends that the department sets up an informal *Advisory Board*** of industry executives, out of the many the Department is well connected to, tasked, a.o., to validate the curriculum according to industry needs and employability characteristics of the graduates. Such a development would solder even further the excellent industry links the department possesses, successfully used in one of the Department's strongest points, i.e. summer internships.

Returning to *quality of teaching* assessments, this committee feels that **the following issues should deserve a closer look by the Department**: a) exam papers of a particular staff member should be aired and OKed by a second one, if not by the department head; b) exam questions should be composed in such a way so as the results be distributed as normally as possible without skews; c) a deadline should exist for the release of grades to students; d) a formal *grade review* procedure should be in place; e) lecture notes, powerpoint presentations, etc. should be uploaded before the class; f) class interaction should be weighed into the overall grade of a subject; g) deadlines of class assignments of various courses should be coordinated so that they do not coincide, thus creating spikes of activity impacting the quality of the assignment.

Journal list

The Department's publications output is prolific and the Department should be commended on this. An interesting aspect, appearing in a large part of staff CVs submitted to the Committee, was the inclusion of citations counts; in some instances those counts were collected manually. **The committee recommends that, in the future, internet-based programmes are used (Scopus; ISI web of science; Publish or Perish (Google Scholar-based), and the relevant statistics/impacts are presented in place of citations counts.**

Faculty views concerning the adoption of a *journal list*, in order to better focus department strategy, were rather negative on grounds of the Department's *pluralism* that would allegedly make such a list impossible to compile and agree upon. **This committee feels that notwithstanding the advantages of pluralism in such a department, research output needs to focus on the curriculum's 'core'**. Just to use a few examples, *mathematics* and *operations research* could be applied to the optimization of container terminal operations; *transport planning* could be applied to liner shipping networks; *microeconomics* could be applied to shipping management; *econometrics* to freight rate forecasting; *geopolitics* to the oil transportation market, and so on.

The committee recommends that each staff member indicates its peers; i.e. colleagues the staff member benchmarks against. On the basis of peer publications, a journal list should be compiled and ranked (A, B, C, D) according to those journals' impact factors. Once such a list is in place, staff members are expected to publish there too or, to put it differently, it should only be *list publications* that count for promotion and/or yearly staff assessment. **In this regard, the Department should also de-emphasize publications in conference proceedings or book chapters and weigh assessment leaning on journal publications.**

APPENDIX

Example of a Course Specification Document drawn under UK specs:

Note that 1 ECTS unit = 2.8 British Credits. 1 British Credit = 10 hours

Course Specification							
School							
Department							
Code							
Course Title							
Course Coordinator							
Level (please tick)	4	5	6	7	✓		
Credit							
Pre-requisites							

Aims

This course meets the first of the Intended Learning outcomes (ILOs) of the programme as a whole..

Learning Outcomes

On completing this course successfully you will be able to:

- Demonstrate and utilise an understanding of;
- Critique;
- Demonstrate and utilise an understanding of.
- Synthesise and apply an in-depth understanding of those key principles, issues and practices.
- Apply this.....
- Abstract, synthesise and interpret key information.

Indicative Content

- Introduction to nnnn
- Types of vessels
- Laws of thermodynamics
- Elements of French cooking etc

Learning and Teaching Activities

Example: Teaching is by formal lectures, tutorials and seminar discussion. Special guest lectures and industry visits as appropriate.

Learning Time (1 British credit = 10 hours)

Scheduled contact hours:	Lectures (ten at 2 hours each)	20
--------------------------	--------------------------------	-----------

Note: include in scheduled time: project supervision, demonstrations, practical classes and workshops, supervised time in studio or workshop, scheduled lab work , fieldwork, external visits, work-based learning where integrated into a structured academic programme	seminars	
	other practical sessions	
	tutorials	4
	examinations	
	other scheduled time	36
Guided independent study Note: include in guided independent study preparation for scheduled sessions, follow up work, wider reading or practice, revision	Independent coursework	40
	Independent laboratory work	
	other non-scheduled time	
Placements (including work placement and year abroad)		
Total hours (should add to credits * 10)		100

Assessment Details:

Methods of Assessment	Essay	Essay
Grading Mode	Review	Review
Weighting %	50%	50%
Pass Mark	70	30
Word Length	2,000	2,000
Outline Details	A question set by the course coordinator relating to ...	Students are expected to reflect on the relevance of what they have seen to all aspects of the course and key issues highlighted. For example,

Indicative Course Materials and Reading:

ISBN Number (for printed material)	Author	Date	Title	Publisher
978-0-19-95458854-9	Collins, Alan, Ed.	2009	Contemporary Security Studies	Oxford University Press

978-				
978-				

The Members of the Committee

Name and Surname	Signature
1. Hercules Haralambides	
2. _____	
3. _____	
4. _____	