



ΕΘΝΙΚΟ ΜΕΤΣΟΒΙΟ ΠΟΛΥΤΕΧΝΕΙΟ

ΣΧΟΛΗ ΑΓΡΟΝΟΜΩΝ ΚΑΙ ΤΟΠΟΓΡΑΦΩΝ ΜΗΧΑΝΙΚΩΝ

ΚΟΣΜΗΤΟΡΑΣ

Αθήνα, 31/1/2014

Αρ. πρωτ.: 5688

Προς

Την Αντιπρύτανη και
Πρόεδρο της ΜΟΔΠ
του Εθνικού Μετσόβιου Πολυτεχνείου
κ. Αντωνία Μοροπούλου

Τ η ν
Α . Δ Ι . Π .
ΑΡΧΗ ΔΙΑΣΦΑΛΙΣΗΣ ΚΑΙ
ΠΙΣΤΟΠΟΙΗΣΗΣ ΤΗΣ ΠΟΙΟΤΗΤΑΣ
ΣΤΗΝ ΑΝΩΤΑΤΗ ΕΚΠΑΙΔΕΥΣΗ

ΘΕΜΑ: Παρατηρήσεις επί του Σχεδίου Έκθεσης Εξωτερικής Αξιολόγησης

Αξιότιμη κα Αντιπρύτανη και Πρόεδρε της ΜΟΔΠ

Με το υπ' αριθμ. 314/16.01.2014 (πρωτ. ΑΔΠ) λάβαμε «Σχέδιο» της Έκθεσης Εξωτερικής Αξιολόγησης της Σχολής Αγρονόμων Τοπογράφων Μηχανικών του ΕΜΠ που συνέταξε η Επιτροπή Εξωτερικής Αξιολόγησης, και κληθήκαμε σύμφωνα με το Ν. 3374/2005, άρθρο 9, παρ. 2, να υποβάλουμε τις παρατηρήσεις μας μέσα σε προθεσμία δεκαπέντε ημερών.

Όπως ενθυμείστε, η χρονική στιγμή, ο τόπος και οι συνθήκες κάτω από τις οποίες κλήθηκε να αξιολογηθεί η Σχολή ήταν οι πλέον ακατάλληλες. Η ΑΔΠ, παρά το εύλογο αλλά και επιτακτικό αίτημα Σχολής και Ιδρύματος για αναβολή, αποφάσισε να προχωρήσει στην αξιολόγηση κάτι που πιστεύουμε ότι αδικεί τόσο τη σοβαρή αυτή διαδικασία όσο και την ίδια τη Σχολή.

Παρόλα αυτά, η Σχολή ανταποκρίθηκε στο μέτρο του δυνατού και προσκόμισε στην Επιτροπή όλα τα διαθέσιμα στοιχεία ώστε να συμβάλει στην αξιολόγηση. Η Επιτροπή είχε το δυσχερέστατο έργο να συναντηθεί με μέλη της Σχολής και να αξιολογήσει πολύ υλικό σε σύντομο χρονικό διάστημα χωρίς μάλιστα τη δυνατότητα επίσκεψης στο φυσικό χώρο της Σχολής. Η Σχολή ευχαριστεί θερμά όλα τα μέλη της Επιτροπής Αξιολόγησης για το χρόνο και την προσπάθεια τους να συντάξουν την Έκθεση Αξιολόγησης η οποία θα αποτελέσει σημαντικό στοιχείο για τις επιλογές της Σχολής την επόμενη πενταετία.

Το «Σχέδιο» της Έκθεσης προφανώς αποτυπώνει την άποψη της Επιτροπής για τη Σχολή σε διάφορα επίπεδα και διατυπώνει προτάσεις-συστάσεις (recommendations). Επί αυτών δεν θα μπορούσαμε να θέσουμε κάποιο θέμα, είναι σεβαστές, και είναι βέβαιο ότι θα εξεταστούν κατά τη συζήτηση προγραμματισμού και αναδόμησης του Προγράμματος Σπουδών αλλά και της γενικότερης φυσιογνωμίας και στρατηγικής της Σχολής. Κάποιες παρατηρήσεις της Επιτροπής άπτονται γενικότερων θεσμικών θεμάτων (λ.χ., υποχρεωτική παρακολούθηση μαθημάτων, προαπαιτούμενα, εξεταστικές, κ.ά.) και δεν μπορούν να αντιμετωπιστούν ανεξάρτητα από τη Σχολή.

Προκειμένου πάντως να συμβάλουμε στην αρτιότερη ολοκλήρωση αυτής της διαδικασίας, έχουμε εντοπίσει κάποια σημεία που μπορούν να συμπληρωθούν/αποσαφηνιστούν και τα οποία μπορούν να ληφθούν υπόψη κατά τη σύνταξη της τελικής έκθεσης. Οι παρατηρήσεις αυτές επισυνάπτονται ώστε να κοινοποιηθούν εντός του προβλεπόμενου χρόνου στην ΑΔΙΠ.

Είμαστε στη διάθεσή σας για τυχόν διευκρινήσεις.

REMARKS ON THE EXTERNAL EVALUATION REPORT

GENERAL REMARKS

The External Evaluation Report (EER) was based on a large amount of information provided by the School. The External Evaluation Committee (EEC) had the hard task of compiling a coherent report out of this. The School recognizes this effort and is thankful to all members of the EEC. The EEC fulfilled their mandate in a professional, objective, and constructive manner.

From our point of view, the most important conclusions drawn out of the EER about the School of Rural and Surveying Engineering and its field of study are the following:

1. The School's discipline has a distinct and substantial identity from other engineering disciplines, which draws heavily on the two key areas of 'surveying' and 'geoinformatics'.
2. It addresses real societal needs and should continue to do so.
3. It must keep up with international developments in the geospatial era and has already provided evidence that it is capable of competing at the cutting edge.
4. The School is aware of the need to meet its challenges, as it is already addressed in the internal evaluation report and in the submitted proposal for the School's identity and strategy.
5. The School should continue and further develop its successful graduate programs.
6. When dealing with areas also addressed by other departments or professional practice, the above key specialties provide a valuable geospatial perspective and approach of complimentary and not competitive or redundant character.

On the other hand, the School is fully aware of the need for an internal streamlining of its program. Several important suggestions towards this objective are made in the

EER. The issue of achieving a level of professional adequacy in the two applied areas of the School in the 5-year program is an issue that remains to be further studied.

MAIN REMARKS

- Although the EEC comments on the outcomes of research work publishing are considered as valid (Section: *C. Research*, sub-section: *Implementation* – 3rd paragraph, p. 12-13), we feel it should be mentioned that the number of publications and citations of staff members reveal a significant increasing rate. For example, the number of papers per staff member has doubled in the last 1.5 years and the number of citations has increased in the same period by 2.5 times (data from Scopus, from 6/2011 to 12/2013).
- Considering the analysis on teaching issues (Section: *B. Teaching* – p. 10-12), we feel that some reference to internships courses («πρακτική άσκηση») on Geodesy, Photogrammetry and Remote Sensing is missing. These internships courses are organized in cooperation with local authorities or other government institutions. They help students to learn in real working conditions, to gain practicing skills and how to collaborate in groups. In addition, internships courses link the academic work to the needs of public organizations and local authorities.
- It should be mentioned that specialties related to “Rural Engineering” in our curriculum are not considered merely as application areas but instead as environmental approaches in applied fields strongly connected with the two pillars of the School: Surveying and GeoInformatics Engineering.
- Considering the analysis on services provided by the School (Section: *F. All Other Services*, last sub-section - p. 19), it should be mentioned that the School of R&SE interacts with society as well as with industry by providing significant services through the Centre of Assessment of Natural Hazards. Furthermore, the School has established several memoranda of collaboration with the Mapping and Cadastral Agencies of Greece and Cyprus, as well as, with local authorities.
- Considering the comment on students programming skills (Section: *A. Curriculum – Undergraduate Programme*, sub-section: *Implementation* - fifth point (bullet), p. 7), we understand that the main effort should be addressed on how to diffuse the programming skills through students’ laboratory assignments rather than to add additional programming courses.
- The term “stream” is used in EER referring to the three “Sections” of School of R&SE and their associated fields of study. In this context, the established term “Section” could be used instead.
- According to the previous point, Section: *A. Curriculum – Undergraduate programme*, sub-section: *Approach* – p. 6, may be rephrased as:

- Section I. Topography (spatial data acquisition, handling, processing and geovisualization)
- Section II. Geography and Regional Planning (spatial analysis, urban planning, regional planning, physical geography and environmental assessment)
- Section III. Infrastructure Works and Rural Development (transportation & water management)

in order to provide a more representative description of the three Sections.

- The suggested “balance of the number of courses among the three streams” is meant outside
- It is clarified that the core “Topography and Geoinformation” (central triangle in Fig.1) offered by “Stream I” to all “Streams”, is necessary for it secures an essential common identity of the School and its graduates. Outside and in addition this core, the EER suggests a balance of the number of remaining courses among the three streams.

MINOR REMARKS

In section: *Introduction* - p. 5, the name of the director of Lab of General Geodesy is: Stathas instead of: Psathas.

In section: *Introduction* - p. 5, the last paragraph needs to be rephrased as:
Wednesday, September 25, 2013

- Presentations and discussions of Section II & III: Geography and Regional Planning and Infrastructure and Rural Development
- Meeting with Professor Th. Vlastos, Head, Geography and Regional Planning
- Presentation of the Physical Geography and Environmental Impacts Lab, M.P. Papadopoulou
- Presentation of the Geography and Spatial Analysis Lab, Th. Vlastos and G. Fotis
- Presentation of the area Regional Planning and Regional Analysis, Unit of Regional Design and Regional Development, A. Stratigea
- Presentation of the Sustainable Mobility Unit, Th. Vlastos
- Presentation of the area Housing and Urban Planning Topics, A. Siolas

In section: *Introduction* – p1, the first row:

- Presentation of the Spatial Analysis and GIS lab
should be deleted.

In section A, ”Implementation” – p7, in the current scientific and technological trends in the field of geomatics engineering, the areas of “remote sensing” and “cartography” might be added to the existing ones since they heavily utilize digital technologies.

In section: *C. Strategic Planning, Perspectives for Improvements and Dealing with Potential Inhibiting Factors*, in Table 1 (p. 21), the following three rows should be added:

Environmental Impact Assessment Studies	Surveying	-	-	-	120
Environmental Impact Assessment Studies	Civil	-	-	-	351
Environmental Impact Assessment Studies	Architects	-	-	-	112

Με τιμή



Άγγελος Σιόλας
Καθηγητής Ε.Μ.Π. και Κοσμήτορας Σ.Α.Τ.Μ.