



ΕΛΛΗΝΙΚΗ ΔΗΜΟΚΡΑΤΙΑ

HELLENIC REPUBLIC

**Α.ΔΙ.Π.**

**H.Q.A.A.**

ΑΡΧΗ ΔΙΑΣΦΑΛΙΣΗΣ ΠΟΙΟΤΗΤΑΣ

HELLENIC QUALITY ASSURANCE AGENCY

ΑΝΩΤΑΤΗΣ ΕΚΠΑΙΔΕΥΣΗΣ

FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

## **EXTERNAL EVALUATION REPORT**

DEPARTMENT OF LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE  
TECHNOLOGICAL EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTE OF KAVALA –  
DRAMA BRANCH

Version 1.0

November 2011

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b><i>Table of Contents</i></b> .....	<b>2</b>
<b><i>The External Evaluation Committee</i></b> .....	<b>2</b>
<b><i>Introduction</i></b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b><i>A. Curriculum</i></b> .....	<b>6</b>
<b><i>B. Teaching</i></b> .....	<b>8</b>
<b><i>C. Research</i></b> .....	<b>10</b>
<b><i>D. All Other Services</i></b> .....	<b>12</b>
<b><i>E. Strategic Planning, Perspectives for Improvement and Dealing with Potential Inhibiting Factors</i></b> .....	<b>13</b>
<b><i>F. Final Conclusions and recommendations of the EEC</i></b> .....	<b>14</b>
<b><i>Appendix: Interviews with students, faculty and staff</i></b> .....	<b>16</b>

### External Evaluation Committee

#### External Evaluation Committee

The Committee responsible for the External Evaluation of the Department of Landscape Architecture of the Technological Educational Institute of Kavala – Drama Branch consisted of the following four (4) expert evaluators drawn from the Registry constituted by the HQAA in accordance with Law 3374/2005 :

1. Dr. **Guy Burgel**, urban geographer, Université Paris Ouest Nanterre La Défense, Paris, France (**Coordinator**), guy.burgel@u-paris10.fr
2. Dr. **Elias Messinas**, Architect & Environmental Consultant, ECOAMA, Jerusalem & Design Unit, Holon Institute of Technology, Israel, elias@ecoama.com
3. Dr. **Thomas Panagopoulos**, Research Centre for Spatial and Organizational Dynamics, University of Algarve, Faro, Portugal, tpanago@ualg.pt
4. Dr. **Ingra Straupe**, Forest Faculty, Latvia University of Agriculture, Jelgava, Latvia, inga.straupe@llu.lv

## ***Introduction***

The External Evaluation Committee (EEC) visited the Department **between November 7-9, 2011**. The group arrived in the early afternoon of the 7<sup>th</sup> and the team was greeted by the Department's Head Prof. A.D. Styliadis and members of the Department. The team was driven to Kavala and was met by the President and Vice-President of TEI Kavala and the Head and some members of the Department of Drama branch. The work meeting was conducted in an atmosphere of cordiality, hospitality and professionalism and after a brief introduction of the Institute's objectives and operational overview, in thereafter casual discussion many issues regarding the TEI and the evaluation process were clarified.

After transportation to the hotel in Drama, the EEC met for dinner with the Head of the Department of landscape Architecture and various members of the Department and also members of the Faculty-Department of Forestry, including the Internal Evaluation Committee members (IEC) for briefing over dinner.

On the 8<sup>th</sup>, the EEC was taken to the TEI Branch of Drama installations located about 35 km north of the City of Kavala. Upon arrival, the team was met the Department's Head who gave us a brief description of the operational protocols and structure. Furthermore, the EEC established the agenda for the day's visit. Thereafter, the EEC met with the Director of the Department, who after some welcoming comments also discussed some of the pressing and important issues surrounding the Department's structure and operation.

The EEC decided to put the Local authorities visit and the facilities visit at the top of the agenda list so that the evaluators might have a round view of the infrastructure that would help not only with the understanding of the lab and teaching facilities level, but also assist in formulating more probing questions to the faculty members regarding their pedagogical and research activities.

**The EEC met with the Mayor of Drama** who immediately expressed his appreciation for the presence of the TEI Branch of Drama in the city, and how this benefits the city (socially, culturally and financially). He expressed the need to bring into the city young people from other Greek cities ('diversity of young population'), the need for the specific professions to be taught in Drama (Landscape Architecture and Forestry), and expressed his support to the Department. In practical terms, he pointed out that the city has fifty-three (53) squares and open public spaces, that need renewal and which could potentially be the experimentation ground for the Department students and alumni. The Mayor also pointed out that the Municipality has projects that it assigns to planning teams with already approved funding, helping both the city with new ideas, the Department with more exposure to the city, and the students with real work. For example, he mentioned of a project he requested from TEE and another one that he assigned to the AUTH in Thessaloniki. The Mayor also expressed his concern about the Department being split between two locations, and took a positive position in being of help by offering an empty building (a former school) – owned by the Municipality – to house the Department, once the Department can come forward with a plan to expand (for example with a FEK that opens the way for a new Masters program). The Mayor also spoke about the plans by the Municipality to establish a new 'Open Popular University' for the city residents. The discussion also touched upon other projects taking place in Drama, such as the Film Festival, which can take a more sustainable format, not only for the short period of the festival, but with activity and benefits throughout the year.

**The EEC met also with the Vice Prefect of Region of East Macedonia and Thrace** based in Drama and two of the Prefecture consultants. The discussion touched upon a number of issues, starting from the location of the TEI Branch of Drama: the Prefecture is apparently weighing the transfer of the Department from the downtown location to the

campus outside the city, in order that it joins the Forestry Department. The EEC members agreed with the position that the two Departments could (or should) be joined together, but did not hide their disagreement with a decision that can seriously harm the Department in terms of functionality, student response and satisfaction, presence, contribution and benefit towards the city, and apparently lead to its isolation and eventually closure. Further, the EEC emphasized the need to give the Department additional space in a downtown location, either in the existing location or in a new location owned by the Prefecture. The EEC mentioned examples abroad where academic institutions moved to distant campuses only to return to a downtown location some years later. The EEC emphasized in the meeting the need of cooperation between the Prefecture and the TEI Branch of Drama, for the benefit of both. For example, the Prefecture can 'promote' the work done at the Department. The Prefecture can offer planning and internship opportunities to the Department internships and alumni. On the other hand, the Department can give more prestige to the city of Drama, and, with the help of the Prefecture, involve more citizens in its activity towards the benefit of Drama.

**The EEC visited firstly one floor of the building in the Drama city center** that is an old but renovated Tobacco warehouse and **then the installations of Department of Forestry outside the city**. Also visited teaching facilities during class time thus allowing for a limited firsthand experience with the teaching methods used in the labs/classes. The tour at the building located at the campus outside city that belongs to the Department of Forestry has many laboratories, classrooms and the library that are used from the students of the Department of Landscape Architecture and some offices from the professors are also located there.

Last, but not least, the team visited the small, but highly impressive Museum of Natural History located inside the building. This provides an overview of the local fauna and flora with real size models, stuffed animals and various other models related to biology and geology including an impressive collection of fossilized woods. The museum has become the magnet and center of natural history education of the local elementary and high schools and there is a continuous stream of pupil visitors. As a footnote, the EEC must not forget to point out the superb condition of the building where every effort is made by staff and students to keep it clean and pleasant.

Upon completion of the tour, the EEC had the opportunity to review a number of supplementary documents provided by the Department including a CD-ROM, booklets and books regarding Landscape, forest and environmental resources, various statistical data, samples of publications, documents pertaining to the curriculum and the Academic/Development Plan (ADP) for 2012 produced by the faculty members.

Subsequently, the committee had a long meeting with Internal Review Committee members involved in the Department's internal evaluation. **The meeting was conducted in a very collegiate and professional ambiance**. It started with the EEC Coordinator's introduction pertaining to the purpose and objectives of the evaluation exercise and the issues that the committee needs to probe. Thereafter, the Director gave an overview of the Department's scholarly activities and the discussion begun. The committee members asked specific clarification questions relating to the internal evaluation and many others related to issues not fully covered by the report. All attendees participated in the discussion. Overall, the committee left that part of the visit with a significant amount of data and clarifications that provided a more complete and spherical image of the Department.

Next step, **the EEC met with a group of undergraduate students** since the Department does not have a graduate program yet. In the beginning the meeting was with the representative of students and the presences of Professors, but after we invited randomly

some students from the classrooms and we interview them individually. The meeting took place in the absence of faculty or staff members. After a brief introduction of our backgrounds and the EEC's objectives, the students introduced themselves and discussed issues related to the curriculum, training and employment opportunities after graduation. The students mentioned that they had not seen the internal evaluation and they believed that the questionnaires and all internal evaluation goes to garbage or there is no follow up.

The meeting was open and frank. Students discussed specific problems related to their curriculum and sequence of studies plus their anxiety about limited work opportunities upon graduation. The committee sympathizes with the employment uncertainty, lack of transportation availability after 8pm and conflicts in the people of the Department. However, it is also noted that there is a significant lack of knowledge of what the students study and what is the scope of the program in the Department, especially at the first semester.

Specifically, after an EEC member asked the students if they would ever recommend this program to others or if they had the opportunity to do this again, they all emphatically replied positively. More, some of the students didn't know what they will study when they enter to this Department, but they loved it and they consider it good luck to be in it.

This is a strong indication of one of the fundamental culprits of the system, namely, where young people study a discipline that they don't know if they will have any interest on it as profession.

This unfortunately is augmented sometimes by the low level of student preparation that are mostly streamed into the TEI system as the last place to enter. This is a political and educational concern that must be urgently addressed by the State in a creative and firm way.

After a brief coffee break, **the EEC had the opportunity to meet with all Department faculty members** and discuss all issues relevant to the curriculum, teaching, research and operations. This discussion part was very informative since the committee had the opportunity to listen to all levels of faculty present in the room.

**The second day**, the EEC also met with two other important groups, namely, the nonpermanent teaching staff (three persons) and the administration support staff (two persons). The former group discussed issues pertaining mostly to quality of teaching, interrelationships with students, their job security and their willingness to do doctoral studies and become part of the permanent staff. Specifically, suggestions were made regarding more hours in the term contracts. The latter group described daily operations of the Secretariat and the EEC must commend the efforts the staff makes to support student and faculty activities.

**In conclusion, the EEC members would like to congratulate the Department faculty and staff for producing a very detailed self evaluation and a professional document** that helped us to better and deeper understand the issues pertaining to the particular curriculum. Faculty and staff are very proud of the Department of Landscape architecture as an elite area of knowledge and a profession with excellent future. They mention the problems of location of the 2 buildings they use and the alternatives for solution. They mention the lack of sufficient permanent staff and they hope that one more member will soon be hired as permanent if the procedure will speed up from the TEI of Kavala. They are waiting for the comments of this evaluation and they truly feel that this evaluation will help them to become a stronger group of teachers and researchers.

## **A. Curriculum**

**The Department is part of the School of Agricultural Technology of the Technological Educational Institute (TEI) of Kavala at Drama. The Department offers a single undergraduate program.** The planning of a postgraduate program is under consideration.

The mission statement of the Department is: *“The Department of Landscape Architecture aims at offering knowledge and techniques applied in designing urban, peri-urban landscapes and in works at natural environment”*. In summary, the goals and the objectives of the curriculum are to provide the highest level of education reflecting the needs of future employers in both private and public sectors.

The curriculum of the Department of Landscape Architecture covers the application of the technical, biological, physical and economic sciences in sustainable and multifunctional management, improvement and protection of urban and suburban landscape and the natural ecosystems, and maintenance and enhancement of the natural and build landscaped environment.

The Department's mission is to promote the development and transmission of relevant sciences, technologies and techniques in teaching and applied research and provide the students with the necessary high-level training for scientific and professional career development.

As part of its mission, the Department:

- Monitors international developments in science, education and vocational training;
- Collaborates with relevant organisations and institutions such as higher education institutions, production units, ecological and environmental organisations in Greece and abroad.
- Protects and enhances the natural, suburban and urban environment as well, and
- Conducts applied ecological and environmental research;
- Develops the students abilities and skills to ensure that are competent and competitive on national and international levels and can raise awareness of design issues, and protect and improve the natural, suburban, urban and wider environment;
- Monitors developments in the educational, economic and social conditions in the regional, national and international environment.

**The curriculum presently meets the current needs of society on the design and construction of natural and build landscapes. The curriculum was never revised since 2003 that started the course but there is an approved revision that will start from spring of 2012. It is suggested to be revised every 3-4 years in an effort to follow the current scientific developments and society demands.**

**The duration of the basic studies is eight semesters** including six months of practical placement. The curriculum includes 40 courses of which 36 are compulsory and 4 are electives. A graduating thesis is compulsory. This is a one-stream curriculum and does not allow specialization in areas of high demand because landscape architecture is a specialization.

Although the Department is willing to bring in curriculum modifications and follow new scientific trends, the EEC understands that current institutional rules delay it. We would greatly support changes to allow such modifications.

The EEC found **no formal process to track the professional development and the careers of graduates** in order to get feedback pertaining to the value of the curriculum to their professional success. A proper system must be setup in order to systematically track the alumni professional progress. A webpage of alumni should be constructed. A committee of

alumni should be formed and will help the Department as consultants and as contact for practice of the students. Alumni also can be used for seminars at the Department.

**The curriculum is considered to be reasonable and corresponding to the overall scope and objective of the Department. According to some members of the Department, the new curriculum will improve many problems.** A major hurdle is the perpetual continuation of the student ability to take repeated examinations of one or many failed courses far and beyond the years of studies resulting in a confusing and incoherent sequence of attendance. This problem will be solved with the application of the new law for higher education. The EEC noted that there is a distinct difference between theory and practice courses. Specifically, it was surprising to observe that laboratory courses are done by different professor from the respective theoretical ones.

Another weak point in the process is the fact that laboratory course attendance is mandatory while that of the theory ones is not. As a result, participation rates are significantly lower at the theoretical courses with low success rates. Moreover, the mandatory nature of laboratory courses and closer involvement of the student in the course's learning process is reflected by the high student success rates. The EEC strongly suggests merging of the two in equivalent hours of theoreticpractical lessons but with the same units in the curriculum.

Although the coursework covers several aspects of Landscape architecture it could be enriched with additional core and advanced level courses and more field training. **A mandatory course entitled "Introduction to Landscape architecture" is highly recommended to be included in the first semester.** This course would provide an overview of the profession of landscape architects art and science and familiarize the students with the artistic, technical, social and biological requirements of it. Other examples include geography-anthropology, history of landscape architecture, urban rehabilitation, and sustainable design as parts of a modern landscape architecture curriculum.

**The educational level of students accepted in the Department is sometimes low both design, in basic knowledge and foreign languages.** The absence of any threshold in the national entry examination system will further lower the level of enrolled students. Institutional changes should direct students with appropriate background to enroll in this undergraduate program.

Potential students with a non-arts background should have preparatory lessons of drawing. Maybe it will be good to add more drawing practices in the first semesters.

The coursework promote critical thinking and problem solving in many courses, especially in the last 2 years. Teamwork should be more emphasized Student intellectual development will benefit by an additional course in the 1<sup>st</sup> OR 2<sup>nd</sup> semester aiming towards critical thinking and improvement of presentation skills.

Digital design that was almost neglected in the old curriculum it is overvalued in the new curriculum. We suggest to change the name of the Digital design to Computer assisted design (without mentioning the firm: 'Autocad').

**During the discussion on the curriculum, the faculty explained the logic behind the curriculum and choices of classes in each semester. The EEC tried to evaluate the choice of classes suggested in each semester as giving the Department the three following choices: (a) First teach the tools (b) First teach the relationship between man and nature, and (c) First throw the student 'in the water to swim' by starting immediately with assignments. In the eyes of the EEC, the Department seems to have chosen option (a), of first teaching the tools, but with a great lack of also explaining the basics, in terms of the relationship between man and nature and by default between Architecture and Landscape/Nature.**

In the eyes of the EEC, the Department seems to have established a good network for the 6-

month practical training of the students, however, the Department has not yet tackled more potential positions for practical training, for example with the Prefecture of Drama, which is in need of interns, but this has not been communicated and coordinated sufficiently with the TEI Branch in Drama.

**Overall the EEC was impressed by the sincere effort from the Department's members to develop a comprehensive undergraduate program that meets the needs of modern landscape architecture. However, it is realized that institutional constraints result in limited flexibility to form a more independent competitive program.**

## ***B. Teaching***

In general, detailed course outlines including learning targets and expected results are presented to the students. According to the internal evaluation report, majority of the theoretical courses are carried out through lectures with the support of electronic means (power point presentations) and follow up discussions to ensure better understanding of the concepts involved.

With regard to the practical/laboratory courses, the main teaching methods focus on applications of the theory and project assignments that are completed at home. Moreover, efforts are made to promote teamwork especially in the field. In the EEC's view, teaching methods should be enriched so that participation in the learning process is encouraged and enhanced.

The total number of permanent and temporary (with contract 'συμβασιούχοι') faculty members is 5 and 6, respectively. Considering the total number of students (436) in 2011, the teaching staff/student ratio is 1/40. This ratio, at first sight, is satisfactory even though in practice this number is better, given the low participation (and graduation) rates, however, given the nature of teaching (for example, design and drawing courses, development of critical thinking, graduation thesis, etc.), there is a need to re-evaluate this ratio based on the specific requirements. Please refer to following table formulated by the EEC based on data provided by the TEI Branch in Drama (p 9).

The availability of teachers to respond and support students in need is considered satisfactory as it is stated in the internal evaluation report and confirmed by the students themselves.

Means and resources are available at the Department **but not for all courses**.

Most of the laboratories at the building of Department of Forestry that is used from the Department of landscape architecture are well equipped to adequately support course implementation. Three rooms of design are well equipped and the room for computer assisted design has the adequate tools but are becoming old and soon will be obsolete.

The problem is the absence of equipment at all other courses except design rooms.

Also there is a problem of inefficient use of space at the building of landscape architecture.

**The EEC considers that this problem should be addressed in a more holistic approach through the collaboration of the Forest Department and the Municipal authorities.**

Matriculation of students to the TEI Branch of Drama in years 2003-2011:

	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	Total
Total registered 1 <sup>st</sup> semester (1)	153	156	143	68	86	56	33	143	70	908
Total removals (διαγραφές) (2)	12	18	44	75	48	50	39	8	14	472
Number of students (3)	141	279	378	371	397	365	306	389	<b>436</b>	
Total graduations	--	--	--	--	12	38	53	52	9	164

**Remarks:**

- (1) The number of enrolled students is directly affected by the State decision to raise the base from 8/20 to 9/20 in 2006-2009, which then is changed in 2010 once the base is lowered again. In addition, the number of enrollments is affected by the drop of student allocation by the State in 2011.
- (2) The number of removals is a total in all semesters.
- (3) This number indicates the number of students enrolled based on data, and not on the real number attending the program.

The practice employed by some courses in using IT in the teaching process (electronic presentations and teaching material available online, course announcements and specific project assignments) is to be commented and serve as a model to the rest of the courses. Provided that the server is accessible and operating, all faculty members should develop their own respective course sites within the Department's portal. Within each course site, the teacher would be responsible for introducing and updating the teaching material as well as providing links to relevant subject matters on the web. This would help in familiarizing students with international developments and improving their linguistic skills.

**In majority of the courses, students depend on course notes prepared by the respective faculty members. This practice is still anachronistic and needs to be substantially improved** to be in line with international standards to offer multiple bibliographic resources. The EEC was told that the updating of the course material is carried out frequently. However, the EEC found no evidence of procedures that secure a systematic updating and validating of the course material, especially taking into consideration that half of the teaching staff is temporary. Such procedures should be institutionalized.

While it is claimed that students are involved in research activities within the framework of a large proportion of courses, the reality is that the link between research and teaching remains limited, since students are not exposed neither to the research work of the Department nor to international research developments. It must be emphasized that a major weakness is the absence of any training on research design and methodology.

The mobility of the faculty members seems to be satisfactory and in line with the Department's research activities. **The mobility of the students is also satisfactory with some presence in Erasmus program and Erasmus workshops.** There are also a satisfactory number of foreign students to follow the courses, but they are mostly from eastern Europe.

However, in the EEC's point of view should be developed appropriate policy and means, for student mobility at both national and EU level (in addition to public transportation, to create opportunities for bicycle routes, walking paths, etc).

Evaluation of teaching by students is carried out by collecting questionnaires on a regular

basis. Concerns were voiced by the students regarding the practical utility of the exercise given that the results are not announced and there is no documented follow up on the findings. Once again this is a case for systematic data collection (which is already done to a large extent), processing and presentation of the results in order to improve teaching methods by the identification of best practice.

**A comment as raised by the EEC regarding the quality of instruction** when the EEC visited one class and were briefed on the methodology. Although this was a very limited exposure to the day-to-day teaching in the Department, nevertheless, the EEC was left with the impression that the class was well equipped and the teacher very capable, however, the EEC felt that the exam method (of learning to identify names of plants) was more of an extension of the High Department method of 'learning' ('παπαγαλία') instead of teaching the students to develop critical thinking, research training, and problem solving. Further, in connection with the comments raised by the students, it seems like there is a need for more excursions outdoors and more hands-on practical experience (planting, tending of plants, etc.).

**The EEC was given the impression that the Department has a good extrovert attitude (including the acceptance and delivery of 'Erasmus' students), which could further be strengthened:** (a) By increasing the countries that they can exchange 'Erasmus' students (to include countries in central Europe – which are currently missing). Today the Department exchanges students with Latvia, Romania and Poland. (b) To make adjustments to the curriculum that will be based on the requirements of the Central European Departments, in order to enable them to exchange 'Erasmus' students (some changes are introduced to the new curriculum). (c) To 'put the Department on the map' of Departments teaching Landscape Architecture internationally.

**Finally, the EEC feels that it is important at a time of financial crisis in Greece to train students in starting their own businesses after they graduate, with a class on 'starting your own business' at the last semester of studies.** On the other hand, and without passing a judgment on the students or alumni interviewed, Greece would benefit more, if the Departments encouraged students to further their education and become more exposed in the profession abroad, receive practical training at established professionals (in Greece or abroad) and finally, either be absorbed to upgrade the services offered by the existing system and businesses or start their private practice when they can offer something valuable and of high quality to the society and the profession.

**In overall, students seem to be satisfied with the quality of the teaching, although certain concerns and remarks were raised during the interviews** (see p 16).

### ***C. Research***

The Department has an internal mandate to pursue applied research regardless of the fact that this contradicts the TEI operational framework. The latter does not make research mandatory, does not provide specific goals of new knowledge creation, and thus, does not provide the funding for necessary infrastructure and research focused post-graduate programs that could provide the force for such development. On the other hand, a significant amount of emphasis is placed on research when faculty members are judged for advancement. The latter has given **a strong incentive to many faculty members to pursue research regardless of the difficulties related to funding. This is**

**recognized and commended by the EEC.**

Faculty members pursue research projects and some funding is provided although it is significantly low by international standards. There is good peer review publication record that for some members is deemed equivalent to international university Departments of the same focus. This has been accomplished through significant effort by the individual faculty members via personal, local and international contacts. No specific and clear metrics and standards have been set on paper by the Department for assessing research, probably due to the fact that no legal framework exists on this issue.

It is noted from our discussions with the faculty members and corroborated by the Internal Evaluation Report (IER) that the Department is doing its utmost under the limited funding provided to promote and support research within faculty members. Efforts are made to promote collaborations locally and internationally, however the level is not high due to the operational framework of the Department.

The EEC found that the Department has a significant amount of space that is and can be used for research purposes and thus host more equipment and people. Proper funding, initiation of a Master degree program, and/or consolidation with other units should be decided by the Ministry. Also, the committee saw that some of the labs were well equipped to carry out the teaching load, but very few had the level of equipment variety and sophistication to pursue advanced research in EU supported programs.

According to the Internal Evaluation Report (IER) and the documents examined during the visit, the number of publications was high for Landscape Architecture but few of those publications are directly related to the objective of the Department and also most are not done within the installations of the Department. This publication list shows good collaborations with other Departments in Greece and abroad.

Furthermore, conference participation has resulted in considerable research results dissemination. This effort is applauded and highly encouraged to continue in the future since conferences are considered a very important venue not only to present work, but also to network and foster new collaborations. This participation also brings good service on conference organizing committees and journal editorial boards. The Department members show some mobility in this area, but further effort is recommended. According to the Internal Evaluation Report (IER), the Department has managed 7 competitive research projects of which 1 is European Cost Action and the rest national.

**The lack of a post-graduate program is considered a strong inhibitor for further development in this area.**

**There is a positive trend towards large numbers of publications that are published in credible journals and presented in conference proceedings.** There is also evidence from the Internal Evaluation Report (IER) and our visit that a more applied version of the research practicalities is produced and distributed (knowledge dissemination) to the Greek potential users through conference and workshops at regular base (for example, **the international conference and workshops on Landscape Architecture initiated and organized by Prof. Spitalas in 2010 and 2011. The conferences had the participation of professionals and experts from Europe and the Middle East. The proceedings of the former conference have been already published, and the proceedings of the latter are still in search of funding for publication).**

**Again, it is clear that the lack of a research focused post-graduate program is a strong inhibitor of the Department's published output. Although such a program is not the panacea, the committee considers it an important element that can assist in this end.**

### **D. All Other Services**

**The library**, in the building outside the city, is quite basic with a limited book selection and internet access to the journal databases.

The organization, experience and number of staff is deemed adequate in the Department Office.

The quality of **the Department's webpage** is deemed good and easy to navigate. Furthermore, the postings about courses and labs that are currently implemented are well done and deserve credit. However, it is highly recommended that a detailed course outline, objectives and outcomes are also posted and updated regularly.

The EEC did not notice much in the area of specific student counseling, cultural and athletic activities.

As already mentioned before, **the small Museum of Natural History is very successful** in its pedagogical contribution not only to TEI students, but also to the local community.

Overall, **administration services and student support** is seems good under the circumstances. The faculty members agree on this, but there are some objections voiced by some of the students which were duly noted in the interviews (appendix p 16). As a response by the secretarial team the EEC was informed that often students expect from the secretaries to provide information already posted in detail in the internet, and referred to by the secretaries.

Interaction with "practice" through specific seminars and workshops was already done with great success and the EEC encourage it to continue implemented.

### **Collaboration with social, cultural and production organizations**

In the basement of the building of Department of Landscape Architecture is developed and working an arts studio and cinema which is unique for the city of Drama.

**Regarding a collaboration of the Department with the Municipal and Regional authorities, the EEC realized that there is ground to develop it at a very high quality, but it is not happening at the moment, at least not in its full potential.**

There are 10 scholarships for practical training at the Prefecture installation.

Other collaborations:

OTA Dramas

Metropolis of Drama

1st and 2nd degree education

Ecological movement of Drama

Center of Environmental Education of Paranesti

TEE Department of Drama

Private Atelier in the area of Landscape architecture

The EEC committee has the impression that there is a need for a re-evaluation of the student body targets, with the need to increase student responsibility and sharing of situation challenges. There is a need (not necessarily as a result of this evaluation) of eliminating political influence on the student body and focus on the issues related to the Department and their situation in Drama. **Also, the students face a challenge of considering the opportunities of intervening in a positive way in the cultural and social life of Drama as a student body, through its representatives or just creating a platform for the creative output of the students.** Some of the students interviewed are critical of the Student body representing them as being 'too busy with politics' ending up not representing and responding to the real needs of the students themselves. Also the faculty was critical of the students' response to the current crisis. For example, we were told by the President of the TEI Kavala that at the meeting that the students were invited to help the Department redistribute the limited funding that was approved (1/3 of the original funding) the students left the meeting saying that 'if we do not discuss the total amount (previous

funding) we have nothing to discuss' (and that they left the room). This point was not cross-examined with the student representative.

**The visit of the EEC was an occasion for the meeting of the Department faculty with the Prefect** – something that should be more frequent and closely coordinated (at the moment seems to be insufficient) – which resulted in a number of positive outcomes: (a) To explaining (for the first time?) to the Prefect of the activity and presence of the Department in the heart of the city of Drama. (b) To emphasize the value of the presence of the Department in the heart of Drama. (c) To communicate to the Prefect the issues of campus for the Department and the pros and cons of the Department being in the city center vs. a campus outside the city. (d) To enabling the flow of information from one body to the other (for example, to inform the Department that the Prefecture is in need of intern positions, which can be filled by Department students for practical training). (e) To establishing a channel of communication and perhaps a platform for the better promotion of the Department activity and student work within / by / with the support of the Prefecture. (f) To clearing a misunderstanding in the process of inviting high officials to the Department events and activities (resulting in the total absence of the Prefect from the activity of the Department), and therefore emphasizing the importance of improving the public relations of the Department, and (g) **To bringing closer the Department and the Prefecture for the mutual benefit of both.**

### ***E. Strategic Planning, Perspectives for Improvement and Dealing with Potential Inhibiting Factors***

1. **To encourage students' skills to teach extra design courses** to the students coming from science origin and **teach extra biology** to the students coming from arts origin.

2. Among the recommendations that the Evaluation Committee would make **to improve the level of the students enrolled in the Department**, is to give the students without previous experience and studies in math and drawing, to give them some intense training weeks of intense full-day classes of math, statistics and drawing. This way, to eliminate the gap between the 'stronger' and the 'weaker' students, reduce the level of drop-outs and raise the entire educational level by creating a common basis to move from.

3 In order to promote links between Department of Landscape Architecture and graduates recommended **to organize the Alumni Council** (Advisers' Board): to encourage feedback contribute to publicity of the Department, to create new opportunities for practice and working places, to share experiences to improve and develop the program in future.

4. The Department / Ministry of Education must **increase awareness on the Landscape Architecture program.**

5. The EEC observed that the Department is in **need of raising the standards of the department, with two different strategies:**(a) raising the point basis, by requiring examination in drawing (similar to Architecture exams), to attract more High Department graduates with the appropriate studies background (e.g. math), (b).more intensive training in the first semesters. **It's depend on the social target of High Education.**

6. **The Department should be inserted in International Networks** related to Landscape like the UNISCAPE (the Network of Universities especially

dedicated to the implementation of the European Landscape Convention, (<http://www.uniscape.eu>) and the European Federation for Landscape Architecture (EFLA) and follow their guideline of requirements and procedures in relation to recognition in all Europe of taught Landscape Architecture Programs (<http://europe.iflaonline.org>)

## ***F. Final Conclusions and recommendations of the EEC***

The Department of Landscape Architecture at the TEI Kavalas in Drama, has **many positive assets:**

- **The educational, scientific and professional overall orientation** of the Department represents a considerable advantage at a time when sustainable development, environmental considerations and development of green spaces in conjunction with the built urban space is receiving considerable attention and importance; it is therefore a direction for the future, with very good employment prospects and opportunities for its alumni.

- **The location in an average-size city of northern Greece** (40,000 inhabitants), such as Drama, with a heritage of quality, natural environment and a substantial urban life, certainly is an added advantage, especially in the context of Greek legislation for equal access to higher education, and the revitalization of the periphery with a fresh influx of young professionals and non-local students.

There was a unanimous opinion among the members of the Evaluation Committee, that this Department is quite unique in Greece, with the exception of a similar Department in Arta - in conjunction with a horticulture for flowers Department. **The Department in Drama must be supported and its importance recognized and reinforced.**

**However, attention has to be put to a number of problems and issues**, that were identified by the Evaluation Committee in the very short time that it was scheduled to spend in situ in Kavala and Drama:

- 1- **There is need for unification of the educational objectives of the Department.** This means that the two directions of the Department, namely Landscape Architecture and Forestry, must be in harmony, and not just a sum of the parts. This may require additional general courses about the relationship between nature and society, and the natural and built environment, not late, but very early and along in the academic program. Also there will need to be a more coordinated curriculum that will take advantage of **the interdisciplinary character** of a program that comprises of these two disciplines.

- 2- **There is need to strengthen the faculty, especially regarding social sciences and Architecture**, requiring additional positions of permanent faculty. Towards that direction, the Evaluation Committee strongly recommends the immediate appointment of the new elected professor of Architecture, the installation of whom seems blocked at the moment.

- New appointments will strengthen the faculty staff and may very well pave the path for more research programs, and will increase the capability towards considering the creation of a post-graduate course of study (Masters program).

- There is no doubt that reaching a critical mass of faculty, the Department would gain in credibility, attractiveness, and ultimately become more effective in recruiting students of higher standard, not only in terms of enrollment numbers, but mostly in terms of graduating diplomas as related to the use of resources. Similarly, one should expect from a faculty team strengthened by additional staff members, to be better equipped to monitor the flow of students, and especially their career progress and development.

**-3** The Department is presently split between two locations: one in the city center and one in the periphery. **Reunification of the two geographic locations in a city the size of Drama is a necessity.** The break between two current locations, central and peripheral, is not only detrimental to the daily lives of students, and students, mostly non-motorized and mostly female, but harms **the possible osmosis between city and university.** In this perspective, we should not underestimate the functionality and aesthetics of the new building. There is no doubt, that **the Evaluation Committee unanimously, strongly recommends keeping and enlarging the present premises of the Department in the downtown location.** This does not necessarily mean staying in the same building, if the building is slated for other uses. It means, though, that the Department should remain in proximity, and within the urban fabric and life of Drama. It is important to point out that other similar examples of Departments or universities, in France or Israel, have developed from moving out of town to a central campus in the 1980s, to returning to the city center in the 2000s. It is unnecessary for the Department, to go through the same errors and conclusions, that have already been through other universities in other countries. The results are obvious and **the necessity of student life to be in proximity to the city life is essential.**

- In order for this to be realized, **it is important that the local authorities, such as the Municipality and Prefecture, embrace this view,** and help the Department overcome any administrative and financial obstacles in order to achieve this successfully. This would also be a strong sign of the commitment of the local society towards the Department. Further, the involvement of the local authorities, can substantially help not only the Department, but towards the improvement, development and beautification of its surroundings.

**-4-** Last but not least, **improving personal relationships within the faculty is essential.** Tensions visible and known to all, including students, can have a negative impact on the collective success of the Department. Again, in addition to the fundamental advantages already mentioned, the arrival of new faculty members can have a beneficial perspective to disarm tension, and bring new energy in the faculty team. Among the Evaluation Committee members, an opinion was raised that has to do with the need for the faculty to enter a process of improvement. Towards that end, a possible collaboration between the Department and the TEI Kavala Department of Business Management, could assist the Department in starting a process to develop better organizational skills, better communication skills, better cooperation skills among the faculty team members, better skills to develop constructive dialogue with the students and between the permanent and temporary faculty. This collaboration could take the form of a barter agreement, where one Department would offer organizational skills, and the other would offer landscape design skills for the improvement of the Business Department physical premises – therefore not becoming a financial burden to either Department, and giving the opportunity for both the students and the faculties of both Departments to engage in a real project, bring forth real improvements, and monitor its results in real time.

**In all, the future of the Department of Landscape Architecture in Drama is very open: it depends as much on external decisions as much as internal resolution within the Department community. The Evaluation Committee hopes that its recommendations and remarks will be taken seriously into consideration, for the benefit of the TEI Kavalas, the Department of Landscape Architecture in Drama, the faculty and students.**

## **Appendix**

### ***Interviews with students, faculty, and staff***

**The EEC met with five (5) students.** One student, the elected representative of the student body of the Department, was recommended by the faculty. Another student was recommended by the faculty. Three (3) students randomly invited for an interview by the Evaluation Committee. The interviews took place as follows: the first two students were interviewed in the presence of the TEI faculty, and the three (3) randomly picked students, were interviewed without the presence of the faculty. The Evaluation Committee interviewed also **three (3) former students (alumni of the Department)** recommended by the faculty, in the presence of the faculty.

*Remark: It is very important to point out that the following interviews with students and alumni, may indicate a trend and have a certain quality; nevertheless they are not sufficient (in terms of sample) to draw representative conclusions on the topics and issues discussed and raised by the students.*

#### Student 1 (representative of the student body).

Originally from Lamia, with engineers background at home. Wanted to study architecture or civil engineering. She has been exposed to these professions from her parents. Rents an apartment in Drama on her own (approx. cost 240 euro per month for rent). She uses her student pass to eat for free at the student restaurant/cafeteria. She described the activity (curricular and extracurricular) of the student body. She raised some issues of insufficient equipment, such as printers to enable all students to print their work for the presentations. She explained that printing is offered for free to the students (as explained by the faculty, at an approx.. cost to the Department of 300 euro for ink cartridges). She explained that she likes the life in Drama, and also the city with the combination of built and natural setting. She explained a bit on her political activity. She explained that approx. 50% of the students vote and that her party (affiliated to the PASOK political party) received 86.2% of the votes. She explained that the new law disassociates the decisions of the institutions of higher education from the political student activity. She was voted as the head of the student body at the last elections. As a representative of the student body, she replied the following when asked ‘what activity are the students undertaking’: the students did the garden of the Department; they do some activity in Departments in the city where they improve their gardens. She also mentioned that the students are doing a project with the Municipality. She also raised the following issues where she was asked ‘what are the issues that the student body is raising for the improvement of education at the Department’ that the students are making efforts to maintain their privileges within the Department. She emphasized the outward looking of the Department with the presence of three (3) ‘Erasmus’ students, and the trip the Department organized for the students to Budapest. She also pointed out the very good relationships between the students and faculty.

#### Student 2 (suggested by the faculty, in the presence of the faculty)

Originally from Thessaloniki, her father is Spanish. Landscape Architecture was her second choice, as it combined design/drawing and nature. She did her practical training at AUTH with a forester. She lives alone, renting an apartment for 180 euro per month. She said that life in Drama does not offer enough opportunities for culture and recreation. There are no theaters, and the society is too small. She mentioned that professional orientation (‘επαγγελματικός προσανατολισμός’) does not enable young people to know what landscape architecture is all

about. She also shared some comments on the Department program. For example, from her experience she felt that during the first Semester it is not clear what the profession is all about. There are no classes that give an overview of the profession and history, but this comes as part of other classes, left at the discretion of the teaching faculty. From the 3<sup>rd</sup> Semester, things start to become more clear. Also she mentioned that students have difficulties when they start their studies at the Department, among them difficulties in drawing. She also pointed out that they did not receive enough practice – for example, to plant on their own and upkeep the plants.

Student 3 (chosen randomly by the Evaluation Committee and interviewed without the presence of the faculty)

**Student 3.1:** In her 1<sup>st</sup> year, she is originally from Athens, the Department was her 5<sup>th</sup> choice. She entered with 9,500 points. She targeted Departments for Architecture, photography, and decoration. She like living in Drama.

**Student 3.2:** In her 2<sup>nd</sup> year, she is from Drama and preferred to have studied in another city. She entered with about 8,000 points. She searched the program through the internet. Did not speak with students previously. She liked that they learn about plants, go on excursions, and the speak about the environment. Regarding professional opportunities, she is of the opinion that only the best will find work.

**Student 3.3:** In his 2<sup>nd</sup> year. The Department was among his last choices, among about 17 choices. He is from Drama, parents of engineer background. He initially wanted to go to Civil Engineering in Athens or Thessaloniki. He decided instead of taking the exams ('Panellinies') again, to give it a try, since it is related to what he wanted. He is planning to take 'Erasmus' next year, and after he graduates, to leave for a Masters abroad.

Discussion with the three students:

**Q: Are you satisfied with your choice to come to TEI Kavalas in Drama?**

A: Yes, satisfied. We do not regret it. It is an interesting program. The Department is under-evaluated, and the base points needed to enroll is low. The base should be higher. We do not regret, but the employment prospects in Greece are worrying.

**Q: Tell us about the classes, the organization of the Department:**

A: The classes are not very well organized. They do not take us for excursions to see things in the field, and open our horizons. The reasoning is that there is no funding for excursions. There were excursions, nevertheless, to Thessaloniki, Xanthi and Komotini. In Thessaloniki they visited the new Seashore Promenade. They commented on the work of the secretary office that, in their opinion, it is open limited hours, and that there are occasions that they are closed without prior notice.

**Q: Tell us your comments on the professors and instruction.**

A: Some classes that include both theory and lab, they only do the lab without the theory. That the professor doing the class ends up only grading their work. There was an occasion that a professor canceled a class, but the students were not notified – they ended up sitting and waiting for the professor that never showed up. They had a complaint that it seems to them that professors are declaring hours ('and getting paid for them') while in practice they are not performing these hours ('they do not show up'). On the other hand, they listed professors who are dedicated in their work and they are doing very good work, resulting in the students ending up choosing the classes, not always based on the subject, but the quality of the professor and his/her ability to transmit knowledge to them. They also mentioned that some professors have no practical experience and therefore keep the class at a theoretical level – while they would prefer to also get more practical knowledge. They also had something to say about the Student body representing the students of the Department saying that 'they are afraid, they do nothing because they are afraid of reprisals'.

**Q: Tell us a bit more about the content in the classes.**

A: There are courses difficult for many students in the beginning. These courses may include courses requiring math, and courses requiring drawing. For example, the class of topography that requires math. They are difficult to the students coming without the appropriate background in High Department. 'About 1/3 of the students leave (drop-out)'. However, they pointed out that the 'difficulty' is not something impossible to overcome. They just 'take more time'. When asked if an introductory course on math and drawing would help them overcome this initial difficulty, they responded that 'yes, it would help' (the faculty, when asked the same question, said that 'the students will not attend these courses'). What the students highlighted is the lack of a general introductory class on the landscape architecture, so that they will know exactly what it is all about. Right now, they have to go till the 2<sup>nd</sup> year to understand what it is they are learning. Learning it earlier, would help many students 'decide to stay or go earlier on'. Some do some research on their own – through the internet – and make their decisions. Regarding the content of classes, they pointed out the fact that students choose classes, not always based on the subject, but the quality of the professor and his/her ability to transmit knowledge to them. They also commented that sometimes the content of a course has no connection to the title of the course. For example,

there are classes that have theory and lab, and in practice there is no need for 'theory' or there is a minimal theoretical content that needs to be taught, and it would be better to spend more time in lab, to work in class, instead of taking work home. Other classes, have underestimated the time needed (for example free-hand drawing) and students end up finishing the work at home. Finally, students pointed out that in the last semester, the number of professors was reduced.

**Q: Tell us a bit about attendance.**

A: The professors in most classes (about 90%) take attendance of students – which is compulsory. There are classes of theory where the teacher does not show up. And there was also an indirect suggestion to the Evaluation Committee, that there are occasions that students perform the teaching tasks of professors.

**Q: Do students suggest changes / improvements to the program?**

A: The students replied that 'there is not really dialogue' where they can propose changes and improvements. They also pointed out that 'there is no communication' and the feeling that 'nothing will change' even if they speak out. So 'many choose to go by their studies without too much aggravation or friction and get their degree'. When asked whether the student body representing the students of the Department, they said that it is 'tied up in politics and not in academic issues'. The Evaluation Committee also asked the students about the evaluation forms they are asked to fill out for each class, and they responded that 'the questionnaires reflect the truth, but we do not feel that they can change anything, ending up after a while not caring and writing just whatever and not seriously evaluating the class'.

**Q: Tell us about having to study in two separate buildings.**

A: Students responded that they have to travel often during the day from one building to the other. There is a bus connecting the two sites, but one cannot walk, because it is too far away and the campus outside the city too deserted for young girls to walk alone, especially in the evening. About the building downtown they are very satisfied as they have easy access to the drafting rooms, especially for those that do not have the equipment at home.

**Q: Tell us about the library.**

A: The students tend to use the library. They said that the library in the downtown building is understaffed and less permanent hours.

**Q: Tell us about the relationship between the faculty.**

A: 'Relationships are not good, it is obvious to all, and we all see it'. 'It looks really bad inside the Department'. 'They are too busy with their own things'. 'They are not involved in the content of the subject matter'. 'They argue and waste time with their own issues.'

**Q: Tell us about living in Drama. How do you spend your Sunday off?**

A: A bit disappointed. A bit too poor culturally. The crisis is evident. One student said that she was quite satisfied. The students asked spend Sunday either working (for a living) or doing sports (the city has the installations to offer, including a swimming pool, tennis courts, basketball and volley courts).

**Q: How do you see your future?**

A: There is professional orientation that they get and it is helpful. Some have not yet thought about it seriously. Others are already planning their next steps during their studies to end up doing a Masters abroad. The students expressed their feeling that 'Greece is not ready for the Department', that they feel they are seen as 'marginal' and as 'gardeners'. Although there is extrovert activity, still there is a lack of understanding from the outside what the Department is doing/teaching.

**Alumnus 1**

Originally from Thessaloniki, she started her studies on 2006 and graduated on 2011, after also taking one year off from her studies. The Department was her 2<sup>nd</sup> choice. Her first choice was Architecture Department in Thessaloniki (AUTH). She did her practical training at an office in Thessaloniki, owned by two alumni of the Department (also interviewed by the Evaluation Committee upon the recommendation of the faculty). She seemed pleased with her 6-month practical training.

**Alumni 2 & 3 (chosen by the faculty and interviewed in the presence of the faculty)**

The two alumni have established a – apparently (in the view of the faculty) – successful practice of landscape architecture in Thessaloniki, comprising primarily of designing gardens for private clients. One of the two alumni was more entrepreneurial and was also working as a student (for financial reasons) and was the one who initiated this private practice. The other alumni joined her. The student who initiated the practice had worked for another alumnus of the Department for her practical training, giving her a good basis to start her own practice. In their professional capacity, they also offer 6-month practical training to students of the Department (for example, alumnus 1 interviewed). In their professional capacity, they also recognize a number of professional issues linked with the recognition of the Landscape Architecture studies in Greece:

landscape architects in Greece at the moment cannot register with TEE (Technical Chamber of Greece) and the insurance body of Architects and Engineers (TSMEDE). When asked of the weaknesses of the program, she mentioned that she would want more ‘practical information’ like for example, the illnesses of plants and the pesticides to cure them, and ways to prevent illnesses. As she was the only student that works to support her studies (and reduce the burden on her parents) she was asked how other students work, and she mentioned that it was about 50%.

### **Interview with faculty members**

#### Faculty member 1:

Graduate of University in Florence and the Politecnico di Milano he is one of the first faculty members of the Department. Has been teaching at the Department for the past 4 years, but not right now. He is one of the non-permanent staff faculty members. He shared with the EEC the vision of the Department and the decision to bring the Department to Drama – **‘with its natural setting, forests, and waters, makes Drama an ideal place for such a Department’**. He shared with the EEC the tension between the Forestry and the Landscape Architecture Departments. He shared with the EEC his opinion that there should be exams for drawings for their students – like there are for Architecture – because they are wasting time in the beginning to teach the basics. When asked about the faculty, he shared with the EEC that ‘there are faculty members that want to work and others that do not’. He also said that the non-permanent faculty numbers have dwindled, and that the faculty is not teaching full time anymore, but splitting the semester in two parts, they teach 3 hours only, 3 days a week.

#### Faculty members 2 and 3:

The two non-permanent (with contract) faculty members explained to the EEC about the reduction of teaching hours (for example, in some classes from 8 hours of lab dropped to only 2) resulting in more work for the students at home. They mentioned that often the lab becomes a mechanism to give grades for homework, instead a process of teaching in class. They said that students often do not do the homework. The two faculty members explained that they often have to work ‘as volunteers’ as there is more work than the salary they get, and that they do not participate in the general assemblies (‘γενικές συνελεύσεις’) both due to the distance (most of the faculty live outside Drama except for one) and due to the fact that legally they are represented by a representative in the general assembly – despite the fact that ‘they have a lot to say in the general assembly’. **The EEC remarked that there is need for a change in the legal structure of the general assembly and the right of participation of the non-permanent faculty, especially in institutions such as the TEI Branch in Drama, where the number of permanent and non-permanent faculty is the same – leaving out of the decision process an important resource for improvement and innovation within the Department.**

#### **Permanent Faculty Members and Present & Former Departmental Directors:**

In a general discussion in the presence of the present and former directors of the Department, certain points were raised. For example: The Department faculty meets more often – 8 general assemblies since September 1, 2011. They expect the EEC recommendations to work as a tool for improvement. They hope that the intervention of the EEC ‘will be the occasion to change something’. They pointed out that the relationships between some faculty members are excellent, but there is place for improvement between the faculty in general. It would be good for many to make concessions (‘όλοι πρέπει να βάλουν νερό στο κρασί τους’) for the future of the Department. That it is important that the faculty should focus on their work and that they ‘should speak less and work harder and more responsibly’. There is great hope that the arrival of new faculty members will improve the relationship between the faculty members, **but the EEC truly believes and strongly recommends that regardless if new faculty arrives, that the Department must seriously consider professional guidance in working out their interpersonal and inter-professional relationships for a more healthy work environment for both them and the students, and for the future of the Department and for the image that the Department is presenting to the outside.**

### **Interview and visit to the secretarial office**

#### Secretaries 1 and 2:

The secretariat work is divided into two sections: one secretary is dealing with student affairs and the other with the faculty, general assemblies, educational excursions, and new hiring. The secretarial office is open to the students two hours every day (10-12). They commented how the system is very bureaucratic, and how everything has to pass through the secretarial office. They complained about how often students are not searching for the information on their own, but

instead ask questions that can be answered directly and easily from the Department website. They commended on the politeness of the students and the excellent relationship that they have with the students.

The Members of the Committee

**TECHNOLOGICAL EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTE OF KAVALA**

**DEPARTMENT OF LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE**

**Dr. Guy Burgel**

Université Paris Ouest Nanterre La Défense, Paris, France

**Dr. Elias Messinas**

Architect & Environmental Consultant, Ecoama, Jerusalem, Israel

**Dr. Thomas Panagopoulos**

Research Centre for Spatial and Organizational Dynamics  
University of Algarve, Faro, Portugal

**Dr. Inga Straupe**

Forest Faculty, Latvia University of Agriculture, Jelgava, Latvia