



**ΕΛΛΗΝΙΚΗ ΔΗΜΟΚΡΑΤΙΑ**  
HELLENIC REPUBLIC



**Εθνική Αρχή  
Ανώτατης Εκπαίδευσης**  
Hellenic Authority  
for Higher Education

Αριστείδου 1 & Ευριπίδου 2 • 10559 Αθήνα | 1 Aristidou str. & 2 Evripidou str. • 10559 Athens, Greece  
**T.** +30 210 9220 944 • **F.** +30 210 9220 143 • **E.** secretariat@ethaee.gr • [www.ethaee.gr](http://www.ethaee.gr)

# **Accreditation Report** **for the Undergraduate Study Programme of:**

**Philosophy and Social Studies**  
**Institution: University of Crete**  
**Date: 5 December 2020**

Report of the Panel appointed by the HAHE to undertake the review of the Undergraduate Study Programme of **Philosophy and Social Studies** of the **University of Crete** for the purposes of granting accreditation.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>Part A: Background and Context of the Review .....</b>	<b>4</b>
I. The External Evaluation & Accreditation Panel.....	4
II. Review Procedure and Documentation.....	5
III. Study Programme Profile.....	10
<b>Part B: Compliance with the Principles .....</b>	<b>11</b>
Principle 1: Academic Unit Policy for Quality Assurance .....	11
Principle 2: Design and Approval of Programmes .....	14
Principle 3: Student-centred Learning, Teaching and Assessment .....	17
Principle 4: Student Admission, Progression, Recognition and Certification.....	19
Principle 5: Teaching Staff.....	21
Principle 6: Learning Resources and Student Support.....	25
Principle 7: Information Management .....	27
Principle 8: Public Information.....	29
Principle 9: On-going Monitoring and Periodic Internal Review of Programmes .....	31
Principle 10: Regular External Evaluation of Undergraduate Programmes .....	33
<b>Part C: Conclusions .....</b>	<b>35</b>
I. Features of Good Practice.....	35
II. Areas of Weakness .....	35
III. Recommendations for Follow-up Actions.....	35
IV. Summary & Overall Assessment .....	37

## **PART A: BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT OF THE REVIEW**

### **I. The External Evaluation & Accreditation Panel**

The Panel responsible for the Accreditation Review of the Undergraduate Study Programme of **Philosophy and Social Studies** of the **University of Crete** comprised the following four (4) members, drawn from the HAHE Register, in accordance with Laws 4009/2011 & 4653/2020:

1. **Prof. Dr. Nikolaos Psarros (Chair)**  
Inst. of Philosophy, University of Leipzig, Germany
2. **Assoc. Prof. Panagiotis Christias**  
Department of French and European studies, University of Cyprus, Cyprus
3. **Professor Dimitris Michailakis**  
Department of Culture and Society University of Linköping, Sweden
4. **Professor Apostolis Papakostas**  
Dept. of Social Sciences, Södertörn University, Sweden

## II. Review Procedure and Documentation

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic crisis and relevant measures taken by the Greek government, the entire undergraduate study program review took place remotely via the Zoom platform. No events or technical problems marked the process of evaluation, which, in spite of the lack of physical presence, went according to planning. Technical communication with the University of Crete and the Department of Philosophy and Social Studies was well established and never interrupted. The interaction, in technical terms, was of great quality and the means to ensure it were appropriate.

The main objective of this report is to accredit the Undergraduate Study Programme, to properly consult the Department and to offer respectful, collegial, and frank advice that may contribute to the Department's future development.

Prior to the online visit of the University of Crete, the members of the Panel (EEAP) had the opportunity to study all documents supplied to them by HAHE in advance, including:

- (a) HAHE Materials such as Guidelines for Accreditation, Mapping Grid for members of AP, indexes of the Department of Philosophy and Social Studies of the University of Crete
- (b) Recommendations of the 2013 External Evaluation Report of the Department of Philosophy and Social Studies.
- (c) The Department's Proposal for Accreditation with relevant annexes.

On the first day of the review procedure, on Monday, Nov. 30th, 2020, the Panel members (EEAP) attended an on-line meeting, at which the Accreditation Procedure was explained by members of the HAHE and useful information was provided on HAHE mission, the guidelines of the Quality Assurance process, and the role and tasks of the EEAP members. Then, the members of the EEAP met in a private consultation to briefly discuss the Proposal, to divide tasks among them and to organize in detail the teamwork.

The *in situ* on-line review procedure began on morning of the second day, Dec. 1st, with a tele-conference with the Vice Rector of Academic Affairs and Head of MODIP, Prof. Georgios Kosioris and the Head of the Department, Prof. Eleni Katsarou. The Vice-Rector informed the EEAP members of the importance that the Department of Philosophy and Social Studies presented for the University. The EEAP members were presented with a broad overview of the history, academic profile, and of the current status of the Undergraduate Study Programme.

Prof. Katsarou explained various aspects concerning the students' profile, mobility, mentoring, the main lines of the study programme, the academic profiles and research interests and programs of the teaching staff (ΔΕΠ), and the professional opportunities for graduates.

After a short break EEAP members discussed the degree of compliance of the Undergraduate Programme to the Quality Standards for Accreditation with:

**OMEA** members:

- Dr. Eleni Katsarou (Professor, Head of Department)

- Dr. Vasiliki Tsourtou (Coordinator, Assistant Professor)
- Dr. Kostas Koukouzelis, Assistant Professor
- Dr. Konstantinos Sargentis, Associate Professor
- Dr. Despoina Stamatopoulou, Associate Professor
- Dr. Aristeidis Tsantiropoulos, Associate Professor

#### **QAU/MODIP:**

- Prof. Georgios Kosioris, Vice Rector – President
- Prof. Eleni Vasilaki, Dept. of Primary Education School
- Prof. Ioannis Zaganas, Faculty of Medicine

#### **MODIP Staff members:**

- Ms. Kalliopi Varouha
- Ms. Eleni Karkanaki

OMEA representatives explained the Department's evaluation processes, which are coordinated by OMEA and answered a series of questions addressed to them by the EEAP, providing supplementary information when requested. After the break, in the afternoon, EEAP members held an online meeting / teleconferences with teaching staff members and students.

#### **Members of the Teaching Staff**

- Dr. M. Venieri, Associate Professor
- Dr. S. Tsinorema, Professor
- Dr. P. Theodorou, Associate Professor
- Dr. K. Androulidakis, Professor
- Dr. K. Bantinaki, Assistant Professor
- Dr. S. Tegos, Assistant Professor
- Dr. J. Pissis, Assistant Professor
- Dr. T. Iatridis, Associate Professor
- Dr. S. Kaklamani, Associate Professor
- Dr. N. Vafeas, Associate Professor

With the members of the academic staff, we discussed professional development opportunities, mobility, workload, student evaluations, competence, and adequacy of the teaching staff to ensure learning outcomes, links between teaching and research, teaching staff's involvement in applied research, projects and research activities directly related to the program, possible areas of weakness. We spent a considerable amount of the allotted time on the discussion of inner coherence of the study programme and its overall studyability.

- **Ten (10) students** of Undergraduate Studies from the first to the fifth year of studies.

The EEAP was particularly interested in the satisfaction of the students and their experiences with the study programme and its realisation by means of remote teaching under the conditions

imposed by the current pandemic. Another focus of the discussion, which took place in a constructive and relaxed atmosphere, took place in a constructive and relaxed atmosphere was set on the students' expectations of the role of the study programme in their future academic and professional career plans.

The first day of the in situ online visit ended with a private consultation of the members of the EEAP for an exchange at the meetings.

The second day of the online visit began with a meeting of the EEAP with administrative staff members & teaching staff members. A virtual tour of the premises and the facilities was taken separately in the form of a video clip that was produced by students of the Department.

During this meeting, the EEAP also had the opportunity to discuss matters of secretarial administration with the following members of the Administrative Staff, Ms. Sofia Gialadaki, Secretary and Ms. Dora Rozaki, Secretary.

With the members of the teaching staff, namely

- Dr. S. Tsinorema, Professor
- Dr. M. Venieri, Associate Professor
- Dr. K. Dalakoura, Associate Professor
- Dr. S. Kaklamani, Associate Professor
- Dr. D. Stamatopoulou, Associate Professor, and
- Dr. A. Tsantiropoulos, Associate Professor

The EEAP resumed the discussion about the coherence and the studyability of the study programme. Additional information about its structure was provided by the two members of the special teaching and research staff (ΕΔΙΠ) Dr. E. Perisinaki and Dr. E. Vitalaki. After the meeting with the teaching staff, the EEAP met at a teleconference with the following alumni:

- Ms. Christianna Koufidaki, ZIZOO TECH COMPANY, "Account Manager of Greece", Berlin, Germany
- Mr. Giorgos Spanakis, Vice-Director, Taste Academy, Heraklion, Crete, Greece
- Ms. Paraskevi Vlachas, High-School Teacher, Atsipopoulou, Rethymno
- Ms. Maria Karakousi, High-School Teacher
- Mr. Odysseas Pappos, Translator
- Ms. Anna Belibasaki, Employee in Bookstore and Secretary
- Mr. Maria Delaporta, primary school teacher
- Dr. Charilaos Platanakis, Assistant Professor, Department of Political Science and Public Administration, National & Kapodistrian University of Athens, Greece
- Ms. Maria Kakepi, administrative staff in the municipality of Rethymno, Crete, Greece
- Ms. Christina Papanastasopoulou, high-school tutoring

All interviewed persons agreed in their statements that the study at the Department provided them with a very good foundation in their respective topics of study, that helped them to con-

tinue their studies the MA level and, in some cases, to pursue a doctoral academic degree. Additionally, all alumni praised the teaching style of their professors and put a strong emphasis on the fact that about half of their study time was spent in seminars and colloquia, where they learnt to express their thoughts in form of written essays, instead of being administered oral exams, as it is usual in most of the Greek universities. This skill helped them in their further studies, especially at universities abroad. They also agreed in the judgment that their success in their careers was mainly due to the support of the Department and the quality of the study programme, and secondarily due to their own ambition, excellence, and determination.

After a short break the EEAP held a teleconference with external stakeholders and discussed their relations with the Department. The external stakeholders were in their overwhelming majority from the public and the semi-public sector. It was noticeable that there were no members of the regional press or of regional enterprises. In the discussion participated following persons:

- Ms. M. Tsoulou, Michelis Foundation
- Mr. G. Gavrilakis, Therapy Center for addicted individuals KETHEA-ARIADNI, Chania, Crete
- Mr. G. Kalomoiris, Androidus Project Tank
- Mr. G. Polyzois, Experimental High School, Rethymno
- Mr. S. Spanoudakis, Vice-Mayor, Municipality of Rethymno
- Mr. N. Tourides, Fulbright Foundation Educational Advisor/American Programme Coordinator
- Mr. N. Tsagkarakis, Deputy Head, General Secretariat for Citizenship, Region of Crete, Ministry of Interior, Greece

Prof. Dr. N. Fokasz from the Eötvös-Loránd University, Budapest was hindered from participating because of a sudden indisposition. The EEAP wishes him a good recuperation.

The discussion focused on the work experience that the students of the Department obtain as interns in their institutions. EEAP appreciated the strong footing of the Department in the region.

After the break, followed a private consultation of the members of the EEAP to discuss the outcomes of the on-line review and begin drafting the oral report.

The in situ online visit concluded with a meeting with OMEA & MODIP representatives and the closure meeting with Vice Rector of Academic Affairs and Head of MODIP, Prof. Georgios Kosioris, and the Head of the Department, Professor E. Katsarou. After the discussion on certain points and findings which needed further clarification, the EEAP presented informally their key findings.

In their overall assessment, the EEAP **strongly commended** the fact that almost half of the teaching takes place in **form of seminars** that encourage the students to participate actively in



the discussion and to express their thoughts in form of written essays. It is also very commendable that the study programme gives the students the opportunity to choose from a sufficiently broad spectrum of special topics within the scope of the main thematic units.

Also, a positive finding is that the Department fully implements the ECTS point system and utilizes an algorithm for the conversion of the Greek scores to the international score system.

However, the EEAP found that the study programme suffers from two main flaws that prevent it from providing a sound scientific foundation to the students, and this especially in the section of social studies.

The first flaw lies in the fact that there are **too many exams**. According to the study plans the students must take about 46 exams in four years, which amounts to ca. 5 ECTS points awarded per course attended. The EEAP admits that there are seminars and colloquia that award 10 ECTS points per course, but the number of them is not sufficient to significantly increase the average number of ECTS points per course.

The second flaw, that affects mainly the part of the programme that is devoted to the Social Studies is that this sub-programme **lacks the necessary coherence and the thematic profile** that would distinguish it clearly from a study programme in sociology, with the additional shortcoming that in its current form it falls behind the normal level of a sociology study programme. We will elaborate on these problems in the relevant sections of the second part of our report.

It is much appreciated that, during their visit to the Department, the EEAP members were given access to all the additional material or information they requested. The EEAP was provided with additional documentation. The EEAP would like to emphasize that the site visit was conducted in a very positive atmosphere. The online reception of the EEAP by the Department was excellent and all staff members and students were particularly cooperative. In writing this report the EEAP has consulted the documentation sent by the HAHE, the webpage of the Department and all supplementary information and documents communicated to it.

The members of the EEAP regret not being able to be present physically at the University of Crete for accreditation.

### **III. Study Programme Profile**

The University of Crete was founded in 1973 with headquarters in Rethymnon, according to Law 87/73 and developed in parallel in Rethymnon and Heraklion. The Department of Philosophy and Social Studies belongs to the Philosophical Faculty of the University of Crete.

Following the European system of credit transfer and accumulation (ECTS), based on what applies internationally to four-year study programs, the minimum number of credits (ECTS) required for graduation is set at 240 (total: 46 courses). The duration of the studies is typically set at 8 semesters. The course material is rationally distributed and in agreement with the ECTS system, with an allocation of 30 ECTS per semester and 60 ECTS per year. About one fifth of the course volume (10 courses, 50 ECTS) is allotted to philological, historical, and pedagogical subjects, including internships in secondary schools, enabling thus the graduates to obtain a so called 'Certificate of Pedagogical Competence' and to participate in the central examinations of the Greek state (ASEP examinations) that lead to an employment in the secondary education sector. 30 ECTS can be obtained by attending freely chosen courses from any other department of the University. The Department offers the students the possibility to prepare a BA thesis, equalling 20 ECTS as an alternative to the standard way of obtaining the study diploma by cumulative exams.

In the beginning of the third year of studies the students are required to set the focus of their further studies on one of the two thematic sectors of the Department, i.e., on Philosophy or on Social Studies.

The courses are supported by the Department's web page and offer training in the use of bibliographic databases and other search tools. Upon successful completion of the Undergraduate Program, students obtain a joint diploma degree from the Department. The chosen focus is noted in the Diploma Supplement that is provided together with the Diploma.

The main employment opportunities lie in secondary education and in the broader education sector. A significant number of graduates pursue careers in national and international academia. Other fields of employment are the civil service, NGOs and to a lesser extent the private sector.

The undergraduate study program aims at providing a general knowledge of the scientific fields that are investigated in the Department and special analytical skills with respect to the reflection on epistemic, ethical and social questions and problems.

## PART B: COMPLIANCE WITH THE PRINCIPLES

### Principle 1: Academic Unit Policy for Quality Assurance

**INSTITUTIONS SHOULD APPLY A QUALITY ASSURANCE POLICY AS PART OF THEIR STRATEGIC MANAGEMENT. THIS POLICY SHOULD EXPAND AND BE AIMED (WITH THE COLLABORATION OF EXTERNAL STAKEHOLDERS) AT ALL INSTITUTION'S AREAS OF ACTIVITY, AND PARTICULARLY AT THE FULFILMENT OF QUALITY REQUIREMENTS OF UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMMES. THIS POLICY SHOULD BE PUBLISHED AND IMPLEMENTED BY ALL STAKEHOLDERS.**

*The quality assurance policy of the academic unit is in line with the Institutional policy on quality, and is included in a published statement that is implemented by all stakeholders. It focuses on the achievement of special objectives related to the quality assurance of study programmes offered by the academic unit.*

*The quality policy statement of the academic unit includes its commitment to implement a quality policy that will promote the academic profile and orientation of the programme, its purpose and field of study; it will realise the programme's strategic goals and it will determine the means and ways for attaining them; it will implement the appropriate quality procedures, aiming at the programme's continuous improvement.*

*In particular, in order to carry out this policy, the academic unit commits itself to put into practice quality procedures that will demonstrate:*

- a) the suitability of the structure and organization of the curriculum;*
- b) the pursuit of learning outcomes and qualifications in accordance with the European and the National Qualifications Framework for Higher Education;*
- c) the promotion of the quality and effectiveness of teaching;*
- d) the appropriateness of the qualifications of the teaching staff;*
- e) the enhancement of the quality and quantity of the research output among faculty members of the academic unit;*
- f) ways for linking teaching and research;*
- g) the level of demand for qualifications acquired by graduates, in the labour market;*
- h) the quality of support services such as the administrative services, the Library, and the student welfare office;*
- i) the conduct of an annual review and an internal audit of the quality assurance system of the undergraduate programme(s) offered, as well as the collaboration of the Internal Evaluation Group (IEG) with the Institution's Quality Assurance Unit (QAU).*

### Study Programme Compliance

Founded in 1983, the Department of Philosophy and Social Studies of the University of Crete underwent from its foundation several phases of restructuring that resulted in the present bi-partite form that was evaluated in 2013.

Following the recommendations of the 2013 evaluation, the Department has proceeded with a reorganization its curriculum that resulted in the reduction of the offered courses to the current 46 (42+4).

In its current form the study programme displays the following positive aspects:

- Wide use of the teaching form of seminar and colloquy and of the exam form of written essay.
- Opportunity of participation in the activities of the research laboratories operated by the Department of Philosophy and Social Studies.
- Encouragement of the students to participate in national and international congresses.
- Encouragement of the students to participate in the ERASMUS programme.
- Broad range of offered seminar themes within the scope of wider thematic units.

However, the study programme in its current form suffers from following flaws that impede the full development of the above-mentioned positive aspects and the transformation of the study programme to a serious player in the international excellence competition:

- There are still too many exams. According to the study plans the students must take about 46 exams in four years, which amounts to ca. 5 ECTS points awarded per course attended. There are seminars and colloquia that award 10 ECTS points per course, but the number of them is not sufficient to significantly increase the average number of ECTS points per course. A further negative consequence of this is the fact that the teaching staff spend a significant part of their labour time on the grading of the resulting exams.
- The graduation with a BA thesis with a value of 20 ECTS points is facultative. This means that diplomas awarded without the composition of a BA thesis do not fulfil the requirements of the Bologna Process and are at risk of not being recognized by universities abroad.
- The curriculum of the sub-programme of Social Studies that by its own definition focuses on epistemological and methodological aspects of these sciences, lacks the necessary coherence and the thematic profile that would distinguish it clearly from a study programme in sociology or ethnology, with the additional shortcoming that in its current form it falls behind the normal level of a sociology or an ethnology curriculum.

The department's Study Guide (Οδηγός Σπουδών) is **not well-structured** and **not easy to navigate**. Additionally, the coding of the courses is not homogeneous. Different coding rules are implemented for the philosophy and the social sciences courses. The schematic diagram of the curriculum does not contain the explicit characterizations of the implemented courses rendering it thus not easily readable.

## Panel Judgement

Principle 1: Institution Policy for Quality Assurance	
Fully compliant	
Substantially compliant	
Partially compliant	<b>X</b>
Non-compliant	

## Panel Recommendations

- Further **reduction** of the number of the exams by combining topic related courses to 10 ECTS point modules. In the case of introductory lectures, the creation of larger modules would also have the additional benefit that the corresponding examinations would be administered and graded by two docents.
- The BA thesis should become **compulsory** for the students that plan to attend the graduate study programme, which leads to a MA degree.
- The sub-programme in Social sciences should **become more theory and methodology oriented** and should **introduce** the students into the foundations of the social sciences and to epistemological and social ontological questions.
- The courses aiming at providing the students with pedagogical competence should become **clearly distinguishable** in the curriculum and should become replaceable with courses in the main fields of the department, or with facultative courses of other departments. The EEAP recommends awarding pedagogical competence **separately** and not as part of the Diploma.

## Principle 2: Design and Approval of Programmes

**INSTITUTIONS SHOULD DEVELOP THEIR UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMMES FOLLOWING A DEFINED WRITTEN PROCESS WHICH WILL INVOLVE THE PARTICIPANTS, INFORMATION SOURCES AND THE APPROVAL COMMITTEES FOR THE PROGRAMME. THE OBJECTIVES, THE EXPECTED LEARNING OUTCOMES, THE INTENDED PROFESSIONAL QUALIFICATIONS AND THE WAYS TO ACHIEVE THEM ARE SET OUT IN THE PROGRAMME DESIGN. THE ABOVE DETAILS AS WELL AS INFORMATION ON THE PROGRAMME'S STRUCTURE ARE PUBLISHED IN THE STUDENT GUIDE.**

*Academic units develop their programmes following a well-defined procedure. The academic profile and orientation of the programme, the objectives, the subject areas, the structure and organisation, the expected learning outcomes and the intended professional qualifications according to the National Qualifications Framework for Higher Education are described at this stage. The approval or revision process for programmes includes a check of compliance with the basic requirements described in the Standards, on behalf of the Institution's Quality Assurance Unit (QAU).*

*Furthermore, the programme design should take into consideration the following:*

- *the Institutional strategy*
- *the active participation of students*
- *the experience of external stakeholders from the labour market*
- *the smooth progression of students throughout the stages of the programme*
- *the anticipated student workload according to the European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System*
- *the option to provide work experience to the students*
- *the linking of teaching and research*
- *the relevant regulatory framework and the official procedure for the approval of the programme by the Institution*

### Study Programme Compliance

The aim of the Department of Philosophy and Social Studies is to promote the study of Philosophy and Social Sciences in their own right and in their interconnections, through high level research and teaching in both academic fields. The study program is thought to correspond to these general statements and at a high level of discourse. According to the statements of the faculty members, the curriculum has been designed to grant its students broad knowledge in the Humanities and the Social Sciences, as well as to acquaint them with different research methodologies and equip them with strong research skills. Students are even able to adjust their studies and prepare for a diploma that enables them to work in the secondary education sector. The approval of the undergraduate programs is strictly regulated in the Greek educational system and involves student participation in the decision process. The department involves students in the revisions of the program and has some established channels to gather information from relevant stakeholders from the society. We have noticed that the programme focuses on preparing students for employment in the public sector and in non-profit organizations.

In the material that was attached to the Department's portfolio there is a certain **ambiguity** regarding the degree of the fixation of the program and its continuity. In the study guide there is a list of ca 150 possible courses that can be included in the program, and of which about one third is required for taking the exam. From this list a number of courses is selected and given every year, and the supply of courses can vary from year to year. And as there is rather a high degree of student freedom to choose, the only safe way to understand what courses the student has taken is to consult the supplement of each individual diploma. The processes of selection, first at the level of the department every year and at the level of student choice, are not clearly understood, at least of the members of the committee.

The fragmentation of the program is extensive as courses are neither appropriately thematized and sequenced nor fixed from year to year. The progression of the studies is difficult to comprehend for an external observer. This applies less to the sub-curriculum in philosophy, where progression is more apparent, and is rather an issue for the sub-curriculum in Social Sciences. The contents of this subject are dispersed during the whole period of study into several introductory courses in the disciplines of sociology, social anthropology, social psychology, and pedagogy. Undeniably the ambition of broad knowledge is fulfilled, but at the cost of the progressive deepening of knowledge. A well-educated alumnus described the school as a "liberal studies" school and the Panel finds this description as telling.

The high level of ambition in the statements of the program to integrate the disciplines Philosophy and Social Sciences in form of the reflection on the theory and the methodology of the Social Science is **not visible in the curriculum** and the content of the courses as there is not a symmetric deepening of the knowledge in the two fields. Furthermore, the bridges that could connect the two themes are not developed in the program, which is probably impossible due to the fragmentation of the courses in Social Sciences. The link between research and teaching can be accomplished in three ways:

1. Linking literature with research
2. Linking teaching with research
3. Linking up the research in the Department with the content of the courses offered.

The first two modes of linking are well established. However, the third mode is only partially established, mainly in the Philosophy sub-curriculum. Furthermore, an overview of the publications of the teaching staff of the Social Sciences division revealed that the correspondence between research and teaching is substantially limited because the majority of the publications are focused on rather simple social science research and not on theoretical and methodological issues of the Social Sciences – as it is proposed in the description of this division.

The observations above are similar to the observations made by the evaluation committee in 2013. The Panel could not find signs of serious efforts to improve the situation. If this depends on unwillingness or incapacity to improve is a question that the Department needs to reflect upon. If the Department wishes to keep the current profile of the program a radical improvement and consolidation of the Social Sciences sub-curriculum as well of the division itself is

needed. The two divisions even need to find bridges that connect the two parts in a process of mutual adjustment.

The working load of the studies is high as there are many examinations due to the fragmentation of the programme.

Regarding the approval and change of the study programme, the Department follows the standard formal routines.

### Panel Judgement

Principle 2: Design and Approval of Programmes	
Fully compliant	
Substantially compliant	
Partially compliant	<b>X</b>
Non-compliant	

### Panel Recommendations

The Panel urges the following actions in order to fix the observed flaws and problems:

- Omission of the ambiguities of the curriculum.
- Reduction of the fragmentation of the study program regarding the number of exams and the contents of the offered courses.
- Assurance of the progression regarding deepening of knowledge during the study programme, especially in the field of Social Sciences.
- Restoring the symmetry between the two disciplines.
- Improving the linking of theory and teaching in the Social Sciences.



### Principle 3: Student-centred Learning, Teaching and Assessment

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

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

*The student-centred learning and teaching process*

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

*In addition :*

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

### Study Programme Compliance

Students from other parts of Greece must take residence in the city of Rethymnon to pursue their studies. This is a major problem for them and for their families, that has a significant impact on their studies. Rethymnon is a major tourist destination, thus the rents and in general the cost of living is high. Some students cannot afford to stay in Rethymnon and continue and finalize (or not) their studies from their homesteads, using the material offered electronically by the University and the Department. The strategy is to be present physically only during the exams, that take place three times a year, offering many possibilities to validate courses that they have

never followed. But even for those who do come to Rethymnon, the financial situation forces many of them to work, thus retarding their degree.

The financial situation of the students is ameliorated to an extent by offering student rates in almost all the necessary services they will need (transportation, food, cinema tickets, etc.) that can be obtained by the student pass, which is issued centrally from the Ministry of Education.

The present form of online teaching imposed by the necessities of the campaign against the COVID-19 pandemic seems to be well accepted by the students interviewed. Participation in an online lecture by one of the members of the Panel revealed that it was attended by many students, a number of which participated vigorously in discussing the topics of the lecture with the docent. The quality of the transmission was very good, and the used platform (zoom) worked very smoothly.

First year students are introduced to research facilities like date bases and other bibliographical instruments. The department implements the institution of academic consultants who accompany and help the students with their academic decisions for the entire duration of their studies. In general, communication between students and academic teachers is excellent, and students feel free to ask for any accommodation or advice to any of the members of the academic staff of the Department, which is never denied. The same applies as to the needs and guidance in the academic relation student-teacher in the learning procedure. This reinforces the student's sense of autonomy, while ensuring adequate guidance and support from the teaching staff.

The courses and seminars receive evaluation by the students, The Department has a formal procedure for student objections and uses various mechanisms for cases of complaints or requests regarding academic topics. Most important of all is the Student Ombudsman at the institutional level.

### Panel Judgement

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

### Panel Recommendations

The efforts to increase the interactions between teachers and students and the participation of the students in the evaluation of the courses offered should be continued and intensified.

## Principle 4: Student Admission, Progression, Recognition and Certification

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

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

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

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

### Study Programme Compliance

The Institution has put in place both processes and tools to act on information regarding student progression. Meanwhile the Panel has noticed a certain amount of ambiguity regarding the information provided in different documents and regarding the content of the studies because the degree of freedom is rather high. It is quite difficult to comprehend and evaluate a diploma from the Department in general terms and even more difficult to find to which diplomas in other universities it corresponds. This problem is less apparent in the sub-curriculum of Philosophy for two reasons. First, there is **a progressive core** of studies in the subject. Second, the discipline of Philosophy in European universities **is more open to disparate canons** of study. The situation is more problematic in the sub-curriculum of the Social Sciences for several reasons. First, there is **no correspondence** between the ambitious statements of the programme and the content of the studies. Second, the programme **contains many introductory courses** in different disciplines, so that it is difficult to find a progressive core of studies. Third, in European Universities Social Science disciplines such as Sociology and Social Anthropology have developed canons of study that include rules of content and progression. It is not easy to **establish a general correspondence** between the study programme of the Department and similar programs in European universities. The only way to assess the correspondence is to consult the diploma supplement of every individual student that is provided with the diploma. While this correspondence can be found in some diplomas the Panel doubts if the correspondence can be stated in general terms.

### Panel Judgement

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

### Panel Recommendations

See general recommendations at the end of the report.

## Principle 5: Teaching Staff

**INSTITUTIONS SHOULD ASSURE THEMSELVES OF THE QUALIFICATIONS AND COMPETENCE OF THE TEACHING STAFF. THEY SHOULD APPLY FAIR AND TRANSPARENT PROCESSES FOR THE RECRUITMENT AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE TEACHING STAFF.**

*The Institutions and their academic units have a major responsibility as to the standard of their teaching staff providing them with a supportive environment that promotes the advancement of their scientific work. In particular, the academic unit should:*

- *set up and follow clear, transparent and fair processes for the recruitment of properly qualified staff and offer them conditions of employment that recognize the importance of teaching and research;*
- *offer opportunities and promote the professional development of the teaching staff;*
- *encourage scholarly activity to strengthen the link between education and research;*
- *encourage innovation in teaching methods and the use of new technologies;*
- *promote the increase of the volume and quality of the research output within the academic unit;*
- *follow quality assurance processes for all staff members (with respect to attendance requirements, performance, self-assessment, training etc.);*
- *develop policies to attract highly qualified academic staff.*

### Study Programme Compliance

All members of the staff testified that the rules about how vacancies are occupied are known and respected by all. There are not suspicions that vacancies are preserved for internal candidates. All announcements are known in advance and open to all. There have never been complaints about the transparent procedure of recruitment and the promotion procedures. This is admirable for Greek conditions and the department deserves congratulations.

The Panel's impression is that the Department has sufficient permanent academic staff even though their number has decreased significantly in the last years. Unlike the situation elsewhere, they do not need to rely heavily on contracting external special teaching faculty.

The gender equality prevailing in the department is worth **special praise**. The positions at all levels of the academic career are equally distributed. The serious lack of resources during the last decade, however, was a limiting factor in the possibilities of supporting the professional development of the teaching staff.

The department aims to develop an organic connection between education and research. It remains unclear, however, how this is to be achieved. According to EEAP's view, the teaching load does not impede research. The staff, however, complained about the burden of administrative duties and mandatory participation in various committees. According to their experience with so much administrative workload the share of research substantially diminishes.

The minimum teaching load per faculty member is determined by law and, at the undergraduate program, is currently four courses per academic year/faculty member. The workload is approximately 6 hours/week. This does not include the supervision of undergraduate and post-graduate theses.

According to the data of the internal evaluation report, the teacher/active student ratio is about 1:36. By international standards this is satisfactory for the undergraduate level; but it is actually much lower if one considers the excessive number of dropouts, absentees, and the reduced number of students regularly attending lectures. In fact, attendance at lectures is not mandatory, and students state that class attendance is indeed low (compared with the teaching load as above).

The department modifies the study program at regular intervals. Preparation is done separately by the two divisions (τομείς), but the decisive decisions about modifications are taken by the general assembly, which is the only organ – besides the Ministry of Education – that can take decisions that are binding for all.

The **institution of seminars is very positive**, something unusual for Greek universities. In the seminars the students practice in the writing of scientific texts that helps them in the further scientific career or in their professional life outside the academia. However, the low number of theses completed by students indicates that there is still space for improvement.

In the study programme there is a disproportionally short core, an excessive disparity between courses and, mainly, an insufficient competence in the field of the epistemology of the social sciences.

The department has no defined pedagogic policy regarding the teaching approach and methodology (e.g., problem solving method). The EEAP has the impression that this is left to the exclusive discretion of the teaching faculty.

The Department's participation in exchange programs like Erasmus is quite low. This constitutes a serious impediment to the student's personal, cultural, and professional development.

The **preparation of a final thesis** for the undergraduate diploma is optional. Students **usually avoid** it. Those choosing to write a thesis are rewarded with 20 ECTS and must attend two courses less. The optionality of the final thesis **constitutes a serious flaw** of the programme. If the preparation of a thesis were compulsory, the students would at least get acquainted with the fundamentals of a research culture, and this would prepare them better for their post-graduate studies.

Another **serious problem** with the preparation of the final thesis in its current form is that it is **not part of a specific course**, in which the student would have the opportunity to discuss their theses with other students and teachers.

It is striking that the scientific publications of the staff from the Social Sciences division that is allegedly devoted to the epistemology and methodology of Social Sciences **are not** in the field of epistemology and methodology of Social Sciences. The same applies regarding the subject of

the doctoral dissertations of the teaching staff. They cover a multitude of diverse fields and disciplines, but epistemology and methodology are not among them. Looking at their CVs the subjects of research are so diverse and disjointed as the study program of the Social Sciences division. Only a few of their publications are in international referee-based journals and when this happens, they publish in journals of low ranking. The same applies for the doctoral dissertations that are prepared in this division.

Mobility, according to the staff, is satisfactory. There are professors from other universities coming to the Department and some from the department leave for a new position elsewhere. The second movement was described as “bleeding” and the Department asks for more resources to make it more attractive.

The education process is examination-centred and not learning-centred.

### Panel Judgement

Principle 5: Teaching Staff	
Fully compliant	
Substantially compliant	
Partially compliant	<b>X</b>
Non-compliant	

### Panel Recommendations

- The division of Social Sciences **has not been able to define a clear, well-structured, and functional** study programme at the undergraduate level. This is a task lying ahead.
- The EEAP strongly recommends that **competence in philosophy** should be radically **strengthened** and the non-philosophical courses drastically reduced. The EEAP also recommends that action should be taken to **reduce the total number of courses** and especially the number of facultative courses.
- There is a huge gap between the two divisions. The EEAP finds that the coupling – if any – between the two divisions is very loose. As it is now, the study program is lacking a common denominator. During our discussions the staff described the connection of the two divisions as a relation between theory and practical application. This is a **misunderstanding** though. The problem of the gap between theory and practical application and how to solve it is not a problem for either Philosophy or Sociology. It is a problem in sciences such as Economics, Political Science, Social Care, Law, Medicine, etc. That is, only in those academic disciplines that represent within the academia functional systems. For instance, the economic system is represented within academia by the science of Economics, the political system by Political Science, the legal system by Jurisprudence, etc. The problem of theory and practical application (or applicability) does not exist in so called “pure” academic disciplines such as Sociology, Philosophy, and to some extent in Mathematics. This means that as far as we can see, a coherent study program

cannot be achieved without major changes. Buzz words and cliché descriptions such as “the program bridges theory and practice” or that “the program combines philosophy and social sciences” do not provide any solution. And no solution can be provided without first identifying the problem. That problem – whatever that might be – is not necessarily theoretical as the staff seems to assume. Only theoretical problems can be solved by theory. Organizational problems are solved through organizational decisions.



## Principle 6: Learning Resources and Student Support

**INSTITUTIONS SHOULD HAVE ADEQUATE FUNDING TO COVER TEACHING AND LEARNING NEEDS. THEY SHOULD –ON THE ONE HAND– PROVIDE SATISFACTORY INFRASTRUCTURE AND SERVICES FOR LEARNING AND STUDENT SUPPORT AND –ON THE OTHER HAND– FACILITATE DIRECT ACCESS TO THEM BY ESTABLISHING INTERNAL RULES TO THIS END (E.G. LECTURE ROOMS, LABORATORIES, LIBRARIES, NETWORKS, BOARDING, CAREER AND SOCIAL POLICY SERVICES ETC.).**

*Institutions and their academic units must have sufficient funding and means to support learning and academic activity in general, so that they can offer to students the best possible level of studies. The above means could include facilities such as libraries, study rooms, educational and scientific equipment, information and communications services, support or counselling services.*

*When allocating the available resources, the needs of all students must be taken into consideration (e.g. whether they are full-time or part-time students, employed or international students, students with disabilities) and the shift towards student-centred learning and the adoption of flexible modes of learning and teaching. Support activities and facilities may be organised in various ways, depending on the institutional context. However, the internal quality assurance ensures that all resources are appropriate, adequate, and accessible, and that students are informed about the services available to them.*

*In delivering support services the role of support and administrative staff is crucial and therefore they need to be qualified and have opportunities to develop their competences.*

### Study Programme Compliance

The EEAP deems the facilities available to the Department to be adequate. The building infrastructure is satisfactory, with classrooms used being comparable to those in other Greek institutions. Most offices and lecture rooms were well-equipped and in relatively good condition.

The teachers have modern audio-visual equipment at their disposal. Reading material and course information may be obtained at the library.

The teaching staff reported that the means and teaching resources at their disposal are good.

Facilities such as libraries, study rooms, equipment, computers, information and communication services, counselling services for the students are, according to the teaching and administrative staff, of a very good standard. This was also the EEAP's impression from the virtual tour in the campus. The EEAP visited virtually the facilities available to the Department and found them to be adequate. The building infrastructure is very good, with classrooms used being comparable to those in other Greek institutions. All offices and lecture rooms were well-equipped and in good condition.

At the undergraduate level there are lots of possibilities for teacher/student collaboration. Students were almost unanimous in commending favourably the staff's presence and willingness to help.

### Panel Judgement

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

### Panel Recommendations

The quality of teaching could be monitored with other methods such as periodic peer teaching evaluation and with discussions among members about what teaching method works in practice. The head of the department could play an active role in the introduction of different teaching methods through internal seminars and by inviting colleagues from the Department of Pedagogy.

## Principle 7: Information Management

**INSTITUTIONS BEAR FULL RESPONSIBILITY FOR COLLECTING, ANALYSING AND USING INFORMATION, AIMED AT THE EFFICIENT MANAGEMENT OF UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMMES OF STUDY AND RELATED ACTIVITIES, IN AN INTEGRATED, EFFECTIVE AND EASILY ACCESSIBLE WAY.**

*Institutions are expected to establish and operate an information system for the management and monitoring of data concerning students, teaching staff, course structure and organisation, teaching and provision of services to students as well as to the academic community.*

*Reliable data is essential for accurate information and for decision making, as well as for identifying areas of smooth operation and areas for improvement. Effective procedures for collecting and analysing information on study programmes and other activities feed data into the internal system of quality assurance.*

*The information gathered depends, to some extent, on the type and mission of the Institution. The following are of interest:*

- *key performance indicators*
- *student population profile*
- *student progression, success and drop-out rates*
- *student satisfaction with their programme(s)*
- *availability of learning resources and student support*
- *career paths of graduates*

*A number of methods may be used for collecting information. It is important that students and staff are involved in providing and analyzing information and planning follow-up activities.*

### Study Programme Compliance

Student evaluations are the main tool in measuring the pedagogical performance of faculty. These are based on a standardized questionnaire. Students are given the chance to evaluate the courses and the instructor at the end of each semester, and while only a small minority participates in the evaluations, the Department is committed to taking their evaluations into consideration. In recent years, the response ratio was with 46% significantly higher compared with other departments of the University. No data were provided regarding gender distribution.

The University offers learning resources and student support services to the entire student body. The library facilities are exceptional to Greek standards. Moreover, the digitization of secretariat services, the ability to have remote access to library resources (via VPN), access to the library's digital collections of books and journals, and the *e-learn* platform for teaching are all adequate resources that facilitate ease of access to university services. Of course, many of these resources are not specific to this Department but most of them exist in nearly all universities in Greece.

During the meeting with the departmental alumni, all persons interviewed praised the teaching style of their professors and put a strong emphasis on the fact that about half of their study time

was spent in seminars and colloquia, where they learnt to express their thoughts in form of written essays, instead of being administered oral exams, as it is usual in most of the Greek universities. This skill helped them in their further studies, especially at universities abroad. They also agreed in the judgment that their success in their careers was mainly due to the support of the Department and the quality of the study programme, and secondarily due to their own ambition, excellence, and determination.

According to information presented to the EEAP, a significant part of the graduates is employed in the secondary, and some also in the primary, education sector and in the adult education sector. Another significant part pursues careers in academia and in the broader civil service sector. Some graduates have achieved higher positions in state administration at ministry level.

The Department plans to establish in cooperation with the Philosophical Faculty a platform that monitors the professional development of its alumni.

### Panel Judgement

Principle 7: Information Management	
Fully compliant	
Substantially compliant	<b>X</b>
Partially compliant	
Non-compliant	

### Panel Recommendations

The establishment of professional monitoring platform should be put forward.

## Principle 8: Public Information

**INSTITUTIONS SHOULD PUBLISH INFORMATION ABOUT THEIR TEACHING AND ACADEMIC ACTIVITIES WHICH IS CLEAR, ACCURATE, OBJECTIVE, UP-TO-DATE AND READILY ACCESSIBLE.**

*Information on Institution's activities is useful for prospective and current students, graduates, other stakeholders and the public.*

*Therefore, institutions and their academic units provide information about their activities, including the programmes they offer, the intended learning outcomes, the qualifications awarded, the teaching, learning and assessment procedures used, the pass rates and the learning opportunities available to their students, as well as graduate employment information.*

### Study Programme Compliance

The EEAP explored the publicly available information on the website as well as sample materials made available by the Department to the Panel members. The EEAP expresses its satisfaction and gratitude for OMEA's willingness to offer all the supplementary material requested. Through its website, the Department provides information about its academic and educational activities. Study guides are published and are available online. Unfortunately, they are not made in a clear and direct way and they reflect partially the reality of the programme studies. There are more than 150 course descriptions and too many abbreviations rendering it unclear, even opaque. The members of the EEAP found it difficult to find an orientation as to the actual courses that the students should follow each semester. It was also difficult for an outsider to understand the actual curriculum that a student should follow to get a degree. This way it is unclear in these documents in what explicit content consists of a degree from the Department.

The teaching, learning and assessment procedures used by the Department are all explicitly presented on the website as are the reports of all past external and internal evaluations.

The Division of Social Studies also uses additional media to foster social networking. Faculty engagement & departmental outreach includes a range of various activities & media. In general, information about graduates' employment opportunities does not appear to be well publicized. The EEAP met with alumni who offered a partial glimpse into the various career paths pursued by individuals – albeit there is no way to ascertain whether this group is representative of most alumni. The alumni interviewed were extremely positive about their experience. However, very little tangible information about specific institutionalized connections between their degree and their career path was mentioned.

### Panel Judgement

Principle 8: Public Information	
Fully compliant	
Substantially compliant	<b>X</b>
Partially compliant	
Non-compliant	

### Panel Recommendations

Information about the students' curriculum should be clearer. The great number of directions and course options gives the impression that the students can make their own degree "à la carte". The presentation of the students' guide should be rethought from the point of view of an outsider that knows nothing of the Department's ways.

## Principle 9: On-going Monitoring and Periodic Internal Review of Programmes

**INSTITUTIONS SHOULD HAVE IN PLACE AN INTERNAL QUALITY ASSURANCE SYSTEM FOR THE AUDIT AND ANNUAL INTERNAL REVIEW OF THEIR PROGRAMMES, SO AS TO ACHIEVE THE OBJECTIVES SET FOR THEM, THROUGH MONITORING AND AMENDMENTS, WITH A VIEW TO CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT. ANY ACTIONS TAKEN IN THE ABOVE CONTEXT SHOULD BE COMMUNICATED TO ALL PARTIES CONCERNED.**

*Regular monitoring, review and revision of study programmes aim to maintain the level of educational provision and to create a supportive and effective learning environment for students.*

*The above comprise the evaluation of:*

- *the content of the programme in the light of the latest research in the given discipline, thus ensuring that the programme is up to date;*
- *the changing needs of society;*
- *the students' workload, progression and completion;*
- *the effectiveness of the procedures for the assessment of students;*
- *the students' expectations, needs and satisfaction in relation to the programme;*
- *the learning environment, support services and their fitness for purpose for the programme*

*Programmes are reviewed and revised regularly involving students and other stakeholders. The information collected is analysed and the programme is adapted to ensure that it is up-to-date. Revised programme specifications are published.*

### Study Programme Compliance

The self-assessment, the external evaluation, the MODIP indicators, the questionnaires of students and graduates, the consultation of the committees of the Department and the General Assembly, are key sources that contribute to the on-going monitoring and periodic review of the Undergraduate Program. Each one of the two divisions proposes new courses at the general assembly, and it seems to be an understanding for mutual respect of the section propositions between the two divisions. Members of the teaching staff are responsible for the updating of the content, the bibliography, and the pedagogical methods of their course. The review of the content of the programme in the light of the latest research in the given discipline, thus ensuring that the programme is up to date, is primarily up to the Department's academic staff and subject to external evaluation.

In the Philosophy division there are two distinctive levels of progression, one preliminary in the first two years and a second of specialization in the last two years. According to EEAP, there is still space for progression to be further developed. The Social Sciences division does not seem to have a specific progressive pattern. This is due to the variety of disciplinary approaches and matters that only permit introductory levels. The same applies to the Department general pedagogic informal section.

Procedures for the evaluation of students seem very well in place. Most actual students and alumni were most satisfied by the seminars and the exercises in which the evaluation was made

through the production of written essays. This has strengthened their critical capacities and understanding.

There is general satisfaction as to the educational results of the students and particularly students of the philosophy section who have a good degree of understanding of their discipline. On the other hand, students who do not have an explicit interest in philosophy have expectations that are not quite compatible with the Department's specific scientific field (i.e., philosophy, theory, and methodology of social sciences), but are rather satisfied with their engagement in social problems and problematics.

### Panel Judgement

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

### Panel Recommendations

For the programme to be progressive, there should be a **dominant Philosophy** curriculum, in which the other two sections, Social Sciences and Pedagogy, should be integrated. For example, Greek and Latin philology courses and language courses ought to be integrated in the perspective of philosophical text reading. The same should apply to the social studies' section: it should create bridges with the three philosophical axes of the programme.



## Principle 10: Regular External Evaluation of Undergraduate Programmes

**PROGRAMMES SHOULD REGULARLY UNDERGO EVALUATION BY COMMITTEES OF EXTERNAL EXPERTS SET BY HAHE, AIMING AT ACCREDITATION. THE TERM OF VALIDITY OF THE ACCREDITATION IS DETERMINED BY HAHE.**

*HAHE is responsible for administrating the programme accreditation process which is realised as an external evaluation procedure, and implemented by a committee of independent experts. HAHE grants accreditation of programmes, with a specific term of validity, following to which revision is required. The accreditation of the quality of the programmes acts as a means of verification of the compliance of the programme with the template's requirements, and as a catalyst for improvement, while opening new perspectives towards the international standing of the awarded degrees.*

*Both academic units and institutions participate in the regular external quality assurance process, while respecting the requirements of the legislative framework in which they operate.*

*The quality assurance, in this case the accreditation, is an on-going process that does not end with the external feedback, or report or its follow-up process within the Institution. Therefore, Institutions and their academic units ensure that the progress made since the last external quality assurance activity is taken into consideration when preparing for the next one.*

### Study Programme Compliance

The Department has undergone several evaluations, mostly internal ([http://www.fks.uoc.gr/\\_pw/eval/](http://www.fks.uoc.gr/_pw/eval/)). The Department has undergone an external evaluation by the HAHE (then HQA) in 2013. The Department has shown a **poor achievement of reforming** the previous undergraduate programme following the guidelines of that evaluation. The undergraduate study programme or the Department hasn't recently undergone any other external reviews conducted by other Agencies.

During the present evaluation, all members of staff present in the evaluation seemed aware of the importance of the external review and the need for an external gaze on their programme. Fully cooperative, all stakeholders of the programme, the academic Department and the University are actively engaged in the external review.

### Panel Judgement

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

### **Panel Recommendations**

The Department should fully engage in the making of all necessary changes recommended by the EEAP.

## PART C: CONCLUSIONS

### I. Features of Good Practice

- University and Department facilities and administration are working **adequately**.
- The institution of seminars is **very positive**, something unusual for Greek universities. In the seminars the students practice in the writing of scientific texts something that helps in their scientific career or in their professional life outside the academia.
- Gender equality among the teaching staff is **much respected and appreciated**.
- Department students and alumni have a **deep esteem** for the University and the Department.
- The Department is **well anchored** in local society.
- The Philosophy division seems to be working according to standards and can be improved even further with relatively small adaptations of good practices.

### II. Areas of Weakness

- **Disciplinary fragmentation** of the Studies Programme is particularly acute. There are two formal (Philosophy and Social Studies – THEMKE) and one informal (pedagogical training preparing for the secondary education) divisions, and sub-divisions (Pedagogy, Psychology, Sociology, History etc.)
- There is **no disciplinary field** for the Social Sciences division. It should be centred on epistemology and the methodology of social sciences.
- The Social Sciences sub-curriculum has **no visible structure**. There seem to be only introductory courses in various disciplines and subdisciplines (see point above). Furthermore, it is constructed to serve the MA degree of the division “Cultural Analysis and Education” (the other two MA programmes have been discontinued). Thus, it does **not serve its own disciplinary vocation**.

### III. Recommendations for Follow-up Actions

- To successfully reform the Studies Programme emphasis should be given to a **dominant Philosophy curriculum**, in which the other two curriculums, one in Social Sciences with focus on epistemology and methodology and one with focus on Pedagogy and Didactic of Philosophy and Social Sciences for the secondary education, should be integrated. For example, courses in Ancient Greek and Latin and language courses should be integrated from the perspective of philosophical text close reading. The Social Sciences division should create bridges to the three philosophical foci of the programme (Theoretical Philosophy, Ethics and Philosophy of Science) and become in a certain way a prolongment of the curriculum in the domain of the Social Sciences.

- The Social Sciences division of the programme **should focus** on the epistemology, theory, methodology and history of Social Sciences, so it can meet the three foci of the advanced level of studies (years three and four) of the division of Philosophy.
- Regarding the structure of the curriculum, the overall number of exams should be reduced significantly. This can be achieved by **combining thematic related** courses to 10 ECTS point modules. In the case of introductory lectures, the creation of larger modules would also have the additional benefit that the corresponding examinations would be administered and graded by two docents. Concerning the Social Studies sub-curriculum, instead of offering separate courses that change frequently and thus render the **proper accreditation of the programme as a programme difficult if not impossible**, formally conceived modules should be implemented that define general aims and methods in the topics of programme that can then be realised by a variety of thematical units. In its current form each singular course offered must be accredited and the accreditation process **must be repeated** every time a new course is added, because the courses are **conceived and presented as separate didactic units**. For example, all seminars and lectures that address epistemological themes in Social Sciences could be offered under within the framework of a module titled "Methodology of Social Sciences" that will define the concrete aims that students should learn and the expertise they should achieve. Within this framework it would be possible to offer each semester various courses that address different aspects of the main topic from many perspectives, methodical and theoretical, and to provide outlooks on the progress of scientific discourse.
- The pedagogic sub-curriculum that aims to provide the necessary competence to teach in the secondary education, and thus does not observe any theoretic aims, should be **separated more clearly** from the main body of the scientific curricula, and it should become **facultative**, so that students who wish to pursue careers in academia or in other sectors of employment can fill this space with additional scientific courses, either from Philosophy and Epistemology and Methodology of the Social Sciences, or from other disciplines, taking advantage from the already existing possibility.
- The preparation of a **final thesis** with a formal value of 20 ECTS points should **become mandatory** for everyone wishing to continue their studies at the MA level. This requirement should be included in the description of the present MA programme and in the description of any future Ma programme of the Department. Students with the explicit orientation towards the secondary education sector could be exempted and attend instead more pedagogic and didactic courses, or courses that can help them to better cope with the requirements for a secondary level teacher in the Greek system. It is important that the preparation of the thesis takes place within the framework of a **special module** that enables the participants to present and discuss their theses with other students and not only with their supervisors. A final defence of the thesis is also recommendable.
- Finally, the overall structure of the study programme should become **self-sustained** and **should not depend** on an ensuing MA programme for its completion. The study pro-

gramme should give the students all the necessary knowledge and skills for the continuation of their studies and their career in any other related MA programme and enable them to have a good starting in a career outside academia, i.e., in the private and the public sector.

#### IV. Summary & Overall Assessment

The Principles where full compliance has been achieved are: 3, 6

The Principles where substantial compliance has been achieved are: 7, 8, 9, 10

The Principles where partial compliance has been achieved are: 1, 2, 4, 5

The Principles where failure of compliance was identified are: None

Overall Judgement	
Fully compliant	
Substantially compliant	<b>X</b>
Partially compliant	
Non-compliant	

## The members of the External Evaluation & Accreditation Panel

Name and Surname	Signature
1. <b>Prof. Dr. Nikolaos Psarros (Chair)</b> Inst. of Philosophy, University of Leipzig, Germany	
2. <b>Assoc. Prof. Panagiotis Christias</b> Department of French and European studies, University of Cyprus, Cyprus	
3. <b>Professor Dimitris Michailakis</b> Department of Culture and Society University of Linköping, Sweden	
4. <b>Professor Apostolis Papakostas</b> Dept. of Social Sciences, Södertörn University, Sweden	