



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

Accreditation Report
for the Undergraduate Study Programme of:

Sociology
Institution: Panteion University
Date: 16 October 2021

Report of the Panel appointed by the HAHE to undertake the review of the Undergraduate Study Programme of **Sociology** of the **Panteion University** for the purposes of granting accreditation

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Part A: Background and Context of the Review.....	4
I. The External Evaluation & Accreditation Panel.....	4
II. Review Procedure and Documentation	5
III. Study Programme Profile	8
Part B: Compliance with the Principles	9
Principle 1: Academic Unit Policy for Quality Assurance	9
Principle 2: Design and Approval of Programmes	11
Principle 3: Student- centred Learning, Teaching and Assessment.....	14
Principle 4: Student Admission, Progression, Recognition and Certification	18
Principle 5: Teaching Staff	20
Principle 6: Learning Resources and Student Support	23
Principle 7: Information Management	26
Principle 8: Public Information	28
Principle 9: On-going Monitoring and Periodic Internal Review of Programmes	29
Principle 10: Regular External Evaluation of Undergraduate Programmes.....	31
Part C: Conclusions	33
I. Features of Good Practice	33
II. Areas of Weakness	33
III. Recommendations for Follow-up Actions	34
IV. Summary & Overall Assessment	35

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 **Sociology** of the **Panteion University** comprised the following four (4) members, drawn from the HAHE Register, in accordance with Laws 4009/2011 & 4653/2020:

- 1. Assoc. Professor Panagiotis Christias (Chair)**
University of Cyprus
- 2. Professor Dimitris Michailakis**
University of Linköping, Sweden
- 3. Assoc. Professor Elisabeth Kirtsoglou**
Durham University, UK
- 4. Professor Apostolis Papakostas**
Södertörn University, Sweden

II. Review Procedure and Documentation

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic and relevant measures taken by the Greek government, the entire undergraduate study programme review took place remotely through Zoom. The process was smooth, with no technical problems, and despite the lack of physical presence, it went according to plan. Communication with Panteion University and the Department staff was unproblematic in technical terms and our interaction was of good quality.

The main objective of this report is to offer respectful, collegial and frank recommendations which will contribute to the Department's future development, after having conducted proper and thorough consultations with all relevant stakeholders.

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

- HAHE Materials such as Guidelines for Accreditation, Mapping Grid for members of EEAP, indexes of the Department of Social Policy, and
- The Department's Proposal for Accreditation with the relevant annexes and all the material given to the EEAP during the evaluation and accreditation procedure according to the demands of the EEAP.

The EEAP has also consulted the recommendations of the 2013 External Evaluation Report of the Department.

During the evaluation and accreditation procedure, the Department shared with the EEAP, further material, presentations and additional data as requested in a prompt manner.

The members of the EEAP were offered on-line meetings, where 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.

On Monday, 11th October, between 11.00 and 13.00, the EEAP held a private meeting to discuss the documentation received, to divide tasks among members and to organize the teamwork in detail.

The in situ on-line review procedure began on the morning of the next day, Tuesday the 12th of October, at 11.00, with a teleconference with the Rector and President of MODIP, Professor Christina Koulouri, and the Head of the Department, Professor Andreas N. Lytras. The EEAP members were presented with a broad overview of the history, academic profile and current status of Panteion University and the Department.

After a short break, the EEAP members discussed the degree of compliance of the Undergraduate Programme to the Quality Standards for Accreditation with the **OMEA** members, **MODIP** members and **MODIP Staff members**. The OMEA representatives explained the Department's evaluation processes and answered a series of questions addressed to them by the EEAP, providing supplementary information when requested.

After the lunch break, from 15.00 to 15.45 the EEAP members held a teleconference with teaching staff members. They 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 involvement in applied research, projects and research activities directly related to the programme, and possible areas in need of further strengthening and development.

Following this meeting, from 16.00 to 16.45, the EEAP members met with **undergraduate students** from the 2nd to the 4th year of their studies. The EEAP was particularly interested in student satisfaction, study experience, the facilities of the University and the Department, and any difficulties students have encountered. The members of EEAP had the opportunity to ask students about their overall satisfaction with the Department, their study fields and the study program. They also discussed future employment opportunities. Students were particularly open to the discussion which was cordial and sincere.

After the break, the EEAP held a private meeting to discuss the outcome of the first day of the visit.

On the second day of the visit, Wednesday, 13th October at 11.00, the EEAP held an online meeting with administrative staff members and teaching staff members. Prior to the meeting, the EEAP viewed a short, screened on-line tour of the facilities of the University and the Department: classrooms, lecture halls, libraries, and laboratories. Professor Charalambos Economou, Head of ELKE (Research Department of University), explained in detail the financial status of the department and gave the EEAP an account of the external funds captured by departmental staff during the years preceding the evaluation. There were also presentations and discussions on and around the library and the IT facilities, the organisation of teaching and assessment during the pandemic, student services, and the teaching staff course tutoring.

Next, from 12.00 to 12.45 the EEAP had a teleconference with a group of **alumni of the Department**. The vast majority (7 out of 9) of the alumni present in the meeting were university professors in various departments of sociology and other disciplines in Greece or abroad. They discussed the underlying knowledge they acquired while studying in the Department and the career paths followed thereafter. The EEAP concluded that this alumni group did not contribute much to the evaluation process, since none of them had actually followed the existing UGP of studies. Also, the EEAP found that all of the alumni were quite exceptional in their professional trajectories, and thus a rather unrepresentative sample of departmental graduates who follow an academic career.

After a break, the EEAP held a teleconference with **employers and social partners**, from 13.00 to 13.45, and discussed the relations of the Department with external stakeholders from both the private and the public sector. Again, the EEAP found that the selected panel members were not in an institutionalized relation to the Department, i.e., involvement in employment or internship. On the contrary, representatives of the police services explained to the EEAP why they could never involve criminology students from the Department to their work.

The EEAP found that in the aforementioned meetings (with alumni and external stakeholders), the Department missed the opportunity to demonstrate the programme's actual strengths through recent graduates who would be familiar with the current UGP, and through existing partners who offer internship opportunities to current students.

A private consultation of the members of the EEAP followed. They exchanged their impressions regarding the meeting, discussed possible outcomes and prepared the final oral report.

The in situ online visit continued in the afternoon of the same day, from 15.30 to 16.00, with the online meeting with **OMEA and MODIP representatives and MODIP staff**. The EEAP asked some last clarification questions and received adequate and clear answers.

The in-situ visit concluded with a final meeting, from 17.00-18.00, in the presence of the EEAP, the OMEA, the Head of the Department and the Rector and president of the MODIP. The preliminary findings of the overall evaluation and accreditation process were discussed. The EEAP presented their preliminary conclusions regarding the international profile of the Department, the structure of the study programme, the necessity for compulsory undergraduate dissertation, and the internship programme. The meeting ended with a cordial discussion of future directions.

III. Study Programme Profile

The Panteion University Department of Sociology is the first such department to be established in Greece. It was founded in 1984 and has since been cultivating the various disciplines of Sociology. The Department aims:

- (a) to respond to the major theoretical quests and modern directions of the interdisciplinary management of social problems and to elaborate on the practices for addressing them, through teaching, research, postgraduate studies and by means of its international presence.
- (b) to provide a systematic study of society, social behaviour in its individual and collective forms, social institutions, the process of building and changing the structure of human society and the problems faced by modern man.
- (c) to educate well-informed sociologists and scientists, who are able to systematically process both the scientific and the current perceptions of social problems they may be required to address in their professional capacity. It seeks to educate and promote the exploration of the different aspects of social life and the problems created by the social coexistence of people.

The four-year programme of studies, which leads to the UG Degree of Sociology, is organised thematically. The courses are divided into compulsory, courses which cover primarily the first four semesters and elective courses which are distributed from the third to the eighth semester. The Curriculum includes both Seminars for subjects that require higher specialization and self-action, as well as courses outside the Department chosen by students from other Departments of the University. The main thematic modules are major sociological theories and themes (that range from history of ideas to sociology of corruption to pre-industrial societies and social anthropology); criminology; contemporary Greece and Europe (including European policy, religion and the state, Islam and radicalisation, sociology of crises). The Programme offers the possibility of an internship, but no UG Dissertation is conducted by the students. A Diploma Supplement is given on graduation by the Department in which all courses not mentioned in the official transcript are listed.

Graduates of the Department are reportedly employed in various sectors in public or civil organisations and the private sector. In its current status the Department accepts some 260 students every year despite its own defined capacity of only a hundred. Additional students are imposed by the Ministry of Education, either by increasing the number of accepted students or through the process of student-transfer according to social criteria.

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

The Department produced the necessary internal report and presented sufficiently the requirements of the UGP. It highlighted the curricular changes that took place since the 2013 external evaluation and explained the revision process well.

Regarding the approval and change of the study program, the Department follows the standard formal routines. The approval of undergraduate programmes is strictly regulated in the Greek educational system and there are institutionalised channels for student participation in the decision process. The department involves students in the revisions of the program and has some established channels for gathering information from relevant stakeholders in the wider society.

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

- Broad range of offered course themes.
- The study guide is well structured and easy to comprehend. It provides all the information necessary to compose the individual study plan.
- Opportunity of student participation in the activities of the research laboratories operated by the Department.
- Encouragement of students to participate in the ERASMUS+ programme.

Despite its commendable and ambitious aims, the study programme in its current form appears unable to provide more than superficial and general insights into many of the offered topics.

Panel Judgement

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

Panel Recommendations

None.

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 programme curriculum has been reportedly designed to grant its students broad knowledge in three thematic areas: theory and applications; criminology; Greek and European society. Additionally, the programme's objectives are to acquaint students with different research methodologies and equip them with strong research skills. We have noticed the programme's strong employability orientation towards the public sector and civil society. In the material attached to the Department's portfolio there is certain degree of ambiguity concerning progression and individual degree structure. In the study guide there is a list of circa 137 courses, while only 44 courses are required for graduating. From this list, reportedly, about 100 courses are offered every year.

There is a rather high degree of student freedom to choose individual courses after the compulsory part and the supply of courses can differ from year to year. These two factors, in combination, introduce great variability to the final transcript of the Department's graduates, thus jeopardising the Degree's overall benchmarking. The process of selecting which courses will be offered on a yearly basis does not follow strict academic criteria but is often held hostage to practical limitations. At the same time, as stated by students themselves, course selection is guided also by non-academic concerns. Consequently, it transpired from the discussion with

students that certain skills, like quantitative methods of research, occasionally end up not being fully consolidated by the time of graduation.

The fragmentation of the second half of the program is extensive. Courses are not appropriately thematized within the three areas, nor properly sequenced and the curriculum is not fixed from year to year, thus not allowing an external observer to comprehend the degree of progression of the studies. The contents of the thematic areas are dispersed in many, rather introductory courses in different sociological sub-themes. The EEAP has for instance reckoned more than 40 courses offered in the thematic area of Theory and Applications. The Committee noticed a clear progression pattern only in the field of statistics, where introductory statistics is followed by a more specialised course and finally by an optional course that enhances statistical skills even further for those who wish to specialise in quantitative methods of research. Undeniably the ambition of broad knowledge is fulfilled, but at the expense of the progressive deepening of knowledge.

The link between research and teaching is accomplished in three ways:

- Linking literature with research
- Linking teaching with research
- Linking up the research conducted by members of the Department with the content of the courses offered.

The impression of the EEAP is that these links are established in varying forms in the vast majority of the courses offered. The committee acknowledges the Department's efforts to address shortcomings identified in the previous evaluation, emphasizing the need for furthering and extending such efforts.

Panel Judgement

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

Panel Recommendations

- The program offers more than one hundred elective courses. We recommend a radical reduction of the elective courses offered and a further qualitative elaboration of the courses at the third and fourth years of the program.
- A core of courses in each thematic area should be structured in a main block that is common for all students who choose a specific thematic area. The progression of knowledge in relation to courses labelled as I and II during the first two years must be demonstrated more clearly.
- Further, the courses that constitute the core block in each thematic area should be sequenced according to the degree of progressivity.
- We recommend that about one year of studies is devoted to the core block of each thematic area. The choice of a thematic area should practically mean that students are expected to read the entire core block of courses.
- The resources that will be freed by the reduction of the number of elective courses could be used to introduce a compulsory undergraduate dissertation course. We suggest that the department offers students the possibility to conduct their own research and write a thesis on a theme of their choice. The length of the space available for a dissertation in the curriculum should correspond to eight/ten weeks of study.
- Specific and uniform supervision should be provided to all students on their dissertation (i.e., standard number of hours on specific aspects such as study design, fit of research methods, analysis, ethics and writing up).

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

The department's approach to teaching practice is in general terms student-oriented within an institutionalised legislative context that enforces certain restrictions (such as academic members of staff being obliged to teach a fixed number of hours on the area of their specialisation as this is defined by the terms of their employment). Such restrictions interfere with the shape of the programme of studies, somewhat threatening the overall coherence of the degree, while certain courses seem to be running with very low numbers of students leading to a less efficient use of staff time.

The main pedagogical method and mode of delivery used is that of standard lectures and seminars. Research-led teaching is supported by four distinct labs (urban criminology; migration, radicalisation and inter-cultural relations; sociology of education and culture; media and communications). Labs present their work in organised, separate webpages. As a case in point, the sociology of education and culture lab demonstrates clearly how the courses offered in the programme are connected with research and publications by members of staff, showcasing appropriate commitment to research-led teaching.

While the ability to specialise thematically unquestionably promotes a student-centred programme, by creating flexible learning paths, and encourages students to develop individual skills, the sheer number of courses and the combinations that students can potentially make produce very different academic outcomes. The lack of variability in pedagogical methods, is partially covered by the fact that students are encouraged to engage in secondary research (essays) that contribute to their overall course marks and allow them to acquire research and writing skills. Bibliography-based research as part of courses is extremely useful, especially vis-à-vis the skills' gap created by the absence of a formalised, obligatory final dissertation.

Members of staff were reported to go at great lengths to support their students' learning process through individual email communication and face-to-face meetings. They were reported to be generally very supportive and responsive. The commitment of the staff to their students and programme is commendable. The Department's strong orientation towards contributing to current social debates is notable.

In terms of formalised academic support, information on academic tutors can be found on the main webpage of the department, but students did not seem aware of their existence. Academic support, although adequate and at times generous, is provided in a rather ad-hoc manner. Assessment criteria, key skills and learning objectives are communicated in individual handbooks and during classes.

Student satisfaction is measured through surveys. In the past, those were handwritten forms distributed in the classroom. A new electronic system has been developed. As a result of pandemic-related disruptions and the introduction of digitised evaluation forms, there was a disruption in the collection and analysis of student feedback. Most importantly however, the EEAP observed a general gap in the feedback cycle. The relevant committees (internal evaluation and programme studies' respectively) do not appear to have established clear pathways that would allow student feedback to contribute to an identifiable centralised plan of action for the degree as a whole. Changes do occur and feedback is taken on board, but on an ad hoc basis.

There is a process in place for student appeals and for examining inconsistencies and cases of multiple failures, but there was not – until recently- a clear process for addressing complaints and grievances. New centralised services were created by initiative of the current rectorship in order to address this gap ('the Student's Advocate' and the "Equality Bureau"). These services are of great importance, and they will cover a lacuna in formal appeals, complaints and grievance procedures.

The department did a very good job to address restrictions enforced on teaching and learning by the pandemic. According to student and staff statements, the e-teaching platform operates efficiently. The ministry's guidance for exclusive face-to-face delivering of lectures in the post-pandemic era poses a missed opportunity for the consolidation of flexible, hybrid forms of learning. This is especially important due to the demographic of the student body in crisis-afflicted Greece, where a sizable number of students work to support themselves and their studies.

In general, the programme is delivered in an environment of mutual respect, but a number of standard processes need to be further developed. We propose a shift in the teaching and learning approach of the department, from the ad hoc covering of pedagogical needs to the creation of clear and centralised

processes of guidance, assessment, student support, feedback, mitigating circumstances and complaints/appeals.

Panel Judgement

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

Panel Recommendations

More specifically the EEAP propose that the department develops:

- a. A clear set of guidance and assessment criteria that is published separately, in advance and addresses all forms of assessment as appropriate (written exams, viva voce exams, essays).
- b. A clear marking rubric in accordance with the guidance and assessment criteria that is used for the provision of feedback additionally to the free-hand comments currently provided.

The above (a) and (b) are important steps and tools for the students' locus of control through promoting awareness of what constitutes a good piece of research (essay), or a good, critical answer (exam). Towards further transparency in marking and assessment, the EEAP urges the department to introduce second marking and moderation processes, at least to a proportion of the assessed work.

- c. The role of the academic tutor needs to be strengthened and the student body needs to become aware of his/her existence and remit.
- d. Office hours need to be fixed and pre-advertised to students.

The above (c) and (d) are important processes of unifying pastoral care, making it transparent to all students, addressing as much as possible issues of differential access to resources and gender, class, ethnicity or personal confidence –related inequalities.

- e. A clear guide for complaints, appeals and reporting needs to be composed by the department and made public and available to all students, so that students become clearly aware of their options.
- f. A clear system of mitigating circumstances, deadlines and extensions (preferably managed by a rotating, small sub-committee of academic tutors) needs to be devised and to become publicly available to students.

The above (e) and (f) ensure fair and equal treatment across the student body and reduce potential inequalities stemming from the circumstantial manner in which issues of appeals or serious adverse circumstances are dealt with. Standardising reporting procedures (point 'e') responds to calls by current research on the positive correlation between absence of such structures and under-reporting of serious incidents of bullying, harassment and abuse of power in educational settings.

Finally, a very clear strategy of acting upon student feedback needs to be devised. Changes that are implemented as a result of student feedback need to be made publicly available to the student body as a way of strengthening cultures of participation in teaching and learning.

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

Students enter the UG Programme of Sociology through a national system of access based on a *numerus clausus* competition, organized by the Ministry of Education. The department has limited influence on admission processes. The Greek educational system allows for student transfers between universities after the national competition is concluded, which renders the number of first year students difficult, if not impossible, to predict in advance. Our colleagues talked about this problem of rational planning, as the number of enrolled students substantially exceeds (by 75 percent) the number of students who secured a place through the national competition.

According to statistical quality indicators provided by the HAHE, the group of n+2 students (as we interpret it, students whose graduation is delayed for more than two years) is more than 53 percent of the total number of students. The committee cannot draw any conclusions on whether delays in progression are caused by factors inherent in the functioning of the department or by other circumstances beyond the reach of the department. Still, both the above-mentioned phenomena of augmented first year student numbers and delayed progression, clearly hamper the rational planning of university education. This of course is not unique for the department in question. In an effort to mitigate some of these systemic weaknesses the threshold for students' admission to the programme is higher now compared to the pre-pandemic situation.

Regarding educational structure, from the inspection of teaching and learning material provided and the evaluation process, we conclude that the programme, its different parts, the expected outcomes at different levels, the duration of the studies and the content of different courses are well documented and detailed in the handbook of studies and other relevant documents. All teaching and learning documents are easily accessible. Greek is predictably the main language of documentation.

Panel Judgement

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

Panel Recommendations

To our knowledge, Greek students attending European universities need to provide official translations of study documents making enrolment in foreign programmes both cumbersome and costly. European departments of sociology often find it difficult to assess the level, content and duration of studies. Given the current labour market conditions in Greece, it is anticipated that many students will attempt to continue their studies abroad or try to enter the labour market in other European countries. It is therefore advisable that the university (or the department) develop a service that will provide students with official transcripts in English (and perhaps other European languages) in order to facilitate movement and exchange in academia and the labour market. We also recommend the existence of a translated version of the UPG on the webpage that will enhance the international profile of the department.

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

The EEAP lacks the necessary factual data to reach safe conclusions on whether recruitment is transparent and impartial. A different set of input and inquiry would have been necessary in order to examine this specific feature. However, the faculty reassured the Committee that there are no complaints over the transparency of new positions which are in any case almost non-existent over the last decade. There is an enormous reduction of faculty members (from 40 to 25). This can partly explain the top-heavy character of the staff cohort which is currently composed of an unusual number of full professors (21 out of 25). The rank distribution is like a reverse pyramid.

Whatever the reasons for this odd situation, the conditions of promotion are very good if we use as a criterion that everyone reaches professor grade quite soon. Uncomplicated progression may also be a result of the marked intention of senior colleagues, to support junior ones in various sways in their efforts to advance in their careers. There seems to be a supportive climate in the department, without internal conflicts that could threaten its cohesion. A research leave of six months is offered every three years to all members of staff.

Teaching depends mainly on lectures. The minimum teaching load per faculty member is determined by law and, at the undergraduate program, is currently 4 courses per academic year / faculty member. This corresponds to 6 hours of teaching obligations per week for every faculty member but does not include supervision of undergraduate and post-graduate theses. We consider the workload appropriate. Even after the reduction of the workforce from 40 to 25, teaching obligations are still lower than the average EU standards (six teaching hours per week, in total 26 weeks per year). Most faculty members teach at the MSc program for about 2.5

hrs/week on average, additionally to their standard workload. Courses are taught in Greek. The staff occasionally invite professors from Greek and foreign universities for seminars or lectures. Foreign exchange students that attend the department are tutored on an individual basis. One course is taught in English in order to accommodate the needs of incoming Erasmus students.

Although the workforce has been so drastically reduced, the rule of four courses per academic year and of six teaching hours per week has not been modified. The same number of courses is offered before and after the workforce reduction.

According to the data of the internal evaluation report, the teacher/active student ratio seems satisfactory for an undergraduate level. Nonetheless, considering the excessive number of dropouts, absentees, and the reduced number of students regularly attending lectures, it is not possible to accurately estimate the real ratio. In fact, attendance to lectures is not mandatory, and students state that class attendance is indeed low (compared to the teaching load as above).

The EEAP noticed the absence of specific procedures for supporting and promoting the attendance of international colloquia and conferences. The absence of these mechanisms – not everything can be attributed to the lack of economic resources – has a negative impact on the amount of staff publications, especially on the number of peer reviewed international scientific publications.

Presently, the department has no clear direction regarding research strategy. The publication rate varies between faculty members, but the collective output seems to be comparatively low in numbers. Most publications are monographs in Greek from independent Greek publishing houses.

Panel Judgement

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

Panel Recommendations

- The EEAP underlines the importance of substantial financial support by the State in order to ensure the continuity and increase of high-quality research outputs.
- At the long term, the Department should establish a strategy to balance staff grades.
- The Department should strengthen its international reputation by:
 - ✓ Increasing publications with international publishing houses and at international high impact journals.
 - ✓ Courses in other languages are almost non-existent, or at least a challenge. It is forbidden by law to include foreign language courses in the curriculum. The Panteion University should lobby to change this antediluvian law. Increasing the number of courses offered in a foreign language can attract more foreign students and also expand the domestic students' academic experiences. Internationalization should be an advantage for all.
- The Department should encourage the student evaluation process to cover all courses taught during an academic year and ask teachers to discuss the findings with the students.

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 infrastructure is deemed satisfactory in most cases. There is internet access (wireless or wired) in the majority of the buildings. There exists sufficient and updated IT infrastructure (e.g., computers, software) and other specialised lab equipment that support the needs of the faculty and students. The department's website is good, organized and informative, with useful information, useful for students as well as for external visitors and observers.

Classrooms seem to be equipped with appropriate technology (e.g., projectors and microphones). A number of other IT tools and services are available to the students, and enhance teaching and learning including OPEN Class, MS Teams, Zoom, Skype, email, SPSS, etc. The Department uses its website extensively to communicate relevant information to the students. Overall, the technical infrastructure seems to be adequate and both faculty and students expressed satisfaction with the available range of services provided.

There is a rich and very well organised library, with good archives and audio-visual material, numerous e-books and subscriptions to online journals. The library also offers plagiarism control software. The accessibility of the databases is excellent. The lack of meeting rooms and of a sufficient number of individual places for studying in the library and in the department's premises limits considerably the students' ability to meet and discuss. The library organises seminars on how to conduct catalogue and database searches and they also teach students how to reference correctly, what counts as plagiarism and so forth. These seminars are compulsory for all new coming students.

The Department provides a number of other services to the students including an orientation week for the 1st year students, as well as health services, psychological support, and studies and career advisory support.

The internship program was launched in 2017. The internship programme functions well in the opinion of faculty members (and students who did not contradict the staff's positive assessment). As a sign of its success, members of staff mentioned that many students find jobs in the private sector as a result of having done their internship in a specific workplace. According to the Department's records, there has been an increasing degree of demand for internships. It is regrettable that the EEAP did not get to meet any of the employers, public or private, that actually offer those internships.

In general, the working environment in the Department is –in comparison to other institutions around the country- favourable for the daily activities of faculty and professional support staff. Professional support administrative staff needs to be increased. In our view, current numbers cannot comfortably cover all operations of the department.

Panel Judgement

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

Panel Recommendations

- Despite the otherwise very good level of infrastructure provisions, space remains a problem. Due to the unpleasant situation instituted by the Ministry of Education that forces the Department to receive twice as many students as they have been requested and planned for, the problem of overcrowded rooms and restricted availability of equipment in the laboratories becomes acute. Decompression is urgent. The university has made great efforts to find new spaces. There is a marked lack of individual and group study rooms in both the library and the Department that considerably limits the students' ability to study independently, or in study groups. We encourage the department to take initiatives to

address this problem in collaboration with the library and central services, by reassigning the use of appropriate spaces.

- The number of equipped workstations in the statistics' lab of should be increased. In current conditions, the department cannot satisfy the needs of everyone who wants to and should be involved. This means extra work for the statistics' instructor.

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

The department has established data collection procedures that need to be used actively to monitor specific areas of interest such as:

- a. The percentage of courses failed, which courses are these and if they are the same from year to year.
- b. The type of assessment (oral, written, essays) and its potential role in progression success or failure
- c. The demographic of students who exceed four years of study.

These are some of the considerations that will help the department to possibly identify motifs in progression failure, and to understand and locate sources of failure with the view of devising specific measures to address or mitigate them.

Addressing issues of equality, diversity and inclusion in the academic community (regarding both students and staff) in a formal and transparent manner is important and currently –again– dealt with in an ad hoc manner and on an individual basis. The systematisation of such processes is significant and a pressing gap in the current system.

Panel Judgement

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

Panel Recommendations

The department should utilise data available to identify sources and motifs of failure, and to proceed to the design of mitigating actions. For example, the department can institute one (or more as needed) special academic tutor(s) for working students who will facilitate their learning in the absence of institutionalised forms of flexible teaching.

The department is encouraged to form a task force composed by members of staff of all grades, UG, PG students and doctoral candidates who will undertake the task of developing basic equality, diversity and inclusion policies. Staff satisfaction surveys can be conducted with special reference to the values of equality, diversity and inclusion. Promotion rates and career paths need to be analysed in terms of gender, disability and other criteria (e.g., long-term carers) that may hold back academics in a systemic manner.

Feedback from student satisfaction surveys needs to be analysed as fast as possible – see recommendations under principle three.

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

All course outlines are complete and available online. The same is true for quality assurance documents, programme of studies, labs, thematic specialisations etc. The web page is clear and up to date. Students reported that the 'internal' communications' system (e-class) is also well designed, appropriately populated, accessible and easy to use.

Panel Judgement

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

Panel Recommendations

Key information needs to be systematised and become available online.

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 assessment, updating and upgrading of the curriculum, seminars and other self-study courses taught by the academic staff is conducted individually by each faculty member and in cooperation with colleagues of related disciplines.

The renewal of the curriculum is based on the participation of faculty members in conferences, workshops, seminars, research projects, etc. These activities should contribute to the production of publications by faculty members, which in turn should enrich the material of the teaching activities thus contributing to the updating of course material.

The UGP is monitored by the faculty members of the Department both individually and collectively within the framework of the OMEA and the Departmental Assembly.

Student evaluations offer a valuable feedback to the OMEA and the Department. However, pandemic restrictions and the process of digitalization created a gap in the participation of students during the last two years. On the other hand, the centralized service for statistical analysis of the results needs to synchronize with the Departmental Assembly in order for results to meaningfully contribute to the yearly update of the programme.

Teaching and learning processes as well as the provision of pastoral care need to be standardized, in order to: (a) cultivate the students' locus of control; and (b) facilitate the departure from the current ad hoc model that is based mostly on the good will and generosity of staff members. For example, learning and assessment criteria must be publicly available in advance and assessment needs to clearly correspond to them. Supervision, mitigating circumstances and extra support processes need to be unified, transparent and publicly available.

In order to further enhance student participatory cultures in teaching and learning the Department needs to devise a clear strategy for discussing and addressing student feedback. The EEAP urges the Department staff to review its externalization strategy, orienting themselves towards the consistent production of publications in internationally recognized peer-reviewed venues.

Panel Judgement

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

Panel Recommendations

- The centralized services for statistical analysis of the results need to synchronize with the Departmental Assembly in order for results to meaningfully contribute to the yearly update of the programme.
- The Department needs to devise a clear strategy for discussing and addressing student feedback.
- The Department is encouraged to run self-initiated evaluation simulations in order to embed the evaluation culture.

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 an external evaluation by the HAHE (HQA at the moment of the evaluation) in 2013. The undergraduate study programme or the Department hasn't, after 2013, undergone any other external reviews conducted by other Agencies.

As mentioned by several staff members the external evaluation in 2013 was a traumatic experience for the department and probably for the evaluators as well. The process of current accreditation review was smooth. All members of staff, in various degrees, and the students seem aware of the importance of the external review and the need for an external gaze on their programme. Despite the quality of the application itself, the EEAP noticed the use of some unconventional methods the Department used to emphasize on its excellence alongside attitudes that demonstrated a certain disbelief towards the culture of evaluation procedures. On the other hand, the adjustments of the programme to recommendations of the previous evaluation and the mostly positive atmosphere during the current evaluation are good indicators that the department has learnt from the evaluation process as such.

Regarding the group of alumni of the Department, the EEAP noticed that the vast majority (7 out of 9) of the alumni present in the meeting were university professors in various departments of sociology and other disciplines in Greece or abroad. The EEAP concluded that this alumni group did not contribute much to the evaluation process, since none of them had actually followed the existing UGP of studies. Also, the EEAP found that all of the alumni were quite exceptional in their professional trajectories, and thus a rather unrepresentative sample of departmental graduates who follow an academic career.

An analogue conclusion could be made regarding the meeting with employers and social partners. The EEAP found that the selected panel members were not in an institutionalized

relation to the Department, i.e., involvement in employment or internship. On the contrary, representatives of the police services explained to the EEAP why they could never involve criminology students from the Department to their work.

The EEAP found that in the aforementioned meetings (with alumni and external stakeholders), the Department missed the opportunity to demonstrate the programme's actual strengths through recent graduates who would be familiar with the current UGP, and through existing partners who offer internship opportunities to current students.

Panel Judgement

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

Panel Recommendations

- Ahead of the next accreditation round, the Department is urged to take the evaluation criteria on board and adjust its internal processes and strategy accordingly.
- Always looking forward to the next evaluation and accreditation process, the Department needs to revise its strategy regarding graduates and external stakeholders selected to participate in evaluation and accreditation processes (see Part A. III).
 - Graduates should be selected out of the cohorts of students that have followed the existing programme and, in any case, they should not have graduated more than 7 years prior to the accreditation process at hand.
 - Stakeholders should be actively involved in the life of the UGP Study (e. g., by offering internships) or otherwise be active collaborators in the teaching and learning activities of the Department.
- The Department is encouraged to run self-initiated evaluation simulations in order to better prepare for the actual formal procedures.

PART C: CONCLUSIONS

I. Features of Good Practice

- The teaching staff is adequately qualified for the curriculum proposed by the Department. The members of the staff are committed to the spirit of research led teaching.
- The teaching staff is committed to student-centered learning and devotes considerable time in helping students overcome problems with the study programme or with student life in general.
- The Department has achieved a respectable level of external funding either from European sources (Horizon 2015-2020) or from programmes of the Greek Ministry of Education (ELIDEK).
- The Department supports well organized research laboratories which are reasonably open to students.
- The library, research facilities and infrastructure, including electronic access to well informed data bases (reviews, journals, e-books) are very well organized, offering broad opportunities to students and staff. The recently concluded digitalization of the old volumes of the library adds another important advantage to consulting bibliography for teaching and research purposes.
- The internship program is institutionalized (open call, directing and evaluation committee, publicly available and objective criteria of selection, open opportunities to public and private sectors). The increasing number of offered internships responds appropriately to increased student demand.
- The EEAP has particularly appreciated two initiatives developed by the current rectorship, namely the institutions of Equality Office and Student Advocate and the digitalization of the student evaluation forms.

II. Areas of Weakness

- Despite the conscientious efforts to revise the UGP towards a more coherent model, there is still room for improvement, especially with regards to the progression and deepening of knowledge. The range of courses available needs to be rationalized and standardized in order to improve the degree's consistency (benchmarking) and teaching efficiency.
- Teaching and learning processes as well as the provision of pastoral care need to be standardized, in order to: (a) cultivate the students' locus of control; and (b) facilitate the departure from the current ad hoc model that is based mostly on the good will and generosity of staff members. For example, learning and assessment criteria must be publicly available in advance and assessment needs to clearly correspond to them. Supervision, mitigating circumstances and extra support processes need to be unified, transparent and publicly available.

- In order to further enhance student participatory cultures in teaching and learning the Department needs to devise a clear strategy for discussing and addressing student feedback.
- The EEAP urges the Department staff to review its externalization strategy, orienting themselves towards the consistent production of publications in internationally recognized peer-reviewed venues.

III. Recommendations for Follow-up Actions

- The range of courses available needs to be rationalized and standardized in order to improve the degree's benchmarking and teaching efficiency.
- Teaching and learning processes as well as the provision of pastoral care need to be standardized.
- The Department needs to devise a clear strategy for discussing and addressing student feedback.
- The Department staff must review its externalization strategy towards consistent production of publications in internationally recognized peer-reviewed venues.
- The Department is encouraged to run self-initiated evaluation simulations in order to embed the evaluation culture.

IV. Summary & Overall Assessment

The Principles where full compliance has been achieved are: **1, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8.**

The Principles where substantial compliance has been achieved are: **2, 3, 9, and 10.**

The Principles where partial compliance has been achieved are: **None.**

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

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

The members of the External Evaluation & Accreditation Panel

Name and Surname

Signature

- 1. Assoc. Professor Panagiotis Christias (Chair)**
University of Cyprus
- 2. Professor Dimitris Michailakis**
University of Linköping, Sweden
- 3. Assoc. Professor Elisabeth Kirtsoglou**
Durham University, UK
- 4. Professor Apostolis Papakostas**
Södertörn University, Sweden