



ΛΛΗΝΙΚΗ ΔΗΜΟΚΡΑΤΙΑ

**Α.ΔΙ.Π.**

ΑΡΧΗ ΔΙΑΣΦΑΛΙΣΗΣ ΚΑΙ  
ΠΙΣΤΟΠΟΙΗΣΗΣ ΤΗΣ ΠΟΙΟΤΗΤΑΣ  
ΣΤΗΝ ΑΝΩΤΑΤΗ ΕΚΠΑΙΔΕΥΣΗ

HELLENIC REPUBLIC

**H.Q.A.**

HELLENIC QUALITY ASSURANCE AND  
ACCREDITATION AGENCY

## EXTERNAL EVALUATION REPORT

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY

UNIVERSITY OF CRETE



**European Union**  
European Social Fund



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

**Co-financed by Greece and the European Union**



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

### **The External Evaluation Committee**

#### External Evaluation Committee (EEC)

The Committee responsible for the External Evaluation of the Department of Sociology of the University of Crete consisted of the following five expert evaluators drawn from the Registry compiled by HQAA in accordance with Law 3374/2005:

1. Professor Michalis Lianos, University of Rouen, France (Coordinator)
2. Professor Apostolis Papakostas, Department of Sociology, School of Social Sciences, Södertörn University, Stockholm, Sweden.
3. Associate Professor Victor Roudometof, Department of Social and Political Sciences, University of Cyprus.

### INTRODUCTION

The External Evaluation Committee [EEC] visited the Department of Sociology of the University of Crete from 15<sup>th</sup> to 17<sup>th</sup> of October 2013, and worked on its report until Saturday 19<sup>th</sup> of October 2013.

On Tuesday 15<sup>th</sup> of October the EEC met the University authorities & the academic staff. The EEC also visited the University Library and other services. On Wednesday 16<sup>th</sup> of October, the EEC members consulted in situ with the staff, the faculty and the students of the Department. The EEC was also provided with additional documents (PhD and Master's theses, publications by the teaching staff and various data about the Department). The Department held structured presentations of its activities for the EEC during the 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> of October. The EEC began consultations with individual members of the Department on the 16<sup>th</sup> which continued on the 17<sup>th</sup>. This report is based both on the information furnished during the in situ meetings as well as the information contained in the various documents supplied to the EEC.

### **A. Curriculum**

#### APPROACH

According to the Departmental report, its goal is the formation of a flexible program of studies, which would keep up with the current trends in the field of Sociology so as to meet the needs of the Greek society.

The Department is composed of a suitable number of colleagues with adequate and often highly regarded teaching abilities.

The curriculum is structured on a relatively thin base of essentially seven core sociological courses focused on theory and methods, plus a commendable course series on English for Sociologists. There are three broad concentration areas shaping a very large course mix from which the students are required to opt for a great number of courses. As a result, these courses function as strict requirements. This pattern continues through the third semester to the end of the two-year Master's course.

The concentration areas do not seem to follow the recently created new fields and areas that can open up Sociology to current international trends – such as global and transnational studies, medical sociology, international migration and transnational connections.

Although this structure represents the breadth of skills of the teaching staff, it is relatively difficult to identify a stable core of sociological education that is supplied to all the students in a uniform way. It is our view that the level of fragmentation that such a structure entails could probably undermine the supply of a comprehensive sociological skill set to every student. It can be argued that every student composes on his or her own account a coherent line of learning, but this implies an excessive level of reliance on student judgment. The impression of the EEC is that this structure reflects an unresolved tension between those members of the Department who conceive of sociology as a broad area in humanities and those who consider sociology to be a structured discipline with its own core knowledge, epistemic objectives and methods.

On the other hand, we would not wish to imply that the current structure should be replaced by a formal iron suit, but a move towards curriculum homogeneity is undeniably necessary.

There is no established procedure for the revision of the curriculum, although a committee of undergraduate studies monitors the curriculum on a yearly basis. However, there is an established procedure of course evaluation by the students although the students seem to question the benefits of this process as they do not receive any feedback on amendments and improvements that they might have suggested. The degree of linking the curriculum to possible needs in the labour market, and the private sector in particular, is of course debated in this Department as everywhere else. There is no formal procedure for consulting stakeholders but there is a dense informal set of tight links with public sector institutions, local authorities, and NGOs which certainly ensures a continuous updating of their needs in the area of sociology.

There is no taught curriculum at PhD level. This is a national policy issue and poses the familiar question of PhD students from other disciplines who are not supplied with the necessary motives and resources to acquire high-level training in sociology. With some exceptions, this is an issue for all universities in Europe, thus it is not specific to the Department. However, it remains a serious problem as some PhD students come from other disciplines.

## IMPLEMENTATION

The Department has the appropriate resources and qualified staff to implement the curriculum. A major issue in that implementation is that it does not ensure the coherent progression of knowledge acquired by the students. For example, it is possible for students to have been taught higher level courses before they have completed basic courses.

There is a large number of non-attending students, possibly up to 60%, which inevitably leads to a large number of students not completing their studies within the initially allocated time. To our knowledge, there is no continuous assessment approach in teaching.

It is remarkable that the students of the Department are exposed to a very high number of teaching hours, which is exceptional by international standards. This is certainly a strong point in a Department in which nearly half of the students have not chosen sociology as a first subject for study and do not receive high marks in the National Examination System.

## RESULTS

For the time being, the Department is not able to define whether all effort has been undertaken to help non-attending students achieve their educational goals. For the attending students the Department has conducted a high quality series of follow-up surveys of its alumni. These suggest that the students greatly appreciate their education and remain attached to the sociological perspective. For those students, their education seems to have been a highly rewarding experience.

Although the Department acknowledges that different teaching and accessing strategies are required for attending and non-attending students, it does not seem to have moved quickly towards developing an appropriate strategy for the latter.

#### IMPROVEMENT

E-learning and distance learning is still debated at a very early stage within the Department and seems to meet with great inertia. Albeit a crucial area, no improvement is planned for the time being in that direction.

No change is planned either concerning access to PhD studies.

A higher degree of reflexivity and centralized planning regarding the curriculum is certainly desirable.

The presence of practical training as an integral part of the curriculum should be praised. Using voluntarism as an aspect of practical training and further involvement with NGOs could offer further options. The creation of a follow-up process to track graduates' success in the job market is a good idea mentioned in the departmental report and should be implemented.

### **B. Teaching**

#### APPROACH:

In a context of continuing strike movements, teaching was suspended at the University of Crete, although the academic staff was not on strike. As a result, the EEC was unable to observe any teaching sessions. All relevant information came from the syllabus, other departmental documents and interviews with academic staff and students.

The Department uses the familiar range of established teaching methods and has a good staff/student ratio. Access of students to teaching staff is really excellent. Excellent support is also provided to undergraduate students via a series of study sessions that supplement lectures. For 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> year students, the curriculum provides for seminars that require greater student involvement and engagement. Teaching time investment per attending student is very high. Although this is highly commendable as such, the balance in terms of research time and cost control should be closely monitored. As informal consultation with the staff is constantly possible, the provision of formal Personal Academic Advisors does not seem to interest attending students and is not used by them.

Postgraduate access and consultation with teaching staff is also highly adequate. The general impression of the EEC is that students are very satisfied with their teaching environment.

#### IMPLEMENTATION

Established methods of examination are employed. The overwhelming majority of courses is assessed via written assignments and final examinations. The dominant form of grading is based on the final examination and this carries the risk of copying and cheating. The Department is aware of that risk and has taken steps to counter such practices.

Writing an undergraduate dissertation is not mandatory. Assessment methods for Master's students are satisfactory. The EEC has noted that there are some repetitions in examination subjects. Naturally, this should be avoided.

The Department is keenly interested in mobility, regarding both staff and students. Provided that the financial structure of the University does not drastically contract under the present circumstances in Greece, the Department seems set to continue this commendable practice.

Monitoring the quality and progress of PhD work is not institutionalized at Departmental level. As a result, there is no horizontal awareness of quality and progress across the members of the academic staff. The Department has not developed a tight and uniform set of standards for assessing Master's and PhD dissertations. A random examination of a sample of PhD and Master's dissertations has convinced the EEC that a new balance needs to be found between length and focus.

The quality of course material is above average, albeit uneven in some cases. Sometimes course material is not entirely up to date whereas in other cases a very long updated reading list is given to the students.

The Department heavily bases teaching on research and this is naturally a great advantage for the quality of knowledge transmitted to the students. However, due to the staff members being identified with narrow specialisms (see *infra*), this approach also causes an undesirable degree of fragmentation, which has already been mentioned. The balance between fertilizing teaching through research and providing basic sociological training should be closely attended to.

Interviewed students<sup>1</sup> noted that sociological theory courses were too difficult, unnecessarily abstract and insufficiently linked to assisting with empirical research. In our view, the scope seems to be too large, both chronologically and conceptually. Despite continuous debate, a fairly broad consensus exists regarding the boundaries between sociological theory and broadly conceived social theory. A sharpening of course focus towards core sociological theory seems to be necessary.

## RESULTS

Beyond these issues, as it has been noted, the major problem regarding the effectiveness of teaching is the high number of non-attending students. The EEC understands that this problem is partly an effect of present economic circumstances hampering student access in terms of geographic mobility and housing costs. The Department fully understands the significance of this problem but largely attributes it to the current crisis despite the fact that this is a permanent trait of Greek Higher Education. The Department has not yet developed a plan to resolve it.

No information was provided on course success rates.

### **C. Research**

#### APPROACH

Firstly, it should be noted that the Department is clearly research active and seeks to attain national excellence and international standards. The departmental publication list contains entries of local, national and international levels, which should be aggregated separately. In this context, one member of the EEC has delved into the data and prepared a technical addendum in order to assist with the suitable presentation of CVs and citations. Of course, research production is not evenly distributed among individual members.

The Department is steadily oriented towards national research excellence. At a national level, it has achieved to do so. A number of individual researchers seek to establish international recognition and in several cases have achieved to do so. The plurality of research traditions and educational backgrounds is very strong and leaves a great margin for improvement in terms of international publishing presence (see addendum). The Department relies heavily on specific individual researchers to defend its international publication record.

The plurality of research interests is not sufficiently integrated so as to become an advantage for all staff and PhD students. There is no frequent communicative research event within the Department, e.g. a common research seminar or a working paper series. The research culture is not entirely collective and does not seem to develop emulation effects in weaker researchers. However, this is completely possible in terms of available research skills.

---

<sup>1</sup> This is anecdotal evidence. There is no claim that the few interviewed students were representative of the entire student body. However, interviewed students were often asked what the “general feeling” was.

There is no recurring internal research assessment process.

#### IMPLEMENTATION

There are two research laboratories built around individual initiatives. A new research centre for all social sciences is currently under completion and is being widely seen as a future source of research promotion and support. Library resources are admirable but persistent low levels of funding have repeatedly led to the interruption of access to indispensable data bases.

The Department has successfully pursued local funding, often from state agencies, the EU or local municipalities and other local organizations, societies and groups. The department has cumulatively raised over 960,000 euros (Table 23 in the Supplementary Report). That seems a satisfactory amount of funding which comes mainly from various state agencies. According to information provided by the Department, there have been twenty seven nationally funded projects, twenty international partnerships and eight competitive internally funded projects during the last twelve years. A considerable but not fully satisfactory amount of international publications has come out of these initiatives. There is no reason why such projects cannot lead to additional international publications.

Given that the Department reports that research administration at the University of Crete is of high quality, there is no reason why coordination of large scale projects cannot be undertaken.

#### RESULTS

There is international acknowledgement for some senior individual researchers.

#### IMPROVEMENT

There are improvement initiatives undertaken by individual researchers but there is no departmental improvement plan.

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

#### APPROACH

The Gallos campus, where the Department is located, is endowed with excellent facilities. The high point of the campus is the impressive university library which offers excellent facilities. It boasts four hundred work stations of which one hundred are equipped with a PC. Naturally, the students use it intensively and appreciate its services. Wireless internet, remote access and direct access to the main collection are among a set of features that satisfy student and staff needs.

'Class web' and 'student web' are two electronic platforms through which the Department maintains efficient exchange and information flows with students and staff. Although the content is regularly updated, interviewed students admit that their platform is underused.

Departmental administration seems to be efficient. In addition to serious efforts at the level of the Department, the improvement and integration of the central information system of the University has greatly contributed to the smooth handling of student and staff administration. The Department seems to be sensitive to student needs.

The University has no central class allocation system, which makes the distribution of teaching space particularly inefficient and time-consuming for the administrative staff. The EEC has not been made aware of any improvements planned in this area.

There is no electronic tool for checking student work against plagiarism and this can be a very serious problem.

The issue of student presence on campus has been dealt with in previous sections. It should be noted here that the members of the academic staff are particularly responsive to electronic communication with students.

#### IMPLEMENTATION

It should be noted that the EEC visited these services at troubled times (the departmental secretary had learned that her post was at risk some hours before the interview).

The organization of the Department follows familiar patterns and is dominated by the General Assembly, which ultimately makes every decision. Students are no longer a decisive factor in this process and this development has greatly contributed to a more functional decision making process, at least according to the majority of the departmental staff. The Greek administrative framework is based a non-hierarchical decision process and allows for the progressive polarization of majorities and minorities. It is therefore an issue if and how the Department should move towards ensuring more consensus, seniority influence and inclusion of minority points.

No information was provided on student counseling and athletic activities. There was concern among several staff that the University career office would close due to funding cuts. That would be a significant drawback.

#### IMPROVEMENTS

At this time of great uncertainty for departmental staff, there is little consideration being given to administrative improvements, as it is believed that funding cuts may annul all prospective thinking.

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

Given the low autonomy of Greek universities, strategic planning is not a key part of academic thinking. However, individual and collective ambition does spontaneously lead to strategic positions. In this case, the Department reacts meaningfully to its environment in terms of maintaining staff quality, international exchange of ideas, fund seeking and local, national and international visibility.

Current conditions in Greece are far from ideal. Administrative and academic staff cuts as well as budget cuts on this scale produce clear qualitative differences. The Department typically appears to be stunned by these changes. Unfortunately, as a result, it has not developed a plan to deal with the high likelihood of continuing to function under such unfavorable circumstances. The Department has no collective plan about increasing the levels of external funding, adjusting teaching methods to maximize attendance and optimizing staff schedules or moving towards e-tools that could reduce cost and increase efficiency in Department communication and decision making.

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

### **I. RESEARCH ENVIRONMENT**

The Departments's national excellence is established. The stake is now the improvement of its international status. This is by definition a challenging task.

One major obstacle is the operation of the broader Greek academic system which does not help the academic staff concentrate on having an impact upon the international community. While Greece's predicament is far from unique, it nevertheless imposes significant constraints upon scholarly activities; and more importantly, it does not seem to offer proper incentives to reward the pursuit of academic excellence.

One particular aspect of the Greek Higher Education is the phenomenon that can be termed 'FEK fetishism', i.e. the formal identification of academics with a rigid, extremely narrow and legally determined label given at the beginning of academic careers. This feature has devastating consequences at all levels and areas of academic activity as individuals are imprisoned in these labels and need to defend them throughout their careers. One of the worst consequences is what one could call a 'defensive fragmentation' of teaching and research activities, i.e. once a staff member has managed to successfully delineate his or her specialist area within a Department, he or she does not need to engage with other areas or emulate success in cogent areas. This administrative straitjacket should be replaced by a system that strongly encourages motivation, emulation and flexibility in autonomously choosing one's research areas and objectives. Established academic criteria and standards should be used to reward achievement within such a culture of broadly defined specialisms. Our addendum to this document can be used to support the establishment of such standards.

Inevitably, the Department lacks a shared culture that could materialise in:

- i. a typical research seminar, which includes academic staff and PhD students
- ii. a departmental working paper series or similar type of publication
- iii. the articulation of a commonly accepted framework that guides MA and PhD students with regard to the content, length and focus of a PhD dissertation. The EEC emphasises the significance of promptly producing such a framework
- iv. peer feedback that could stimulate creativity and enhance achievement. This is of particular importance for the Department's younger cohorts
- v. cross-fertilisation of ideas, perspectives and research agendas
- vi. increased recognition and departmental influence of individual academic excellence
- vii. enhanced departmental cooperation and forms of permanent collaboration with academic institutions on a regional, national and international scale

The above points are not to diminish the significance of the Department's activity in organising a series of important local, national and international events, such as the yearly National Seminar for PhD students. However, that activity does not by definition amount to a shared departmental culture and an open research environment. Creating such an open environment will lead to researchers realising their full potential and particularly support the development of very promising younger colleagues.

### **II. TEACHING**

As we mentioned, the entire design of the curriculum is a repercussion of what we termed 'defensive fragmentation'. The ratio between many specialized courses and too few essential foundation courses is unbalanced throughout the undergraduate and postgraduate curriculum. The Department should at least double the number of the seven core undergraduate courses. At the undergraduate level, non-core courses should only address the level of broadly defined thematic areas (e.g. sociology of religion, family, social change, education, social movements, rural sociology, economic sociology etc.). Further specialization is inappropriate for that teaching level and should be rapidly restructured. ECTS distribution should be tightened across fewer courses so as to achieve a number of at least 7 ECTS per course.



There seems to be a large number of ‘dead courses’ at both undergraduate and postgraduate levels. These should be omitted from the course list so as to obtain a clear representation of what is actually being taught on a regular basis or at least be grouped and marked as “not currently offered” if there are administrative reasons to maintain them on the list.

Prerequisites should be established at the undergraduate level so as to structure course progression in a meaningful way. Ideally, course content should be cumulative. Student assessment should be based on the continuous assessment method and the final grade should not be based predominantly (i.e., more than 50%) on the final exam’s grade. That strategy would increase motivation for attendance and allow for more extensive student engagement.

For both MA and PhD students that come from other disciplines, the EEC suggests that the Department undertake an assessment of their past coursework and effective sociological knowledge and establish consequent prerequisites for enrolment (theory, methods etc.).

For PhD students, the EEC suggests that the Department should creatively construct strategies for solving the problem of offering adequate knowledge for students with lack of previous engagement with the discipline. Possible solutions include a graduate level comprehensive examination and/or specific course requirements, designed to meet the needs of specific PhD students on a case by case basis.

### III. ADMINISTRATION

An easy and cheap standardized system of distant communication (conference calling, video conferencing, etc.) must be introduced in order to change the premises of staff participation in collective events, both academic and administrative ones. Many staff members either live or need to be elsewhere. They should be able to constantly participate on that basis, without the requirement of physical presence at all times. The easy contact of departmental staff members with colleagues in the cities where they live is an advantage and should be exploited.

The conditions for research, teaching and administration have drastically changed since 2009. It is high time that the Department integrated these changes as permanent parameters of its planning and produced strategies based on the assumption that such difficult conditions will continue, at least for the foreseeable future. For example:

- i. more intensive pursuit of external funding and consequent increase of the departmental administrative budget
- ii. cost effective methods of teaching, staff participation and interaction
- iii. the introduction of postgraduate tuition fees for students of adequate income and access funds for low income students that undertake MA, PhD or postdoctoral work.
- iv. the introduction of academic courses that may appeal to the labour market and may receive financial support or sponsorships for low income students
- v. joint degrees with other universities so as to maximize effects of economies of scale
- vi. the introduction of low cost electronic platforms for distance teaching

### IV. CONCLUSION

The Department has achieved national excellence and has the potential to substantially improve its international status, provided that a series of changes – mainly in mentality and culture – take place in the near future.

We have emphasised two negative consequences (‘FEK fetishism’ and ‘defensive fragmentation’) of the legal and institutional framework for Greek Higher Education. Although this does not solely concern the Department or the University of Crete, it is the strong view of the EEC that drastic changes to this framework should be made in order to allow for a functional Higher Education system and to liberate international academic potential.



### **External Evaluation Committee**

The Committee responsible for the External Evaluation of the Department of Sociology of the University of Crete consisted of the following three (3) expert evaluators drawn from the Registry constituted by the HQAA in accordance with Law 3374/2005 :

1. Professor Michalis Lianos (President)  
University of Rouen, France
  
2. Professor Apostolis Papakostas  
Södertrörn University, School of social sciences, Sweden
  
3. Associate Professor Victor Roudometof  
University of Cyprus

### **TECHNICAL ADDENDUM**

The following observations *are not specific to this Department* alone but reflect broad tendencies within Greek higher education. Hence, these technical observations are not meant as individual or collective criticism but as suggestions for improvement and realignment with international scientific standards.

US-based and/or British unpublished PhD dissertations should not be classified as ‘monographs.’ These should be listed under separate entries. Similarly, academic textbooks should not be listed as ‘monographs’. While academic textbooks serve important functions and are indispensable for teaching – especially in Greek – they are not equivalent to nor can these be considered as ‘monographs’. The goal of a monograph is to produce new academic knowledge while the goal of a textbook is to communicate established academic knowledge to students. Unfortunately, there is no separate entry for ‘textbooks’ in the staff’s CVs. A single chapter authored as part of a collective volume should also not be listed under a ‘monograph’ entry. Consultants, editors of Greek editions or translators of foreign publications into Greek should not take credit or appear as the authors of these publications. While the labor that goes into the publication of a Greek edition of a sociological classic (such as *the Elementary Forms of Religious Life*) should be acknowledged, it can by no means be considered proper to take credit for this work as an ‘author’.

An additional distinction not made in the staff’s CVs concerns the choice of national as opposed to international publishing. In the CVs international publishing and local publishing is intermingled: one can go from an edited volume published by Routledge to a volume published locally by a cultural association or local municipality or the University. These publications are of unequal ranking and significance; yet, their listing as of equal standing reveals quite a problematic understanding of what constitutes academic excellence. It is as if no difference exists between a book published by a local publisher (often without the benefit of peer review) and a book published by a major international publisher (after peer review). The formal acknowledgment of the difference between the two could greatly enhance the quality of Greek academic scholarship.

In faculty members’ CVs, one further observes the inclusion of articles in popular semi-scientific magazines – such as *Σύγχρονα Θέματα, ο Πολίτης* – under the list of refereed journals. Such practices do not enhance the faculty members’ profiles. A similar problem appears in the referencing of paper presentations – where often the participation or organization of panels in international conferences is listed alongside local symposia. The organizational structure of the CVs ought to allow for the differentiation of such presentations and modes of participation; moreover, invited presentations are listed alongside regular presentations, in spite of the vast difference between the two.

With regard to cited reference results, it is possible to select the far more accurate *ISI-Web of Knowledge*<sup>2</sup> as an appropriate indicator of citations in journals that are central in various fields. This could and should be supplemented by additional indicators – especially for books – and *Google Scholar* could also be used. The department’s updated report includes a Table (Table 21) in which the information on publications has been cumulatively grouped together in accordance to what appears to be international standards; however, it must be checked that such a classification do not simply group together the information provided on the CVs.

The reporting of just a raw number of citations – without screening the source of these citations – is quite problematic: such a practice can lead to widely inflated figures that might not reflect actual performance. Table 24 (in the Supplementary Report) is an effort to group some of the faculty’s research results. The sum total of 776 citations for 16 faculty members (23 by 2011) is not particularly high (assuming that the citation sources are problem-free). It is also unclear whether the sum total of memberships in international advisory editorial boards includes reviewing – a rough comparison between the faculty CVs and Table 24 suggests that this must be the case. The result is that the reported total figure (41) is not actually the memberships in international advisory boards but also includes the reviewers.

---

<sup>2</sup> The EEC presumes that paid subscription to such databases is maintained without interruption, despite current economic difficulties.

**N.B.** The structure of the “Template” proposed for the External Evaluation Report mirrors the requirements of Law 3374/2005 and corresponds overall to the structure of the Internal Evaluation Report submitted by the Department.

The length of text in each box is free. Questions included in each box are not exclusive nor should they always be answered separately; they are meant to provide a general outline of matters that should be addressed by the Committee when formulating its comments.

## ***Introduction***

### I. The External Evaluation Procedure

- Dates and brief account of the site visit.
- Whom did the Committee meet ?
- List of Reports, documents, other data examined by the Committee.
- Groups of teaching and administrative staff and students interviewed
- Facilities visited by the External Evaluation Committee.

### II. The Internal Evaluation Procedure

Please comment on:

- Appropriateness of sources and documentation used
- Quality and completeness of evidence reviewed and provided
- To what extent have the objectives of the internal evaluation process been met by the Department?

## **A. Curriculum**

*To be filled separately for each undergraduate, graduate and doctoral programme.*

### **APPROACH**

- What are the goals and objectives of the Curriculum? What is the plan for achieving them?
- How were the objectives decided? Which factors were taken into account? Were they set against appropriate standards? Did the unit consult other stakeholders?
- Is the curriculum consistent with the objectives of the Curriculum and the requirements of the society?
- How was the curriculum decided? Were all constituents of the Department, including students and other stakeholders, consulted ?
- Has the unit set a procedure for the revision of the curriculum?

### **IMPLEMENTATION**

- How effectively is the Department's goal implemented by the curriculum?
- How does the curriculum compare with appropriate, universally accepted standards for the specific area of study?
- Is the structure of the curriculum rational and clearly articulated?
- Is the curriculum coherent and functional?
- Is the material for each course appropriate and the time offered sufficient?
- Does the Department have the necessary resources and appropriately qualified and trained staff to implement the curriculum?

### **RESULTS**

- How well is the implementation achieving the Department's predefined goals and objectives?
- If not, why is it so? How is this problem dealt with?
- Does the Department understand why and how it achieved or failed to achieve these results?

### **IMPROVEMENT**

- Does the Department know how the Curriculum should be improved?
- Which improvements does the Department plan to introduce?

## ***B. Teaching***

### **APPROACH:**

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

Please comment on :

- Teaching methods used
- Teaching staff/ student ratio
- Teacher/student collaboration
- Adequacy of means and resources
- Use of information technologies
- Examination system

### **IMPLEMENTATION**

Please comment on:

- Quality of teaching procedures
- Quality and adequacy of teaching materials and resources.
- Quality of course material. Is it brought up to date?
- Linking of research with teaching
- Mobility of academic staff and students
- Evaluation by the students of (a) the teaching and (b) the course content and study material/resources

### **RESULTS**

Please comment on:

- Efficacy of teaching.
- Discrepancies in the success/failure percentage between courses and how they are justified.
- Differences between students in (a) the time to graduation, and (b) final degree grades.
- Whether the Department understands the reasons of such positive or negative results?

### **IMPROVEMENT**

- Does the Department propose methods and ways for improvement?
- What initiatives does it take in this direction?

### **C. Research**

*For each particular matter, please distinguish between under- and post-graduate level, if necessary.*

#### **APPROACH**

- What is the Department's policy and main objective in research?
- Has the Department set internal standards for assessing research?

#### **IMPLEMENTATION**

- How does the Department promote and support research?
- Quality and adequacy of research infrastructure and support.
- Scientific publications.
- Research projects.
- Research collaborations.

#### **RESULTS**

- How successfully were the Department's research objectives implemented?
- Scientific publications.
- Research projects.
- Research collaborations.
- Efficacy of research work. Applied results. Patents etc.
- Is the Department's research acknowledged and visible outside the Department?  
Rewards and awards.

#### **IMPROVEMENT**

- Improvements in research proposed by the Department, if necessary.
- Initiatives in this direction undertaken by the Department .



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

*For each particular matter, please distinguish between under- and post-graduate level, if necessary.*

#### **APPROACH**

- How does the Department view the various services provided to the members of the academic community (teaching staff, students).
- Does the Department have a policy to simplify administrative procedures? Are most procedures processed electronically?
- Does the Department have a policy to increase student presence on Campus?

#### **IMPLEMENTATION**

- Organization and infrastructure of the Department's administration (e.g. secretariat of the Department).
- Form and function of academic services and infrastructure for students (e.g. library, PCs and free internet access, student counseling, athletic- cultural activity etc.).

#### **RESULTS**

- Are administrative and other services adequate and functional?
- How does the Department view the particular results.

#### **IMPROVEMENTS**

- Has the Department identified ways and methods to improve the services provided?
- Initiatives undertaken in this direction.

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

Please, comment on quality, originality and significance of the Department's initiatives.

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

*For each particular matter, please distinguish between under- and post-graduate level, if necessary.*

Please, comment on the Department's:

- Potential inhibiting factors at State, Institutional and Departmental level, and proposals on ways to overcome them.
- Short-, medium- and long-term goals.
- Plan and actions for improvement by the Department/Academic Unit
- Long-term actions proposed by the Department.

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

*For each particular matter, please distinguish between under- and post-graduate level, if necessary.*

Conclusions and recommendations of the EEC on:

- the development of the Department to this date and its present situation, including explicit comments on good practices and weaknesses identified through the External Evaluation process and recommendations for improvement
- the Department's readiness and capability to change/improve
- the Department's quality assurance.

### The Members of the Committee

Name and Surname	Signature
1. _____	
2. _____	
3. _____	
4. _____	
5. _____	