



ΕΛΛΗΝΙΚΗ ΔΗΜΟΚΡΑΤΙΑ
HELLENIC REPUBLIC



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

Αριστειδου 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@ethaae.gr • www.ethaae.gr

Accreditation Report for the Undergraduate Study Programme of:

English Language and Literature

Institution: National and Kapodistrian University of Athens

Date: 11 December 2021

Report of the Panel appointed by the HAHE to undertake the review of the Undergraduate Study Programme of **English Language and Literature** of the **National and Kapodistrian University of Athens** 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.....	6
Part B: Compliance with the Principles	8
Principle 1: Academic Unit Policy for Quality Assurance	8
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	17
Principle 5: Teaching Staff	19
Principle 6: Learning Resources and Student Support	21
Principle 7: Information Management.....	23
Principle 8: Public Information	25
Principle 9: On-going Monitoring and Periodic Internal Review of Programmes	26
Principle 10: Regular External Evaluation of Undergraduate Programmes.....	28
Part C: Conclusions.....	30
I. Features of Good Practice	30
II. Areas of Weakness	30
III. Recommendations for Follow-up Actions	30
IV. Summary & Overall Assessment	31

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 **English Language and Literature** of the **National and Kapodistrian University of Athens** comprised the following three (3) members, drawn from the HAHE Register, in accordance with Laws 4009/2011 & 4653/2020:

1. **Prof. George Tsoulas** (Chair)
University of York, United Kingdom

2. **Prof. Margaritis Fourakis**
University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland, United States of America

3. **Dr Eleni Markou**
University of Surrey, Guildford, United Kingdom

II. Review Procedure and Documentation

Before the online visit, the External Evaluation & Accreditation Panel (EEAP) studied a wide variety of documents provided in advance by HAHE, including the Department's Proposal for Accreditation, the Handbook of Studies (Οδηγός Σπουδών) and the description of courses (Περιγράμματα Μαθημάτων), the HAHE Guidelines, and other relevant information about the Department (statistical data, quality indicators, student questionnaires, strategic goals, etc.). The EEAP also consulted the Department's web-page and the 2011 External Evaluation Report.

The members of the EEAP also took part in the orientation meeting with HAHE's Director General Dr. Christina Besta, which was held some weeks earlier and consisted in the presentation of general standards and guidelines for the accreditation process.

Apart from the documentation sent previously by the HAHE, during the online visit the EEAP was provided with several presentations including by Prof Velissariou, the head of the Department, as well as detailed presentations from the members of the OMEA. The EEAP was further provided with various pieces of more recent data. We note that the Proposal for Accreditation was prepared two years ago and therefore some more recent data were not included. The EEAP thanks the members of OMEA and MODIP for supplementing the existing data with more recent statistics.

The EEAP's online visit began on Monday, 6 of December with a meeting with the Vice Rector, Prof. D. Karadimas, and with the Head of the Department, Prof. A. Velissariou. Prof. Karadimas gave a short overview of the current situation of the University of Athens and stressed various strategic initiatives that are relevant to the current shape of the Department within the wider educational and legal context. The meeting was joined subsequently by members of the Department's OMEA and MODIP including Prof. N. Sifakis, Dr V. Markidou, Dr K. Blatanis, Dr N. Lavidas and Dr A. Hatzidaki as well as Mr K. Bourletidis, Secretary of MODIP, Prof. S. Papaioanou (MODIP) and Ms S. Krousaniotaki equally from MODIP.

At this meeting the EEAP were given detailed presentations of the history of the Department and its current status. Various aspects concerning the Department's strategic goals, academic profile, Quality Assurance Policies, Study Programme structure, teaching staff etc., were explained and discussed.

On December 7, the EEAP met with teaching staff members from both the Linguistics and Literature divisions of the Department. In this meeting the EEAP discussed topics related to teaching methodologies, connections between teaching and research, financial issues, mobility, workload, career development, research opportunities and possible areas of improvement.

Next the EEAP met with employers and social partners from a wide variety of settings and discussed the relations that they maintain with the Department and its graduates and well as its students.

Following that the EEAP had a meeting with administrative staff members and teaching staff members. The EEAP had seen beforehand a video with a presentation of the Department's facilities. It was followed by a discussion on the Department's equipment and facilities, the University Library and other University services.

At 19.30 the EEAP held a meeting with ten Undergraduate students of different semesters and majors of the Programme. The students spoke at length about their experience with the Programme and their degree of satisfaction with the Department.

The penultimate meeting of the day was with 10 Programme graduates who shared their experiences as students in the Department and described the link between their studies and their career path. The graduates came from a variety of places, professions and career stages.

Finally, between 21.15 and 21.45, the EEAP had a private meeting to share their impressions and to prepare an outline of their findings.

On Wednesday 8 of December the EEAP met with OMEA and MODIP members where certain questions of clarification were addressed. Finally a closure meeting with the Head of the Department and the OMEA and MODIP representatives took place. In this final meeting the EEAP provided an informal overview of some of its conclusions.

All meetings were conducted in an extremely constructive and collaborative atmosphere. All members of the Department were eager to answer questions and provide all information requested by the EEAP.

It should also be noted that students, graduates and social partners all expressed very positive opinions about the work of the Department and the quality of its Study Programme.

Finally, the EEAP wishes to highlight the excellent work carried out by the University and the Department in preparing the Evaluation visit and the quantity and quality of the information and data provided.

III. Study Programme Profile

The undergraduate programme in English Language and Literature of the National and Kapodistrian University of Athens is the oldest foreign language programme in Greece and also the largest currently running. The Department, which is part of the School of Philosophy, has an illustrious history.

The Department currently has 23 permanent and 6 associate members of staff as well as 3 members of administrative staff.

Currently the programme consists of 38 courses distributed across eight semesters. 16 of these courses are compulsory while the remaining 22 are option choices. 8 of the latter are offered by other departments of the School of Philosophy.

The Department has two main constituent sections, literature and linguistics. The programme aims to provide students with very broad knowledge of the literatures of the English speaking world and the structural, social and cultural aspects of the language as well as its history.

Apart from its focus on English the programme aims to provide comparative perspective by placing several aspects of the study of English in comparison with relevant aspects of Greek language and literature.

Several aspects of the programme coalesce around the focal point of the preparation of students for the teaching professions both in terms of language, literature and the cultural aspects of English, given the status of English as a global language.

The Department also maintains as part of the programme significant relations with external organisations both academic (the Department takes full advantage of the opportunities offered at institutional level, such as the takes full advantage of the CIVIS programme) as well as non-academic organisations such as Publishers and so on.

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 of English Language and Literature of the National and Kapodistrian University of Athens has established a Quality Assurance Policy for the Undergraduate Programme that is in line with the Institutional Policy on Quality. The responsible institution for applying the Quality Assurance process is the Internal Evaluation Group (OMEA) in effective collaboration with MODIP.

The Department has clear strategic goals to promote the quality and effectiveness of teaching, which are duly monitored, updated and communicated. The EEAP has formed the view, following extensive discussions with members of the Department as well as the relevant committees (mentioned above) that the Department is working seriously for continuous improvement and is open to any action that may promote the use and dissemination of best practices within the Department. This is true not only of the committees whose job it is to ensure such dissemination but also individual members of staff who have shown themselves to be open and receptive to this. The final recipients of this process, the students, also agreed that staff take continuous improvement and feedback seriously.

The main strategic goals are as follows: a) to improve the international standing of the Department, b) to continuously revise and update the study Programme, c) to promote research and link it with teaching, d) to support students and student-centered learning, e) to improve adequacy of students' skills and competences for their future career in the labor market.

The main sub-divisions of the Department are Literature and Linguistics. There seems to be excellent collaboration and coordination between the two divisions of the Department, which discuss changes in courses or possible areas for improvement, if necessary. The Programme is reviewed and discussed separately by each of the two divisions of the Department and forwarded to the Department as a whole in a second stage for discussion and approval.

An external evaluation of the Department took place in 2011. Since then, the last major revision of the Study Programme took place in the academic year 2015-2016. The Department has also undergone two internal evaluations in the periods 2003-2008 and 2011-2016. According to institutional regulation, all courses are evaluated by students through questionnaires, and the degree of satisfaction is high.

In conclusion, the Panel has found evidence of an appropriately designed, regularly reviewed and under more informal processes of regular evaluation and improvement. The Panel found that the staff is highly dedicated, fully qualified and on the lookout for opportunities to enhance the student experience.

At the same time the Panel noted that the Department is seriously understaffed. It is of vital importance for the continuation of the high quality work taking place in the Department the University presses the relevant authorities in order to obtain the relevant replacement posts as soon as possible (several retiring staff have never been replaced). It is not inconceivable that the programme may not be able to run fully in the future at current staffing levels.

Panel Judgement

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

Panel Recommendations

One recommendation for the consideration of the Department is, staffing permitting, to extend the coverage of the literatures of the English speaking world to cover more of African, Indian (and the subcontinent more generally), Caribbean literatures in English. Perhaps this could be developed in tandem with modules on world Englishes, again staffing permitting.

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 Department of English Language and Literature has a well-defined set of procedures that govern the design, periodic review and implementation of the programme of studies. The process involves a continuous and fruitful interaction between the constituent parts of the Department (Literature and Linguistics) and the Internal Evaluation Committee, which feeds directly into the deliberations of the general Departmental Meeting (Συνέλευση Τμήματος). As a result, a two-way relationship with the University's Quality Assurance Unit is maintained. It is through this articulated and interactive process that the Department ensures that its programme is up-to-date, serves well the academic vision of the staff, the learning requirements of the students as well as their preparation for the world beyond University, be it in work or further study. The process is also designed to ensure compliance with the National Qualifications Framework for Higher Education.

The programme consists of 8 semesters during which a student has to take a total of 38 courses that are assigned appropriate ECTS credits.

Some of the content of the course was covered above.

The programme is fully taught in English as far as courses provided by the Department are concerned (this may, of course not be so for courses offered in cross-departmental programmes and initiatives).

The programme is permeated by a sense of gradual progression leading in a well-constructed and rational manner to the most advanced stages. This is particularly well supported by the team of Student Advisors who assess that students are well aware of both their obligations and the opportunities available to them. Student progression is smooth and unproblematic. Feedback that the EEAP received from both current and past students was overwhelmingly positive indeed.

The programme demonstrates particularly high standards as evidenced both by the subjective judgment of the students who qualified it as "intellectually demanding" and staff but also the professional destinations of students and the fact that they retain a high level of attachment to the Department for years after they have graduated.

Staff in every area carry out cutting-edge research and manage to feed it into their teaching most efficiently through the use of advanced, seminar-based courses which prepare students for the research-based courses. As a result, aside from the solid foundational knowledge that the programme provides, the programme follows the latest research findings and strives to incorporate new knowledge in the curriculum. The EEAP also noted that every member of the Department has, over a period of time, the opportunity to teach seminar-based courses in which their personal research interests feature prominently. The different laboratories that the Department has set up and equipped to a high standard are instrumental to the successful linking of teaching and research.

Also, beyond the already invaluable experience that the programme supplies in terms of contact with the latest research, students also have the opportunity to hone their professional skills through the work experience programmes that the Department provides. The practical teaching experience is integrated in the programme and consists of a preparatory stage (Practice 1) and a placement stage (Practice 2) which takes place in a school or other educational organisation amongst the many with which the Department maintains close links. Students receive credit for the practice part. Feedback from external stakeholders was also extremely positive as evidenced both by their evaluation of the students that undertake internships in their organisations and from the feedback provided to the EEAP during the visit.

Work experience is also a key instrument for the Department to reach out to external stakeholders, receive feedback, consider it, incorporate it into the Department's practice where appropriate and most importantly feed it into the process of periodic review of the Department's programme.

As it stands, the programme provides good coverage of the Literatures of the English-speaking world focusing on British and North American literature as well aspects of theoretical and applied linguistics and language teaching methodology.

In conclusion, the programme is well-structured in its different stages, highly efficient in delivering knowledge and skills, and appropriately challenging for the students' intellectual development.

Panel Judgement

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

Panel Recommendations

Although the relations with external stakeholders are very good insofar as schools are concerned, the relations with publishing houses etc. are less connected to the student population. It would be an idea for the Department to try and establish and develop further links in terms of the practice component with other professional outlets for the students such as publishers, local government, archives, libraries and so on. The University's services and infrastructure should be pressed into service here.

Principle 3: Student- centred Learning, Teaching and Assessment

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

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

The student-centred learning and teaching process

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

In addition:

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

Study Programme Compliance

Students are the main focus of the undergraduate programme and are systematically encouraged to become active participants in the learning process. The curriculum combines structure and flexibility and enables the students to trace their own distinct trajectory, within clearly defined parameters. The Diploma Supplement represents a concrete statement of the chosen path.

The cultivation of autonomy in students so that they become partners in learning is reflected in the range of optional courses that the students can choose and the interaction that exists in some of the more advanced ones such as the course Practice 1 but also elsewhere. The

Department also encourages students to become effective independent learners through the self-study labs that it maintains.

The programme and individual courses are subject to student evaluation that takes into account all aspects of the course including the effectiveness of instruction and every other aspect of the course. In the more traditional lecture courses, faculty manage to incorporate various modes of instruction and evaluation, including quizzes, midterm tests, oral presentations, and short papers. All the different methods of assessment are clearly articulated in the course descriptions. In addition, students are encouraged to meet with the faculty to go over their graded exams and the professor's comments, so that the exam itself becomes an integral part of the learning process.

It is clear both from the written material that the EEAP received and from the virtual visit as well as the discussions with students that the Department is deeply sensitive to the diversity in the student body and strives, in cooperation with the appropriate University offices, to accommodate students with disabilities, by making sure that all students have equal access to buildings, professors, teaching materials, and modes of instruction and examination. As mentioned elsewhere there is room for improvement in terms of accessibility especially for software (e.g. Webex vs Zoom).

The Department offers sufficient guidance to students, both collectively and individually. There are three academic advisors for students without special needs and one for students with such needs (See also Principle 6).

The Department publishes sufficient documentation to cover the needs of the students at all levels. The documentation defines explicitly criteria and expectations.

Complaints about grades are handled separately from complaints about other issues that may arise such as sexual harassment. Grade complaints are handled by the Department whereas other complaints are handled by the three advisors.

Student-instructor relationships seem to be very positive as can be inferred from the comments of current students and graduates of the Department.

Overall, all available evidence points to a learning environment informed by a student-centred approach and a general climate of mutual respect. It further highlights the seriousness and sense of urgency with which the professors of the Department go above and beyond expectations to place students at the center of the high-quality teaching they offer.

Panel Judgement

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

Panel Recommendations

- It would be advisable to have complaints handled by a person or by persons independent of the Department.
- It would also be interesting for the Department's internal processes and in order to gauge the place of the Department within the institution and the School of Philosophy to obtain comparative data on student evaluations.

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

Incoming new students spend a day being introduced to the study programme. The Department's web page includes a Study Guide with all the information needed concerning courses, obtaining student id's etc. and more generally the integration of the new student in the University and Departmental community.

As part of the general understaffing that we have already pointed at we should also point out that the secretariat is not adequately staffed in order to appropriately follow the very large number of registered students. There are roughly 1100 students with expected graduation in six years or less, but there are roughly 3000 extra students in the seventh year or beyond.

Even so, the Department has been able to keep adequate records of student's progression as seen in the ten reports under HAHE documents.

The Department encourages participation in the Erasmus+ programme, with 30 some agreements with foreign universities and takes full advantage of the University's membership of the CIVIS network.

Students can seek and be given an appendix to their diploma (the diploma supplement), in English or Greek, stating all the courses they have taken and the ECTS for each course.

Practical training: Students who wish to follow a teaching career can take two semesters of training in the fourth year, one semester of applications of theory to practice and one semester of actual teaching in schools. This lasts 9 weeks and is under the supervision of a mentor. The Department also has software that allows the creation of a teaching portfolio by each student. The end result is the students obtain a certificate of teaching competency equivalent to that obtained by teachers anywhere else in Europe.

In conclusion, the Panel has found evidence that the Department and the Programme includes significant elements of guidance that facilitate the students' progress and integration in the

community. The Panel found that at all stages of the student's journey there was adequate documentation and adequate recognition, official and otherwise, of student achievement.

Panel Judgement

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

Panel Recommendations

- 1. Try to encourage n+3 students to come back and finish.
- 2. Increase the number of administrative staff (The Panel realizes that this is easier said than done).

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

Staff consists of 23 members meaning that each member has to teach more than the necessary hours and look after many students (staff to student ratio=1/50). New staff are hired in accordance with Greek legislation, but staff that have retired in recent years have not been fully replaced (12 retired and only 6 replaced). Also the number of the members of the administration is too low (3) for the large number of students that the Department is catering for.

The election of the members of the staff is done through procedures and criteria set centrally. It is compulsory to post on “Diavgia” information on the election and development of members of the staff. Also, there are formal processes for the promotion of existing members.

Existing staff are enthusiastic and strive to promote teaching while carrying out research and following professional development.

The average teaching load of members of staff is 25 hours per week but may vary according to the type of course from 25 to 30 hours. These hours include preparation times, teaching times, and marking and exam times. With the addition of time spent for PG programmes and administrative duties, the workload of the staff is on the heavy side.

There is cooperation between staff and academics from other universities while two members are also teaching in other departments. Members of staff are encouraged to take study leaves as well as time to participate in conferences and other events of scientific interest. There is a special fund (ELKE), which financially supports members’ (and PG students’) participation in conferences.

Student evaluations and evaluations by MODIP and OMEA inform the development, changes and adjustments to the programme so that it is up to date with scientific developments in the sector.

There are various collaborations among members of the staff with academics from other institutions and there is a clear research strategy and focus on English studies set by the Department.

Panel Judgement

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

Panel Recommendations

- Increase the number of the members of the Teaching & research staff
- Increase the number of administrative support
- Reduce the number of students to staff ratio to enable staff dedicate more time in research

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

There are three teaching rooms, four amphitheatres, and four laboratories for different lessons and activities that seem to adequately cover student needs.

Student-centered teaching/learning and student support by staff is implemented throughout. All courses are taught and assessed in English. Students can also take optional courses offered by other Departments of the School of Philosophy.

Special care and attention to disabled students is offered by staff and although facilities are not entirely suitable, the personal care and relationships compensate for that. As far as specialist support is concerned, there is one advisor for disabled students and an academic advisor but student support mainly relies on teaching staff.

The Department is offering synchronous and asynchronous remote learning and there were sufficient resources during the pandemic.

The inability to access the necessary books and other resources has been noted as has the fact that students are no longer being provided with the required reading materials but have to rely on numerous photocopies provided by staff.

It has also been noted that for part-time/working students more provisions could exist to help with their workload.

Finally, a series of workshops, external guests and practical experience are offered to undergraduate students as part of their programme.

At the end of each semester, students evaluate by anonymised evaluations submitted to the survey.uoa.gr platform the following:

Lessons, additional lessons, written and oral work submitted by them, the members of staff and the additional personnel. The Department makes a systematic effort to respond to the evaluations by reviewing the materials used, the teaching methodology as well as the way student work is evaluated. It was noted that the response in these questionnaires was low, and thus feedback for each course is given to students by members of the staff so that each course can be evaluated more fully.

The results are presented in document form with year on year comparisons, but graphs or any other detailed analysis is unavailable, probably due to historical rather than any other reasons.

Panel Judgement

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

Panel Recommendations

- Increase/improve the facilities for disabled students.
- Re-establish the system of offering students the basic books required for their courses.
- Establish an improved system for working/part-time students.
- Offer more comprehensive comparative quality data and clarifying graphs.

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

As far as Student information is concerned, the Department has implemented an electronic system for keeping track of individual student performance as well as keeping statistical information each year and for each graduating class. The system track years of enrollment, courses taken and passed, average grades, etc.

The Department also tracks instructor performance in teaching through the student questionnaires described in Principle 3 above and in research activities on a per instructional member basis as well as overall. All relevant information is available on the web site.

The Department also maintains a separate web page tracking graduates and informing them of events in the Department.

For infrastructure, the Department keeps track of all equipment and learning resources.

Panel Judgement

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

Panel Recommendations

- Standardize the computation of individual instructor research productivity, taking into consideration years of service to the Department.
- Keep track of how many undergraduate students are involved in research projects every year.
- Given the large number of n+3 students, try to collect information about the reasons that have caused this situation, maybe by polling these students using a mass survey and then use this information to help them work towards finishing their studies.

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 key information with regards to the Department, the structure, external and internal evaluations, courses, facilities, publications, and news is easy to find and clearly laid out.

All course outlines of the programme are complete and available online for both directions. Also a class timetable is available for the current year.

The Quality Assurance Policy is university-wide and information is available on the main university webpage. On the Department website there is general information about the staff and their contact and research interests. There is also a link to the full CV of each member of staff.

An easy search function both in English and Greek facilitates finding more information that the students and other interested parties may need.

There is also a description of the courses and the ECTS offered. Finally there is information on the e-class platform and a link to it.

Panel Judgement

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

Panel Recommendations

- Continue keeping the website updated
- Offer information on student support and details of the persons to contact in case of need for support
- Consider using social media to reach interested parties and inform about/showcase the Department

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

There have also been two internal evaluations by OMEA, one for 2011-2016 and one for 2004-2016. Both reports are also available online.

Every year, there is qualitative and quantitative information given to MODIP by OMEA in cooperation with all members of the staff. The recommendations are discussed and measures are taken to comply with and satisfy said recommendations.

Also, annually the members of staff submit personal reports with regards to their teaching and research activities.

The Department has compiled extensive data supplied to our Panel in ten annual reports from 2015-16 to 2019-20. Five of these reports concentrate on instructional staff teaching and productivity and five on student body makeup, graduation rates etc.

The Department employs several types of assessment of students' work, among them: Final examinations, written assignments as agreed with the instructor, and ongoing evaluations during the semester. Both current students and graduates praised to the Panel the family atmosphere and the personal relationships they can build with their instructors, which allows them flexibility in progressing through the courses and following their interests.

The Department has established data collection methods to monitor both student and staff populations and adjust the content of the undergraduate study programme accordingly in order to respond to changing conditions in Academia and new requirements of the labour market that will receive its graduates.

The Secretariat supports students in enrolling them for classes, providing information on examinations, available internships, etc.

The current faculty to student ratio at 1 to 50 is not sustainable and it is only through the tremendous effort exercised by the faculty members that the department has been successful at educating its students. The comments by current and graduated students reinforce the impression that the department is successful. This high ratio also affects the overall research productivity of the staff.

Panel Judgement

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

Panel Recommendations

- Try to increase the number of the instructional faculty. This, we understand is not really up to the Department, but we hope the higher authorities will listen as we have noted before too.
- The current method of **measuring research productivity** assigns equal weight to the work of younger and older faculty members. A more equitable method would take the number of publications in peer-reviewed journals for each individual and divide it by the number of years post-PhD or post being hired at the Department. Then the average across all faculty can be computed in a way that does not discriminate against younger (or more recently hired) professors.

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

There has been only one external evaluation by HQA, HAHE's predecessor, in 2011, which is available in English online.

Following the last external evaluation, a number of steps for the improvement of the department were taken. Amongst them was the redefinition of the credit units (ECTS) and the introduction of a group of seven courses to provide a qualification of Pedagogical and Teaching Adequacy to the students that opted for it.

The EEAP members met with members of staff who were fully aware of its validity, keen to supply information and willing to answer the Panel's questions.

External stakeholders and alumni also participated in the external evaluation and gave very positive feedback on their experience with the Department. However, it was not made clear to the Panel whether stakeholders will formally be informed by the department about measures that will be taken following the current evaluation.

Overall, the Panel is happy with the degree and amount of evaluation and the kinds of follow up activities and actions that the Department is taking in response to such evaluation.

Panel Judgement

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

Panel Recommendations

- Inform all stakeholders about the results of the external evaluation
- Involve stakeholders more with the measures that will be taken by the Department in order to comply

PART C: CONCLUSIONS

I. Features of Good Practice

- The Department and the programme, as it is structured, promotes close collaboration and interaction between students and staff across a variety of activities.
- The Department has embraced research-led teaching, as evidenced by the various higher level modules.
- The undergraduate programme incorporates a significant degree of flexibility without sacrificing the benefits of a clearly defined structure.
- The Department has cultivated and maintains robust connections with educational organizations as well as NGOs and other organisations.
- Staff are willing and ready to take part in activities often beyond the strict educational remit. (e.g. Involvements with the Refugee charities etc.)
- The Department has built on its high quality to establish a significant network of collaborations and to achieve visibility (local, national, and international).
- There are good resources for research, including its laboratories and the University library.

II. Areas of Weakness

- The Department as a whole remains understaffed and this may prove threatening to the successful continuation of the programme.
- Generally, funding is not sufficient.
- Teaching staff have undertaken an excessive load of administrative work and responsibilities and these responsibilities fall on the same people over and over due to requirements of seniority.
- Mechanisms for staying in contact with alumni are not as developed as they could be.
- Mechanisms for remaining in contact with students who have not finished for several years should also be more developed.
- The number of administrative support staff is significantly below what is required for a department of this size.
- Connections with organizations beyond secondary education ones are not as strong as they could be in order to channel students to a greater variety of careers.

III. Recommendations for Follow-up Actions

The recommendations below summarise and generalise from the often overlapping recommendations following our judgement for each principle. It is difficult to insist more on the fact that by far the most important recommendations concern funding and staffing. We are fully aware that staffing is not within the power of the Department but

we do hope that this reaches the right ears and it is understood that the continued success of the Department cannot be left only to the goodwill of its outstanding staff. With this in mind, our recommendations are as follows:

- Establish and develop further and more diverse links in terms of the practice component with other professional outlets for the students such as publishers, local government, archives, libraries and so on and keep all stakeholders informed about the results of the external evaluation in order to improve student employability.
- Encourage n+3 students to come back and finish.
- Reduce the number of students to staff ratio to enable staff to dedicate more time to research and professional development more generally.
- Review facilities for disabled students with a view to improve accessibility.
- Re-establish the system of offering students the basic books required for their courses.
- Establish an improved system for working/part-time students.
- Standardize the computation of individual instructor research productivity, taking into consideration years of service to the Department.
- Consider using social media to reach interested parties and inform about/showcase the Department.

IV. Summary & Overall Assessment

The Principles where full compliance has been achieved are: **1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10**

The Principles where substantial compliance has been achieved are: **None**

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. **Prof. George Tsoulas** (Chair)
University of York, United Kingdom
2. **Prof. Margaritis Fourakis**
University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland, United States of America
3. **Dr Eleni Markou**
University of Surrey, Guildford, United Kingdom