



ΕΛΛΗΝΙΚΗ ΔΗΜΟΚΡΑΤΙΑ

HELLENIC REPUBLIC

**Α.ΔΙ.Π.**

**Η.Ο.Α.**

ΑΡΧΗ ΔΙΑΣΦΑΛΙΣΗΣ & ΠΙΣΤΟΠΟΙΗΣΗΣ  
ΤΗΣ ΠΟΙΟΤΗΤΑΣ ΣΤΗΝ ΑΝΩΤΑΤΗ ΕΚΠΑΙΔΕΥΣΗ

*ENIC QUALITY ASSURANCE*  
AND ACCREDITATION AGENCY

## EXTERNAL EVALUATION REPORT

DEPARTMENT: SOCIAL ANTHROPOLOGY

UNIVERSITY: PANTEION



**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**

#### ***Introduction***

##### I. The External Evaluation Procedure

- Brief account of documents examined, of the Site Visit, meetings and facilities visited.

##### II. The Internal Evaluation Procedure

- Comments on the quality and completeness of the documentation provided and on the overall acceptance of and participation in the Quality Assurance procedures by the Department .

#### ***A. Curriculum***

##### APPROACH

- Goals and objectives of the Curriculum, structure and content, intended learning outcomes.

##### IMPLEMENTATION

- Rationality, functionality, effectiveness of the Curriculum.

##### RESULTS

- Maximizing success and dealing with potential inhibiting factors.

##### IMPROVEMENT

- Planned improvements.

#### ***B. Teaching***

##### APPROACH:

- Pedagogic policy and methodology, means and resources.

##### IMPLEMENTATION

- Quality and evaluation of teaching procedures, teaching materials and resources, mobility.

##### RESULTS

- Efficacy of teaching, understanding of positive or negative results.

##### IMPROVEMENT

- Proposed methods for improvement.

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

##### APPROACH

- Research policy and main objectives.

##### IMPLEMENTATION

- Research promotion and assessment, quality of support and infrastructure.

##### RESULTS

- Research projects and collaborations, scientific publications and applied results.

##### IMPROVEMENT

- Proposed initiatives aiming at improvement.

***D. All Other Services***

## APPROACH

- Quality and effectiveness of services provided by the Department.

## IMPLEMENTATION

- Organization and infrastructure of the Department's administration (e.g. secretariat of the Department).

## RESULTS

- Adequateness and functionality of administrative and other services.

## IMPROVEMENTS

- Proposed initiatives aiming at improvement.

**Collaboration with social, cultural and production organizations*****E. Strategic Planning, Perspectives for Improvement and Dealing with Potential Inhibiting Factors***

- Short-, medium- and long-term goals and plans of action proposed by the Department.

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

- The development and present situation of the Department, good practices and weaknesses identified through the External Evaluation process, recommendations for improvement.

### **External Evaluation Committee**

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

1. Professor Peter Allen (Coordinator)

Rhode Island College, USA

2. Professor James Faubion

Rice University, USA

3. Dr Vassos Argyrou

University of Hull, UK

**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.**

Dates: 2 December – 7 December, 2013 : The site visit began with a visit to the headquarters of HQA where the External Evaluation Committee (EEC) was briefed by the head of the organization on the evaluation procedures. The EEC then proceeded to Panteion University where they met with the Chair, George Tsimouris, and faculty members of the Department of Social Anthropology. The EEC also met with the Vice-Rector for Economic Affairs of the University, Evangelos Prontzas, who briefed the team on the financial condition of the University.

3 Dec.: The day began with a meeting with the members of the Social Anthropology Faculty, followed by a meeting with approximately 75 undergraduate students. After lunch the EEC met with the Department secretaries in their offices. After this, they met with approximately 25 graduate (master and doctorate) students and a bit later with 18 graduates of the program.

4 Dec.: On this day the EEC had a tour of the University facilities beginning with the Library and including the Office of Internal Assessment, the Student Welfare Office, the Career Development Officer, Eleni Kakoulidis, a representative of the Heraklitus scholarship program, and representatives of the ERASMUS program. This was followed by a meeting with Vice-Rector for Academic Affairs, Ismene Kriari, and a tour of the Rectors’ offices and meeting rooms. In the afternoon the EEC attended a seminar organized by the Social Anthropology Department featuring Apostolos Lambropoulos of the University of Cyprus.

- **Whom did the Committee meet?** Throughout the course of the visit, the EEC met with the Chair and all of the members of the Department of Social Anthropology, undergraduate students in the department, graduate students in the department, graduates of the department, two Vice-Rectors (Evangelos Prontzas and Ismene Kriari, the Head of the Library (Dina Kakalli), the head of Internal Assessment (Dino Efthimiou) and staff member Markos Konstadakis, the head of student welfare (Zikos Tzanakas) and his staff, a representative of the Heraklitus scholarship program Mr. Antonis Alevizos, the Career Development Officer (Eleni Kalkaulikis), and the head (Alexandros Dambas) and staff member Angeliki Kardiokaftiti of the ERASMUS program.

- **List of Reports, documents, other data examined by the Committee.** The following documents were examined by the team: Internal assessment review of the Department covering several years including 2013, curriculum vitae of faculty members, course descriptions, course syllabi, a document on the Department prepared for this evaluation (see attached), a written guide to the Library and other printed sources on the Library, and publications of department members.

- **Groups of teaching and administrative staff and students**

**interviewed.** Those interviewed include: the Chair and all faculty members of the Department of Social Anthropology, three department secretaries, two Vice-Rectors, the head of Internal Assessment and members of his staff, the head of Student Welfare, the Career Development Officer, a representative of the Heraklitus scholarship program, and the coordinator of the ERASMUS program and members of his staff, undergraduate students, graduate students, and graduates of the Department.

- **Facilities visited by the External Evaluation Committee.** The following facilities were visited by the team: faculty offices, classrooms, auditoriums, secretaries' offices, the Library and its offices, Internal Assessment offices, Student Welfare offices, the ERASMUS program and its offices, the office of the Heraklitus representative, and the offices and meeting rooms of the Rectors and Vice-Rectors.

## II. The Internal Evaluation Procedure

Please comment on:

- **Appropriateness of sources and documentation used.** All the sources and documentation provided were very relevant and extremely helpful in the evaluation process. There was nothing extraneous.
- **Quality and completeness of evidence reviewed and provided.** The quality and completeness of the meetings with faculty, students and administrators as well as those of the materials examined – reports, course descriptions, syllabi, etc. – were uniformly high. The EEC did not find any of the evidence lacking in any way. Everything asked for was promptly provided and all of it was very thorough.
- **To what extent have the objectives of the internal evaluation process been met by the Department?** It is the opinion of the EEC that the Department of Social Anthropology of the Panteion University has fully met and even exceeded the stated objectives of the internal review process.

## **A. Curriculum**

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

### APPROACH

Undergraduate:

The aim of the undergraduate programme is to train students in the theory and methods of social anthropology and to provide them with the knowledge and skills necessary for understanding and operating effectively in an increasingly multicultural society and globalised world. The aim is achieved through the delivery of a robust and comprehensive curriculum that covers all key aspects of the discipline and includes a wide range of cutting-edge optional courses in the third and fourth years.

The curriculum was decided on the basis of good practice in European and American Universities where most of the faculty members have been trained. It reflects the needs of the rapidly changing Greek society where issues of multiculturalism, tolerance and understanding of difference have become central and is in accord with the government's stated aim of keeping Greece an open and outward looking society.

The process of revising and improving the curriculum is on-going as it takes into account student evaluations of each course.

### Post-graduate Programs

The goals of the Master's and Doctoral Programs in Social and Cultural Anthropology at Panteion are clearly articulated in the department's internal report. They include:

- 1) The enrichment of students' knowledge of anthropological theory and methodology;
- 2) Education in the tools and the skills of ethnographic research;
- 3) The design and structure of ethnographic research programs;
- 4) Interdisciplinarity;
- 5) Interdepartmental cooperation and collaboration within the university;
- 6) Cooperation and collaboration with other universities inside and outside of Greece;  
and
- 7) Interaction with society and the professional environment.

The faculty collaborated on the definition of these goals and unanimously endorsed them. The goals themselves would be expected of any graduate program in the discipline (inside or outside of Greece) that could claim to provide effective professional training. They are clear evidence of the faculty's recognition of those expectations and of their commitment to standards that rival those of programs internationally regarded as the most distinguished that the discipline has to offer.

### Master's Program

Consistent with procedures that one would find at any university, courses are subject to student evaluation (a university-wide procedure which also concerns the undergraduate program). Students are not obliged to complete the evaluation form with which they are provided, but the department's Internal Report provides evidence that a large majority of the students who are enrolled in any given course regularly do so. The evaluations—which are standardized across the disciplines—are among the most important resources that they

faculty use to assess the effectiveness and appropriateness of the curriculum. The form consists of 25 questions, plus a space for written commentary. Six of the questions are particularly directed to curricular assessment. One asks students to assess the degree to which the themes covered in the course were in accord with the stated goals and subject. Another asks about the degree to which the educational materials used and the educational process itself facilitated a better understanding of the subject. A third asks about the degree to which the readings and other assigned materials were effective in covering the subject, and another about the degree to which the assignments were pedagogically effective. A fifth question asks about the degree to which students were able to put to use knowledge from other classes, and the sixth about the degree to which the course contributed to the further cultivation of critical thinking.

The forms are based on a five-point scale, with 5 registering the highest ranking. The records from the 2012-2013 academic year provided in the Internal Report provide evidence of a truly exceptional degree of student satisfaction. The responses to all of the relevant questions are very positive. Between four-fifths and nine-tenths of the responses to each question is a 5, and in only a single case (concerning the degree to which knowledge gained from other courses was put to use in the course under review) did any response fall below 3. In this case, 3 of 30 responses were 2, but a total of only 9 below 5. The responses overall strongly indicate that the curriculum is very effective as it stands. The above case is only very slightly at variance with such a conclusion, and the External Evaluation Committee can find no particular reason for the variance, which perhaps has more to do with the circumstances of particular students than with any structural problem with the curriculum itself. The External Evaluation Committee is in accord that it is expertly informed and crafted with the consummate pedagogical responsibility. It recommends that the curriculum be kept in place as it currently stands.

#### IMPLEMENTATION

##### Undergraduate:

The curriculum was revised in 2010-11 to facilitate the flow of students from one year to the next and to strengthen the internal unity and coherence of the two two-year cycles of study that make up the programme. The curriculum compares very favourably to British and American standards. Indeed, in some areas it exceeds them. We would like to mention in this respect the very innovative practice of placing students with NGOs and other organisations for a period of three months. We should also mention here the Erasmus programme of student exchanges in which the Department is playing a leading role both in terms of sending its own students to other European Universities and accommodating students from European Universities in the Department.

The academic staff is trained to the highest international standards and is qualified to implement the curriculum. Regrettably, it does not have the resources required and the curriculum is currently implemented at a very high personal cost. To begin with, the number of faculty members employed is not large enough to accommodate the ever-increasing student body. Secondly, there is lack of work space both in terms of office and teaching space. There are three faculty members sharing each office and not enough rooms in which to teach, while those that do exist are in a terrible condition. We were shocked to see that in one of the lecture rooms the windows were broken and could not be closed so that the students were forced to keep their coats on during the lecture. Faculty do not have computers and printers and use their own, and when they run out of ink, paper and other office supplies, they buy such things from their own pocket. We are in deep admiration of the

faculty for delivering an excellent programme under such extreme circumstances.

#### Master's Program:

In order to achieve its goals, the department has designed a two-year program of study. In each of the first three semesters, students enroll in five courses, all required. (Students admitted to the program who do not have the B.A. in Social Anthropology may be asked to audit certain undergraduate courses as well.) The curriculum is progressive and its rationale straightforward. The courses in the first semester are synoptic surveys that provide the foundations for the thematically more specialized courses that follow. One critically addresses issues of concern to modern and contemporary Greece. Another treats anthropological theory and method. A third offers instruction in scientific writing. The other two cover kinship and symbolic systems, topics that have long been and remain central to the discipline. The courses in the following two semesters provide students with critical reviews of domains of inquiry that are particularly salient to the discipline today; they also succeed in acquainting students with the domains of research in which the members of the departmental faculty specialize.

All courses are seminars and attendance is mandatory. Students are further invited to consult with instructors as they wish or as needed. After thirteen weeks of instruction, students are assessed in each course through oral presentations and an essay submission. A score above 5 is passing; a score nearing or at 10 is excellent. The procedures are effectively the same as those of all other programs in continental Europe.

In the last semester of the program, students are required to complete a thesis, the topic of which they have defined and refined in consultation with an official committee of three members of the departmental faculty. Such a requirement is once again in accord with the requirements one would expect of programs aspiring to the highest disciplinary standards. The committee jointly evaluates the thesis and its public defense. It may agree that the thesis is acceptable as submitted. It may judge the thesis passable with revision, or (rarely) reject it as inadequate. With only the rarest of exceptions, students who do not successfully complete the M.A. at the end of the fourth semester are not eligible to receive the degree, though they may file an appeal for an exception with the head of the department, on which the departmental faculty collectively will decide.

M.A. students are further expected to attend the "Wednesday Seminar," a colloquium series that unfolds weekly during each academic semester. The faculty agree that the series is an especially vital dimension of the program and devote considerable energies to carrying it out. Two faculty are assigned the responsibility of specifying the theme and securing the speakers for the series in any given semester. The records of the past two years of the series are intimately related to the goals that the faculty has set both for the Master's and for the Doctoral programs. They indicate an enduring commitment to interdisciplinarity. They have included such speakers from outside the academy who come from cultural foundations, the Ministry of Culture and civil society. One semester of lectures was exclusively devoted to graduate students' presentations of research in progress. As with other dimensions of the graduate program, the series reflects the faculty's commitment to standards to which the best programs in the discipline aspire. Such series don't merely address topics and materials students might not otherwise encounter. Just as importantly, they offer students practical examples of professional skills that would be crucial to their careers, whether academic or non-academic. It is particularly impressive that the series has also offered students the opportunity to cultivate and exercise those skills on their own. The External Review Committee was able to attend one lecture in the current series. Its members were impressed with the exceptionally attentive and constructive atmosphere, and with the extent to which

students felt free actively to engage the speaker who addressed them.

#### Doctoral Program

As is standard in most of Europe, doctoral students are not required to take regular courses. Instead, they work closely with a supervising professor and with the other two faculty who officially constitute their Advisory Committee. Students admitted to the program are not required to have undergraduate degrees in Social Anthropology. The department may require any student to audit certain undergraduate or graduate courses to make up for deficiencies that would compromise his or her progress toward the degree.

The first step toward the degree is the preparation of a final research proposal, no later than two years after admission to the program.

Every student must submit a final research proposal no later than two years after his or her admission to the program. The proposal must provide a comprehensive and detailed account of the choice of the site of research, the theoretical framework that will guide research, the methodology of inquiry, and the prospective originality of the results. The members of the Advisory Committee are responsible for evaluating the proposals of the students with whom they are working. Any student whose proposal is approved then proceeds to conduct fieldwork, a requirement that is central to the doctoral degree in all departments of anthropology in Europe and the Americas. Fieldwork is typically long-term (from several months to more than a year); the Advisory Committee has final authority to judge whether fieldwork may be regarded as complete. Once having completed fieldwork, the student begins writing the dissertation. He or she consults with members of the advisory committee at his or her own initiative. The dissertation cannot be submitted to the Committee for evaluation until at least six months after the conclusion of fieldwork. In the course of writing and on a yearly basis, students also present their work in the Wednesday Seminar series.

Once complete, the dissertation must have a public defense, over which the Advisory Committee presides (this is changing with the current law). This is not a universal requirement of candidates for the Doctorate, but it is unquestionably to be counted among best practices.

The department faculty all hold doctoral degrees from distinguished anthropology programs in either Europe or the US. They are eminently capable of effectively implementing the M.A. curriculum as designed and directing doctoral research.

#### RESULTS

The implementation of the curriculum meets the Department's goals. We had the opportunity to meet with both current and ex students and all expressed their enthusiasm about social anthropology. They also commented on how their training transformed their world view and allowed them to function more effectively in their professional and personal lives.

The Department is well aware of how these results have been achieved and continuously strives to improve delivery.

All of the regular members of the faculty are actively involved in the teaching and supervision of the M.A. and doctoral students. The courses required of M.A. students are consistently taught yearly, which allows candidates to complete their degrees in a timely fashion. The

content of the courses offered coheres closely to the goals specified. Doctoral students of course pursue highly individualized courses of study. Those with whom we met were pursuing projects that were in close accord with the goals of the postgraduate program, and indeed many of the students connected their projects with those goals in very precise terms. Students whom the Committee consulted did not voice any dissatisfaction whatever with the program and the Committee itself can see no deficiencies in its current operation.

#### IMPROVEMENT

The internal evaluation report and the discussions we had with individual members of staff demonstrate that the Department is well aware of the need to improve the curriculum in certain areas. One such area is the provision of more seminars where the small number of students enrolled allows for their active participation in the learning process and a more in-depth analysis and discussion. A second area of improvement is the introduction of a final year dissertation. The dissertation is considered as the culmination of four years of training and demonstrates that the students have mastered those tools necessary for the investigation, analysis and explanation of a particular social issue or problem.

Although the Department is well aware of the need to implement these changes much will depend on the numbers of students taught as well as the number of faculty. The latter already work over and above of what is considered as a normal load.

Again, the primary impetus for the improvement of the curriculum is student evaluation, which indicates high satisfaction with the curriculum as it stands. The departmental faculty would, however, like to be able to offer fewer lectures and a greater number of seminars. This would further increase faculty-student interaction. Seminars are also an important dimension of the process of professionalization, since students have opportunities among other things to give oral presentations in the style of those presented at professional conferences. Because of the size and number of undergraduate courses and the enormous commitment of time that they impose on the faculty, this improvement will be difficult to implement without an increase in departmental faculty positions.

Another of the department's ambitions is to secure more financial support, which would allow students to enroll in courses and conduct field research in sites more diverse than those to which they currently have effective access. At present, the ERASMUS and other EU-sponsored programs are means through which students can find such support, but they are limited. Existing agreements that foster exchanges through the ERASMUS program are fewer than the faculty deems desirable. It is accordingly actively seeking to expand its network of inter-European university alliances. Doctoral students may compete for funds to support the writing up of their dissertations through application to the EU-funded HERACLETUS Program, but the Program is at present able to offer very few awards.

The department has already established an alumni association, which it hopes will lead to another source of funds.

## ***B. Teaching***

### APPROACH:

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

The members of the Department are well aware of the latest trends in pedagogy and do their best to implement as much as they can under difficult circumstances. For example, they are well aware of the benefits of small group teaching, such as seminars and tutorials, and of the fact that the process of learning is better served when students are active participants rather than passive recipients of information. Hence the existence of a few seminars and the Department's plans to expand their number if possible. We should also note that the staff work together as a team and help each other out with teaching.

Despite this however, the primary teaching method is still the lecture and the primary form of assessment the final (written or oral) exam. This is due to the sheer number of students taught which includes students from across the University who take anthropology courses as options. However, it should be noted that student assessment also includes essays and presentations in class during the semester.

The teacher-student relationship is very strong. Faculty members go out of their way to facilitate student learning—for example, by lending students books from their own personal library—and this is recognized and highly appreciated by the students themselves. Teaching resources however are inadequate and becoming more so with the deepening of the economic crisis. There is a shortage of books and access to electronic journals through JSTOR has been curtailed because of the crisis. There is no technological infrastructure in the classrooms to speak of, and the staff is forced to use its own equipment (to make a power point presentation for example).

The examination system seems to operate quite efficiently. Students marks are placed on line by the staff and students have access to their marks as soon as they are put on line.

### IMPLEMENTATION

Please comment on:

Although we did not observe faculty members teaching, students appear to be extremely satisfied. What they appreciate most is their teachers' commitment and dedication to the discipline of social anthropology and to the students themselves. Although the Department is technologically limited and the conditions under which teaching is carried out extremely problematic (windows are broken and there is no heating) the students are very pleased with the instruction they receive. As one graduate put it, the time he spent in the Department was 'the best years of his life.'

Syllabi are up to date and include the most recent and relevant literature, while in many cases teaching is research-led. Students and staff are outward looking and many spend time abroad in other European Universities.

As already mentioned students are very pleased with the quality of instruction as well as the content of courses. This was clear in the discussions we had with them as well as their evaluations of the various courses. In these evaluation students systematically point to inadequacy of the library in terms of books and other reading material.

#### RESULTS

The efficacy of teaching has already been commented upon. The staff is doing an excellent job under extremely difficult circumstances. We have not been given information that would allow us to compare differences between courses. The Department's self-evaluation report notes however, that most students take between 4-5 years to graduate. Around half of these students graduate with marks between 6-6.9 and around a quarter with marks between 7 and 8.4. Although it is difficult to make a meaningful comparison between different marking systems, we feel that there may be room for improvement in terms of final degree grades.

The internal evaluation report mentions a number of factors which arrest further progress in this area, and we would like to concur with this assessment. Among these factors is (a) the system of national entrance exams which leads students who did not choose social anthropology to come to the Department and (b) the low marks with which students are allowed to enter tertiary education, itself a reflection of the low quality of secondary education.

#### IMPROVEMENT

The problems that the Department faces in this respect are structural and there is little that the members of staff can do about them individually or collectively.

## **C. Research**

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

### **APPROACH**

#### **Undergraduate Program**

Beyond the scholarly work required for the completion of the B.A., students who are beyond their second year of study and have completed 12 courses in the program are strongly encouraged to pursue “Practical Training” through being placed as interns in cooperating local foundations and corporations, at present for a period of three months. The specified objectives of Practical Training include linking students to the broader society and specifically to the labor market; cultivating students’ professional orientation and their future integration into the work environment; establishing to the greatest degree possible the integration of the subjects that students are being taught with the requirements of working bodies; creating a continuous two-way exchange of information between the Department of Social Anthropology and the workplace, and; putting into place that facilitate finding work.

The program is especially attractive to the best students in the program, the majority of whom report a high degree of satisfaction with their experience and every one of whom reports that he or she would recommend participating in the program to others. The technical assessment of students’ success in the program comes primarily from members of the institutions who offer internships.

#### **Master’s Program**

Students are required to complete a research-based thesis in order to receive the M.A., which the Department appropriately regards as a crucial preparation for further academic study and of great benefit of well to students who choose to pursue non-academic careers. Students must submit an initial proposal of their intended project before the beginning of the second semester of their studies. Students are required to complete and their theses by the end of their second year of studies under the supervision of a three-member Advisory Committee, one of whose members serves as primary supervisor. The Committee is collectively responsible for assessing the quality of the thesis and the defence.

#### **Ph.D. Program**

Scholarly research and fieldwork are essential components of the profile of any properly credentialed social anthropologist. The Department accordingly requires both for the completion of the Ph.D. See the remarks on progress toward the Ph.D. in the section on Curriculum for the details of the process of the assessment of the Ph.D.

### **IMPLEMENTATION**

#### **Undergraduate Program**

The Department strongly encourages its students to apply for admission to the Practical Training program. About one-tenth of the Department’s students successfully gain admission to the program. The Department scientific staff member, responsible for the program of Practical Training, reviews student applications and conducts three orientation sessions with students selected to participate in the program. He/she is also primarily responsible for connecting students with appropriate organizations for which to serve as interns. The Department is actively involved not only in preparing students to participate in the program but also in pursuing avenues through which the program might be expanded and enriched.

### Master's Program

The Department keeps active track of sources through which students might secure financial support for their research. It is also among the most active departments in the University in its cultivation of ties to the ERASMUS program. Students can rarely if ever expect to publish their written work on their own. Except for a few relatively informal on-line venues that would hardly be of service to their further career, opportunities are extremely few and far between. We were not made aware of any instances in which an M.A. student's work was incorporated into and given credit in one or another of the faculty's publications. It should, however be noted, that in contrast to the natural sciences and such social sciences as psychology and sociology, most research and publication in social anthropology does not actively involve the organization of a research team.

### Ph.D. Program

The foundation of the Ph.D. program was of great importance to the Departmental faculty. Before its foundation, all Greek anthropologists (and all anthropologists of Greece) were of necessity trained abroad. The Department is singly responsible for bringing about a very important change. What it has done plainly reflects the depth of its commitment to anthropological research, a commitment that all of the Ph.D. students with whom the EEC spoke also expressed. The faculty are aware of all possible sources of the funding of Ph.D. research and actively work with their students in preparing grant applications and their first (and many of their subsequent) publications. Once again, we are not aware of any instances in which faculty and students have collaborated in producing a publication, but we would not consider such collaboration an unequivocally best practice. Very often in the discipline, emerging scholars who publish work with their advisors are suspected of «riding coattails,» however much credit they actually deserve.

### RESULTS

The implementation of the research objectives of the Department at all educational levels has in every case been at least satisfactory and in some cases, given current circumstances, extraordinary. Given the relatively recent establishment of the Ph.D. program, little can be said about the visibility of its first cohort of graduates. Much more can be said of the visibility of the faculty itself, all of whom are astonishingly productive and all of whom are producing work in Greek but also in English and French. In the context of Panteion University of Social and Political Sciences, the research and published work of the Department has contributed both to the furthering of the dialogue between social sciences in Greece, and to the enrichment of anthropological discourse in Greece and abroad.

### IMPROVEMENT

The only shortcoming that is worth mentioning concerns the undergraduate program. The Department's enthusiasm for and support of the Practical Training program is admirable, but as noted above, the program is not precisely focused on research. Increasingly, as the Department is well aware, anthropology departments abroad offer courses or other venues in which undergraduates have the opportunity to conduct fieldwork, however minimal it might be. Some of these venues require funding that the department is very unlikely to be able to procure in the foreseeable future. It might nevertheless be possible to put together a practicum in which students could conduct research in Athens itself, whose anthropological richness is inexhaustible. In any case, the Department has already introduced opportunities in several courses for undergraduate fieldwork in Athens and has specified its ambition to develop them even further.

## **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).** In general, the Department is very pleased with the services provided to the academic community. It should be noted, however, that their satisfaction is relative to the current economic crisis. The Department is fully aware of the constraints under which the university and, indeed, the whole country of Greece, is operating. The Department is disappointed by the salary and other spending cuts, the absence of funds for research and travel, the limited space for faculty offices, the fact that the University cannot provide computers for the faculty, the broken windows in classrooms and lack of heat on cold winter days, but they feel that the administration is doing the best they can under the circumstances.
- **Does the Department have a policy to simplify administrative procedures? Are most procedures processed electronically?** The Department does many procedures electronically and continues to streamline such procedures with the limited electronic resources available due to the crisis.
- **Does the Department have a policy to increase student presence on Campus?** Given the limited resources at present, the Department does plan to expand the numbers of students and faculty once economic conditions improve. They will recruit more graduate students from other Greek universities and try and make Social Anthropology more attractive to students at Panteion. The Department would like to expand the number of students at the graduate level, but that is dependent on expanding the faculty and facilities.

### IMPLEMENTATION

- **Organization and infrastructure of the Department's administration (e.g. secretariat of the Department).** The Department is well organized and well run. The Chair and other Department members get along well with each other and with the secretaries and Rectors. The faculty are united and work well as a team. The same can be said for the students, both graduate and undergraduate. From an administrative point of view, things seem to be running smoothly.
- **Form and function of academic services and infrastructure for students (e.g. library, PCs and free internet access, student counseling, athletic-cultural activity etc.).** The students, both undergraduate and graduate, have broad and open access to a wide variety of services and facilities including computers at the library and counseling and orientation services. The stacks at the library are open and students seem to make good use of the library, both as a place for resources and a place to study and use the computers. There is a small collection of anthropological films that are used for teaching, but there need to be many more. There are also some scholarships available for both undergraduate and graduate students, but not nearly enough.

### RESULTS

- **Are administrative and other services adequate and functional?** It is the opinion of the EEC that the administrative and other services are both adequate and functional, with the exception of those affected by the economic crisis – funds for faculty research and travel, funds for visiting faculty and lecturers, funds for library acquisitions, funds for building maintenance, funds for scholarships and other student

support services. The EEC was particularly impressed by the high level of commitment and dedication exhibited by every administrator interviewed. Many work long extra hours without compensation. The Director of the Library, Dina Kakalli, is a good example of this -- she has scheduled her staff to work in rotating shifts so that there is always a staff member available for students. It should also be noted that the Library has the best collection in Greece of books and other resources for Social Anthropology. The Department secretaries are another good example. They are exceptionally well-trained (one has a Master's degree) and they all work extra hours.

- **How does the Department view the particular results?** The Department is pleased with the delivery of these administrative services and appreciates the extra efforts being made by the secretaries, rectors and other administrators, but looks forward to more economically favorable times when they can get more of the basic necessities that are now lacking and issues of deferred maintenance can be addressed.

#### IMPROVEMENTS

- **Has the Department identified ways and methods to improve the services provided?** The Department is constantly working with the administration to solve outstanding issues. They also have a "wish list" of things they need and things they would change if and when funds become available.
- **Initiatives undertaken in this direction.** Requests have been submitted to the administration for additional faculty positions and better resources to handle a larger department. Requests have also been submitted for more and better facilities as well as support for research and travel. Faculty are also seeking financial support from outside the University for research.

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

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

The Department has an international reputation and has hosted lectures by scholars from many different countries. Even with limited resources, faculty members travel to professional conferences and seminars in several different countries. They are active in the discipline, having organized international conferences at Panteion on several occasions. They also encourage their students to take advantage of the ERASMUS program and host ERASMUS students from outside Greece who are usually individually tutored as they have little or no modern Greek. Moreover, almost 40% of the graduate students served by the faculty come from outside the Department of Social Anthropology.

It is a very dynamic department with highly committed faculty and intelligent and articulate students.

Faculty are further active in a variety of community affairs. They appear on radio and television; they give non-academic lectures to the general public; they publish articles in non-academic magazines; and they participate in a variety of testing programs for various groups.

#### ***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.** The most significant inhibiting factor is the deadening economic crisis that has engulfed the Greek state. Department members have taken significant cuts in salary and there are no funds for research, travel, or building maintenance. Faculty are not provided with computers. Windows in classrooms are broken and cannot be closed, so classrooms are cold in the winter and a lack of air conditioning in the summer makes them also difficult for learning. Small offices are shared by two and three faculty members without room for their books, etc. Office expenses are paid by the faculty as there are no funds for paper, pens, and other office supplies. There are not enough scholarships for students, both undergraduate and post-graduate.

- **Short-, medium- and long-term goals.** The short-term goals of the Department are mostly directed at surviving the economic crisis currently affecting all aspects of Greek society, including higher education. For example, high priority is replacing retiring faculty and maintaining the status quo. It would be unrealistic to expect more in the short term given the economic climate in the country.

Medium-term goals include an expansion of both the student body and the faculty. The Department would also like to see improvements in the physical infrastructure – more building maintenance, more office space, more funds for office supplies and photocopying, and more resources for all aspects of the Department's operation. Finally, the faculty would like to see funds from the salary cuts restored.

Long term goals also include expansions in the numbers of students and faculty. If economic conditions improve, it would be nice to have more secretarial support and more scholarships for students, both undergraduate and graduate. With the restoration of funds, the Department could host more speakers and visiting scholars, organize more conferences, and have a greater presence in the international scholarly arena.

- **Plans and actions for improvement by the Department/Academic Unit.** The Department plans to expand and increase their course offerings for students. They plan to send more graduate students outside the country for their field research and send more students to prestigious graduate schools abroad, especially to the US, UK and France. As the premier graduate department in Greece, the Department would also like to attract more graduate students from Greek universities. Long term plans further include increasing the visibility of social anthropology in Greece amongst the general public. It would like to see its faculty more engaged with the Greek public in ways that would bring positive attention to the University and the Department.
- **Long-term actions proposed by the Department.** Long-term actions proposed by the Department include expansion in the number of students and faculty, an increase in the number and variety of courses offered, an increase in research both inside and outside Greece by both students and faculty, and new initiatives in the field such as conferences on specific topics organized and hosted by Social Anthropology Department faculty and students, a festival of anthropological films organized by students, and an improvement in the conditions for teaching and learning.

## ***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 EEC concludes that the Social Anthropology Department of Panteion University has experienced very impressive development in its decade as an autonomous department. It has expanded the number of full time faculty from five to sixteen (two of whom have recently retired) with a number of adjuncts (ΠΔ 407/80) intermittently. The Department has 1340 undergraduate students and almost 40 graduate students. Moreover, almost 40% of the graduate students served by the faculty come from outside the Department of Social Anthropology. It has sent a number of students for graduate study at prestigious universities in the US, UK, France and elsewhere. The Department is *the* center of Social Anthropology in Greece and has an international reputation; its faculty are known and respected throughout the world.

The faculty members are successful in the classroom according to the students interviewed and the success of its graduates. They are fully engaged with their students both inside and outside the classroom. Faculty members have kept up with new developments in pedagogy and new developments in the field of anthropology. They are further successful in the scholarly world with extensive publications – reviews, articles, and books. Despite the thin to non-existent resources for research and travel, faculty members manage to conduct significant research and travel to conferences all over the world to deliver scientific papers. They are often invited to speak at other universities, both in Greece and abroad. All of these accomplishments are all the more impressive given the limits imposed by the current economic crisis in Greece.

Of course, there is room for improvement. The EEC would like to see more publications in better known journals and presses outside of Greece. It would also be an improvement if faculty member applied for and received more external grants as in the past. Finally, despite the fact that several staff members are already engaged in fieldwork abroad (Albania, Bulgaria, Russia, Serbia, Sudan, Turkey), as mentioned in the Internal Evaluation Report, the EEC would like to see faculty members conduct even more research outside Greece. The same holds true for PhD candidates, though some of them already do fieldwork in places like Albania, Egypt, Ethiopia and Ukraine.

- **the Department's readiness and capability to change/improve.** Department members are fully open to change and have shown themselves capable of changing with the times. They have recently revised the curriculum and are ready to make further modifications when needed or desired.
- **the Department's quality assurance.** There are several ways the Department can assure quality and there is clear evidence that its members are doing so. They have an annual review of each faculty member where his/her accomplishments are detailed. If a faculty member is deficient in any way, the Department will encourage that person to improve in the weak areas. There is also the Internal Assessment that monitors faculty teaching excellence. Moreover, the Department Chair, the Deans and the Rectors all pay attention to each faculty member's progress.

It should be noted that the Department is doing a very important job of educating young men and women, as well as members of the general public in multiculturalism and tolerance of cultural differences. Since Greece, like the rest of Europe and indeed the rest of the world, is rapidly changing with more and more people coming.

#### **Final Note**

Re pages 7 and 8 of the *Guidelines*:

The *Internal Evaluation Report* of the Department of Social Anthropology is very detailed and includes all the necessary information and data needed by the EEC. There were no inconsistencies or missing information. The strategic dimensions (approach, implementation, results and improvements) concerning the criteria of curriculum, teaching, research and other services are all dealt with extremely effectively, thus making the task of the EEC much easier and making it clear which procedures and services needed most careful examination during the Site Visit. It was also made clear which key persons were to be met with – Chair and faculty members, undergraduate students, graduate students, alumni, Department secretaries, Vice-Rectors, Head Librarian, Internal Review Coordinator, ERASMUS program representatives, and Student Welfare Officer. The Department does have a realistic and functional plan for improvement. All of the constituents of the Department participated fully in the Internal Evaluation process.

The program of the EEC visit met with all the individuals and groups spelled out on page 8 of the *Guidelines*. In fact, the EEC met with all those specified and more.

## The Members of the Committee

- | Name and Surname  | Signature |
|-------------------|-----------|
| 1. Peter S. Allen | _____     |
| 2. James Faubion  | _____     |
| 3. Vassos Argyrou | _____     |