

MA SECURITY & CULTURAL HERITAGE (SCHER2)

EUROPEAN INSTITUTIONS, FINANCIAL INSTRUMENTS, AND CULTURAL HERITAGE

Term 1: Autumn 2026-Winter 2027
Instructor : Alex G Papadopoulos, PhD
Office hours: On ZOOM, by appointment
Mobile: +1 773-255-9307
E-Mail : apapadop@depaul.edu

Syllabus

I. COURSE DESCRIPTION:

European Institutions, Financial Instruments, and Cultural Heritage

In this course we explore how the European Union – its institutions, policies, and funding mechanisms – shapes the protection and management of cultural heritage across a diverse and often contested continent. We begin by introducing the key concepts of heritage protection through the lens of security: why cultural heritage matters not only as memory and identity, but also as a dimension of human, social, and geopolitical stability.

We will then trace Europe's historical trajectory from a fragmented postwar landscape toward "an ever-closer union," examining how integration has deepened through treaties, governance structures, and enlargement rounds. The course next turns to the financial architecture of the EU: how the Union mobilizes resources to foster growth, cohesion, and competitiveness, and how these same instruments are used to support cultural heritage, from the *European Regional Development Fund* to *Creative Europe* and *Horizon Europe*.

In later modules, we will shift our attention to practice. We will analyze how heritage protection operates through EU planning and financing frameworks, and how conflicts (between development and preservation, national and EU priorities, or local and transnational stakeholders) are negotiated. We will conclude by mapping the multiple scales and actors/stakeholders that define the European heritage landscape and by integrating these insights into student portfolio presentations and final reflections.

By the end of the term, students will understand the institutional logics, financial tools, and governance practices that underpin cultural heritage protection in Europe, and how these shape both the opportunities and tensions of the European project itself.

II. STRUCTURE:

Each of the six thematic module is delivered over two weeks:

- Six thematic modules x 2-week duration = 12 weeks
- Example: **Weeks 1 & 2** = Module I;
Weeks 3 & 4 = Module II...

Week 13 is reserved for activities including student presentations, summative comments, final examination, course evaluation, and/or one last free-ranging discussion about the course experience.

SIX THEMATIC MODULES: SCHEDULE

- **MODULE I:** *Understanding cultural heritage protection – The security dimension (Key definitions & Concepts)* – Weeks 1 & 2
Meetings: 12 & 19 November

Readings: Meskell – Preface (2018); Betts (2015)

- **MODULE II:** *From fragmented Europe to an “Ever Closer Union”: Foundations, “deepening,” and “enlargement” of the EU* – Weeks 3 & 4
Meetings: 26 November & 03 December

Readings: Pinder and Usherwood (2018)

- **MODULE III:** *European integration as generator of wealth, regional and social solidarity, and competitiveness: The financial dimension* – Weeks 5 & 6
Meetings: 10 & 17 December

Readings: TBD

Holiday recess – December 24 to January 04

- **MODULE IV:** *EU planning and financing instruments in the service of cultural heritage and its protection* – Weeks 7 & 8
Meetings: 07 & 14 January

Readings: TBD

- **MODULE V:** *Managing contestation in cultural heritage protection in Europe – Negotiation methods & practices* – Weeks 9 & 10
Meetings: 21 & 28 January

Readings: TBD

- **MODULE VI:** *Scales of action and the stakeholder “map:” Interdependency and conflict management in European heritage protection* – Weeks 11 & 12
Meetings: 04 & 11 February

Readings: TBD

- **MODULE VII:** *Putting it all together: Content overview, portfolio presentations, final reflections* – Week 13
Meeting: 18 February

III. ASSESSMENT:

A. ATTENDANCE POLICY

Weekly attendance is mandatory. More than two unexcused absences will negatively impact your participation grade and may result in course failure. Excused absences require advance notification and documented justification (illness, family emergency, religious observance, professional obligation). Submit a 2-page reading synthesis for missed sessions. Arrive on time and remain for the full session. Repeated tardiness (>10 minutes late) affects your participation grade.

B. PARTICIPATION (Weekly/Rolling) – 25%

Participation means active, informed, and constructive engagement in seminar discussions and activities. This requires:

- *Preparation:* Complete all assigned readings with careful attention to arguments, evidence, and connections across modules;
- *Contribution:* Make regular, substantive contributions that advance collective understanding through analysis, synthesis, questioning, and building on others' ideas;
- *Engagement:* Actively participate in small-group discussions, workshops, and portfolio feedback sessions;
- *Intellectual citizenship:* Listen actively, create space for diverse voices, and maintain scholarly professionalism. Quality matters more than quantity. Strong participation demonstrates deep engagement with course materials through specific references to readings, analytical questions, cross-module connections, and constructive dialogue.

C. REFLECTIVE JOURNAL (Weekly/Rolling) – 25%

The Reflective Journal tracks your intellectual engagement with course materials across the semester. Complete ****6 entries minimum**** (300-500 words each), with at least one entry per module. Each entry should critically analyze readings (not summarize them), connect concepts across modules, and develop ideas for and from your portfolio project. Move beyond summary to engage analytically with arguments, identify tensions, and make connections.

Submission schedule:

- Modules I-III entries: Due 15 November
- Modules IV-VI entries: Due 17 January. Detailed guidelines provided separately.

D. PORTFOLIO PROJECT (50%) – See appendices A-C for instructions

The **Portfolio Project** is the central, term-long assignment for this course and accounts for a substantial portion of the final grade. It asks students to integrate the analytical, institutional, and financial dimensions of cultural heritage protection developed across the six modules.

Each student will pursue a concrete case study situated within the European Union or a candidate state, tracing how policies, funding mechanisms, and governance structures shape the security and resilience of cultural heritage. The project will be developed through successive stages—proposal, midterm report, and final synthesis—each supported by in-class workshops. It assesses not only knowledge of institutions and instruments but also critical thinking, originality, and ethical awareness.

The final submission serves as a professional portfolio piece, demonstrating the student’s capacity to analyze complex, real-world heritage challenges through the combined lenses of *security*, *governance*, and *financial resilience*.

TWO-WEEK MODULE SCHEMA

ODD-NUMBERED WEEKS (1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 11)

Part I (90’ including a 15’ break)

- *Pre-Load*: Asynchronous lecture with captions, replayed at the top of the session (1 hour max)
- Address student questions/Clarify difficult terminology or concepts from the pre-loaded lecture
- Short “round robin” reflections (each student shares one takeaway)
- Short comprehension quiz (periodic)

15’ break

PART II (60’ including a 15’ break)

Activities – *deliver one or more*

- Guided seminar discussion on the week’s theme
- Small breakout rooms for case study analysis or policy comparison
- *Source critique*: analyzing a primary source, a document, a satellite image, or media artifact
- Reflection on the module’s lessons

15' break

PART III (30')

- **WORKSHOP (every week):** Self-guided work on the term-long individual case study

EVEN-NUMBERED WEEKS (2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12)

Part I (90' including a 15' break)

Reinforce retention, keep track of students' progress, prepare continuity for next week.

Example activities:

- **Reflective journal entry** (200–250 words) – Composed and shared in class (2'–3' per student)
- **Instructor-created forum posting/replies** – graded by the instructor post-session (opportunity for feedback)
- **Student self-assessment checklist:** “What I understand; what I need clarified”

15' break

PART II (60' including a 15' break)

- Office hours (meeting with individual students in break-out room)

15' break

PART III (30')

- **WORKSHOP (every week):** Self-guided work on the term-long individual case study

APPENDIX A

Portfolio Project

Cultural Heritage Security and Financial Resilience in Europe

I. Rationale and Overview

Cultural heritage in Europe exists at the intersection of culture, politics, economy, and security. It is rarely “at risk” in the abstract. Threats emerge in concrete settings—sites, landscapes, communities—where political agendas, environmental stress, market forces, and social contestations converge. The European Union responds to these challenges through a web of institutions, legal frameworks, and funding mechanisms that together define the evolving architecture of *heritage governance*.

This term-long portfolio invites you to explore one such real-world case. Your goal is to demonstrate how European institutions and financial instruments—acting at local, national, and transnational levels—shape the protection and resilience of cultural heritage under pressure. You will combine analytical and creative approaches: tracing institutional logics, identifying stakeholders and conflicts, and assessing both vulnerabilities and strategies for resilience.

II. Case Study Selection

Each student will develop a sustained, evidence-based case study that integrates political, economic, and spatial dimensions of heritage security.

Select:

1. **A country:**

Any **EU Member State** (any among the 27), **candidate country** (e.g. Albania, Serbia, Montenegro, Ukraine, Türkiye), or **European Economic Area** country (e.g. Norway, Switzerland, Iceland).

2. **A type of heritage:**

- **Tangible heritage** (e.g. archaeological site, monument, historic district, cultural landscape); or
- **Intangible heritage** (e.g. craft, performance, language, ritual, or social practice).

3. **A policy framework or instrument:**

Examples include *Creative Europe*, *European Framework for Action on Cultural Heritage*, *Horizon Europe (Cluster 2)*, *Regulation (EU) 2019/880 on the Import of Cultural Goods*, or *Council Conclusions on Heritage in Conflicts and Crises*.

4. A core issue or tension:

Identify a site or situation where **heritage, security, and finance intersect**—for example, post-conflict reconstruction in Ukraine, community resistance to EU-funded redevelopment in Venice, or the management of intangible heritage under economic duress in rural Greece.

III. Analytical Dimensions

Throughout the term, analyze your case through selected lenses from the course:

- **Governance and EU Institutions** – Who makes decisions, under what authority?
- **Security and Risk** – What kinds of threats (environmental, political, military, economic) affect heritage?
- **Finance and Resilience** – Which EU or national financial instruments are involved? How do they enhance or compromise protection?
- **Law and Policy** – What legal instruments (EU directives, UNESCO conventions, national laws) frame the case?
- **Stakeholders and Ethics** – Whose interests are served or marginalized? How is cultural value negotiated?
- **Community and Identity** – How do local actors interpret and engage with the protection process?

IV. Deliverables and Milestones

Stage	Description	Due Date	Format
1. Proposal	Define your case (country, heritage type, policy framework, issue). Submit the provided proposal form outlining your topic, rationale, and preliminary sources.	End of Week 2	Form (≤ 1 page). Workshopping in Week 3.
2. Midterm Progress Report	Summarize your developing argument and preliminary findings. Focus on key institutions, actors, and funding mechanisms.	Week 6 or 7 (TBD)	~ 500 words + 1 slide + 5 min presentation + 5 min Q&A
3. Final/Synthesis Report	Present your full analysis and recommendations. Integrate political, financial, and ethical perspectives and situate your findings within broader EU frameworks.	Week 13	~ 1,500 words report + 1-slide poster + 5 min presentation + 10 min Q&A.

V. Assessment Criteria

- **Relevance and originality of case** – clarity of selection, appropriateness to EU context.
- **Analytical depth** – application of course concepts (institutions, finance, security).
- **Research quality** – use of credible, verifiable sources and proper citation.
- **Structure and coherence** – logical organization and clear narrative.
- **Visual and oral presentation** – clarity, focus, and professionalism.
- **Reflective insight** – awareness of the complexities and ethical dimensions of heritage protection.

VI. Purpose and Learning Goals

By completing this project, you will:

- Understand how European institutions and instruments operate in heritage protection.
- Connect financial mechanisms with social and political realities on the ground.
- Develop the analytical skills to map actors, assess risks, and interpret policy frameworks.
- Produce a compact professional portfolio piece suitable for policy, heritage, or research applications.

APPENDIX B

Portfolio Project Research Handbook

Companion Guide for the Course: *European Institutions, Financial Instruments, and Cultural Heritage*

Purpose

This handbook is designed to help you develop your **Portfolio Project: Cultural Heritage Security and Financial Resilience in Europe**. It provides a clear, practical roadmap—from identifying a case to completing your final synthesis report. Whether you have extensive research experience or are new to independent study, the guide will help you think critically, plan effectively, and work ethically.

I_Starting the Process: Framing Your Case

Step 1 – Understand the Assignment

Your case must link **cultural heritage, security, and finance** within the **European Union or a candidate country**. You are expected to show how institutions, funding instruments, and political or social pressures shape heritage protection in a real context.

Step 2 – Identify a Focus

Think of cases where cultural heritage is **under stress or negotiation**. Consider:

- Environmental or climate-related threats (e.g., flooding in Venice)
- Conflict or post-conflict reconstruction (e.g., Ukraine)
- Urban redevelopment or tourism pressures (e.g., Dubrovnik)
- Economic sustainability of traditional practices (e.g., craft heritage in Greece)
- Heritage and minority identity (e.g., Roma cultural sites in Hungary)

You may focus on:

- **Tangible heritage** (monuments, historic centers, cultural landscapes)
- **Intangible heritage** (performing arts, languages, craftsmanship, rituals)

II_Conducting Desk Research

Desk research means using **existing published and verified sources**, not new fieldwork.

A. Begin Broad, Then Narrow Down

Start with background reading to understand the issue. Then move to targeted searches on:

- **Institutional frameworks** (EU, UNESCO, national ministries)
- **Funding mechanisms** (Creative Europe, Horizon Europe, ERDF)
- **Legal instruments** (Regulation (EU) 2019/880, UNESCO Conventions)
- **Current events or policy debates** (reliable media, official reports)

B. Recommended Research Tools

- **Google Scholar** – For academic papers and peer-reviewed research.
- **Europa.eu** – The official EU portal; use it for treaties, policies, and regulations.
- **EUR-Lex** – For full-text EU legislation and directives.
- **Culture.ec.europa.eu** – EU’s cultural heritage portal (programmes, calls, initiatives).
- **UNESCO.org / whc.unesco.org** – For conventions and heritage site documentation.
- **OECD iLibrary** – For policy reports on culture and sustainability.
- **National ministries of culture** – For country-specific policy and data.

Tip: Always prefer **official, academic, or institutional sources** over personal blogs or unverified media.

III_Organizing Your Research

A. Keep a Research Log

Create a simple spreadsheet or notebook to record:

- Source title and URL
- Type (policy, academic, news, etc.)
- Key insight or data
- Relevance to your case
- Date accessed

B. Distinguish Primary and Secondary Sources

- **Primary sources:** original policy documents, legal texts, funding calls, official reports, site management plans, stakeholder interviews, media statements.
- **Secondary sources:** scholarly analysis, policy commentaries, academic books and journal articles interpreting those documents.

C. Citation Practice

Use in-text **author-date** citations (e.g., *Stanley-Price 2015*) and include a full bibliography. Use a consistent academic citation style (APA, Harvard, or Chicago are recommended).

IV_Ethical and Responsible Use of AI Tools

AI (e.g., ChatGPT, Claude, Gemini, translation aids, image tools) can help **organize, brainstorm, or clarify** ideas—but not generate your analysis or write your report.

Allowed Uses

- Brainstorming possible case study topics.
- Summarizing verified public documents.
- Clarifying terminology or conceptual frameworks.
- Designing tables, outlines, or visual diagrams.

Not Allowed

- Submitting AI-generated text as your own writing.
- Using AI tools to fabricate sources, data, or citations.
- Relying on AI summaries without verifying against original documents.

Rule of thumb: AI may *assist* your thinking but must *never replace* your reasoning or research. Always cross-check output against verifiable sources.

V_Building a Work Schedule

A realistic schedule keeps your project on track. Below is a suggested timeline aligned with course milestones.

Week	Task	Deliverable
1	Review course materials and handbook; explore potential cases.	—
2	Select country, heritage type, and issue. Begin initial research.	Proposal due (end of Week 2)
3–4	Workshop proposals, refine focus, gather primary/secondary sources.	Instructor feedback & refinement
5–6	Conduct deeper analysis of EU policies, funding, and stakeholders.	Midterm progress report (Week 6 or 7)
7–9	Expand research, begin drafting final report; test arguments.	Optional check-in or short presentation
10–12	Draft, revise, and finalize synthesis report and 1-slide poster.	—
13	Present findings and reflections.	Final submission & presentation (Week 13)

VI_Writing the Final Report

Structure (Approx. 1,500 words)

1. **Introduction** – Define your case, research question, and rationale.
2. **Context** – Country background, heritage type, and relevance.
3. **Policy and Institutional Frameworks** – Key EU or national mechanisms.
4. **Analysis** – How security, finance, and governance interact in your case.
5. **Stakeholders and Ethics** – Actors involved, competing interests, moral considerations.
6. **Conclusion and Reflection** – What the case reveals about cultural heritage protection in Europe.

Include:

- A **bibliography** of 8–10 credible sources.
- A **poster (1 PPT slide)** for your Week 13 presentation. Include least one **visual element** (map, chart, or table).

VII_Tips for Success

- **Be specific** – Avoid generalities. Focus on *one* case and unpack it deeply.
- **Be analytical, not descriptive** – Explain *why* policies matter, not just *what* they are.
- **Stay within scope** – Your case should fit within the 1,500-word limit.
- **Integrate course concepts** – Governance, finance, EU instruments, and ethics.
- **Revise continuously** – Use feedback at each stage to sharpen your focus.
- **Practice academic integrity** – Cite accurately, paraphrase responsibly, verify facts.

VIII_Example Case Directions

(a) Western and Southern Europe

- **Venice (Italy):** EU Cohesion Funds and heritage preservation under climate stress.
- **Mostar (Bosnia and Herzegovina):** Reconstruction and reconciliation through EU funding.
- **Rhodes (Greece):** UNESCO site management, tourism pressure, and EU policy support.

- **Seville (Spain):** Managing the coexistence of Islamic, Jewish, and Christian heritage through EU-funded urban regeneration.
- **Marseille (France):** Heritage-led urban regeneration in multicultural port cities—social inclusion vs. gentrification.
- **Matera (Italy):** Post-European Capital of Culture funding cycles and sustainable cultural tourism.
- **Valletta (Malta):** Heritage valorisation vs. tourism saturation in small island economies.
- **Sintra (Portugal):** Balancing conservation and real-estate speculation pressures in a UNESCO cultural landscape.
- **Portugal:** Adaptive reuse of heritage in Lisbon or Porto through *Creative Europe* initiatives.

(b) Central and Eastern Europe

- **Kraków (Poland):** EU heritage funding and the politics of memory in Holocaust commemoration.
- **Vilnius (Lithuania):** Jewish heritage recovery and identity politics within EU cultural inclusion frameworks.
- **Budapest (Hungary):** Heritage and illiberal governance—contestation of EU cultural values.
- **Bratislava (Slovakia):** Adaptive reuse of industrial heritage through *Creative Europe* and regional innovation funds.
- **Timișoara (Romania):** EU Capital of Culture legacy and the financial sustainability of cultural districts.
- **Tallinn (Estonia):** Digital heritage protection and cyber-security of archives under the EU Digital Europe Programme.

(c) Northern Europe

- **Ribe (Denmark):** Managing archaeological landscapes under coastal erosion and EU climate adaptation policy.
- **Stockholm (Sweden):** Museums, restitution debates, and sustainable funding models in the Nordic welfare context.
- **Helsinki (Finland):** Cultural infrastructure and heritage integration in post-industrial waterfront regeneration.
- **Dublin (Ireland):** Georgian heritage and housing crises—social equity vs. conservation mandates.
- **Edinburgh (United Kingdom):** Heritage protection and governance after Brexit—loss of EU support mechanisms.
- **Reykjavík (Iceland):** Intangible maritime heritage and climate-driven shifts in Arctic cultural policy.

(d) Southeastern Europe and the Balkans

- **Sarajevo (Bosnia and Herzegovina):** Shared sacred spaces and EU cultural diplomacy in post-conflict urban settings.
- **Skopje (North Macedonia):** State branding and contested monumental heritage under EU accession frameworks.
- **Belgrade (Serbia):** Industrial riverfront heritage and geopolitics of Chinese investment vs. EU standards.
- **Tirana (Albania):** Cultural heritage, urban renewal, and social inclusion through IPA funding.
- **Kotor (Montenegro):** UNESCO protection vs. tourism-driven urban development conflicts.
- **Dubrovnik (Croatia):** Over-tourism management and digital visitor regulation through EU Smart Tourism initiatives.
- **Athens (Greece):** Industrial heritage reuse and cultural economy resilience under austerity.
- **Sofia (Bulgaria):** Church-State tensions and heritage protection under post-socialist redevelopment pressures.

(e) Frontier and Peripheral Regions

- **Lapland (Finland/Norway border):** Safeguarding Sámi intangible heritage and land rights under EU Arctic policy.
- **Baltic coast (Poland–Germany):** Cross-border heritage cooperation through *Interreg* programmes.
- **Ukraine:** Cultural heritage protection amid war—EU and UNESCO emergency frameworks.
- **Cyprus (divided Nicosia):** Heritage diplomacy and EU mediation in conflict-affected urban zones.
- **Azores (Portugal):** Island cultural landscapes and sustainability through Cohesion and Horizon funding.
- **Canary Islands (Spain):** Managing colonial-era heritage and migration narratives at Europe's Atlantic frontier.
- **North Mitrovica, Leposavić, Zvečan, or Zubin Potok (Kosovo):** Heritage protection in Serbian enclaves as state-building-UNESCO exclusion and EU stabilization mechanisms.

(f) Themes for Intangible Heritage

- **Fado (Portugal):** Safeguarding intangible heritage through creative economy instruments.

- **Flamenco (Spain):** Cultural branding, authenticity, and EU funding for performance traditions.
- **Carnival of Binche (Belgium):** Heritage identity and resilience of local economies.
- **Greek shadow theatre (Karagiozis):** Preservation of traditional performance in digital education contexts.
- **Romanian folk crafts:** Market integration and sustainability through EU rural development funds.
- **Irish language revival:** Funding linguistic heritage as part of EU cultural and regional policy.
- **Cuisine of the Mediterranean diet:** Transnational cooperation and agricultural heritage under EU quality schemes.

(g) Emergent or Cross-Cutting Issues

- **Illicit trafficking of cultural goods:** Application of Regulation (EU) 2019/880 and customs enforcement.
- **Digital heritage resilience:** Safeguarding archives and 3D models through the *Europeana* and *Copernicus* platforms.
- **Cultural heritage in migration zones:** Heritage and belonging in EU border regions (e.g., Lampedusa, Melilla).
- **Post-disaster heritage recovery:** Financial and institutional frameworks for sites damaged by earthquakes or floods.
- **Energy transition and industrial heritage:** Reusing decommissioned industrial sites across the EU.
- **Gender, memory, and heritage:** Feminist perspectives in heritage programming and funding.

APPENDIX C

Portfolio Project Proposal Template

Cultural Heritage Security and Financial Resilience in Europe

Use this form to outline your case study proposal. Complete all sections clearly and concisely (maximum 1 page). Your proposal will guide class discussion and feedback in Week 3 & 4.

1. Student Information

- **Name:**
- **Email:**
- **Country / Case Focus:**

2. Case Study Overview

Working Title:

(Create a concise, descriptive title for your case study — e.g., “Safeguarding Post-Conflict Heritage in Dubrovnik: EU Instruments and Local Agency.”)

Brief Summary (100–150 words):

Describe the case you intend to study. Identify its location, the main heritage issue, and why it is significant for understanding the security and financial dimensions of cultural heritage in Europe.

3. Key Components

A. Country / Regional Context:

Specify the EU Member State or candidate country and explain its relevance to EU heritage policy or financial frameworks.

B. Type of Heritage:

☐ Tangible (site, monument, urban district, landscape)

☐ Intangible (craft, performance, language, ritual, practice)

Explain briefly why this form of heritage is central to your case.

C. Policy or Institutional Framework:

List and briefly describe one or more key policy instruments shaping your case (e.g., *Creative Europe*, *European Framework for Action on Cultural Heritage*, *Horizon Europe*, *Regulation (EU) 2019/880*).

D. Issue or Problem of Contestation:

What threat, pressure, or tension defines your case (e.g., climate risk, redevelopment, political conflict, tourism, post-war recovery, under-funding, illicit trade)?

4. Analytical Focus

Indicate which of the following analytical lenses you plan to apply (select at least three):

- ☐ Governance and EU institutions
- ☐ Security and risk assessment
- ☐ Finance and funding mechanisms
- ☐ Law and policy instruments
- ☐ Stakeholder mapping and ethics
- ☐ Community engagement and identity
- ☐ Geopolitical or environmental factors

Briefly justify your selection (2–3 sentences).

5. Preliminary Sources

List 3–5 verified or official sources (academic, institutional, or policy-based) you will begin with. Include EU or UNESCO documents where possible.

6. Expected Outcomes

What do you expect to learn or demonstrate through this study? (3–4 sentences).

7. Visual Component (Optional at Proposal Stage)

If you already envision a map, diagram, or image relevant to your case, describe it briefly or include a placeholder (e.g., site map, stakeholder chart, risk diagram).

8. Instructor Feedback (for Weeks 3–4 Workshop)

After review, I will return brief written comments on the **scope**, **clarity**, and **focus** of your proposal, together with suggestions for refinement—such as sharpening the research question, improving alignment with EU frameworks, or identifying more suitable sources and analytical lenses.

9. Preliminary Outcome:

- ☐ **APPROVED** – Your proposal is clearly defined and ready to proceed to the research stage.

☐ **CONDITIONAL APPROVAL** – Proceed with revisions as indicated in the feedback; changes to focus or framing are recommended.

☐ **REDRAFT & RESUBMIT** – Substantial revision required before approval (e.g., unclear scope, weak case definition, or insufficient link to course themes).

Instructor Comments: *(to be completed during workshop feedback)*