Evolving Approaches to Peacebuilding and Human Rights Education

Insights from European Peace and Conflict Studies Programmes

Orli Fridman & Dragana Stojanović
Data collection by Nikola Tucakov

SHARINPEACE Report #1.2

Simulating Human Rights in Peacebuilding (SHARINPEACE)

Evolving Approaches to Peacebuilding and Human Rights Education: Insights from European Peace and Conflict Studies Programmes
Project SHARINPEACE, Project Result 1
Authors: Orli Fridman & Dragana Stojanović, Data collection by Nikola Tucakov
© 2025 SHARINPEACE

Co-funded by
the European Union

Human rights and peace as key elements of Europe's shared values and as cornerstones of our democratic constitutions are fundamentally challenged by today's multifaceted crises. SHARINPEACE addresses these encounters and aims at qualifying the decision-makers of tomorrow in conceiving and practising human rights as intrinsic part of peacebuilding. SHARINPEACE offers an innovative approach to deal with the challenges of social, ethnic, linguistic and cultural diversity in Europe and beyond. Through SHARINPEACE, students and educators increase their awareness on how to include human rights in the training of conflict management. The core objective is the implementation of an EU-wide organised two-part module. Students will first gain central competences in the interrelated domains of human rights and peacebuilding and, in the second part, put their gained competences in a network-wide Crisis Intervention Simulation (CRIS) into (simulated) practice.

Project Partners:
University of Marburg (DE) [coordinating institution]
Justus Liebig University Giessen (DE)
Singidunum University/ Faculty of Media and Communications (RS)
Södertörn University (SE)
University of Lodz (PL)
University of Southern Denmark (DK)

www.uni-marburg.de/sharinpeace

Content

Executive Summary

The Erasmus+ project "Simulating Human Rights in Peacebuilding (SHARINPEACE)" aims to address contemporary crises affecting human rights and peace, and to integrate human rights education into peacebuilding practices. The project highlights the importance of human rights as a fundamental element in building sustainable peace, and proposes an educational framework to instill these principles in future peace and policymakers. Through an interdisciplinary two-part university module, SHARINPEACE seeks to promote a deeper understanding of human rights as an integral part of peacebuilding and to encourage collaboration between educational and policy initiatives. The SHARINPEACE project outlines several objectives to achieve this educational integration. Key among these are embedding human rights in peacebuilding education, establishing a Crisis Intervention Simulation (CRIS) for hands-on learning, and engaging peace and policymakers in educational development.

This report examined Peace and Conflict Studies (PCS) curricula to find out how human rights and peacebuilding intersect and to identify effective ways of combining theory and practice in the education of future leaders. The analysis of 17 European MA programmes revealed different approaches to the integration of human rights, with critical and affirmative perspectives emerging. Our research revealed that critical programmes see human rights as part of the liberal peace model that may overlook local contexts. As such, they advocate context-sensitive strategies. Affirmative programmes see human rights as an integral part of PCS, emphasising cooperation with institutions such as the UN and NGOs and recognising their role in conflict resolution.

Many PCS programmes fall between these two ends of the spectrum, embedding human rights within broader courses such as transitional justice or migration, without stand-alone modules. Such programmes often balance theory with practical training through simulations or internships, preparing students for careers in academia, diplomacy, civil society or international organisations. Challenges remain in establishing partnerships with non-academic institutions and expanding exchange opportunities, which are hampered by logistical and accreditation complexities.

Introduction

Human rights and peace as key elements of Europe's shared values and as cornerstones of our democratic constitutions are fundamentally challenged by today's multifaceted crises. The Erasmus+ Cooperation Partnership project "Simulating Human Rights in Peacebuilding (SHARINPEACE)" addresses these challenges and aims at qualifying the decision-makers of tomorrow in conceiving and practising human rights as an intrinsic part of peacebuilding. Through SHARINPEACE, students and educators increase their awareness on how to include human rights in the training of conflict management. Organisations in the domain of peacebuilding are invited to become partners in this education process within SHARINPEACE.

We are convinced that this topic deserves greater attention. It is of significant value to understand human rights as an inclusive part of peacebuilding processes and that it is correspondingly relevant to introduce this into teaching and learning. Hence, the core objective of the project is the EU-wide introduction and implementation of an interdisciplinary two-part university module on human rights and peacebuilding.

We aim to achieve this through the following four sub-items:

1) Introducing human rights in peacebuilding education
2) Implementing a network-wide Crisis Intervention Simulation (CRIS)
3) Involving peace and policymakers
4) Planning joint MA modules

In this module, the participating students will first gain central skills in the interrelated areas of human rights and peacebuilding and, in the second part, put their newly acquired expertise into (simulated) practice.

To facilitate this learning experience, the SHARINPEACE project envisages six Project Results (PR1-6) which are tangible results of individual Work Packages. The first Work Package dedicates itself to mapping the nexus of human rights education and peacebuilding. The results of PR1 form the basis for PR2, which explores needs and experiences by focusing on the stakeholder's perspectives; PR3 addresses the contents of the learning materials for teaching human rights in peacebuilding; technical tools for teaching and learning are subject of PR4; then, PR5 consists of the implementation of a pilot project of the module "Simulating Human

Rights in Peacebuilding". Finally, PR6 is a policy brief on how to teach and learn human rights in peacebuilding within the EU.

PR1 is concluded by this report, which examines the state of the art of human rights in peacebuilding and provides an overview of human rights education curricula. First, we provide insights into the current and past discussions of human rights and peacebuilding in the academic literature, focusing on the need to think both together. Based on the findings of the literature review, we develop recommendations for teaching an integrated approach to human rights and peacebuilding.[1] Secondly, we examine curricula in human rights education and similar approaches by conducting and analysing qualitative interviews and written questionnaires. This is the focus of this report.

Preliminary data and discussion

Phase 1: Desk Research

Our initial desk research included the mapping out and a review of existing programs in peace and conflict studies in Europe, followed by the review of their curricula. We initially took into consideration undergraduate as well as graduate study programs in the field of Peace and Conflict Studies, and yet ended up with data collection focusing mainly on the MA level searching for presence (and/or lack of) of courses on Human Rights.

In our initial list, we reviewed 19 different programs (see Appendix A), and we narrowed our choice to 17 programs that presented the most comprehensive curricula and information online (see Appendix B). We selected programs that would reflect

a) a wide spectrum in terms of their pedagogies and academic approaches and practical implementations in the field;
b) geographical locations and diversity to include EU member states as well as non-EU member states, and various regions including Southeast Europe/Balkans, Central and Eastern Europe, Northern Europe, and Southern Europe.

---

[1] Hanke, Tabea and Thora Pindus 2025. Bridging Divides: Integrating Human Rights and Peacebuilding – Literature Review for Curriculum Development. SHARINPEACE Report #1.1

Also, the language used for online programme presentations played a significant part; due to languages that the researchers spoke (local languages and English), we could only review and consider those programmes that presented some information in the English language. After the initial selection of the programmes, the invitations were sent to all the mentioned universities (Appendix B), but only 7 answered (Appendix C, with contact persons). The content of this report is based on data collected during the interviewing process, which was done with the contact persons from the universities that responded to our invitations. The goal of the report was to understand and mark the function and meaning of the terms peacebuilding and human rights in MA programmes connected to Peace and Conflict Studies, as well as to map the nexus of Human Rights Education and Peacebuilding, uncovering their relations and juxtapositions.

Phase 2: Data Collection

In this phase we focused on data collection through interviews and written questionnaires. Seven university professors/programme coordinators have responded to our request for an interview.

Our interview guide has defined our main goal in this phase: to understand the aims of every programme, together with its core values and structure. We were interested in the profile of the students, and their academic and professional background. Also, we asked about the lecturers and professors engaged in the programme, in order to place the particular programme on the spectrum between two poles we have identified: theoretically oriented academic programmes of peacebuilding and/or Human rights education, and more practically oriented academic preparation for the professional field in peacebuilding and/or Human rights education. We paid special attention to the approach to peace and conflict studies, with the particular concentration on the courses that bridge between issues of peacebuilding and/or human rights (if they exist within a certain programme or curriculum). We asked how important theoretical knowledge versus practical skills is, and we asked whether they are positioned separately or intertwining. As SHARINPEACE ERASMUS+ project is dedicated to building a joint module „Human Rights & Peacebuilding" (PR3, PR4, and the implementation in PR5), directed equally to stakeholder groups of students, educators, and

policy/peacemakers, we aimed to find out about already existing cooperations of the academic institutions with other institutions or programmes, as well as about the exchange programmes for students and/or lecturers. Among the interview questions, we posed the one about the professional positions of alumni, and about the relation and presence of field practitioners within the academic study programmes in peacebuilding and Human rights education (see appendix D for interview guide).

Phase 3: Preliminary Findings and Discussion

Among the most interesting, and the most important findings is that the programmes display a range of different attitudes not only towards teaching human rights, but also the place of human rights within Peace and Conflict studies or lack thereof. Among the programmes we reviewed, we have identified those programs that hold 'critical' perspectives and those with more 'affirmative' ones in regards to human rights. The 'critical group' contested the very place of human rights within the field of Peace and Conflict Studies and regarded it as an essential part of the liberal peace approach that they seek to distance themselves from. The critical programmes also tended to have a highly developed theoretical approach, characterised by egalitarian, emancipatory and local perspectives. For example, according to one of the interviewed professors:

> *"We aspire for the 'local turn', which criticises the liberal peace, and since human rights are an important aspect of this liberal peace project both in the individual and political sense. Every intervention on the part of the international community has cited human rights as important. We argue for a different approach - that every region has its context, and that the context should dictate what peacebuilding should look like."*

Similarly, another interviewee explained that they:

> *"don't have a specific course on Human rights. If anything, it would be a thread that runs through the program. Peace Studies was never really, as a field, strong in terms of human rights. The complexity of rights, human rights in particular, in this context, is the question of who is accountable for all this. We as a programme don't teach human rights per se, there is an option for students to take a class from the other faculty in human rights and international law, but it's something very few students ever take. I think the reason*

for it is because Peace Studies look at things more transformatively than the human rights approach does. Human rights also became a fashion, and those come and go with academic trends. So although we recognize the need for basic human rights to be respected, it's also about the question of what power you have as a community to be able to do something about it."

On the other end, the 'affirmative' group, which enthusiastically embraces human rights as a theme within its curriculum, is also characterised by a highly institution-oriented perspective, in the sense that close cooperation and/or employment of students/alumni within prominent international organisations and NGOs in the field is seen as a major priority. One of the professors, for example, says:

"For us, Human Rights and conflict management are part and parcel of the same sort of endeavour, in the sense that respect for HR and accountability for HR violations is part of what you need to manage a conflict, and conflict resolutions are of course functional and instrumental to guarantee the protection of HR. Now, I know there are quite different views on this, but although we are aware of these debates and we present them to the students, our approach is that these two elements are profoundly interlinked, and one cannot be pursued without the other. We never see them in counterposition, we always see them as twin objectives which need to be achieved at the same time."

Similarly, another contact from another university considers human rights as especially important and significantly valued, including a specific Human rights course and Human rights themes addressed as such throughout the curriculum.

Several programmes fall somewhere between these two poles, and our data seems to indicate a correlation between the explicit prioritisation of human rights and a high level of cooperation with international institutional actors. In terms of future employment opportunities and alumni dispersal, all programmes seem to be geared towards future employment in academic institutions, governmental agencies, NGOs and international bodies, although there is no data about how much the percentages may vary from programme to programme. Overall, a minority of programmes seem to explicitly underline human rights as a major topic or a course within the programme, with the majority responding, when prompted, that human rights-related concerns find their expression in different courses within the programme, more or less explicitly. In connection to this, even interviewees that do not come from a strictly

critical perspective admitted to rarely explicitly consider human rights as a key part of their curriculum. Sometimes human rights can be found in the form of a specific course, or elements of Human rights education can be found indirectly, within courses such as Transitional justice, that appears on several study programs. One of the interviewees was speaking about this underlying, but never quite directly present Human rights tone in certain courses, topics, or lectures:

> *"We have an approach to the liberal peace which is both critical and liberal in a way, having respect for human rights. The liberal peace is very much a basis for a lot of our human rights themes, but various courses, in fact all core courses, pay attention to human rights considerations, like transitional justice courses. In particular, Consolidating Peace after Violence and Conflict Prevention and Sustainable Peace incorporate this transitional justice dimension. There is also a course on gender within that HR frame, as well as a course on migration and displacement. There is no one course that has 'human rights' in its title but those issues run throughout the entire program in a significant way."*

As for the aims of selected programs, to name just a few, interviewees stressed the interrelation between academic and theoretical insight into conflict resolution and reconciliation, and practical skills and experience through placements and workshops. Some of the programs accentuated very practical approaches such as to provide knowledge and skills necessary for students to perform effectively in field missions, whether in human rights issues or conflict management. All the programs shared core values such as diversity, inclusion, equality, re-evaluation, nonviolence and critical thinking. Two of the programs specifically mentioned human rights as one of the core values.

The students' body is heterogeneous and diverse. As the interviewees stressed, although the majority of students come to study peace and conflict studies in their twenties, after their BA studies, about a third of students consisted of professionals already present in the fields of peacebuilding and Human Rights. They opt for enrolling into MA studies later during their professional life, mostly for their interest in academic approaches and theoretical tools that would enrich their practical approach and experience. As for lecturers, most of the programs gather their lecturers both from the academic world (political sciences, critical social studies, post-colonial studies, anthropology), and from the practical field (community and policy makers, NGO activists, former or current

UN human rights officers, people who work for the EU etc.). Many of the interviewees stressed that they would like to have even more cooperation with the non-academic, practitioners' sector, but that it is often impossible or hard to achieve because the system of academic accreditation is, in most cases, tied with a complicated process. The same goes for student exchange and mobility – most of the interviewees expressed their interest in that possibility, but it is not always easy due to technical and logistic academic mechanisms which are, oftentimes, not flexible enough. For example, according to one of the professors:

> *"exchanges would be wonderful, but it is a headache for universities, so to say. In Bradford, in their very early days at the Peace Studies department, '78-'79, they had a one-year opportunity to gain experience. It wasn't an exchange per se, but it happened, and from the people that I know did the programme, they learnt so much. But I definitely think that exchanges should be easier and should be done more."*

Contrary to that, some of the schools strongly prefer learning in person. As one of the interviewees stressed,

> *"This is a residential programme, so our priority is to do everything in person. We think distance learning is not the same as in-person learning, it's not as effective, I'm afraid, and certain parts can only be done in person."*

Most of the study programs we included in our sample, use all the different forms of relevant academic sources – printed books, electronic book formats, documents, researches, but they also use forms of participatory learning – through internships and simulations. As for the academic vs. practical approach and knowledge, most of the study programs value both, but in different ratios. For example, some are leaning more to academic approaches, some stress anthropological and practical approaches, some state 50:50, while others combine academic knowledge, practical tools and the opportunities for the students to apply their knowledge during their study time.

Based on our data as shared by participants, most of the alumni of these programs turn to employment at a number of sectors: NGOs, diplomacy, UN, OSCE or EU institutions; within those international bodies, some alumni found themselves working for the UNHCR, Human Rights Watch or Amnesty International, but some of them continued their aca-

demic paths into their PhDs and, later, towards academic lecturing professions. Possibly and quite expectedly, interview participants from the institutions more opened to classical Human Rights paradigm stated that their alumni gravitate more towards high ranks in diplomacy, or to the positions in the UN and EU – basically, towards the professional context in which peacebuilding is tightly interconnected with human rights discourse. One of the professors, following such an approach, directly says:

> *"Nowadays we have diplomats, high-ranking officers of the UN or the EU, of the OSCE, people working for the UNHCR, for both local and international NGOs such as Human Rights Watch and Amnesty International among our alumni ... Due to the recent situation ... for example, we've had a number of alumni working in organisations for assisting migrants, asylum seekers and refugees, both on the government and NGO side."*

Other schools, with different positions towards the gravitational node of peacebuilding and human rights nexus, express different kind of data when it comes to alumni professions and employment, so one of the interviewees states that the alumni find their employment in „mostly NGOs, and a lot go on to PhD research."

However, even in schools where the critical stance towards Human Rights education in peacebuilding studies is quite strong, the alumni often find jobs in „government positions, some in EU institutions, some have gone into the NGO sector, a few have gone into the military, but primarily government and NGOs", or „in international NGOs, community organisations, government and local authority positions, and people that move to politics, middle or high level politics, as high as in Parliament". It seems that, regardless of the school's position on Human Rights education in peacebuilding, alumni are nevertheless finding jobs in the organisations with a strong influence of human rights discourse and context – but it can also be in order to bring in a critical position and change. As one of the professors shared:

> *"Primarily, we aim to help students make sense of what is going on in the global context. The skills and knowledge we teach them serves their professional development and allows them to approach their current challenges in a more critical and analytical way."*

The sampled MA programs in peacebuilding we reviewed, indeed, are quite diverse, but on the other hand, they are all based on a more or less critical approach. All of the interviewees stressed the importance for academic knowledge to be applied in a practical kind of sense, and all expressed a thought that theory and practice should go hand in hand. The biggest difference among the programmes is related to their academic, practical, critical, and political attitude towards Human rights/Human rights education, so we see this point as a particularly sensitive and an important one, and we recommend our project continues to explore these variations not only in terms of teachings and curriculums but also through the discourses available today and critical discussions. Human rights have only moved to the forefront of global discussions in the 1970s, and since were even invoked as the guiding rationale of the foreign policy of states (Moyn 2010). In his critical analysis of the rise of human rights discourses as a prominent ideology he traces its appearances and practices. Those in many ways echo other fields in the social sciences, as well as the interdisciplinary field of peace and conflict studies. Tracing the rise and institutionalisation of human rights international regimes and discourses, in light of more polarisation, internal conflicts/divisions, populism and nationalism globally, should stand at the heart of our shared critical inquiry.

Conclusion

The SHARINPEACE initiative underscores the importance of integrating human rights and peacebuilding within European Peace and Conflict Studies (PCS) curricula, acknowledging both the synergies and tensions between these fields. Based on findings from current programme evaluations and academic interviews, this report recommends that PCS curricula adopt a balanced approach that includes both critical and affirmative perspectives on human rights. Integrating human rights education requires sensitivity to local contexts while addressing global standards, aligning with a "local turn" that respects regional complexities. Such an approach could help overcome criticisms of human rights as solely a Western liberal construct and ensure its relevance in diverse peacebuilding settings.

It is recommended that future PCS modules be designed to embed human rights topics within broader peacebuilding subjects rather than restricting them to isolated courses. This can be achieved through courses on transitional justice, migration, gender studies, and community engagement, which would help students appreciate the interplay between rights and peacebuilding. Practically, PCS programmes should prioritise experiential learning opportunities, such as simulations and internships, allowing students to apply theoretical knowledge in real-world scenarios. Developing partnerships with non-academic organisations, such as NGOs and international institutions, could further enhance students' exposure to the practical challenges of human rights in peacebuilding.

Furthermore, universities should strengthen exchange programmes and cooperation with international institutions, although institutional flexibility will be essential to address logistical barriers. Increasing lecturer diversity, involving practitioners from fields like diplomacy and advocacy, would enrich learning and connect theory with practice.

Appendix

Appendix A

Institutions and programmes considered for selection

1. Security and Peace Studies - Faculty of Political Science, University of Sarajevo - Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina.
2. Peace, Security and Development - Faculty of Political Science, University of Belgrade - Belgrade, Serbia.
3. Conflict Analysis and Management - Conflict Studies Center, Babes-Bolyai University - Cluj-Napoca, Romania.
4. European Regional Master's Programme in Democracy and Human Rights in Southeast Europe - University of Bologna/University of Sarajevo - Sarajevo, BiH/Bologna, Italy.
5. Conflict and Democracy Studies - Faculty of Social Studies, Masaryk University - Brno, Czechia.
6. Strategic Peace and Conflict Studies - Collegium Civitas University, Warsaw, Poland.
7. Peace and Conflict Studies - Uppsala University - Uppsala, Sweden.

8. Peace and Conflict Transformation - UiT The Arctic University of Norway - Tromsø, Norway.

9. Peace and Conflict Studies - Phillip University of Marburg/University of Kent - Marburg, Germany/Canterbury, UK.

10. Peace, Justice and Development - Leiden Law School, Leiden University - Leiden, The Netherlands.

11. Conflict Resolution and Peacebuilding - School of Government and International Affairs, Durham University - Durham, UK.

12. Peace and Conflict Studies - Faculty of Arts and Humanities, Coventry University - Coventry, UK.

13. Advanced Practice in Peacebuilding and Conflict Resolution - School of Social Sciences, Faculty of Management, Law and Social Sciences, University of Bradford - Bradford, UK.

14. Conflict Resolution and Reconciliation - School of Religion, Trinity College Dublin - Belfast, UK.

15. Peace and Conflict Studies - School of Applied Social and Policy Science, Faculty of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences, Ulster University - Coleraine, NI, UK.

16. Conflict Transformation and Social Justice - Queen's University Belfast - Belfast, NI, UK.

17. Human rights and Conflict Management - Sant'Anna School of Advanced Studies, Pisa - Pisa, Italy.

18. International Relations - Conflict Studies and Human Rights - Faculty of Humanities, University of Utrecht - Utrecht, The Netherlands.

19. MA programme in Peace, Mediation and Conflict Research – Tampere Peace Research Institute – Tampere University – Tampere, Finland

Appendix B

Institutions selected for contact

1. Security and Peace Studies - Faculty of Political Science, University of Sarajevo - Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina.

2. Peace, Security and Development - Faculty of Political Science, University of Belgrade - Belgrade, Serbia.

3. Conflict Analysis and Management - Conflict Studies Center, Babes-Bolyai University - Cluj-Napoca, Romania.

4. Conflict and Democracy Studies - Faculty of Social Studies, Masaryk University - Brno, Czechia.

5. Strategic Peace and Conflict Studies - Collegium Civitas University, Warsaw, Poland.

6. Peace and Conflict Studies - Uppsala University - Uppsala, Sweden.

7. Peace and Conflict Transformation - UiT The Arctic University of Norway - Tromsø, Norway.

8. Peace and Conflict Studies - Phillip University of Marburg/University of Kent - Marburg, Germany/Canterbury, UK.

9. Conflict Resolution and Peacebuilding - School of Government and International Affairs, Durham University - Durham, UK.

10. Peace and Conflict Studies - Faculty of Arts and Humanities, Coventry University - Coventry, UK

11. Advanced Practice in Peacebuilding and Conflict Resolution - School of Social Sciences, Faculty of Management, Law and Social Sciences, University of Bradford - Bradford, UK.

12. Conflict Resolution and Reconciliation - School of Religion, Trinity College Dublin - Belfast, UK.

13. Peace and Conflict Studies - School of Applied Social and Policy Science, Faculty of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences, Ulster University - Coleraine, NI, UK.

14. Conflict Transformation and Social Justice - Queen's University Belfast - Belfast, NI, UK.

15. Human rights and Conflict Management - Sant'Anna School of Advanced Studies, Pisa - Pisa, Italy.

16. International Relations - Conflict Studies and Human Rights - Faculty of Humanities, University of Utrecht - Utrecht, The Netherlands.

17. MA programme in Peace, Mediation and Conflict Research – Tampere Peace Research Institute – Tampere University – Tampere, Finland

Appendix C

List of participants (live interviews or via questionnaire [participant 6 & 7])

1. Durham University
2. Coventry University
3. Scuola Superiore Sant'Anna
4. Collegium Civitas University
5. Faculty of Political Science, University of Belgrade
6. Babes-Bolyai University
7. Trinity College Dublin at Belfast

Appendix D

Interview guidelines (questions)

1. Please introduce yourself and your position within this study program.
2. What are the aims of the program?
3. What is the structure of the program?
4. What would be the core values of this study program?
5. How would you describe your students, or those interested in your program
6. How would you describe your lecturers, or those engaged in the program?
7. What is the approach to peace and conflict studies you build your curriculum on?
8. Do you have courses that bridge between issues of peacebuilding and/or human rights?
9. If so, what are the themes and aspects taught?
10. Additional questions we may ask as related to the nexus of human rights and peacebuilding:
11. What are the resources you recommend to the students during the courses (books, digital sources, online sources, communication with professors or guest speakers etc)?
12. Are you using/promoting some digital tools for teaching/learning?
13. Do you have distance learning students? What are their experiences?

14. Do you have guest speakers during the program? Please tell us more about it and why it is important (if it is).

15. Do you foster cooperation with other academic institutions or programs? Please tell us more about that.

16. Do you foster cooperation with non-governmental organizations, or the civil sector? Please tell us more about that.

17. Do you foster exchange programs for your students or lecturers? If yes, what are the experiences?

18. How important is theoretical knowledge, and how important are practical skills within your study program? Are they positioned separately or intertwining? Why is it so?

19. Do you have practical implementation practice within your curricula?

20. In what kind of professional positions are your alumni engaged in, do you have information about it?

21. Do you see this program relevant to the current sociocultural or geopolitical context, and if yes, how?