



**REPORT**  
**of the Expert Panel**  
**on the**  
**RE-ACCREDITATION OF**  
**The Faculty of Humanities and Social Science in Split**

**Date of the site visit:**  
**07. - 09.04.2014.**

**Date of publication**  
**09.04.2014.**

## Contents

<b>INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>SHORT DESCRIPTION OF THE EVALUATED INSTITUTION .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>CONCLUSIONS OF THE EXPERT PANEL.....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>ADVANTAGES OF THE INSTITUTION.....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>DISADVANTAGES OF THE INSTITUTION.....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>FEATURES OF GOOD PRACTICE.....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT .....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>DETAILED ANALYSIS OF INSTITUTIONAL COMPLIANCE TO THE STANDARDS AND CRITERIA FOR RE-ACCREDITATION .....</b>	<b>13</b>
Institutional management and quality assurance.....	13
Study programmes.....	14
Students .....	13
Teachers .....	15
Scientific and professional activity.....	17
International cooperation and mobility.....	18
Resources: administration, space, equipment and finances.....	18

## INTRODUCTION

This report on the re-accreditation of the Faculty of Humanities and Social Science in Split was written by the Expert Panel appointed by the Agency for Science and Higher Education, on the basis of the self-evaluation of the institution and supporting documentation and a visit to the institution.

Re-accreditation procedure performed by the Agency for Science and Higher Education (ASHE), a public body listed in EQAR (European Quality Assurance Register for Higher Education) and ENQA (European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education) full member, is obligatory once in five years for all higher education institutions working in the Republic of Croatia, in line with the Act on Quality Assurance in Higher Education.

The Expert Panel is appointed by the ASHE Accreditation Council, an independent expert body, to perform an independent peer review based evaluation of the institution and their study programs.

The report contains:

- a brief analysis of the institutional advantages and disadvantages,
- a list of good practices found at the institution,
- recommendations for institutional improvement and measures to be implemented in the following period (and checked within a follow-up procedure), and
- detailed analysis of the compliance to the Standards and Criteria for Re-Accreditation (...).

The members of the Expert Panel were:

- Professor Katrin Boeckh, Ludwig-Maximilians Universität München, Germany
- Professor Jan Fellerer, University of Oxford, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
- Prof. Francesco Capello, University of Kent, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
- Professor Carlinda Leite, Faculty of Psychology and Sciences of Education University of Porto, Portugal
- Professor Patrick Baert, Department of Sociology, University of Cambridge, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
- Petra Glavor Petrović, student, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb, Croatia
- Iva Lulić, student, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb, Croatia

In the analysis of the documentation, site visit and writing of the report the Panel was supported by the ASHE staff:

- Vlatka Šušnjak Kuljiš, coordinator, ASHE
- Frano Pavić, coordinator, ASHE
- Goran Briški, translator, ASHE

During the visit to the Institution the Expert Panel held meetings with the representatives of the following groups:

- The Management;
- The representatives of the Quality Assurance Board;
- Vice-dean for education and student matters;
- Vice-dean for research and international cooperation;
- The project leaders, PhD programmes coordinators and with Head of The Studia Mediterranea Centre for Interdisciplinary Research;
- The Heads of Departments;
- The lecturers;
- The students;
- The PhD students working as TAs and with assistants

The Expert Panel also had a tour of the library, IT rooms, student register desk, and the classrooms at The Faculty of Humanities and Social Science in Split, where they held a brief question and answer session with the students who were present.

Upon completion of re-accreditation procedure, the Accreditation Council renders its opinion on the basis of the Re-accreditation Report, an Assessment of Quality of the higher education institution and the Report of Fulfilment of Quantitative Criteria which is acquired by the Agency's information system.

Once the Accreditation Council renders its opinion, the Agency issues an Accreditation Recommendation by which the Agency recommends to the Minister of Science, Education and Sports to:

1. **issue a confirmation** to the higher education institution which confirms that the higher education institution meets the requirements for performing the higher education activities or parts of activities, in case the Accreditation Recommendation is positive,
2. **deny a license** for performing the higher education activities or parts of activities to the higher education institution, in case the Accreditation Recommendation is negative, or
3. **issue a letter of recommendation** for the period up to three (3) years in which period the higher education institution should remove its deficiencies. For the higher education institution

the letter of recommendation may include the suspension of student enrolment for the defined period.

The Accreditation Recommendation also includes an Assessment of Quality of the higher education institution as well as recommendations for quality development

## **SHORT DESCRIPTION OF THE EVALUATED INSTITUTION**

**NAME OF HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTION:** The Faculty of Humanities and Social Science, University of Split

**ADDRESS:** Sinjska 2, Split, Croatia

**NAME OF THE HEAD OF HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTION:** Professor Aleksandar Jakir Ph.D.

**ORGANISATIONAL STRUCTURE:** Dean, Vice-Deans, Heads of Departments, Faculty Council, Department Council, Ethics Committee, Heads of Centres.

Faculty has 10 (ten) Departments and 1 (one) independent chair:

- The Department of Art History
- The Department of Croatian Language and Literature
- The Department of English Language and Literature
- The Department of History
- The Department of Italian Language and Literature
- The Department of Pedagogy
- The Department of Philosophy
- The Department of Pre-school Education
- The Department of Sociology
- The Department of Teacher Training
- The Independent Chair in Psychology

Faculty comprises the following Centres:

- The Centre for Research and Development in Lifelong Education (CIRCO)
- The Studia Mediterranea Centre for Interdisciplinary Research

- The Centre for Croatian Studies Abroad
- The Centre for Student Counselling
- The Centre for Integrative Bioethics

**LIST OF STUDY PROGRAMMES:**

Undergraduate study programmes:

- Croatian Language and Literature (double major)
- English Language and Literature (double major)
- Italian Language and Literature (double major)
- History (double major)
- Sociology (single major)
- Philosophy (double major)
- Art History (double major)
- Pedagogy (double major)
- Early Childhood and Pre-school Education (single major)

Integrated undergraduate and graduate study programme

Teacher Education (single major)

Graduate study programmes:

- Croatian Language and Literature (double major)
- English Studies (single and double major)

- Italian Studies (double major)
- History (double major)
- Sociology (single major)
- Philosophy (double major)
- Art History (double major)
- Pedagogy (double major)

Postgraduate Study Programmes:

- Humanities Postgraduate Doctoral University Study Programme
- Probation Treatment Postgraduate Specialist University Study Programme

**NUMBER OF STUDENTS:** According to the Self-evaluation document they have 1876 full-time students.

**NUMBER OF TEACHERS:** According to Self-evaluation document they have 83 full-time teachers (60 appointed into scientific-teaching grade and 23 appointed into teaching grade) and 16 assistants.

**NUMBER OF SCIENTISTS:** 60 scientists elected to grades

**TOTAL BUDGET** (in HRK): 31.360.496,00 HRK (4.181.399,00 EUR)

**MSES FUNDING** (percentage): 28.647.102,66 ( 3.819.613,00 EUR) **91% from State budget**

**OWN FUNDING** (percentage): **9%**

**SHORT DESCRIPTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTION:**

College of Pedagogy was the oldest higher education institution established on 24 March 1945. This institution witnessed a series of changes in its sixty-year history regarding its programmes, organisation and status. It existed as an independent institution and a legal entity from its



foundation (as the College of Pedagogy and the Academy of Pedagogy) until 1974, when several higher education institutions joined together to form the University of Split. Between 1990-1998 humanities and social sciences study programmes were carried out at the Faculty of Natural Sciences, Mathematics and Education of the University of Split. Late in 1998, a Regulation of the Government of the Republic of Croatia removed the Primary Education Studies and Pre-school Education Studies from that Faculty. That is how the Primary School Teacher Training College was founded as an independent organisational unit of the University of Split. The Humanities Department was founded in 2001 as a subsidiary of the University of Split, with three core study programmes (Double Major programmes) Croatian Language and Literature, English Language and Literature and Italian Language and Literature, along with the off-campus History study programme of the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences at the University of Zagreb which started in the academic year 2003/2004, based on an agreement between the University of Split and the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences at the University of Zagreb. The permit to set up and teach the university study programme in Sociology at the University of Split was issued on 30 August 2004 (file no. 533-07-04-1). On 30 September 2004 the Senate of the University of Split accepted "the proposed university undergraduate study programme in Sociology at the nascent Department of Sociology". The study programme eventually joined other departments that would soon give birth to the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences.

On 6 October 2005, the Primary School Teacher Training College and the Department of Humanities of the University of Split were joined into a new institution – The Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences in Split, which then also marked the beginning of new study programmes and departments: Sociology, Philosophy and Art History. In the academic year 2007/08 the first generation of students enrolled in the undergraduate Pedagogy study programme, and as of the academic year 2008/09 there are also the independent university undergraduate and graduate History study programmes at the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences in Split. The university graduate study programme in Psychology is awaiting accreditation. On 16th March 2012 the Humanities Postgraduate Doctoral University Study Programme was inaugurated at a ceremony attended by the President of the Republic of Croatia – 23 students were enrolled at the time, one of which has already been awarded a doctoral degree. Furthermore, on 6th March 2013 the Probation Treatment Postgraduate Specialist Study Programme was inaugurated at a ceremony attended by the President of the Republic of Croatia who, on the occasion, also held the inaugural lecture.

## **CONCLUSIONS OF THE EXPERT PANEL**

### ***ADVANTAGES OF THE INSTITUTION***

1. Partly because of the small numbers of students, there is a strong informal network between academics and students. Academics can be contacted whenever needed and are very helpful. This informal network is very effective.
2. The teaching is of a good standard.
3. The institution has a clear profile. For instance, it is centred round the Mediterranean theme, and various departments have developed a distinctive curriculum both at undergraduate and postgraduate level.
4. The students are enthusiastic and more than satisfied with the courses provided.
5. The institution cooperates with the city and the region, and it fulfils its mission as a major intellectual centre promoting the local heritage in its Mediterranean context.

### ***DISADVANTAGES OF THE INSTITUTION***

1. The academics have a very high teaching load and this makes it difficult to carry out internationally recognised research.
2. Although there is research of an international standard, it is limited. The procedures for monitoring and encouraging research are limited.
3. Credits obtained abroad on the Erasmus scheme are not always recognised at the University of Split. Students are not properly informed about which credits will be recognised.
4. Research resources are limited. The faculty library has a small collection, and journal databases are also limited.
5. The career prospects of PhD students and post-docs are not adequately addressed, not even considering the current financial constraints.

## ***FEATURES OF GOOD PRACTICE***

1. There are intense, regular contacts between professors and students. Swift action is taken when the students need assistance or have questions.
2. There is very strong support for extracurricular activities.
3. Particular concern is given to students with special needs. This is a considerable achievement given the problems with space and the current financial constraints.

## ***RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT***

### **1. Management of the Higher Education Institution and Quality Assurance**

- The institution should implement more rigorous procedures for monitoring and improving research quality.

### **2. Study Programmes**

- Computer and library resources will need to be improved.

### **3. Students**

- The panel would recommend the institution puts in place a career service.
- It would be advisable to have an alumni database and alumni club.

### **4. Teachers**

- The teaching load should be lowered if possible.
- There should be a consistent policy across the faculty that ensures that most of the teaching is provided by permanent academics. Research or teaching assistants or visiting lecturers should not be used to fill gaps in the teaching provision.

### **5. Scientific and Professional Activity**

- The institution should ensure that there are more publications of international standard.
- Procedures should be put in place to reward academics with an international research reputation.
- An overarching research strategy at Faculty level might be further developed. This would be beneficial for the research profile of the institution, and could be helpful in the application process for European and international grants.

## **6. International Cooperation and Mobility**

- The institution should inform students who plan to go abroad under the Erasmus scheme which credits/courses will be recognised at the University of Split. The institution should make an effort to recognise credits obtained abroad whenever possible.
- The institution should offer further support for staff to make research trips or attend international conferences.

## **7. Resources, Administration, Space, Equipment and Finance**

- The faculty should obtain proper office and teaching space. A central building will be important. The panel supports the current plans for a new building. Students with special needs should be taken in mind whilst developing this building project.
- The panel suggests a multi-media lab for language learning.
- The panel would recommend that, if possible within the legal structure, the faculty is able to manage its own budget.
- Serious thought should be given to centralising the library catalogue and developing the collection. Library holdings should be significantly expanded.

# DETAILED ANALYSIS OF INSTITUTIONAL COMPLIANCE TO THE STANDARDS AND CRITERIA FOR RE-ACCREDITATION

## Institutional management and quality assurance

1.1 The self-evaluation includes brief comments on the long-term mission and strategy of the Faculty (pp. 38-39). There are elements of specific long-term strategic planning, such as the focus on the theme of a 'Mediterranean habitus' and collaborative work with the engineering department on the modelling of heritage in the framework of HORIZON 2020. In other parts, the long-term mission and strategy remains more generic and is not as specific as it could be. The assessment panel recognises that it is difficult for a young institution to determine specific long-term goals. There was mention of the current financial situation as a further difficulty. However, the assessment panel is of the opinion that the formulation of a long-term strategic plan is not mainly, or perhaps not even predominantly, contingent upon money. The institution has defined certain short-term, annual operational goals, such as a regular check-up on funded research projects. We also noted that there was good cooperation between the Faculty Dean and the departments in discussing strategic goals.

1.2 All the relevant legal documents are in place. The Faculty's overall organisational structure and processes are well established, with the Faculty Council as the main body (pp. 20, 32 of the self-evaluation document). The members of the assessment panel had difficulties in identifying the difference between the department of teacher training, the department of pedagogy, and the department of pre-school education. Apart from departments, there are also centres, some of them academic, some of them administrative. There appears to be clear decision making structures. The Vice-deans working with the Dean is a good set-up to share and take decisions at the top of the management structure of the Faculty.

1.3 We only had a brief opportunity to see the strategy document of the University. Generally speaking, we received information on how the Faculty strategy aligns with that of the wider University with respect to exchange and mobility, ethical codes, internal quality, assurance policies, research excellence policies, employment and promotion procedures. It was clear how Faculty and University strategies align in the areas of doctoral programmes and, as far as applicable, resource sharing.

1.4 Most of the programmes are very new. Some of them have already undergone some changes and adjustments. The teacher training programmes are in line with international standards. The Ph.D. programme is general, rather than discipline-specific, which has merits, such as interdisciplinarity, but also potential pitfalls, such as lack of discipline-specific methodological training.

1.5 There is an institutional Quality Policy, and there are well established internal quality assurance procedures. Given the age of the institution there is inevitably little historic data on quality assurance. Existing day-to-day quality assurance is predominantly internal, while external quality insurance is largely relegated to the re-accreditation process. The Quality Assurance Board mentioned plans to solicit external opinions about teaching standards in

the Faculty. There is, it seems, good involvement of students in quality assurance procedures. At the same time, the assessment panel noticed some lack of clarity as to what exactly happens with students' questionnaires, and how the Faculty acts upon them, apart from informal meetings between the Dean and any teaching staff, both internal as well as external, where there may be concerns about teaching standards. There was mention of other stakeholders from outside the University in quality assurance, such as future employers and institutions in the region. The panel thought of this as a very good idea, but it was not clear whether there were any efforts to put this into practice.

1.6 It was brought to the panel's attention that teaching in higher education in Croatia did in general still put emphasis on acquiring and reproducing knowledge. The Faculty wishes to change this culture and introduce stronger emphasis on critical study and discussion. The institution is also clearly aware of the need for further teaching training for their staff. It was reassuring to learn that the evaluation of teaching does not only include established staff, but also contractual, external or part-time teachers. There is as yet no self-evaluation of teachers. There is no peer-review or observation of classes and lectures, even though there is clear awareness of the need for this.

1.7 There was limited information on mechanisms for monitoring and improving the quality of research. As the Faculty is young, it is necessarily still developing such mechanisms. The panel members were not certain how, or if, the Faculty monitors indicators of research excellence for each researcher. Academic promotion is contingent on research out-put, but since all promotions have currently been halted there is little incentive. Members of the Faculty are strongly encouraged to be research-active, but there does not seem to be an annual plan for participation in conferences, workshops, seminars and no annual publication plan. Under the current financial circumstances, there appears to be little room to be able to offer incentives for research excellence (cf. p. 245).

1.8 The Faculty has an ethics board. Members of the assessment panel heard an example of its workings, which testifies to the efficiency of the mechanisms. There is a 'Code of ethics' (cf. p. 246 of the self-evaluation document). However, it was not clear to the panel how well known it is within the Faculty. There is also a student ombudsperson.

## **Study programmes**

2.1 Detailed study programmes are in place. The Faculty has already revised some of these. The teaching staff has the possibility to submit for approval changes to programmes. This needs to be approved by the department and, if more than 20% of the programme is subject to change, by the Faculty Council and by the University. Students can submit comments on study programmes on the student questionnaires. There does not seem to be any possibility for other stakeholders from outside the university to comment on study programmes.

2.2 There are detailed data on enrolment quotas in the self-evaluation document. The quota appears to be handled with some flexibility and can be re-negotiated with the Ministry of Higher Education. Currently, there is no alumni tracking, which would be the main basis of analysing the society's need for graduates in the University's study programmes. All departments of the Faculty lowered their quotas in response to difficulties in the labour market, but this was done on a somewhat impressionistic basis, rather than based on

proper data of employment opportunities for graduates. The Ministry monitors employment opportunities by profession, but not specific to individual HEI.

2.3 Student pass rates are satisfactory. The teacher-student ratio varies from department to department. Detailed relevant information was made available to the panel. Teachers and students were satisfied with the ratio, typically an average of ca. 10-20 participants in seminars, 25-30 participants in lectures.

2.4 The Faculty provides general teaching objectives and learning outcomes for degree programmes. These are not detailed and rather generic. Course descriptions, on the other hand, are detailed and explicit.

2.5 Each course is examined in a specific way, either orally, by written examination, by coursework, continuous assessment, or a combination thereof. Assessment of students is comprehensive, varied and, apart from marks, includes elements of more detailed feedback. However, the Faculty does not appear to monitor systematically whether the learning outcomes correspond to the general teaching objectives as stated in the programme and course descriptions.

2.6 There are clear norms for the allocation of ECTS. These norms reflect a realistic estimate of student workload. The ECTS credit allocation may be changed in view of student comments, and this has happened already. There were no comments by students on excessive workload.

2.7 The study programmes consist of compulsory and optional courses. They are in line with European and national curriculum frameworks. Students expressed satisfaction with the content and quality of their study programmes. Teaching staff strives towards integrating new scholarly and scientific discoveries in their respective areas.

2.8 The programmes and courses taught include a good variety of different teaching and learning methods, ranging from imparting knowledge in lectures to critical engagement with contents in seminars and classes. The Faculty encourages the ongoing shift towards independent and more varied forms of student learning. A good range of different learning materials is used.

2.9 The current state is not satisfactory, presumably due to funding constraints.

2.10 Students training to become teachers visit special training schools, where there are then often employment opportunities after completion of the course. There are internship opportunities in libraries, archives and museums. Students are given opportunities to participate in translation projects. However, there do not seem to be any other business partnerships or cooperation with the private sector.

## **Students**

3.1 In the selection process, the Matura results seem to be the most important criterion taken into consideration. There are no longer any admission tests, therefore the institution has little autonomy over admission. For this reason, demands and expectations in terms of the students' future careers are not significantly assessed. The dropout rate is very low.

3.2 Students agree that in general teachers are extremely supportive when it comes to extracurricular activities. They are encouraged to publish student magazines, to attend conferences, to take part in the organization of art and cultural festivals, to pursue individual research on cultural topics they feel passionate about.

3.3 There is no formally-implemented structure of student services in place. However, students have stressed that they have the opportunity to discuss and address their needs and problems informally because of their good and close relationship with their teachers. No further, formal provision of student support would seem to be required as far as their academic career is concerned. However, a careers service would be beneficial in view of the employment difficulties raised by their majority.

3.4 Students have the possibility to appeal against grades they perceived as unfair, and they have provided instances of cases when the grades in question were changed. Students were mostly satisfied with the feedback received for their exams and coursework, though this is not yet formalized (e.g. through feedback forms).

3.5 Professors often remain in touch with at least some of their former students, but this occurs within the frame of their personal relations. No alumni organization has been established as yet, but it is currently being planned.

3.6 There is a university fair where information is provided to the public. Some of the academic staff is engaged in school visits where they inform pupils on their study programmes. There is a Faculty webpage in place, which is certainly useful in terms of its visibility. The cultural magazines written by students also contribute to the dissemination of information regarding the Faculty.

3.7 While undergraduates in general have the opportunity to express their opinion freely on matters concerning them, they do not always appear to have sufficient knowledge of the context they wish to comment on. In contrast, postgraduate students appear to be extremely knowledgeable in terms of the procedures that most affect them (i.e. employment). However, they strongly feel that they do not have a say in this respect, and they are not confident at all that they might influence the relevant decision making processes in any way. In addition, they do not feel that they are adequately represented by members of staff on permanent contracts.

3.8 Students feel that their feedback on teachers and courses is adequately taken into consideration, and that this has often led to an improvement of the teaching offer.

## **Teachers**

4.1. The professors have the necessary qualifications (PhD). In a couple of disciplines, however, a considerable part of the teaching is not provided by permanent staff but by research and project assistants as well as visiting academics. The evaluation panel not certain how this is reflected in the listed teaching load.



4.2. Information is provided about research trips abroad by teaching staff and about their attendance at international conferences. There is a lack of compelling evidence that research excellence is properly rewarded, for instance, through decreased teaching loads or leadership positions.

4.3. The teaching-student ratios are within the limits set by the Ordinance. The class sizes are not too large, which means that the students are able to participate fully.

4.4. The head of department, in consultation with the relevant academics, ensures that the teaching they provide is in line with their competences and research experiences. There are, however, few professional development programmes available to help academics apply for international grants, assist them in writing in English or generally help them enhance their international visibility.

4.5. The precise amount of the academics' workload seems to be the product of their negotiations with their Heads of Department. It is clear, however, that a considerable number of academics have a teaching load that exceeds by more than 20% the maximum teaching load as stipulated in their contracts.

4.6. Based on table 4.3. of the self-evaluation document (pp. 179ff.), most the academics at the University of Split do not have commitments elsewhere. However, a few academics employed in the institution seem to have commitments elsewhere that exceed 33% of a full-time load, whilst it appears that they have a full-time contract with the University of Split. It might well be the case, however, that the statistics provided do not do justice to the complexity of the individual cases involved.

## **Scientific and professional activity**

5.1. There is a plan of scientific and professional activity in the self-evaluation report (see p. 193) but it is quite generic. During the evaluation panel visit it became clear that there was some strategic thinking about both European projects (e.g. Marie Curie, Horizon) and Croatian government initiatives, but the concrete plans still remained rather vague. During the visit, the Ordinance report was not available. However, the panel recognises that, in comparison with the natural sciences, it is more difficult to have a coherent and collectively binding research agenda in the humanities and social sciences.

5.2. There is clear evidence of collaboration within Croatia (Rijeka & Zagreb), the Mediterranean (Rome & Trieste) and other universities in Europe (Lyon, Graz & Konstanz).

5.3. The academics employed have the right institutional credentials (PhD). However, they have a high teaching load and in some areas their publication record is less impressive than it might be in more favourable circumstances.

5.4. Some academics employed in the institution are clearly very productive. In some areas, however, the number of publications in internationally recognised journals is rather low.

5.5. The evaluation panel is not entirely convinced that effective procedures are in place to reward research-productive academics but the panel is also aware that the current economic constraints have affected the system of promotions. There are sabbatical leave arrangements but the procedures seem rather vague.

5.6. There is evidence of a considerable number of peer-reviewed scientific Croatian publications.

5.7. There are a considerable number of domestic projects and a few European projects. The institution has been relatively successful in applying for Croatian projects. The evaluation panel noted many successful projects centred round the Mediterranean theme. The institution encourages its academics to apply for further funding in the new funding cycle.

5.8. This institution offers courses in pedagogy and organises cultural summer courses. There are some outreach activities: for example, some academics contribute to the science festival.

5.9. The institution has clearly given thought to activities of this kind, in particular language courses. It has stipulated internal regulations, in particular about the amount of extra-academic activities in which the academics can be involved.

5.10. There is a university doctoral programme in place; it's an interdisciplinary endeavour. Lectures and training are provided, and the supervisors are either Associate Professors or Full Professors. Most PhD students are part-time. It is difficult to assess the quality of the programme because it is still very young.

## **International cooperation and mobility**

6.1 A number of international collaborations have been established (e.g. through the Erasmus Programme). A service of student support is guaranteed by the management. The institution is aiming to attract an increasing number of students from across Croatia, and this attempt seems to have been successful until now.

6.2 As stated above, the institution has signed the Erasmus charter. All related activities are currently being carried out.

6.3 There is evidence of a significant number of academics based at the Institution going abroad in recent years to visit foreign universities. However, the documentation provided does not seem to specify the nature of the activities carried out there. Specific policies to encourage

international mobility do not seem to be in place. The self-evaluation reports provided by staff on their return seems rather vague.

6.4 A number of international cooperations are documented in the self-evaluation report. However, the specific nature of the collaborative activities remains unspecified. As highlighted in section 5, international publications do not seem to have been a priority in the research agenda until now. Staff have attended several international conferences. The majority of conferences attended remains however within Croatia. The English version of the website provides some information and contact details of members of staff, but it could be improved by adding personal profiles of staff including research interests, publications etc.

6.5 During interviews with the panel, some faculty members stressed that they were pleased to be able to offer courses in English. This could be an asset in terms of attracting students from abroad. That said, promotional activities aiming to attract students from abroad are quite limited. The number of incoming students is rising, though it might be improved further. The websites are only partly adequate in promoting the activities of the Faculty to foreign students. Croatian language courses are offered to foreign incoming students.

6.6 The website provides very limited information in this respect. Foreign teachers have visited the Institution both in the framework of the Erasmus programme and through other research networks. No student evaluation was reported as far as the quality of these visits is concerned. The duration of the visits was often rather limited, although some academics have been hosted by the Institution for longer periods of time.

6.7 Staff are occasionally able to take advantage of the Erasmus scheme of staff mobility to lecture abroad and visit foreign institutions. Some students complained that the credits achieved at other institutions during their Erasmus period were not recognized at Split University, so that they were forced to resit the exams on their return. Students enrolled in the teacher training program do not feel it advisable to go abroad as it would interfere with the opportunity to teach in local schools. The number of outgoing students has been very low in recent years, but seems to be increasing. Cooperations and projects at European level do not currently seem to be in place, with the exception of Erasmus.

## **Resources: administration, space, equipment and finances**

7.1 The Faculty is currently located in various places. This clearly makes it difficult to provide appropriate learning resources. The Faculty hopes to secure funds to build a new Faculty building on the University campus. The Faculty's current premises for the Humanities departments appear old and tired, even though they are equipped with state-of-the-art equipment. There is a specifically assigned IT room too. There is no particular multi-media laboratory for language teaching. Irrespective of this, short visits to classes suggested that standards of language teaching are high. Library reading rooms provide individual study space. As to the Social Sciences departments, the building itself is good, but it is rented and separate from the Faculty's other buildings. Library resources for learning purposes appear scarce and not as efficiently organised as they could be. E.g., the Faculty library is in two different locations. Its catalogue is separate from the catalogue of the University Library.

7.2 The panel is not certain about the amount of administrative support which is available to the Faculty's teaching staff. The self-evaluation report states that there are 34 administrative,

technical and maintenance employees at the Faculty compared to 160 teaching staff. Some members of the academic staff mentioned that their administrative load was high, while one member of staff acknowledged that a certain administrative burden will be inevitable.

7.3 There is only very brief mention of this in the self-evaluation report (p. 347). The panel did not have any further opportunity to verify this.

7.4. Not applicable.

7.5 An IT room is available to students, and computers were used in the lectures observed by the panel for PowerPoint presentations. Electronic Databases such as Web of Science are already available, and others including JStore and ProjectMUSE will be subscribed to shortly. The Faculty and Departmental libraries, however, seem to be lacking adequate IT resources

7.6 A visit to the main University Library, which seems to hold the majority of items, was unfortunately not included as a part of the site visit of the Panel. The book collection of both the Faculty and the Departmental libraries is very limited for the majority of disciplines. The majority of the books in the Faculty library are included in the reading lists of the courses. The study space is equally limited. The photocopying service appears to be quite efficient, and the staff were helpful. Research active staff conceded that they often need to resort to libraries outside Split as a research tool

7.7 In view of the State Regulations concerning University funding, the Faculty does not seem to be in the position to manage its finances autonomously.

7.8 The institution's own funds (i.e. funds not provided directly by the State) are considerably limited, amounting to about 8% of the total budget. That income originates mostly from PhD fees and private language courses, and is used to cover costs related to teaching, research, and more generally the smooth running of the Faculty.

Date: 8 April 2014