Report
of the Expert Panel
on the REACCREDITATION
of the University Postgraduate (Doctoral) Programme
Pre-Modern History
Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences at the University of Zagreb

Date of the visit:
May 6th 2019

September 2019

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

The Expert Panel appointed by the Agency for Science and Higher Education (ASHE) created this Report on the Re-accreditation of the University Postgraduate (Doctoral) Programme *Pre-Modern History* on the basis of the Self-Evaluation Report of the Programme, other documentation submitted and a visit to the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences at the University of Zagreb.

The Agency for Science and Higher Education (ASHE), a public body listed in EQAR (European Quality Assurance Register for Higher Education) and a full member of ENQA (European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education), re-accredits higher education institutions (hereinafter: HEIs) and their study programmes in line with the Act on Quality Assurance in Science and Higher Education (Official Gazette 45/09) and the Ordinance on the Content of a Licence and Conditions for Issuing a Licence for Performing Higher Education Activity, Carrying out a Study Programme and Re-Accreditation of Higher Education Institutions (OG 24/10). In this procedure parts of activities of higher education institutions and university postgraduate study programmes are re-accredited.

Expert Panel is appointed by the Agency's Accreditation Council, an independent expert body, to carry out independent evaluation of post-graduate university study programmes.

The Report contains the following elements:
- Short description of the study programme,
- The recommendation of the Expert Panel to the Agency's Accreditation Council,
- Recommendations for institutional improvement and measures to be implemented in the following period (and checked within a follow-up procedure),
- A brief analysis of the institutional advantages and disadvantages,
- A list of good practices found at the institution,
- Conclusions on compliance with the prescribed conditions of delivery of a study programme,
- Conclusions on compliance with the criteria for quality assessment.

Members of the Expert Panel for Humanities and Social Sciences:
1. Prof. Alan O'Leary, School of Languages, Cultures and Societies, University of Leeds, United Kingdom,
2. Prof. Tim Woods, Department of English and Creative Writing, University of Aberystwyth, United Kingdom,
3. Prof. Claudia Tiersch, Philosophische Fakultät, Humboldt-Universität Berlin, Germany,
4. Prof. Vladimir Unkovski-Korica, School of Social and Political Sciences, University of Glasgow, United Kingdom,
5. Prof. Bojan Aleksov, School of Slavonic and East European Studies, University College London, United Kingdom,
6. Prof. Kurt Villads Jensen, Stockholms Universitet, Sweden,
7. Prof. Emmerich Kelih, Department of Slavonic Studies, Universität Wien, Austria,
8. Prof. Barbara Sonnenhauser, Universität Zürich, Switzerland,
9. Iuliana Soficaru, doctoral candidate, Central European University, Hungary,

10. Dajana Vasiljevićová, doctoral candidate, Charles University, Czech Republic,
11. Prof. James Wickham, Trinity College Dublin, Ireland,
12. Prof. Gergely László Rosta, Institut für Soziologie, Universität Münster, Germany,
13. Prof. Václav Štětka, Loughborough University, United Kingdom,
14. Ieva Bloma, doctoral candidate, European University Institute, Italy,
15. Nika Đuho, doctoral candidate, Catholic University of Croatia, Croatia.

The higher education institution was visited by the following Expert Panel members:
1. Prof. Alan O'Leary, School of Languages, Cultures and Societies, University of Leeds, United Kingdom,
2. Prof. Tim Woods, Department of English and Creative Writing, University of Aberystwyth, United Kingdom,
3. Prof. Claudia Tiersch, Philosophische Fakultät, Humboldt-Universität Berlin, Germany,
4. Prof. Vladimir Unkovski-Korica, School of Social and Political Sciences, University of Glasgow, United Kingdom,
5. Prof. Bojan Aleksov, School of Slavonic and East European Studies, University College London, United Kingdom,
6. Prof. Kurt Villads Jensen, Stockholms Universitet, Sweden,
7. Prof. Emmerich Kelih, Department of Slavonic Studies, Universität Wien, Austria,
8. Prof. Barbara Sonnenhauser, Universität Zürich, Switzerland,
9. Iuliana Soficaru, doctoral candidate, Central European University, Hungary,
10. Dajana Vasiljevićová, doctoral candidate, Charles University, Czech Republic.

The following Expert Panel members took part in the analysis of the documentation, site visit and writing of the report:
1. Prof. Claudia Tiersch, Philosophische Fakultät, Humboldt-Universität Berlin, Germany,
2. Prof. Kurt Villads Jensen, Stockholms Universitet, Sweden,
3. Iuliana Soficaru, doctoral candidate, Central European University.

The Panel was supported by:
- Marina Matešić, coordinator, ASHE,
- Ivana Rončević, interpreter at the site visit and translator of the report, ASHE.

During the visit to the Institution the Expert Panel held meetings with the representatives of the following groups:
- Management,
- Study programme coordinators,
- Doctoral candidates,
- Teachers and supervisors.

The Expert Panel also had a tour of the library, IT rooms, student register desk and the classrooms.

SHORT DESCRIPTION OF THE STUDY PROGRAMME

Name of the study programme: *Pre-Modern History*
Institution providing the programme: University of Zagreb
Institution delivering the programme: Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences
Scientific area and field: Humanities, History
Place of delivery: Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences
Number of doctoral candidates (all): 28
    Number of HEI funded doctoral candidates: 0 (2 partly funded by the programme based on excellence)
    Number self-funded doctoral candidates: 28 (3 employer-funded)
    Number of inactive doctoral candidates: 3
Number of teachers at the doctoral study: 62 (46 employed, 16 external)

Number of supervisors: As the programme started in 2017**,** 16 supervisors were *proposed* (according to SER) to 12 students, and 18 advisors were appointed to 23 students.

Learning outcomes of the programme:
    LO 1: to approach critically on a higher level (in comparison to the graduate programme) the specialist literature as to understand research concepts
    LO 2: to analyse and compare research theories and paradigms relevant for individual research
    LO 3: to design and implement new theoretical paradigms in individual research
    LO 4: to apply new research methods to individual research
    LO 5: to interpret on a higher level (in comparison to the graduate programme) the qualitative and quantitative source data acquired through individual research
    LO 6: to respect the ethical principles in terms of general social usefulness of individual research
    LO 7: to formulate oral and written reports related to research work using modern forms of research communication (research/academic mode of expression)
    LO 8: to plan and lead research projects
    LO 9: to promote Croatian historical and cultural heritage respecting research, professional and ethical principles and practices

Programme outline: 45-120
Structured/taught part: 45 ECTS (but not all in classical courses)
29 ECTS attained through 3 basic courses during first year;
9 ECTS for elective courses in the second year (3 semester),
4 ECTS for attending Lecture Series throughout the programme
3 ECTS for attending Doctoral Workshops (3rd year)

12 ECTS for Academic practice – presentations, conferences, publishing,
The rest is allocated to research and thesis writing (108 ECTS)

RECOMMENDATION BY THE EXPERT PANEL TO THE ASHE'S ACCREDITATION COUNCIL

Upon the completion of the re-accreditation procedure and the examination of the materials submitted (Self-Evaluation Report, etc.), the visit to the higher education institution and interviews with HEI members in accordance with the visit protocol, the Expert Panel renders its opinion in which it recommends to the Accreditation Council of the Agency the following:

1. **issue a confirmation on compliance** for performing parts of activities.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF THE STUDY PROGRAMME

1. Increase the visibility of the program, by introducing short research exchange programs. Increase the international academic impact of the program and continue working on the promotion on international exchange for students and supervisors as well as on attracting foreign students.
2. Involve students in the programme more – e.g. research from the beginning. Assist self-organization, via improvements of communication, e.g. homepages. Ensure the dissemination of relevant calls for fellowships, grants, and other funding possibilities.
3. Increase the transparency of the research projects and how they are organized and funded.
4. Discuss the employability of doctoral candidates, and how it could be increased during the programme.
5. Encourage candidates to mature in the expertise of project management and funding acquisition especially at EU level.
6. Introduce the possibility for an external member of the PhD evaluation committee to be from abroad.
7. Transparency of the gender balance regarding PhD students and supervisors.
8. Increase activities to attract international applicants, for example summer schools.
9. Encourage and increase the number of courses delivered by external/foreign experts.

ADVANTAGES OF THE STUDY PROGRAMME

1. Great interdisciplinarity, competence on a high level in various periods, disciplines, and theoretical and methodological perspectives.
2. Great enthusiasm from students and staff. Close cooperation on personal level.
3. Head of programme with clear and strong visions, and functioning management structures and rules, for example e-mails response time.
4. Quality of proposals for doctoral projects.
5. The integration of the two former programmes of medieval and early modern history seems to have given several advantages, in shared teaching and synthesis.
6. Students receive ECTS credits for extra-curricular activities.
7. The number and the variety of courses allows freedom and interdisciplinarity, with a strong source language basis.
8. The students and the supervisors are pleased with the structure and content of the program.

9. Great infrastructure, which ensures the same conditions and access to information to all the students.

DISADVANTAGES OF THE STUDY PROGRAMME

1. The special needs of self-financing students should be better recognized.
2. The insufficient possibility to attract students from outside and thereby create an international milieu.
3. Low degree of internationalization: there is a lack of international components, such as recruitment of international researchers as supervisors or co-supervisors or members of the defence committee.
4. That dissertations projects are not defined right from the beginning.
5. That doctoral students are not represented in managing bodies on all levels, not only at the faculty level but also in the doctoral programme.
6. The supervisors do not confirm the feasibility of the draft research projects upon admission of the candidate or upon submission of the application.
7. There is no formal training for potential supervisors and no transparent feedback for the evaluation of the supervisors by the PhD candidates.
8. Lack of specified procedures for how students can apply for funding, for example for participating in international conferences.

EXAMPLES OF GOOD PRACTICE

1. The close relationship between supervisors and students, including that there is a limit to how many students one supervisor can have.
2. Flexibility of choice in suitable courses for candidate's topic.
3. The head of the program is positively minded re-evaluating current praxis, absorb new ideas and to open new possibilities for collaboration.
4. Good collaboration with local research institutes, archives and potential employers.
5. The great weight put upon learning the necessary skills for working with sources, languages, principles of editing, etc.
6. The variety of teaching methods.
7. The wide variety of high research expertise and disciplines that can complement each other, methodologically and theoretically.
8. The contact to research milieus also outside Zagreb University (which could still be increased).
9. Awarding ECTS for scientific activities motivates the candidates.
10. Encouraging students to write many term papers connected to their dissertation topic and to publish them as scientific articles.
11. The requirement of a minimum of two publications in an international journal to complete a PhD thesis and Academic Practice.

COMPLIANCE WITH THE PRESCRIBED CONDITIONS FOR THE DELIVERY OF A STUDY PROGRAMME

Minimal legal conditions:	YES/NO notes
1. Higher education institution (HEI) is listed in the Register of Scientific Organisations in the scientific area of the programme, and has a positive reaccreditation decision on performing higher education activities and scientific activity.	YES
2. HEI delivers programmes in the two cycles leading to the doctoral programme, i.e., first two cycles in the same area and field/fields (for interdisciplinary programmes), and employs a sufficient number of teachers as defined by Article 6 of the Ordinance on the Content of a Licence and Conditions for Issuing a Licence for Performing Higher Education Activity, Carrying out a Study Programme and Re-Accreditation of Higher Education Institutions (OG 24/10).	YES
3. HEI employs a sufficient number of researchers, as defined by Article 7 of the Ordinance on Conditions for Issuing Licence for Scientific Activity, Conditions for Re-Accreditation of Scientific Organisations and Content of Licence (OG 83/2010).	YES
4. At least 50% of teaching as expressed in norm-hours is delivered by teachers employed at the HEI (full-time, elected into scientific-teaching titles).	YES
5. Student: teacher ratio at the HEI is below 30:1.	YES
6. HEI ensures that doctoral theses are public. Note: There are no dissertations in this programme yet, but the dissertations from the former programmes have been made public on the university homepage, except in the cases where the students have decided not to give permission to publish it.	-
7. HEI launches the procedure of revoking the academic title if it is determined that it has been attained contrary to the conditions stipulated for its attainment, by severe violation of the studying rules or based on a doctoral thesis (dissertation) that has proved to be a plagiarism or a forgery according to provisions of the statute or other enactments.	YES
Additional/ recommended conditions of the ASHE Accreditation Council for passing a positive opinion	**YES/NO notes**
1. HEI (or HEIs in joint programmes) has at least five teachers appointed to scientific-teaching titles in the field, or fields relevant for the programme involved in its delivery.	YES
2. In the most recent reaccreditation, HEI had the standard Scientific and Professional Activity marked as at least "partly implemented" (3).	YES
3. The doctoral programme is aligned with the HEI's research strategy.	YES
4. The candidate : supervisor ratio at the HEI is not above 3:1.	- no supervisors have been

	appointed yet.
5. All supervisors meet the following conditions: a) PhD, elected into a scientific title, holds a scientific or a scientific-teaching position and/or has at least two years of postdoctoral research experience; **YES** b) active researcher in the scientific area of the programme, as evidenced by publications, participation in scientific conferences and/or projects in the past five years (table 2, Supervisors and candidates); **YES** c) confirms feasibility of the draft research plan upon admission of the candidate (or submission of the proposal); **The programme has enrolled students twice, 9-11 each time, and rejected two applicants in all, but the most substantial evaluation of the project happens at the submission of the proposal after the first introductory courses have been taken.** d) ensures the conditions (and funding) necessary to implement the candidate's research (in line with the draft research plan) as a research project leader, co-leader, participant, collaborator or in other ways; **With few exceptions, it is not possible to ensure funding to the candidate's research.** e) trained for the role before assuming it (through workshops, co-supervisions etc.); **The trainings system is not formalized into one model, but supervisors have been trained in different ways and are, as far as the evaluation committee is able to judge, all qualified.** f) received a positive opinion of the HEI on previous supervisory work. N/A	YES/NO the remarks concern potential supervisors among the staff, as no supervisors have been appointed yet.
6. All teachers meet the following conditions: a) holds a scientific or a scientific-teaching position; **YES** b) active researcher, recognized in the field relevant for the course (table 1, Teachers). **YES**	YES
All teachers have a scientific or scientific-teaching position, and are active researchers in relevant areas. However, a very few seemed not to have published very much within the field within the latest 5-10 years, but it is actually because the information on the national bibliography webpage, that the teachers link to, need updating. A few of the teachers work outside university, which is important as they contribute with extra competences in specialized areas. A few of the teachers are also experts in the modern period or in fields other than history, which even more contributes to the interdisciplinary nature of the programme and enhances the quality of it.	
7. The supervisor normally does not participate in the assessment committees. According to regulations, the supervisor do not participate in assessing the	YES

dissertation, but is commonly included in the meetings of the assessment committee to answer questions.	
8. The programme ensures that all candidates spend at least three years doing independent research (while studying, individually, within or outside courses), which includes writing the thesis, publishing, participating in international conferences, field work, attending courses relevant for research etc.	YES

QUALITY ASSESSMENT

	Quality assessment ("high level of quality" or "improvements are necessary") and the explanation of the Expert Panel
1. RESOURCES: TEACHERS, SUPERVISORS, RESEARCH CAPACITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE	
1.1. HEI is distinguished by its scientific/ artistic achievements in the discipline in which the doctoral study programme is delivered.	**Improvement are necessary** The programme includes a huge number of researchers of whom very many are recognized experts within their own field of research. The programme as such has been established very recently and has therefore not had any possibility of establishing a scientific reputation. It is important for the future development of the programme, that the management discusses how to describe and define the programme ('sell' it to doctoral students, make it 'visible' to colleagues at other HEIs, in Croatia and internationally) – whether it should have a more clear-cut and limited profile, or whether the profile should be that it is very broad and interdisciplinary. **Improvements** The overwhelming majority of the publications are written in Croatian, and published in Croatian journals. It is common – and important – to publish history and archaeology in your own language in all countries, but it is not helpful to the doctoral students in their future careers. They will need training, and inspiration from the examples of supervisors, in publishing in English. Some of the topics at the study programme are also of such general nature that the research in it would be of interest also outside Croatia, e.g. older Mediterranean cultures, methods in text editing, and similar. The funding of projects that can also provide funding for doctoral students seems inadequate. As such funding will most often be national, this may reflect economic considerations within Croatia, or political prioritization, but it is an important issue that should be addressed directly by the management. Concerned efforts to attract funding outside Croatia is highly recommended.

		Individual researches in the programme have organized conferences and invited researchers from outside, but there is not yet any clearly formulated strategy from the programme concerning how and why to make conferences with external participation.
1.2.	The number and workload of teachers involved in the study programme ensure quality doctoral education.	**High level of quality** For 2017-18, teachers have spent ca 5% of their workload on courses within the study program, so there is capacity for covering more topics, and teaching more students. It is essential, that the course teaching in the programme is counted as part of the normal workload. Supervisors are spending a considerable amount of time on personal contacts and supervision, which they claimed to the evaluation committee not to be counted as part of the normal workload. It seems to be accepted by the teachers, but should in the long perspective be changed to ensure a continuous high engagement and enthusiasm among staff.
1.3.	The teachers are highly qualified researchers who actively engage with the topics they teach, providing a quality doctoral programme.	**High level of quality** In general, teachers are very active and with a high profile of publications. It is, however, unclear if there are any procedures for helping researchers if they for one reason or another are underperforming for a period. That is not an actual or relevant problem now. It is not possible to define precisely to what extent a publication is relevant or not for the study programme. Any historical study can, if the teacher is good enough, be used to illustrate methods and theories that can be transferred to and inspire studies in other areas. This said, the majority of the publications listed by researchers are directly relevant for what they teach. It would still be recommendable to include more studies in comparative methods, and more in areas outside Croatia. The participation in international research programmes is relatively high, but it is often unclear from the material provided by the programme to what extent the researchers have formulated and are leading the research programmes, or to what extent they are participating without any managerial role. From interviews the evaluation panel got the impression that most researchers are participating in rather than initiating international research projects.

1.4. The number of supervisors and their qualifications provide for quality in producing the doctoral thesis.	**High level of quality** Arguments above.
1.5. The HEI has developed methods of assessing the qualifications and competencies of teachers and supervisors.	**High level of quality** The programme has procedures for assessing qualifications and performance of teachers, based among other things on surveys and questionnaires, and decided in groups with broad representations of all stakeholders. However, it is not always totally transparent to which extent the feedback to teachers is standardized and consistent. Is possible dissatisfaction always communicated to the teacher? The rate of completion of candidates cannot be calculated, as the programme has only been running for two years.
1.6. The HEI has access to high-quality resources for research, as required by the programme discipline.	**Improvements are necessary** The doctoral students lacking some of the basic research facilities as common and individual study areas, common platforms on an institutional network, and similar. The access to international databases and on-line journals and publications is not optimal, but dependent upon the university's policy and not on the programme. The libraries at the university and the near access to the national library are excellent. The doctoral students have a rich opportunity to engage with teachers and researchers outside the history department and outside Zagreb University. International scholars have been invited to give lectures and hold seminars, and it is the intent to continue to do so even more regularly in the future. The programme has positive experiences with web-based seminars with other research milieus.
2. INTERNAL QUALITY ASSURANCE OF THE PROGRAMME	
2.1. The HEI has established and accepted effective procedures for proposing, approving and delivering doctoral education. The procedures include identification of scientific/ artistic, cultural, social and economic needs.	**High level of quality** The Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences follows the procedure by which the Faculty Council is a competent body where the programme proposals are discussed and after being accepted are sent into further accreditation procedure at the University level. The programmes that have been accepted by the Faculty Council have to be additionally validated by the Council of Humanities and Social Sciences Area and then by the University Senate. The mission of the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences is

	to promote the university education in all areas of humanities and social sciences, encourage scientific activity, top quality researches and publication of the research results. The programme is not directly addressing the recommendations from previous evaluations, since it has been launched after the latest evaluation of doctoral programmes at the Faculty of Humanities at Zagreb University. It is, however, clear that the present program has taken into consideration some of the recommendations given to the former programmes of which this is a continuation or an amalgamation; for example concerning extent of courses and their content, internationalization and much other. The programme addresses and is intended to contribute actively to the profile areas defined by the faculty, including scientific, cultural, social and economic needs.
2.2. The programme is aligned with the HEI research mission and vision, i.e. research strategy.	**High level of quality** The SER states, that the new Postgraduate Doctoral Programme in Pre-modern History is launched **primarily** by reasons of "consolidation of personnel, material and intellectual resources within the framework of historical and related social and humanities sciences, in particular within the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences in Zagreb, but also beyond, as well as by a desire to more closely connect doctoral education and scholarly research." **It is not totally clear what this actually means,** but in discussions with the management of the programme the argument was brought forth that the expansion of the chronological frame for the programme compared with the earlier ones actually makes the new programme scientifically more solid and also attractive to more students. It becomes more flexible, and creates synergy between more disciplines. It is explained relatively in detail in SER how the Doctoral Programme is aligned with the strategy of the Faculty of Humanities, especially in the fields such as History of networks, exchanges and mobility; Historiography and other forms of communication and reception of history; History of settlements, space and environment; Cultural politics and heritage in the Croatian historical area; History of violence and solidarity. It is pointed out, that because of the programme's interdisciplinarity, several other research topics are relevant,

		such as Information and Communication Sciences, Philology, Art History, Archaeology, Ethnology and Anthropology.
2.3.	The HEI systematically monitors the success of the programmes through periodic reviews, and implements improvements.	**High level of quality** The programme is reviewed or will be reviewed regularly, both through the external evaluation of doctoral programmes at the faculty, and by internal organisations. This is the responsibility of the Managing Programme Council which should assess and monitor the qualifications and competencies of teachers and supervisors. The Managing Programme Council recommend potential new teachers and researchers to be included in the doctoral programme. Its decision must be accepted by the Doctoral Programme's Teaching Council, at which stage each and every of its members has a right to voice their opinion. The qualifications and competencies of supervisors are assessed in the same manner. **This structure** is relevant and solid. It is, however, **strongly recommended** that the Managing Programme Council and the Teaching Council is expanded to also include representatives from the doctoral students. As of now, they are only represented on the faculty level and not on the level of the doctoral programme. Teachers and supervisors will be monitored through annual questionnaires and reports from them and from doctoral students. These reports will be assessed by the Managing Programme Council. **This procedure is relevant,** but also very time consuming. It is **recommended** to follow it closely and after 2-4 years, when the programme has gained more experience and material, to discuss how useful and how necessary this procedure is.
2.4.	HEI continuously monitors supervisors' performance and has mechanisms for evaluating supervisors, and, if necessary, changing them and mediating between the supervisors and the candidates.	**Improvements are necessary** The candidates are first given advisors who are responsible for monitoring the quality and progress, and only during the second semester, the supervisors are formally appointed. It seems unnecessary to wait until the second semester to appoint the supervisor who will be responsible for the entire doctoral study of the candidate. **It is recommended** to appoint the responsible supervisor immediately at the beginning of the doctoral study.

	Candidates and supervisors shall submit an annual report, and there are clearly defined procedures in the case that these reports should be insufficient, and for mediating between students and supervisors, or for replacing a supervisor. There is as yet no feedback from former candidates as the programme is new. For the same reason, there is not yet any statistics collected regarding the length of study time, progress etc.
2.5. HEI assures academic integrity and freedom.	**High level of quality** Teachers on all levels are expected to instruct the students about academic integrity and ethical behaviour. It is stressed in the SER that doctoral students can choose the topic of their research freely. This is an important element. **It is recommended** that the Faculty provide this and other doctoral programmes with software to detect plagiarism.
2.6. The process of developing and defending the thesis proposal is transparent and objective, and includes a public presentation.	**High level of quality** The procedure for developing and defending thesis proposals is the general one for doctoral programmes at the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences at Zagreb University. It is described at the Faculty's Postgraduate service's homepage and meets all the requirements for being transparent and objective. The programme has provided five proposals for doctoral study. They are of very high quality and well documented.
2.7. Thesis assessment results from a scientifically sound assessment of an independent committee.	**High level of quality** The procedure for developing and defending theses is the general one for doctoral programmes at the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences at Zagreb University. It is described in detail at the Faculty's Postgraduate service's homepage and meets all the requirements for being scientifically sound. It includes that the evaluation committee must have at least one external member. As the programme is new, no dissertation has yet been defended in it, so documentation concerning how defence was actually conducted is not available, neither statistics of the distribution between internal and external evaluators. Students are encouraged to have at least one peer-reviewed

	article published on an international level during their study. Training for this include inter alia doctoral students' workshop. Students' seminar papers have been submitted for evaluation, but as the programme is new, no conference presentation has yet been made. Students have, however, signed up for presenting at conferences in the near future. According to the Faculty regulations, theses can be written as monographs or as a collection of articles.
2.8. The HEI publishes all necessary information on the study programme, admissions, delivery and conditions for progression and completion, in accessible outlets and media.	**High level of quality** All information on the study programme and admissions, etc. is available at the programme's home page or from there via links to the Faculty's homepage. Head of the programme and those responsible for the various modules of the programme are required to regularly inform students about anything of relevance for their study. This is done by e-mail, which is probably the most effective way of communicating news. It is not clear whether this communication is ad hoc or comes with regular intervals.
2.9. Funds collected for the needs of doctoral education are distributed transparently and in a way that ensures sustainability and further development of doctoral education (ensures that candidates' research is carried out and supported, so that doctoral education can be completed successfully).	**High level of quality** Collected funds are used for internationalization in the form of round tables and lectures with foreign researchers; for acquiring scholarly literature; and for funding students' participation in conferences. However, the relevant information is not to be found on the Faculty's homepage. SER states that "The HEI teachers involved in the Doctoral Programme are paid only if their regular workload exceeds the work hours as prescribed by the law on higher education and research as well as the collective agreement."
2.10. Tuition fees are determined on the basis of transparent criteria (and real costs of studying).	**High level of quality** The amount of tuition fee is decided centrally and explained on the Faculty's homepage.

3. SUPPORT TO DOCTORAL CANDIDATES AND THEIR PROGRESSION	
3.1. The HEI establishes admission quotas with respect to its teaching and supervision capacities.	**High level of quality** Based on the SER and the site visit, the evaluation panel has found out that the HEI provides for a high-quality admission policy, systematically considering: - The number of available supervisors and their teaching workload; - Quality of supervisors - their competencies suit the candidates' research proposals; - The number of candidates a teacher already supervises, with no more than 3 candidates per supervisor on the programme. However, the Regulations on Doctoral Studies at the University of Zagreb have been prepared by a group consisting only of the faculty or senior researchers and it is not clear whether the PhD students had proper representation in the Working Group. Recommendation: a better representation of students in the PhD Working Group during a future revision of the rules and regulations concerning the structure of the program, the supervisors' obligations, and the students' rights. A clear recourse of appeal procedure for students should be included in the rules and regulations.
3.2. The HEI establishes admission quotas on the basis of scientific/ artistic, cultural, social, economic and other needs.	**High level of quality** When determining admission quotas, the HEI is taking into account the needs of society and the academia and the number of students expected to complete the programme. Admission quotas are shown to be based on wider scientific/artistic, cultural, social and economic needs.
3.3. The HEI establishes the admission quotas taking into account the funding available to the candidates, that is, on the basis of the absorption potentials of research projects or other sources of funding.	**Improvements are necessary** The HEI does not establish the admission quotas considering the funding available to the candidates, that is, on the basis of the absorption potentials of research projects or other sources of funding. There is not enough project activity to accommodate the needs of the candidates. Some of the admitted candidates are partially funded by research projects, economy or other public sources. Recommendation: More students should be included in the preparation and implementation of research projects.

3.4. The HEI should pay attention to the number of candidates admitted as to provide each with an advisor (a potential supervisor). From the point of admission to the end of doctoral education, efforts are invested so that each candidate has a sustainable research plan and is able to complete doctoral research successfully.	**High level of quality** Based on the SER and the site visit, the evaluation panel has found out that there is no need for advisors. All candidates are provided with a supervisor and none have requested for the change.
3.5. The HEI ensures that interested, talented and highly motivated candidates are recruited internationally.	**Improvements are necessary** In SER the HEI has described the ways in which it ensures that the best prospective applicants learn of the opportunities to apply. A programme admits the best undergraduate and graduate students leaning towards a career in research. The call for applications is published internationally, and the department is trying to attract and recruit international students but there have been no international students enrolled in the programme until this year (one student from Bosnia and Herzegovina). Recommendation: more international students should be recruited (not only from the region but also from the whole Adriatic and also Mediterranean area). This could be improved by employing international co-supervisors from the Adriatic region.
3.6. The selection process is public and based on choosing the best applicants.	**High level of quality** The HEI publishes the call for applications in a timely manner, and the criteria for the selection of applicants include past performance, demonstrated interest in scientific research, publications, recommendations by teachers and a prospective supervisor, and a research proposal. Recommendations: an increase in the rejection rate, which at the moments ranges between 0% to 20%.
3.7. The HEI ensures that the selection procedure is transparent and in line with published criteria, and that there is a transparent complaints procedure.	**High level of quality** The HEI ensures that the selection is clear and that applicants have a right to complain. There is a time limit for complaints and responses to complaints.
3.8. There is a possibility to recognize applicants' and candidates' prior	**High level of quality**

learning.	The HEI has established a quality procedure of recognizing prior learning and achievements relevant for the doctoral programme. This is an example of good practice.
3.9. Candidates' rights and obligations are defined in relevant HEI regulations and a contract on studying that provides for a high level of supervisory and institutional support to the candidates.	**Improvements are necessary** The HEI has an effective quality assurance procedure on the doctoral programme which ensures a high level of institutional as well as supervisory support to the candidates. Recommendations: a better representation of the students in the decision-making process and a clearer recourse and appeal procedure, including the steps to follow in case of abuse or of unsatisfactory response to a complaint.
3.10. There are institutional support mechanisms for candidates' successful progression.	**Improvements are necessary** The HEI offers comprehensive institutional support to the candidates in their research and career development, with support mechanisms presented with the lists including the number of candidates' publications, the number of international conferences and the candidates presenting there, and the number of candidates that have collaborated in projects. However, this applies only to certain number of students who are active researchers and not to most of them. There is a low number of students whose research is funded from the projects and there is a low number of students involved in projects. We recommend to include more students in research projects and also to fund more students' research from the project funds.
4. PROGRAMME AND OUTCOMES	
4.1. The content and quality of the doctoral programme are aligned with internationally recognized standards.	**High level of quality** The programme is allowing the students three years of independent research work, as prescribed by CroQF. The teaching courses are an integrated part of the doctoral education and consist of two parts: 1) those providing necessary specialized skills, for example for working with sources from pre-modern times or old languages, and 2) generic courses with transferable skills. The balance between these two forms for courses are delicate, and both are necessary. Compared to the former two programmes in Medieval and Early modern history, the

	number of content courses has been reduced in favour of generic courses. It illustrates that the management of the programme is aware of the importance and the complications with an extensive course module in research education.

The programme has provided a systematic and schematic list of methods, objectives, etc. compared to the Central European University, the doctoral programme "Southeast Europe" of the University of Graz, and of University College London.

All elements in such programmes can be measured and presented in different ways, and a schematic representation of them is a methodological challenge, but the overall impression – from this and from the entire evaluation process – is that the programme meets the standards of comparable doctoral programmes internationally.

The huge interdisciplinarity of the programme is a strength also in an international comparison.
A weakness of the programme is the still underdeveloped international profile, in network, exchange, ability to attract students from foreign countries, and a publishing profile with a very strong emphasis on publishing in Croatian. In an international perspective, this is not unusual, and the programme management is aware of this and concerned about changing it. |
| 4.2. Programme learning outcomes, as well as the learning outcomes of modules and subject units, are aligned with the level 8.2 of the CroQF. They clearly describe the competencies the candidates will develop during the doctoral programme, including the ethical requirements of doing research. | **High level of quality**

The learning outcomes are in alignment with the level 8.2 of the CroQF.

They are all listed in a table in the SER and explained in the description of the single courses.

Because it is a new programme, it has not been possible to get an impression of to which extent the described skills have actually been acquired, for example in specific research competencies, project planning and management competencies, etc. |
| 4.3. Programme learning outcomes are logically and clearly connected with teaching contents, as well as the contents included in supervision and research. | **High level of quality**

The learning outcomes are logically and clearly aligned with individual courses, supervisory work and research. |

4.4.	The doctoral programme ensures the achievement of learning outcomes and competencies aligned with the level 8.2 of the CroQF.	As the programme is new, there are no examples of finished and submitted theses.
4.5.	Teaching methods (and ECTS, if applicable) are appropriate for level 8.2 of the CroQF and assure achievement of clearly defined learning outcomes.	**High level of quality** The programme has a precisely described and very well thought pedagogical approach, applying a variety of teaching methods to achieve the stated learning outcomes, from lectures over private seminars in very small groups to round tables and workshops, supplemented with Academic Practice course including presenting research at conferences or in scientific publications.
4.6.	The programme enables acquisition of general (transferable) skills.	**High level of quality** The programme includes several courses providing the students with transferable skills. Most of these are aiming at positions within academia or research institutes such as archives, libraries, and publishing. This is important and obvious. Actually, the courses provide more transferable skills than the SER lists, for example for working within heritage industry, museums, conservation, but potentially also tourist industry and natural protection policy. Courses include training in qualitative and quantitative methods, but it is not specified to what extent this includes working with digital resources. Digital humanities in general, and specific programmes as DIS or other spatially oriented mapping systems could be of interest to the programme for scholarly reasons as well as for providing transferable skills.
4.7.	Teaching content is adapted to the needs of current and future research and candidates' training (individual course plans, generic skills etc.).	**High level of quality** The programme is so new, that there is not yet any candidates' individual annual research plan available.
4.8.	The programme ensures quality through international connections and teacher and candidate mobility.	**High level of quality** The programme is new and only beginning to establish more formalised institutional networks with exchange of staff and doctoral students. However, students are encouraged to explore the possibilities for spending some of their study time abroad, and they can submit their thesis in English. The programme has not yet attracted foreign researchers or

	students for any longer period. It is unclear whether there is a formulated strategy to do so. **It is recommended** that the international engagement be expanded and intensified, <u>especially that funding is provided for students to spend time at other, international research milieus.</u>

* NOTE: RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE EXPERT PANEL TO THE ASHE'S ACCREDITATION COUNCIL AND QUALITY LABEL

The role of the Expert Panel in the re-accreditation of doctoral study programmes is manifold. The Expert Panel or part of the Expert Panel visiting a higher education institution drafts a report on the basis of a self-evaluation report, the accompanying relevant documentation, and a site visit to HEI. The draft report is adopted by all members of the Cluster Expert Panel, while the president of the Cluster Expert Panel is responsible for coordinating the assessment levels.

The report contains an assessment on whether a doctoral study programme delivered at a higher education institution complies with the prescribed laws and by-laws, as well as any additional/recommended requirements defined by the Agency's Accreditation Council, and whether a higher education institution can obtain a positive, i.e. satisfactory quality assessment according to the criteria set out in this document. Moreover, the Expert Panel must make recommendations for quality improvement.

Based on the assessment of all these elements, the Expert Panel may propose to the Accreditation Council of the Agency to issue either a confirmation on compliance, a letter of expectation for the period up to three (3) years in which period the higher education institution should eliminate the identified deficiencies, or to deny the license.

If the Expert Panel has assessed that a doctoral study programme delivered by a higher education institution does not meet legal and other requirements or that the quality of a study programme is not ensured (i.e. that HEI does not meet additional requirements or recommendations made by the Accreditation Council, or has a very poor quality assessment), they should propose to the Accreditation Council to deny the license.

If the Expert Panel considers that the relevant laws and bylaws have been met by a higher education institution, but that certain elements mentioned above do not meet the quality requirements, while they consider that the identified shortcomings can be corrected within a time frame of three years, they should issue a letter of expectation.

If the Expert Panel considers that all legal and additional/recommended requirements have been met and the quality assessment is satisfactory, i.e. that a study programme fulfils the learning outcomes appropriately defined for that level and scientific area, they may propose the issuance of a certificate and have a HEI commit to quality improvement and reporting to the Agency during the follow-up period.

Finally, if the Expert Panel has, in accordance with the criteria mentioned above, proposed issuing the certificate of compliance and assessed that, in addition to meeting the minimum quality requirements – i.e. the qualification framework level - for a study programme, the programme should be identified as a doctoral programme of a 'high level of quality', the Expert Panel may propose to the Agency's Accreditation Council that such a doctoral study programme be awarded the 'high quality label'. Thus the Agency, with the consent of the Accreditation Council, grants a higher education institution the right to use the label for their academic and promotional purposes.

The 'high quality label' cannot be proposed or awarded to a programme or a higher education institution that does not comply with the requirements laid down by the laws and bylaws mentioned in this document, and any additional requirements recommended by the Accreditation Council. Moreover, the quality assessment awarded to a study programme should reflect a high level of quality inasmuch that at least half of the sub-criteria in each of the quality assessment criteria are assessed as being of high quality. The Accreditation Council of the Agency issues a final opinion on the label awarded. The content and form of the quality labels shall be prescribed by the Agency in a relevant general act.

The Accreditation Council of the Agency discusses the final report with all recommendations and suggestions, and issues their opinion on the report. Based on a prior opinion of the Accreditation

Council, the Agency issues an Accreditation Recommendation to the minister responsible for science and higher education, and upon receipt of the minister's final decision on the outcome of the procedure, awards the 'high quality label" to a higher education institution.