



**Report
of the Expert Panel
on the REACCREDITATION
of the University Postgraduate (Doctoral) Programme
Philosophy and Contemporaneity
Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences University of Rijeka**

**Date of the visit:
December 6th, 2017**

March, 2018



The project was co-financed by the European Union within the European Social Fund.
The contents of this document are the sole responsibility of the Agency for Science and Higher Education.

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION..... 3

SHORT DESCRIPTION OF THE STUDY PROGRAMME..... 5

RECOMMENDATION BY THE EXPERT PANEL TO THE ASHE'S ACCREDITATION COUNCIL 6

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF THE STUDY PROGRAMME..... 6

ADVANTAGES OF THE STUDY PROGRAMME..... 7

DISADVANTAGES OF THE STUDY PROGRAMME..... 7

EXAMPLES OF GOOD PRACTICE 8

COMPLIANCE WITH THE PRESCRIBED CONDITIONS FOR THE DELIVERY OF A STUDY PROGRAMME 9

QUALITY ASSESSMENT..... 11

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 Philosophy and Contemporaneity 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 University of Rijeka.

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:

- President of the Expert Panel, Dr. Igor Štiks, University of Edinburgh, United Kingdom,
- Dr. Ljiljana Reinkowski, Universität Basel, Switzerland,
- Prof. Dr. Rozita Dimova, Ghent University, Belgium,
- Dr. Vladimir Unkovski-Korica, University of Glasgow, United Kingdom,
- Dr. H. J. M. J. (Harm) Goris, Tilburg University, Netherlands,
- Prof. David Maxwell, Emmanuel College Cambridge, United Kingdom,
- Prof. Elzbieta Osewska, Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński University in Warsaw, Poland,
- Prof. Mikhail Dmitriev, Central European University, Hungary,
- Prof. Andrej Blatnik, Univerza v Ljubljani, Slovenia,
- Prof. Ljiljana Šarić, University of Oslo, Norway,
- Prof. Dr. Katrin Boeckh, University of Regensburg, Germany,
- Prof. Vincent Gaffney, University of Bradford, United Kingdom,
- Prof. Mika Vahakangas, Lund University, Sweden,
- Dr. sc. Nicole Butterfield, Marie Curie Fellow, Seged University, Hungary,
- Anna Meens, Leiden University, Netherlands,

- Kevin Kenjar, University of California, Berkeley, United States of America,
- Dr. Elżbieta Gajek, University of Warsaw, Poland,
- Dr. Kyle Jerro, University of Essex, United Kingdom,
- Dr Nadia Mifka-Profozic, University of York, United Kingdom,
- Dr. Moreno Mitrović, University of Cyprus, Cyprus,
- Dr. Catherine MacRobert, Oxford University, United Kingdom,
- Prof. Emeritus Svein Mønnesland, University of Oslo, Norway,
- Dajana Vasiljevicová, Charles University, Prag, Czech Republic,
- Prof. dr. Christian Neuhäuser, Universitaet Dortmund, Germany,
- Dr. Dries Bosschaert, KU Leuven, Belgium,
- Dr. Oliver George Downing, University of Liverpool, United Kingdom,
- Prof. Hanoch Ben-Yami, Central European University, Hungary,
- Sonja Kačar, University Toulouse II – Jean Jaurès, France,
- Garrett R. Mindt, Central European University, Hungary,
- Prof. Vieri Samek Lodovici, University College London, United Kingdom,
- Mišo Petrović, Central European University, Hungary.

The higher education institution was visited by the following Expert Panel members:

- Prof. Dr. Christian Neuhäuser, Universitaet Dortmund, Germany
- Oliver George Downing, University of Liverpool, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
- Garrett Mindt, Department of Philosophy, Central European University, Hungary

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

- Maja Šegvić, coordinator, ASHE,
- Vladivoj Lisica, interpreter at the site visit,
- Ivana Rončević, translator of the report.

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,
- Alumni,

The Expert Panel also had a tour of the library.

SHORT DESCRIPTION OF THE STUDY PROGRAMME

Name of the study programme contained in the licence: Philosophy and Contemporaneity

Institution delivering the programme: Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences University of Rijeka

Institution providing the programme: Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences University of Rijeka

Place of delivery: Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Sveučilišna avenija 4, Rijeka

Scientific area and field: Humanities, Philosophy

Learning outcomes of the study programme:

1. Independent research in the area of philosophical disciplines (especially in the field of the PhD student's PhD thesis) in alignment with internationally recognised standards of quality, with the application of appropriate scientific methodology and in the spirit of generally accepted research ethics.
2. Exploration of contemporary philosophical problems in the context of current debates and, where possible, an interdisciplinary approach.
3. Delivery of advanced scientific-research and professional work in the exploration of relevant philosophical literature and, individually and/or in a team, observation of the essence of a problem and formation of its solution via an argumentative articulation of a philosophical text.
4. Critical analysis and judgement of one's own research and published original research results of other authors from the area of philosophical disciplines.
5. Drafting and successful publication of one or more original scientific papers in internationally reviewed journals.
6. Preparation and presentation of one or more communications of achieved results at international scientific conferences and argumentation of one's opinion in discussion with other researchers.
7. Acting within the academic and broader social community and dissemination of scientific-research accomplishments to future generations of students, as well as their presentation to the public with the aim of popularisation of science, development of a humane society and sustainable development.
8. Development of a PhD thesis, its successful presentation and defence.

Number of doctoral candidates: 35

Number of funded doctoral candidates: 1

Number of doctoral candidates who cover their own studying costs: 34

Number of teachers: 12

Number of supervisors: 10 currently active supervisors (total number of supervisors: 14)

Taught / research ratio:

Taught component: 60-67 ECTS (1. and 2. year of study)

Research component: 113-120 ECTS from 4. semester onwards (defence of the PhD thesis, supervisors work..)

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:

Issue a letter of expectation for the period of three (3) years in which period the higher education institution should make the necessary improvements. Suspension of student enrolment for the defined period is not recommended.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF THE STUDY PROGRAMME

1. There should be more flexibility in the required classes and some of them should be more skilled-focused
 - For PhD-students who already have a good background in analytical philosophy the number and workload of required classes is too high and the risk of a repetition of content that was taught in master classes is too high.
 - The assignment of required content-based classes should be individualized and adjusted to the need of students to attend their classes (based on their prior knowledge of the content and pertinence to for their PhD-project).
 - Additionally to content-based classes, the department (faculty) should offer skill-oriented classes. According to discussions with students and faculty the classes should focus on the following topics: 1. academic writing; 2. publication strategy; 3. project management (like pursuing a PhD, which is a project); 4. fund raising, including proposal writing; 5. presentation skills.
 - Those classes should get a high number of ECTS-points in order to encourage students to take them. They should be aligned with the faculty and university, however there might be a need to design them specifically for PhD-students in philosophy since each discipline has its own traditions and standards.
2. ECTS-points for supervisory work should be more structured:
 - Students should get a good number of ECTS-points for regular meetings with their supervisors and for submitting material to them.
 - This would show the importance of supervision to all relevant parties and also give a certain structure to it.
3. There should be a continuous research student meeting after year one for all PhD-students
 - There are several advantages of such a meeting: 1. students get feedback on their theses from a wider variety of people; 2. they can share information on all sorts of things relevant to pursuing a PhD; 3. it makes it easier for students who had to discontinue the programme for a while (due to work or personal reasons) to get back into the programme.

- Meetings do not have to be on a weekly basis; they could take place on a bi-weekly or monthly basis. It is also possible to have a few meetings in the whole group and more meetings in smaller working groups.
 - There should be an encouraging number of ECTS-points for those meetings and presentations given there.
4. Establish more funding opportunities
 - Only one student is funded at the moment. All other students have to do external work in order to earn their living and to be able to afford the program fees. We were told that there are little funding opportunities for PhD students on a national level. It is also true that international funding opportunities are hard to get. However an extension of international contacts and more concerted efforts might bring more funding in.
 5. Encourage students to work on a preliminary project proposal at an earlier stage
 - PhD-students are required to submit their research plan after one year. In general this is fine. However it would also be good to have something like a preliminary research proposal at the beginning of the program for the following reasons:
 - i. Having a research proposal submitted as part of the application process helps to ensure that the forthcoming PhD student has a general direction for their future research and project. One that can be improved and focused with time spent under the supervision of their potential supervisor.
 - ii. It helps orient the coming student in the department according to their research focus and the strengths of their possible supervisors to oversee such a project.
 - iii. Such a proposal gives a baseline by which to track the PhD students' progress through the program.
 - iv. And most importantly, it helps the PhD student track their own progress and the direction of their research from the very beginning of the PhD programme.

ADVANTAGES OF THE STUDY PROGRAMME

1. The programme has a very clear and outstanding research focus in analytical philosophy. It is carried out by an exceptional department.
2. There already is a very good international network, many teachers and guest lecturers come to Rijeka.
3. There are good interactions between faculty and students including a climate of trust and support.

DISADVANTAGES OF THE STUDY PROGRAMME

1. The major structural disadvantage is the lack of integration into university and national funding structures. This is a problem for all PhD-programmes in Croatia, making it very hard for departments to be competitive in research on an international level.

2. The content-based class workload is too heavy (especially at the beginning of the course), then in the second and especially third year there are almost no classes offered that support students in their research.
3. Students do not get enough structural support with finding their topic in the first year.

EXAMPLES OF GOOD PRACTICE

1. Senior faculty, other supervisors and students are very open and speak their minds. There is a high level of trust and support. The department managed to create a good atmosphere of collaboration and mutuality.
2. The department makes a huge effort to internationalize especially through the invitation of guest lecturers.

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
HEI employs a sufficient number of researchers, as defined by Article 7 of the 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
3. 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
4. Student: teacher ratio at the HEI is below 30:1.	YES
5. HEI ensures that doctoral theses are public.	NO*
*They are publically available in the library, however they are not online because of copyright protection.	
6. 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.	YES
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;	a) YES b) YES c) NO (research plan is delivered

<p>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 Supervisors and candidates);</p> <p>c) confirms feasibility of the draft research plan upon admission of the candidate (or submission of the proposal);</p> <p>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;</p> <p>e) trained for the role before assuming it (through workshops, co-supervisions etc.);</p> <p>f) received a positive opinion of the HEI on previous supervisory work.</p>	<p>after first year)</p> <p>d) NO (only one PhD student is financed by the HEI)</p> <p>e) YES</p> <p>f) YES</p>
<p>6. All teachers meet the following conditions:</p> <p>a) holds a scientific or a scientific-teaching position;</p> <p>b) active researcher, recognized in the field relevant for the course (table 1, Teachers).</p>	<p>YES</p>
<p>7. The supervisor normally does not participate in the assessment committees.</p>	<p>YES</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>NO</p> <p>see the section Recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • too many mandatory classes • (draft) research plan developed too late
<p>9. For joint programmes and doctoral schools (at the university level): cooperation between HEIs is based on adequate contracts; joint programmes are delivered in cooperation with accredited HEIs; the HEI delivers the programme within a doctoral school in line with the regulations and ensures good coordination aimed at supporting the candidates;</p> <p>at least 80% of courses are delivered by teachers employed at HEIs within the consortium.</p>	<p>n/a</p>

QUALITY ASSESSMENT

1. RESOURCES: TEACHERS, SUPERVISORS, RESEARCH CAPACITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE	
<p>1.1. HEI is distinguished by its scientific/ artistic achievements in the discipline in which the doctoral study programme is delivered.</p>	<p>HLQ Given that this is one of only a few philosophy departments in Croatia offering a PhD-program it is impressive how high the quality of research and teaching is. Many of the faculty, including former PhD-students have a very good publication record. They are respected researchers on an international level. The department obviously is a centre for exceptionally excellent studies in the whole region. This is a first-rate environment for PhD-students.</p>
<p>1.2. The number and workload of teachers involved in the study programme ensure quality doctoral education.</p>	<p>IN Overall, the workload seems to be fine. There appear to be a few exceptions, though, of too many Norm Hours, so more attention should be given to this. However, it is notable that it is the senior staff that has a slight overload.</p>
<p>1.3. The teachers are highly qualified researchers who actively engage with the topics they teach, providing a quality doctoral programme.</p>	<p>HLQ As indicated above, the publication record of the faculty is very good. It is obvious that researcher take an active part in international philosophical discourse. There is even additional potential to turn the department into a regional centre of excellence.</p>
<p>1.4. The number of supervisors and their qualifications provide for quality in producing the doctoral thesis.</p>	<p>HLQ The ratio is met and there is a very good selection of highly qualified supervisors in all fields of analytical philosophy. There could be some more supervisors in practical philosophy, since there is a certain concentration of PhD-students leading to an overload for supervisors There could also be some more teaching in continental philosophy to make students more familiar with this important tradition.</p>
<p>1.5. The HEI has developed methods of assessing the qualifications and competencies of teachers and supervisors.</p>	<p>IN The scientific competence of supervisors is ensured and the stated criteria are sufficient. It would be useful to also have some kind of reflection and consultation mechanism regarding the activity of supervision itself, since the supervisor-student relationship on the PhD-level is a very specific kind of</p>

	relationship that could gain from such a mechanism.
1.6. The HEI has access to high-quality resources for research, as required by the programme discipline.	IN This is a weak point. Students do not have sufficient access to books. Especially the fact that they cannot check out books from the library for an extended period of time, but only for a couple of days at most, is a major problem. This is made worse by the fact that many students have to earn money through other employment and may not live close by the university.
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.	IN Most of the programme is of high quality. The areas that need improvement are listed above. The PhD-theses are of high quality as well, some of them are written in English language adding to the international outreach of such research.
2.2. The programme is aligned with the HEI research mission and vision, i.e. research strategy.	HLQ As demonstrated by the 'Faculty of Humanities Social Sciences in Rijeka's Research Development Strategy 2016-2020,' the department of philosophy, and its doctoral programme, it strongly aligned with, and integrated into, the HEI's (i.e. faculty's) research strategy.
2.3. The HEI systematically monitors the success of the programmes through periodic reviews, and implements improvements.	IN There is a Postgraduate Board of Studies in place monitoring the programme. Also, there seems to be good and open relations between students and faculty, evidenced by the fact that there are meetings between them to discuss the improvement when the need arises. However, the current cohort of students did express some concern that not all issues raised in periodic reviews received an adequate response or feedback.
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.	IN Mostly this works fine. However, there are two areas in need of improvement: 1. The average completion time for a thesis is rather long. This is mostly due to the fact that students have to work in order to finance their studies. However, the institutions should also consider the above listed recommendations for improvement to shorten the time. 2. It would be useful to have also some kind of counsellor or student representative who can work as a bridge

	between single students and faculty in case of personal problems.
2.5. HEI assures academic integrity and freedom.	HLQ The department uses Turnitin software, which is state of the art.
2.6. The process of developing and defending the thesis proposal is transparent and objective, and includes a public presentation.	IN The process of developing and defending the thesis proposal is adequate. The panel, though, felt that the student's experience of the process (and potentially the eventual quality of the thesis) could be improved if students were encouraged to begin the preliminary development of their thesis proposal earlier in their course of study (e.g. as part of skills-based courses in the first year). As per our recommendation that a research proposal be part of the application process, such an initial proposal could be used as a working draft in such skills based courses.
2.7. Thesis assessment results from a scientifically sound assessment of an independent committee.	HLQ Some theses are written and defended in English. Quite a number of students have a number of publications before finalizing the PhD. The supervisor/co-supervisor and coordinator of the study programme are present at the defence, but not members of the committee. This seems to be in compliance with requirements.
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.	IN The SER declared that this is all published in Croatian on the website. Students seemed to be well informed and did not complain about a lack of information (except, that is, for the defence procedure). The creation of an orientation/induction document may be helpful in this regard, as well as in other areas where information is currently passed onto from supervisor to supervisee on an ad hoc basis.
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).	IN Funding goes into teaching mostly, which in general is fine. However, there are too many obligatory classes. If this is corrected then more funding could go into: 1. skill-based classes 2. supervision 3. traveling grants.

2.10. Tuition fees are determined on the basis of transparent criteria (and real costs of studying).	HLQ The criteria are clear. It is not the job of the expert panel to evaluate the amount of money paid for teaching.
3. SUPPORT TO DOCTORAL CANDIDATES AND THEIR PROGRESSION	
3.1. The HEI establishes admission quotas with respect to its teaching and supervision capacities.	IN The competence of supervisors is very high. However, some supervisors have too many PhD-students at the same time and their teaching workload is too high as well, although this seems to affect full professors mostly.
3.2. The HEI establishes admission quotas on the basis of scientific/ artistic, cultural, social, economic and other needs.	HLQ Given that there are only a few PhD-programmes in Croatia in philosophy and the wide variety of topics covered in philosophy the number of intakes per year does not seem to be too high. This is true especially if they are more equally distributed among supervisors, which might require additional supervisors in practical philosophy.
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.	IN We are aware of the fact that PhD-programmes in general are underfinanced in Croatia. All involved parties should make an effort to correct this structural problem. The department should make a concerted effort to bring in more funding for PhD-students, especially through international research projects. We are aware of the difficulty this presents.
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.	HLQ So far, it seems, all students have completed their PhD and none have dropped out. Moreover, the supervisors seem to be highly motivated and approachable as corroborated by the PhD-students. The criteria for admission are clear and reasonable.
3.5. The HEI ensures that interested, talented and highly motivated candidates are recruited internationally.	IN The department advertises the programme only in the area or Rijeka (local newspaper). Given the quality of the department it would be possible to attract more students from neighbouring countries which would further increase the international reputation of the department.
3.6. The selection process is public and based on choosing the best applicants.	IN In general the criteria for admission, including a personal

	interview, are transparent, clear and reasonable. However a PhD proposal should be added to the documents that have to be provided. It is not necessary that this proposal is the decisive factor for admission. However, such a proposal would give the committee a better perspective on the merits of the candidate. Also candidates would have a better understanding from the very beginning what they are expected to do.
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.	HLQ/IN Generally, this seems to be quite good. The department even offers to justify to those rejected why their application was not successful. It also states that there is a right to appeal. It is not clear to us, however, how this is done and how due process is ensured. Since there is also no information in Croatian this should be clarified.
3.8. There is a possibility to recognize applicants' and candidates' prior learning.	IN The required classes should be reworked in such a way that they more easily accommodate individual student's needs. This could be done by creating individualized schedules. Doing this is achievable, given that only 10 students are accepted each year.
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.	HLQ This all seems to be fine and there were no complaints by PhD-students.
3.10. There are institutional support mechanisms for candidates' successful progression.	IN The personal research support is excellent. However, see the above-mentioned financing problems. At least some more money could go into a fund that allows students to participate in international conferences. Also, there should be an ongoing research seminar that all PhD-students could/should attend (see recommendations above).
4. PROGRAMME AND OUTCOMES	
4.1. The content and quality of the doctoral programme are aligned with internationally recognized standards.	IN (approaching HLQ) In general, the quality of the program is high. As stated it is modelled after the program at King's College in London, although in London more classes in practical philosophy are offered. As stated above there are too many compulsory content-based courses overall, and not enough skills-based classes, in particular. This should be adjusted to individual student's needs.

	The supervision and finalized theses (in English) are of high quality.
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.	HLQ Formally this is fine. Also, some of current and former PhD-students have excellent publication output, indicating the quality of teaching. During the visit current and former PhD-students showed their high level of research capacity and their international focus.
4.3. Programme learning outcomes are logically and clearly connected with teaching contents, as well as the contents included in supervision and research.	IN The supervisory work could get more recognition in the programme (see above).
4.4. The doctoral programme ensures the achievement of learning outcomes and competencies aligned with the level 8.2 of the CroQF.	HLQ It was shown sufficiently during the visit that this is the case.
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.	IN Again, there are too many required classes. Moreover, a continuing research seminar for PhD-students would be useful.
4.6. The programme enables acquisition of general (transferable) skills.	IN Beside typical professional skills, project writing, delivering skills are usually considered to be academically relevant and transferable skills. However, students acquire those skills rather in a process of learning by doing. Someone who managed to finalize a PhD in philosophy in a decent time and with a satisfactory result is able to run complicated projects and manage difficult circumstances. It would be suitable to augment this process of learning by running a number of skill-oriented classes. See recommendations above.
4.7. Teaching content is adapted to the needs of current and future research and candidates' training (individual course plans, generic skills etc.).	HLQ The teachers cover all relevant areas of philosophy, enabling students to choose a specialized topic according to their interest. Teachers made it clear that they take student's specific interests into account in their teaching. The HLQ assessment somewhat depends on the future reduction of mandatory classes.

<p>4.8. The programme ensures quality through international connections and teacher and candidate mobility.</p>	<p>IN (close to HLQ) The department makes a huge effort to internationalize and is on the right track. Especially impressive is the list of internationally renowned philosophers giving classes there. The next step is to bring in more funding for students to be able to participate in international conferences and study abroad.</p>
---	---

*** 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.