



**Report
of the Expert Panel
on the REACCREDITATION
of the Postgraduate university study programme in
Lifelong Education and Educational Sciences**

**Faculty of Teacher Education
University of Zagreb**

**Date of the visit:
April 29rd, 2019**

May, 2019



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..... 4

RECOMMENDATION BY THE EXPERT PANEL TO THE ASHE'S ACCREDITATION COUNCIL 7

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF THE STUDY PROGRAMME..... 7

ADVANTAGES OF THE STUDY PROGRAMME..... 8

DISADVANTAGES OF THE STUDY PROGRAMME..... 8

EXAMPLES OF GOOD PRACTICE 8

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

QUALITY ASSESSMENT..... 13

INTRODUCTION

The Expert Panel appointed by the Agency for Science and Higher Education (ASHE) created this Report on the Re-accreditation of the Postgraduate university study programme in *Lifelong Education and Educational Sciences* on the basis of the Self-Evaluation Report of the Programme, other documentation submitted and a visit to the Faculty of Teacher Education 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 (OG24/10). 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:

- Professor Nihad Bunar, Department of Child and Youth Studies, Stockholm University;
- Professor Reinhold Stipsits, Universität Wien;
- Dr Rachel Katherine Shanks, School of Education, University of Aberdeen.

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

- Josip Hrgović, coordinator, 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 visited the library.

SHORT DESCRIPTION OF THE STUDY PROGRAMME

Name of the study programme contained in the licence: *Doctoral study program Lifelong Education and Educational Sciences.*

Institution delivering the programme: Faculty of Teacher Education

Institution providing the programme: University of Zagreb

Place of delivery: Zagreb

Scientific area and field: Interdisciplinary sciences: Educational sciences

Number of doctoral candidates: 27

Financed by HEI: 1

Financed from other sources: 26

Number of teachers: 45 (35 teachers employed by the Faculty and 10 external)

Number of supervisors: 23 supervisors to 29 candidates

Ratio of supervisors to doctoral students: 1:1.3

Teaching / research activity ratio: 90 ECTS: 90 ECTS (1:1)

Programme outline: During their doctoral studies, students are provided with 130 hours of courses and a total of 90 ECTS points. Of the total number of hours dedicated to direct teaching, 90 hours are allocated to compulsory and 40 hours to elective courses. Elective courses are more focused on individual and individualized collaborative work of the doctoral students with the teachers, on-line consultations and joint research within the educational system or through a kind of field work. Apart from 130 hours of direct teaching, the remaining 2700 hours of the first three semesters are invested in reading relevant literature, preparing materials for research seminars and workshops, and preparing for exams and other activities related to their obligations within the studies. The remaining 90 ECTS points may be awarded to doctoral students for their participation in scholarly and research activities related to drawing up research design for their doctoral thesis, defending research proposal and carrying out research, statistical calculations and analysis, writing the doctoral thesis and preparing for the defense of the doctoral dissertation. Students' total workload during their doctoral studies, including both immediate communication with their professors and their individual work is 5400 hours and 180 ECTS points.

Learning outcomes of the study programme:

L01: generating new and relevant knowledge in the area of educational sciences; educating researchers and experts in the scientific area Educational sciences (8.05); training doctoral students for independent research and interdisciplinary approach to challenges in lifelong education, and for independent research and critical evaluation of the work of other researchers in the given interdisciplinary scientific area; ability to lead original research in the selected area; ability to independently carry out and write about original research results in such a form that they can be published; ability to learn in cooperation with others, creative communication in one's research environment, solving problems and participation in interdisciplinary research; thorough understanding of theoretical and methodological concepts in the area of lifelong education and educational sciences; training for independent development of new knowledge and skills and for solving the most demanding professional and scientific problems in the interdisciplinary context of educational sciences; profound understanding of the quantitative and qualitative research methods and possibilities of their appropriate usage in research within a certain area (educational sciences);

profound understanding of the position of philosophy of education in the context of educational sciences; developing critical reflection and ethical responsibility in research and social and communicative competences for leading professional and research activities; training for critical observation (action research, experiments, improvements) of the known factors and formation of new solutions for the scientific-disciplinary field and practice; training for independent leading of the research-based scientific and professional projects as well as the most demanding operating systems in the area of educational sciences; training in comparative research methods in the area of educational sciences; gaining specific knowledge related to the methodology of scientific research in the area of kinesiological education; ability to create, form and carry out extensive research processes; ability to employ research in order to independently develop new knowledge, skills and techniques; solving the most complex problems by checking and perfecting the known solutions and creating new ones; making use of abstract problems, which extend and deepen the existing procedural and metacognitive knowledge with regard to lifelong education practice; ability to carry out critical analysis, synthesis and evaluation of complex ideas; ability to identify problems and find new solutions for them based on scientific research results; gaining specific knowledge related to the methodology of scientific research in the area of language teaching and literature from the perspective of educational sciences;

LO2: acquiring skills, experience and knowledge which will provide scientists with PhDs in Educational Sciences the capacity for providing creative and research-based solutions to complex social and economic problems, based on the competences acquired in the interdisciplinary scientific area 8.05; internationalization of research activity at the University.

LO3: developing transferable skills: communicative skills, skills in written and oral presentations, information-management skills, critical thinking, career management, teamwork.

LO4: thorough understanding of the theoretical concepts in the area of educational sciences from pedagogic, psychological, philosophical, anthropological, kinesiology and teaching viewpoints; profound understanding and mastery of various research approaches in the scientific field of social and educational sciences; profound understanding of scientific research methods in psychology, in the area of emotions and motivation; profound understanding of scientific research methods and results in the area of inclusive pedagogy; ability to conduct interdisciplinary study and to understand of the contemporary family; the ability to conduct interdisciplinary research of the phenomenon of education for human rights and democratic citizenship; taking part in the critical dialogue – leading and encouraging complex social processes within the professional field – ability of critical and self-critical reflection; training for independent leading of the research-based scientific and professional projects as well as the most demanding operating systems in the area of educational sciences; ability to present research ideas and results of one’s field of expertise to one’s coworkers and the wider scientific community; ability to publicly present and defend scientific studies; perfection of research competences in the area of lifelong learning economy; gaining and transfer of new knowledge from education sociology to educational sciences; ability to promote society’s cultural advances in the academic and professional circles, which will be based on knowledge; ability of creative thinking and creative problem solving; understanding the ethics of research work and acting in accordance with it; personal responsibility and mostly autonomous encouragement in complex and unpredictable situations in the profession and similar areas, which are connected to the wide and narrow subject area; training for research of language learning, language

teaching and literature from the perspective of educational sciences; systematic knowledge and understanding of theory and theoretical systems, scientific paradigms and development of the field of lifelong education, i.e. educational sciences; critical attitude with regard to the wide implications of the use of knowledge in concrete educational and professional environment; thorough analysis and reflection of the social norms and relationships within a certain area which would become the doctoral student's study subject, directing activity to changing them and mediation between the academic research and social environment; ability to identify practical problems in the subject area, which can be solved by employing the methods and instruments of academic research;

LO5: ability to acquire new knowledge in the area of neuroscience and educational neuroscience and transfer it to the area of educational sciences; ability to acquire new knowledge in the area of anthropological research and transfer it to the area of educational sciences; connecting the knowledge from educational neuroscience and multimedia constructivist didactics in the context of new knowledge development in the area of educational sciences;

LO6: training for critical analysis of conditions in the area of kinesiology education and understanding of research methods within different curriculum approaches; gaining knowledge for administering different diagnostic procedures which estimate the state of anthropological features in the area of kinesiological education; understanding the methods for motor learning techniques and motor control, along with the implementation of new knowledge in the process of teaching in kinesiology education;

LO7: training for scientific approach to the research of free time for children and youth and for independent research and implementation of the new knowledge in the area of free time in the context of upbringing and education.

Table LO:

Course codes (according to the order in Doctoral Study Program Proposal - Lifelong Education and Educational Sciences)	Learning outcomes (to be numerated and stated above)						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Course 1-4, 13	x						
Course 5; 10-13; 20; 22;		x					
Course 6;				x			
Course 7;						x	
Course 8;					x		
Course 9;						x	
Course 7; 22	x	x		x			
Course 14-20				x			
Course 20			x				
Course 21					x		
Course 23-24						x	
Course 25							x
Mobility							
Publications	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Scientific research work	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Work with mentor/project team	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Writing and defending dissertation	x	x	x	x	x	x	x

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 up to three (3) years in which period the higher education institution should make the necessary improvements.

We would like to point out that this is a recently started programme and so our focus has been on the recruitment and first years of the programme.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF THE STUDY PROGRAMME

1. To ensure that there is a selection process with only those who will benefit personally and professionally being admitted onto the programme.
2. To remove the requirement of a peer reviewed article before defending the thesis proposal and beginning the PhD study.
3. Reduce the number of electives so that students can benefit from being in slightly larger study groups.
4. Review and reduce the number of learning outcomes. Make sure they are aligned with the expected outcomes of the program.
5. Reduce the norm hours of teachers in favour of optional joint research groups (teacher and doctoral students).
6. Strengthen, widen or extend existing networks e.g. with CEEPUS and encourage students and teachers to participate actively.
7. Look to the improvement of candidates' financial situation, for example can the Faculty ensure that candidates are involved in supervisors' externally funded projects.
8. Increase international research activities (including staff publications) and international recruitment of students.
9. Enhance the library facilities with more reading resources for students.

ADVANTAGES OF THE STUDY PROGRAMME

The support and dedication of advisers and supervisors on the programme.

The large number of potential supervisors and a reasonable workload of teachers and supervisors.

The variety of available courses. However, as pointed out above, some of them should be reviewed, merged and strategically reduced.

Regulations for delivering and monitoring doctoral program are in place, aligned with University of Zagreb strategical documents and transparent.

DISADVANTAGES OF THE STUDY PROGRAMME

The expectation of a publication in a peer reviewed journal (listed in Web of Science or Scopus) before defending the thesis proposal is not helpful.

It was stated that qualitative research is not accepted without some quantitative element in mixed methods.

As very little funding is available, the candidates are expected to study full-time and work.

EXAMPLES OF GOOD PRACTICE

These include the research methods courses for the students at the beginning of their doctoral programme.

Teachers make themselves available to students through different communication methods.

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

Minimal legal conditions:	YES/NO notes
<p>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.</p>	<p>YES FTE is listed in the Register of Scientific Organizations and has a positive outcome of re-accreditation (permit) for scientific activity and higher education. On 28 March 2018, the Faculty of Teacher Education of the University of Zagreb received the confirmation by the Ministry of Science and Education (CLASS: 602-04/13-04/0025, FILE NO.: 355-02-04-18-0014) stating that the Faculty of Teacher Education of the University of Zagreb met all requirements for implementing higher education and scientific activities. The license for foundation and implementation of the study program Lifelong Education and Educational Sciences was issued to the Faculty on 16 June 2017 (CLASS: 641-01/16-02/23, FILE NO.: 380-130/027-17-16).</p>
<p>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 (OG24/10).</p>	<p>YES HEI has a „vertical“ structure of the study programs (carries out undergraduate and graduate university study programs) that lead to the doctoral study program in the same area and field or fields (in case of interdisciplinary studies) and the necessary number of teachers, defined by the Article 6 of the Regulations on the Content of a License and Conditions for Issuing a License for Performing Higher Education Activity, Carrying out a Study Program and Re-Accreditation of Higher Education Institutions (Official Gazette 24/2010).</p>
<p>3. 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).</p>	<p>YES FTE has the required number of full-time employees appointed to scientific ranks, altogether 86 of them. More precisely, out of 90 teachers appointed to either research-and-teaching or art-and-teaching ranks, four are appointed to art-and-teaching ranks, and 86 to research-and-teaching. There are six more teachers appointed to research-and-teaching ranks, so altogether 96. Out of 45 teachers who carry out the doctoral study program Lifelong Education and Educational Sciences, 33 of them are the teachers at the Faculty of Teacher Education, where they are full-time employees, all appointed to research-and-teaching ranks.</p>
<p>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).</p>	<p>YES According to the data available from the Human Resources Department of the Faculty, in the academic year 2017/2018, across the entire HEI, the teachers at FTE carried out the total of 61.031,6 man-hours, while the external associates of the Faculty carried out 15.878 man-</p>

	hours. FTE carries out far more than 50 per cent of the program by its employees.
5. Student: teacher ratio at the HEI is below 1:30.	YES FTE has 142 fully-employed teachers and 110 external associates, altogether 252 teachers. In all three locations, there are 1999 regular students in all years (including graduates), 827 part-time students, and 27 students attending the doctoral study program Lifelong Education and Educational Sciences. That makes the total of 2853 students. The ratio of teachers and students at the FTE is 1:11.
6. HEI ensures that doctoral theses are public.	YES https://repozitorij.ufzg.unizg.hr
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 Article 41 of the Regulations on Doctoral Studies at the Faculty of Teacher Education University of Zagreb defines the procedure of revoking the academic degree which is launched in case of a violation report.
Additional/ recommended conditions of the ASHE Accreditation Council for passing a positive opinion	
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 HEI employs 33 teachers appointed to research-and-teaching ranks in the fields relevant for carrying out the studies involved in the doctoral study program.
2. In the most recent reaccreditation, HEI had the standard Scientific and Professional Activity marked as at least "partly implemented" (3).	YES Scientific and Professional Activity was marked as "partly implemented" .
3. The doctoral programme is aligned with the HEI's research strategy.	YES As stated in the FTE mission, incorporated in the Strategic Program for Scientific Research of the Faculty of Teacher Education, University of Zagreb, between 2017 - 2022, the Faculty strives to establish vertical mobility through all its programs in order to enable lifelong education for educators from all levels and scientists, either formal or informal. In that sense, the doctoral study program Lifelong Education and Educational Sciences is enrolled by researchers from higher education institutions, teachers and other educators, some of which are in the leading positions in their institutions (e.g. school principals).
4. The candidate: supervisor ratio	YES

at the HEI is not above 3:1.	1,3:1
<p>5. All supervisors meet the following conditions:</p> <p>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;</p> <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 2, 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>a) YES</p> <p>b) YES</p> <p>a) and b) According to the Regulations on Doctoral Studies at the Faculty of Teacher Education University of Zagreb, Article 21, Paragraph 2, mentor must meet the following requirements:</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> appointed to minimally research-and-teaching or artistic rank of Assistant Professor, scientific rank of Research Associate, or an equivalent rank if it was acquired abroad;</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> during the past five years, have scientific papers published in the research area related to the thesis theme of the doctoral candidate;</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> to be internationally recognizable in the scientific or artistic area and field related to the thesis theme of the doctoral candidate</p> <p>c) YES</p> <p>Mentor signs and thus confirms the research feasibility plan upon thesis submission via the official University form.</p> <p>d) YES</p> <p>The conditions for scientific research in the area of educational sciences are often modest in terms of finances. Doctoral students have the Faculty infrastructure at disposal. Perhaps the most valuable aspects of support are the domestic and foreign contacts, which helps the students set the stage for their research. Teachers who employ doctoral students on their projects, also provide them with financial support. Other than that, the Faculty provides all employees with HRK 3.000,00 per year for the purpose of scientific development. The faculty supports doctoral student mobility through Erasmus+.</p> <p>e) YES</p> <p>The mentors who have not had a doctoral candidate who defended their thesis successfully, must attend the workshop for new mentors, organized by the FTE.</p> <p>f) NO</p> <p>First-generation of doctoral students have not completed their studies yet, so the analysis of mentorship could not be done.</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>a) YES</p> <p>b) YES</p>
<p>7. The supervisor normally does not participate in the assessment committees.</p>	<p>YES</p> <p>According to Article 21 Paragraph 9 of the Regulations on Doctoral Studies of the University of Zagreb at the Faculty of Teacher Education, mentors do not take part in the committees that assess research themes or grade</p>

	dissertations.
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.	Students spend at least 1 ½ years studying taught courses and then go on to prepare their research proposal and defend it. As the programme has only just started it is not possible to state how many years of independent research the students will carry out after the taught element is finished.
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; at least 80% of courses are delivered by teachers employed at HEIs within the consortium.	NOT APPLICABLE

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.	Improvements are necessary – there is a limited number of publications in the last 3 to 5 years. The panel’s assessment is that HEI has not yet proved its scientific achievements in the relevant discipline, in terms of i.e. staff having more recent publications and in a wider selection of international journals.
1.2. The number and workload of teachers involved in the study programme ensure quality doctoral education.	High level of quality – as there is a sufficient number of staff involved in the programme and the workload is shared across the staff.
1.3. The teachers are highly qualified researchers who actively engage with the topics they teach, providing a quality doctoral programme.	Improvements are necessary – the panel’s assessment is that a number of high quality publications by the teachers involved in the programme in the last five years is insufficient.
1.4. The number of supervisors and their qualifications provide for quality in producing the doctoral thesis.	Improvements are necessary – the panel was not presented with the evidence to prove that supervisors met the criteria for this in relation to publications and research projects but it did do well with its ratio of staff to students.
1.5. The HEI has developed methods of assessing the qualifications and competencies of teachers and supervisors.	High level of quality – the Faculty has formal monitoring systems in place to achieve this criterion.
1.6. The HEI has access to high-quality resources for research, as required by the programme discipline.	Improvements are necessary – the panel was not presented with the evidences that there were ‘state of the art’ facilities after visiting the library and not being given details of the benefits provided by the international contacts mentioned in the self-evaluation.
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 self-evaluation document refers to the university procedures and regulations and provides sufficient information on the needs for this doctoral programme in Croatia.

2.2. The programme is aligned with the HEI research mission and vision, i.e. research strategy.	High level of quality – the programme appears to be aligned with the research mission and vision of the institution as documented in the strategic goals of the Faculty of Teacher Education.
2.3. The HEI systematically monitors the success of the programmes through periodic reviews, and implements improvements.	High level of quality – the panel notes that there are procedures in place to hold periodic reviews. As the programme only began in March 2018 (13 months prior to this assessment) it is not possible to inspect documentation for implementing improvements, but the panel have been assured this will take place in due course.
2.4. HEI continuously monitors supervisors' performance and has the mechanisms for evaluating supervisors, and, if necessary, changing them and mediating between the supervisors and the candidates.	High level of quality – while the continuous monitoring of supervisors' performance was not addressed in the self-evaluation report, the panel were satisfied with the information provided during the visit that annual reports are completed by PhD candidates and there are mechanisms to change and mediate between supervisors and candidates. The panel were shown an example of an annual evaluation report by one of the PhD candidates.
2.5. HEI assures academic integrity and freedom.	High level of quality – the panel were informed of procedures in place in both the self-evaluation report and through answers to their questions, for example that Turnitin is used by the Faculty.
2.6. The process of developing and defending the thesis proposals transparent and objective, and includes a public presentation.	High level of quality – there are transparent and objective procedures which includes a public presentation. However, 90 days for the report to be submitted seems a long time for the candidate to wait for their feedback. The panel suggest that the timing of the thesis proposal defence is made earlier, or the 90-day feedback maximum is reduced. The panel disagree with a publication being needed for the defence of the thesis proposal. The panel did not see some of the documentation (proposal template, proposal defence protocol and the assessment form) because the programme has only just begun, and no candidates have gone through their thesis proposal defence yet.
2.7. Thesis assessment results from a scientifically sound assessment of an independent committee.	High level of quality – sufficient information was provided in the self-evaluation report, but no candidate has yet completed their study. Based on information provided in SER and in interviews the panel's assessment is that there are procedures in place for a scientifically grounded thesis assessment.
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 – the Faculty has confirmed that this information is published on its website.
2.9. Funds collected for the needs of doctoral education are distributed transparently and in a way that	Improvements are necessary – the Faculty has not yet sourced funding for the PhD candidates, for example for attending international conferences or other expenses.

<p>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).</p>	<p>More action on achieving core funding for the PhD candidates is necessary to achieve High level of quality.</p>
<p>2.10. Tuition fees are determined on the basis of transparent criteria (and real costs of studying).</p>	<p>High level of quality – the panel were not aware of any concerns from staff or candidates in relation to the tuition fees and the panel noted the large number of taught courses that candidates were studying as part of the programme which entailed a large amount of staff time.</p>
<p>3. SUPPORT TO DOCTORAL CANDIDATES AND THEIR PROGRESSION</p>	
<p>3.1. The HEI establishes admission quotas with respect to its teaching and supervision capacities.</p>	<p>High level of quality – the panel noted the low number of candidates for each advisor and the workload hours were in accordance with set regulations.</p>
<p>3.2. The HEI establishes admission quotas on the basis of scientific/ artistic, cultural, social, economic and other needs.</p>	<p>Improvements are necessary – the panel's assessment is that a stricter selection process is needed to ensure that only candidates who are able to achieve a PhD are recruited. The panel's assessment is based on just one recruitment round as the programme has only begun in March 2018 cohort but everyone who applied was accepted onto the programme which surprised the panel.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>Improvements are necessary – the Faculty only has one PhD candidate who has funding. The panel's strong recommendation is that more work is necessary to secure funding for more candidates. For example, the senior researchers must put in more efforts to actively participate in research applications to domestic and international research funds.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>High quality – the panel were impressed by the comments from candidates and teachers concerning the level of support provided to candidates. The panel did not see examples of candidates' sustainable research plans. As the programme is new there are no successfully completed theses yet.</p>
<p>3.5. The HEI ensures that interested, talented and highly motivated candidates are recruited internationally.</p>	<p>Improvements are necessary – the panel was not provided evidence on attempts to recruit internationally through networks or contacts of the Faculty. The Faculty lacks the strategy to recruit candidates internationally.</p>

3.6. The selection process is public and based on choosing the best applicants.	Improvements are necessary – the panel found the selection process being public and with the evidence on which to base the selection. However, the panel’s recommendation is that more work is needed to ensure that more candidates apply and that the selection process identifies only those candidates who are likely to benefit from the programme. Again, the panel notes its disquiet that every applicant for March 2018 entry was accepted.
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 panel found that the selection process is transparent with relevant criteria. The self-evaluation document notes that there is a right to appeal.
3.8. There is a possibility to recognize applicants' and candidates' prior learning.	High level of quality – the panel commends the possibility of students moving directly into semester 3 on the basis of their prior learning.
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.	High level of quality – the panel notes that the regulations of the University of Zagreb are adhered to and candidates sign a contract upon enrolment.
3.10. There are institutional support mechanisms for candidates' successful progression.	Improvements are necessary – the self-evaluation report has not provided the detail needed in this section. There are taught courses and advisors but there does not appear other forms of support for successful progression, for example written requirements detailing the contact with advisors and mentors that candidates are entitled to, regular research seminars, workshops on relevant academic skills such as academic writing and publishing, annual PhD candidate conference, personal advisors. The candidates mentioned the high level of support they received from their advisors, but this appeared to be on a case by case basis rather than as required by the programme.
4. PROGRAMME AND OUTCOMES	
4.1. The content and quality of the doctoral programme are aligned with internationally recognized standards.	Improvements are necessary – while the self-evaluation document shows that international comparison work has been undertaken, the panel does not find that the programme, as currently constituted, is equivalent to three years’ independent research as there are 3 semesters of taught courses.
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	Improvements are necessary – the learning outcomes are not well-described as they covered all the taught courses rather than giving the information on the generic research skills which the programme provides. The panel notes that with just one year of the programme taking place so far it is not possible to inspect completed doctoral theses, and

doctoral programme, including the ethical requirements of doing research.	other documentation that a more mature programme would already have in place.
4.3. Programme learning outcomes are logically and clearly connected with teaching contents, as well as the contents included in supervision and research.	Improvements are necessary – the self-evaluation document does not show a clear enough alignment between specific learning outcomes of individual courses and the overall programme. The list of learning outcomes for each individual learning outcome is too long and includes too much information from all the courses, both compulsory and elective.
4.4. The doctoral programme ensures the achievement of learning outcomes and competencies aligned with the level 8.2 of the CroQF.	As the doctoral programme began in March 2018 it has not been possible to assess this criterion.
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 panel has learned that the candidates are satisfied with the teaching so far, thus implying the teaching methods are appropriate. The panel has certain doubts about the size of groups on elective courses with just one, two or three candidates as there are limited opportunities for class discussion and experiential learning. The panel recommends the HEI to review the current number of elective courses offered to avoid small student groups. With larger groups the teaching methods would be enhanced.
4.6. The programme enables acquisition of general (transferable) skills.	Based on the material accessible to the panel a proper assessment in relation to this criterion cannot be made. Nevertheless, the panel assert that improvements may be necessary as the candidates do not have access to skills workshops, only the taught courses, they do not get the opportunity to present their research in research seminars for example.
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 – this is based on two factors, firstly that candidates can move directly to semester 3 on the basis of prior learning, and secondly due to the wide number of electives. However, as previously pointed out the number of electives should be strategically reduced.
4.8. The programme ensures quality through international connections and teacher and candidate mobility.	Improvements are necessary – the panel did not have confidence that the international connections listed had made any impact on the doctoral programme and candidate mobility.

*** 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.