REPORT of the Expert Panel on the

RE-ACCREDITATION OF

The Faculty of Humanities and Social Science in Zagreb

Date of the site visit: 10. - 12.11.2014.

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	3
SHORT DESCRIPTION OF THE EVALUATED INSTITUTION	6
CONCLUSIONS OF THE EXPERT PANEL	11
ADVANTAGES OF THE INSTITUTION	
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT	12
DETAILED ANALYSIS OF INSTITUTIONAL COMPLIANCE TO THE STANDARDS AND CRITERIA FOR RE-	
ACCREDITATION	15 15
Study programmes	16
3. Students	
4. Teachers	
5. Scientific and professional activity	
6. International cooperation and mobility	
7. Resources: administration, space, equipment and finances	20

INTRODUCTION

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

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

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

The report contains:

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

The members of the Expert Panel were:

- Prof. Francesco Lorenzo Capello, University of Kent, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
- Prof. Roland Walter Marti, Saarland University, Federal Republic of Germany
- Prof. Tim Woods, Aberystwyth University, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
- Prof. Katrin Elisabeth Boeckh, Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München, Federal Republic of Germany
- Prof. Vincent Gaffney, University of Bradford, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
- Prof. Robert H. Logie, University of Edinburgh, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
- Prof. James Wickham, Trinity College Dublin, Republic of Ireland
- Aleksandar Šušnjar, student, The Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences University of Rijeka, Republic of Croatia
- Marin Spetič, student, The Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences University of Split, Republic of Croatia

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

- Sandra Bezjak, coordinator, ASHE
- Vlatka Šušnjak Kuljiš, coordinator, ASHE
- Frano Pavić, coordinator, ASHE
- Đurđica Dragojević, translator, ASHE

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

- The Management;
- The representatives of the Quality Assurance Committee;
- Vice-dean for education and students:
- Vice-dean for study programmes and life-long learning;
- Vice-dean for research and international cooperation;
- The Heads of Departments;
- The students;
- The lecturers;
- The project leaders, Ph.D. programmes coordinators;
- The Ph.D. students working as teaching assistants

The panel visited the Faculty of Humanities and Social Science of the University of Zagreb on November 10-12 2014 after a preliminary briefing by Agency staff on November 9. Prior to the visit panel members were provided with a very full selfevaluation report for the Faculty written in English. During our visit we were also provided with an initial draft of the Faculty's Strategic Plan and some departments were able to provide us with full documentation in English of their programmes. During the visit, the panel had meetings with the management team, individual vice-deans, heads of department, teaching staff, heads of research projects, doctoral supervisors, doctoral students working as teaching assistants. At these meetings participants responded to questions raised by panel members. The panel also held a question and answer session open to all undergraduate and graduate students and were given access to students' comments on the AZVO homepage. The Expert Panel also had a tour of the library, IT rooms, student register desk, and selected classrooms at The Faculty of Humanities and Social Science in Zagreb, where they observed teaching in seminars and lectures; some panel members were able to hold brief question and answer sessions with groups of students in class. In the final session the panel presented an initial outline of conclusions to the management team. The panel members wish to record their appreciation for the Faculty's preparation of the documentation needed for the visit, for its collegial hospitality and for the full and frank discussions we were able to hold with all groups of staff and students. We also wish to commend the Agency for the efficiency with which our visit was organised.

Upon completion of re-accreditation procedure, the Accreditation Council renders its opinion on the basis of the Re-accreditation Report, an Assessment of Quality of the

higher education institution and the Report of Fulfilment of Quantitative Criteria which is acquired by the Agency's information system.

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

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

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

SHORT DESCRIPTION OF THE EVALUATED INSTITUTION

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

ADDRESS: Ivana Lučića 3, Zagreb, Croatia

NAME OF THE HEAD OF HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTION: Director Professor Vlatko Previšić Ph.D.

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

The Faculty has 23 Departments, 2 independent chairs and 2 centres:

Departments

- 1. Department of Archaeology
- 2. Department of Ethnology and Cultural Anthropology
- 3. Department of Philosophy
- 4. Department of Information and Communication Sciences
- 5. Department of Comparative Literature
- 6. Department of History
- 7. Department of Art History
- 8. Department of English Language and Literature
- 9. Department of Phonetics
- 10. Department of German Language and Literature
- 11. Department of Classic Philology
- 12. Department of Croatian Language and Literature
- 13. Department of Linguistics
- 14. Department of Indology and Middle-East Studies
- 15. Department of Turkology, Hungarology and Judaic Studies
- 16. Department of Romance Language and Literature
- 17. Department of East Slavic Languages and Literature
- 18. Department of South Slavic Languages and Literature
- 19. Department of West Slavic Languages and Literature
- 20. Department of Italian Language and Literature
- 21. Department of Pedagogy
- 22. Department of Psychology
- 23. Department of Sociology

Independent Chairs

Chair of Physical Education Independent Chair of Anthropology

Centres

Centre for Foreign Languages Croaticum

LIST OF STUDY PROGRAMMES:

Undergraduate university study programmes:

- 1. English Language and Literature (double major)
- 2. English Language and Literature (single major)
- 3. Anthropology (double major)
- 4. Archaeology (single major)
- 5. Archaeology (double major)
- 6. Czech Language and Literature (double major)
- 7. Ethnology and Cultural Anthropology (double major)
- 8. Philosophy (double major)
- 9. Philosophy (single major)
- 10. Phonetics (double major)
- 11. French Language and Literature (double major)
- 12. German Language and Literature (double major)
- 13. Greek Language and Literature (double major)
- 14. Hungarian Language and Literature (double major)
- 15. Indian Language and Literature (double major)
- 16. Information Sciences (double major)
- 17. Information Sciences (single major)
- 18. Judaic Studies (double major)
- 19. South Slavic Languages and Literatures (double major)
- 20. Comparative Literature (double major)
- 21. Comparative Literature (single major)
- 22. Croatian Language and Literature (double major)
- 23. Croatian Language and Literature (single major)
- 24. Latin Language and Literature (double major)
- 25. Linguistics (double major)
- 26. Dutch Language and Literature (double major)
- 27. Pedagogy (double major)
- 28. Pedagogy (single major)
- 29. Polish Language and Literature (double major)
- 30. Portuguese Language and Literature (double major)
- 31. History (double major)
- 32. History (single major)
- 33. Art History (double major)
- 34. Psychology (single major)
- 35. Romanian Language and Literature (double major)
- 36. Russian Language and Literature (double major)
- 37. Slovak Language and Literature (double major)
- 38. Sociology (double major)
- 39. Sociology (single major)

- 40. Spanish Language and Literature (double major)
- 41. Swedish Language and Culture (double major)
- 42. Italian Language and Literature (double major)
- 43. Italian Language and Literature (single major)
- 44. Turkish Language and Literature (double major)
- 45. Ukrainian Language and Literature (double major)

Graduate university study programmes:

- 1. English Language and Literature (double major)
- 2. English Language and Literature (single major)
- 3. Anthropology (double major)
- 4. Archaeology (single major)
- 5. Czech Language and Literature (double major)
- 6. Ethnology and Cultural Anthropology (double major)
- 7. Philosophy (double major)
- 8. Philosophy (single major)
- 9. Phonetics (double major)
- 10. French Language and Literature (double major)
- 11. German Language and Literature (double major)
- 12. Greek Language and Literature (double major)
- 13. Hungarian Language and Literature (double major)
- 14. Indian Language and Literature (double major)
- 15. Information Sciences (double major)
- 16. Information Sciences (single major)
- 17. South Slavic Languages and Literatures (double major)
- 18. Comparative Literature (double major)
- 19. Comparative Literature (single major)
- 20. Croatian Language and Literature (double major)
- 21. Croatian Language and Literature (single major)
- 22. Latin Language and Literature (double major)
- 23. Linguistics (double major)
- 24. Dutch Language and Literature (double major)
- 25. Pedagogy (double major)
- 26. Pedagogy (single major)
- 27. Polish Language and Literature (double major)
- 28. Portuguese Language and Literature (double major)
- 29. History (double major)
- 30. History (single major)
- 31. Art History (double major)
- 32. Psychology (single major)
- 33. Romanian Language and Literature (double major)
- 34. Russian Language and Literature (double major)
- 35. Slovak Language and Literature (double major)
- 36. Sociology (double major)
- 37. Sociology (single major)
- 38. Spanish Language and Literature (double major)

- 39. Swedish Language and Culture (double major)
- 40. Italian Language and Literature (double major)
- 41. Italian Language and Literature (single major)
- 42. Turkish Language and Literature (double major)
- 43. Ukrainian Language and Literature (double major)

Integrated undergraduate and graduate university study programme

History and Geography; specialisation in: Teaching

Postgraduate university study programmes (doctoral studies):

- 1. Croatian Culture
- 2. Archaeology
- 3. Pedagogy
- 4. Medieval Studies
- 5. Glottodidactics
- 6. Information Science
- 7. Croatian Language and Literature
- 8. Psychology
- 9. Philosophy
- 10. Sociology
- 11. Linguistics
- 12. Literature, Performing Arts, Film and Culture
- 13. Art History
- 14. Modern and Contemporary Croatian History in the European Context
- 15. Ethnology and Cultural Anthropology
- 16. Early Modern Period

Postgraduate university study programmes (specialist studies):

- 1. Clinical Psychology
- 2. Conference Interpreting
- 3. Translation Studies

NUMBER OF STUDENTS: According to the Self-evaluation document the Faculty has 7,221 enrolled students (full-time and part-time students)

NUMBER OF TEACHERS: According to the Self-evaluation document the Faculty has 268 full-time teachers appointed into scientific-teaching grade and 84 appointed into teaching grade and 50 assistants.

NUMBER OF SCIENTISTS: 268 scientists elected to grades

TOTAL BUDGET (in HRK): 188.763.798,39 HRK (24.539.293,79 EUR)

MSES FUNDING (percentage): 160.018.645,12 (20.802.423,86 EUR) **84,77% from**

State budget

OWN FUNDING (percentage): **15,23**%

SHORT DESCRIPTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTION:

The Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences is the oldest and largest Croatian research and higher education institution in humanities and social sciences, as well as a significant cultural institution with a great impact on Croatian culture and society. The Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences is part of the University of Zagreb, the oldest university in Croatia and one of the oldest universities in Europe.

The Faculty of Philosophy began its work in the academic year 1874/1875. The Faculty of Philosophy had devoted special attention to developing the fundamental disciplines of the Natural Sciences and Mathematics Department that eventually evolved into a foundation for several new faculties of the University of Zagreb. There were six Chairs (Philosophy, History, Croatian History, Slavic Philology, Classical Philology (Latin) and Classical Philology (Greek)) and 26 students. From the original Chairs several new Chairs were developed. For example, in 1875 the Chair of Croatian Language and Literature was founded, having previously been a part of the Slavic Philology Chair; in 1877 the Chair of Art History and Art Archaeology was created. During this period teaching and research in foreign languages (German, Russian, Hungarian, Italian, etc.) was gradually introduced. The first PhD thesis was defended in 1880. In 1893, the Pedagogy Chair was founded, followed in 1896 by the Classical Archaeology Chair, in 1924 the Ethnology Chair, and in 1929 the Psychology Chair, etc.

A major reorganization of the Faculty took place in 1948 – 12 study programmes were founded, each a single major, and in 1952, the double major system was introduced. Since then, the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences has taken great care to nurture the double major studies while respecting the right of certain study programmes to remain a single major. In the second half of the 20th century, research facilities were founded: the Research Facility of Linguistics, the Research Facility of Literary Criticism, the Research Facility of Art History, and others. Departments were gradually formed as well as Chairs which represent fundamental scientific and teaching units of the Faculty. In 1990s, after Croatia gained independence, new programmes were introduced: Hungarian Language and Literature, Turkish Language and Literature, Slovak Language and Literature, Ukrainian Language and Literature, Romanian Language and Literature, etc. The development of study programmes was further extended in the 2000s with the establishment of Dutch Language and Literature, Scandinavian Languages and Literatures, Portuguese Language and Literature and the independent Programme of Japanese Studies and Chinese Studies.

In 1996 the construction of the third floor of the Faculty building began, and continued in the 2000s. The result was a sufficient number of new offices and classrooms allowing some departments (e.g. the Department of Romanian Language and Literature, the Department of Italian Language and Literature, the Department of Classical Philology, the Department of German Language and Literature, the Department of Information Science) to move to the new premises. It is important to note that all the upper floors of the building are accessible to students with disabilities due to newly installed elevators.

CONCLUSIONS OF THE EXPERT PANEL

ADVANTAGES OF THE INSTITUTION

- 1. The Faculty is a large and prestigious part of Croatia's most important university; its location within the capital city facilitates interaction with government and opinion-makers; the Faculty has a strong reputation for its contribution to national culture and public debate.
- 2. The staff of the faculty are of high quality and committed to the institution and to their profession as teachers and researchers; the students are enthusiastic and proud to be members of the Faculty; there is a noticeably positive social atmosphere in the Faculty.
- 3. The Faculty is an appropriate size for a major component of a large university. Thus it is able to provide its departments with an outstanding library, adequate IT systems and student administration services. It is large enough to provide support for small areas, in particular those which are important for the university (and indeed for national culture) but for which student demand is currently weak. It would also be the right size for a dedicated research office and a careers office; with more autonomy it would be able to use its financial resources to ensure effective staffing.

DISADVANTAGES OF THE INSTITUTION

- 1. The current institutional framework makes the Faculty unable to make staffing decisions or plan staffing going forward. The Faculty faces a definite staffing crisis in the next few years which will inevitably impact upon the quality of both teaching and research.
- 2. There is no research office to support the capture and administration of grants.
- 3. There is no careers office to support students (including doctoral students) in their future careers and to enable them to maximise their employability.
- 4. The Faculty lacks a standardised marking procedure that would stand up to international scrutiny.
- 5. There is no faculty-wide policy for curriculum review.
- 6. While the student administration system appears efficient, the panel was surprised that there was a separate student-run information office to compensate for apparent deficiencies in the Faculty student office.
- 7. There is not yet an agreed Faculty Development Strategy and this is especially important given the upcoming staffing crisis. The Faculty must take the initiative in planning to address this impending problem with some radical proposals.

FEATURES OF GOOD PRACTICE

- 1. Student and staff mobility and international collaboration supported by a well-functioning international relations office.
- 2. An impressive state of the art library serving the whole Faculty.

- 3. The support and encouragement received by students; the frequent contact between students and staff; staff are accessible and involved.
- 4. The high quality of the teaching which we observed.
- 5. Within the existing framework, staff workload is well organised.
- 6. Students are involved in the administration of the Faculty and actively disseminate information.
- 7. In some courses there are clear Learning Objectives and transparent assessment procedures.
- 8. Across the Faculty there are instances of excellent research at both individual and department level.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT

Some aspects of the Faculty's work are excellent. However, methods are often ad hoc and derive from initiatives by individual staff members or departments. There is a general lack of systematic procedures that can ensure and demonstrate quality. The Faculty's own draft strategic plan shows that it is already well aware of many of the issues listed below.

1. Higher Education Institution Management and Quality Assurance

The Faculty already has a management committee comprising the Dean and the Vice-Deans. However, much work occurs through committees that are too large and consequently unwieldy. Thus the Quality Assurance Committee and the Faculty Council are both much too large to ensure quality and effective leadership across the Faculty and both confuse implementation with representation.

- The Quality Assurance Committee should be very much smaller with its members focused on developing and implementing Faculty-wide quality. There might be a case for having two Quality Assurance Committees, one concerned with teaching and student assessment, and the other with quality of research and research infrastructure.
- The Faculty needs strong sub-committees with appropriate membership able to plan strategically for specific areas and implement policy.

2. Study Programmes

The breadth of the Faculty's programmes is clearly a distinctive strength of the Faculty. However, the following issues must be tackled:

- The existing range of programmes and in particular the range of possible combinations (double majors) generates complexity especially in timetabling; it also leads to an imbalance of resources. To a large extent these problems are inevitable if the current range of programmes is to be maintained. The Faculty needs to clarify at a high level the extent to which it is prepared to accept these costs and the constraints they place on its activities.
- The issue of marking standards must be tackled as a high priority. Students experience the marking as fair but it would not stand up to international scrutiny. Marking must involve some independent assessment (even if only on a sample basis) such as double-marking and the use of external examiners who are subject-specific

experts from other universities; annual and year-on-year cumulative analyses and comparisons should be undertaken for individual markers, courses, and years. The Faculty needs standard procedures which can both guarantee the objectivity of assessment and enable comparison between departments as well as comparison with equivalent departments in other universities. Such robust procedures would enhance the Faculty's national and international reputation.

• While the contents of individual programmes are often up to date, there is no standard procedure for curriculum review across the Faculty.

3. Students

There is excellent support for students' extra-curricular activity. Overall students clearly believe that they can contribute to the improvement of teaching and learning and in some cases believe that their views are taken seriously. The Faculty needs to build on this excellent foundation.

- In general students' comments are usually considered by the Faculty, but students do not know if this happens. The Faculty needs to 'close the feedback loop' and communicate its response to students' concerns. For example, the regular university-level student evaluation (student survey of lecturers) is under-used and, quite understandably, students do not believe it is taken seriously. The Faculty could report changes that it has implemented as a result of the survey, for example through a 'You said, we did' page on its website.
- Students and teachers appear to believe that students are only acquiring specialist knowledge of their discipline. However through university study students also acquire general 'transferable skills', ranging from critical thinking to oral and written presentation skills, as well as computer literacy and, for some programmes, statistical and analytical skills. Students need to be facilitated to become more aware of these aspects of their education, not least in terms of its benefits for their employability in a wide range of occupations that may not be directly linked to the discipline of their degree.
- Despite their initial expectations, it is clear that many or perhaps most doctoral students will not be able to follow an academic career. The Faculty needs to take responsibility for supporting these students in developing alternative career paths, not least through greater use of their existing networks and transferable skills.
- The Faculty needs to develop its alumni relations and acquire a better knowledge of its graduates' careers; it should develop a Faculty careers office and provide administrative support for alumni relations. This would immediately benefit current doctoral students. Over time it might be desirable to develop separate careers and alumni offices, but in the immediate future a combined office would make best use of limited staff numbers.

4. Teachers

Teaching staff at all levels appear committed and enthusiastic. We witnessed examples of up-to-date, innovative and engaged teaching. The Faculty needs however to systematise and professionalise its teaching. The objective here is to facilitate improvement, not to undermine scholarship through bureaucratic controls!

- The Faculty should introduce immediately formal training for teaching assistants (including doctoral students) before they are allowed any teaching role.
- The Faculty should ensure that as soon as possible all those appointed to scientificteaching grade have access to formal training in third level pedagogy.
- The Faculty should institute systematic workshops etc. in teaching methodology so that *all* staff can continually update their teaching.
- At the moment teaching staff clearly exchange ideas and experiences. This can be greatly enhanced by a formal programme of Peer Observed Teaching involving all teaching staff.
- The Faculty should in due course require all newly appointed teaching staff to acquire some formal HE teaching qualification, like the Postgraduate Certificate in Teaching in Higher Education (PGCTHE), as part of a longer term enhancement programme.

5. Scientific and Professional Activity

There are examples of impressive research at individual and departmental levels. However, more could be achieved by greater systematisation and support. Through the Vice-Dean of Research, the Faculty needs to have a clear overview of its research activity.

- The Faculty needs to develop an explicit overall research strategy while re-affirming academic freedom and the fundamental importance of individual scholarship, especially in the humanities. The research strategy should identify areas of existing strength which need to be promoted and supported; it could identify a few areas for development in the medium term; it should identify the research infrastructure needed to support both areas of strength and individual scholarship.
- The Faculty has a pressing need for a dedicated research office. This would: (a) systematically monitor opportunities for grants, fellowships etc. at both national and especially European level relevant to the Faculty and alert Faculty members as appropriate; (b) provide administrative and costing support for grant applications (e.g. budgets, standard information about the University and the Faculty, records of successful grant applications to serve as models); (c) facilitate liaison with national and international collaborators in the case of large collaborative grant applications; (d) provide post-award administrative support in terms of budgeting, reporting etc.; (e) arrange for training in the process of writing research grant applications, particularly for larger international grants such as from the EU Horizon 20/20 Programme. This would require a small but professional staff.
- The Faculty should introduce a system of individual research plans drawn up between each staff member and the person responsible for the co-ordination of research in their discipline. Individual research plans enable staff members to set themselves goals and ensure that the research leaders can support and facilitate their colleagues; they would also enable an annual overview of the Faculty's research activities.

6. International Cooperation and Mobility

The Faculty has an impressive level of international co-operation and mobility but this remains rather ad hoc and depends largely on individual contacts.

- The Faculty needs to develop procedures for documenting and analysing its international activity as the basis for a more systematic approach. In particular, the Faculty ought to give greater scrutiny to and have a better knowledge of partner institutions where students are sent on exchange, in order to ensure the strength of the student experience.
- An immediate priority is to update the English language information on the Faculty's international website: http://www.ffzg.unizg.hr/international/about-fhss/programs/ba-and-ma/

7. Resources, Administration, Space, Equipment and Finance

In general the Faculty has adequate resources and effective administration. However, some re-allocation of resources is needed to support future development:

- As a priority the Faculty should establish a dedicated research office and a dedicated careers office; it should provide administrative support for alumni relations.
- Some technical equipment especially in psychology needs upgrading. There is no research computing infrastructure of the sort seen in many leading institutions; there is no GIS (Geographical Information Systems) software, no visual software, no qualitative data analysis software and only limited statistics software.
- There needs to be a programme of professional development for non-teaching staff especially those working in the student administration office.
- The Faculty is facing a loss of teaching staff over the next few years and must recognise that the current funding model for teaching assistants will not be renewed. Especially in this context, it is imperative that the Faculty develops effective and strategic level financial planning.

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

1. Institutional management and quality assurance

- 1.1. The Faculty's strategic plan is still under development and only an initial draft has been completed. While distinctive objectives are proposed as part of this strategy, they remain at a general level. There is no operational plan and no proposed system for monitoring progress.
- 1.2 The Faculty needs to strengthen its strategic management potential. However, at a day-to-day level, it is effective and well organised; procedures and regulations are well documented.
- 1.3. The Faculty has only limited information about the university's strategy and the Faculty's own strategy is not yet finalised. However, on the basis of current information, the Faculty appears to be working in line with the university's overall objectives.

- 1.4. The Faculty's mission stresses the importance of a broad educational offering. The Faculty offers a wide range of subjects which can also be combined as double majors. This is very much in line with the Faculty's mission. Some work is still required on the Learning Outcomes of some study programmes.
- 1.5. A lot of data is incomplete or was not available for the panel. Data on research output is collected but is not analysed. There is no assessment of the quality of the Faculty's research which cannot be assessed solely from bibliometrics. There is no standardised analysis of exam results across departments or even within departments. However, individual departments (e.g. English Language and Literature, Psychology) have instituted quality policies which are examples of good or even best practice.
- 1.6 The Head of Department has overall responsibility for teaching quality in his/her Department and ensures that teaching is delivered as planned. However, there is no monitoring of the results given by individual examiners and no systematic analysis of assessment results within or between departments. There appears to be no formal mechanisms for improving teaching quality.
- 1.7. Although the quantity of research is measured, the Faculty has no systematic formal mechanisms for monitoring or improving research quality.
- 1.8. There is a Student Ombudsman but this appears to be an information source rather than a student representative and/or investigator on behalf of students. Although students mostly considered their assessments to be fair, the system is clearly open to favouritism. Students and staff also have little protection against possible cyberbullying and mobbing.

2. Study programmes

2.1. Some individual departments monitor the quality of study programmes (e.g. Psychology), but there is no standardised procedure. The views of students are collected but the "feedback loop" to students on actions taken by the Faculty is less clear (see 3.7).

While Psychology and some other departments involve outside professionals in the development of their programmes, in most cases the role of outside stakeholders is limited and often non-existent.

2.2. Given the society's need for educated and critically aware individuals, enrolment quotas appear to be appropriate. However, information on the employment of the Faculty's graduates is limited and not well documented. It is important to develop this information rather than relying on information from national statistical agencies such as the Croatian Employment Service (CES), for international experience suggests that such sources usually fail to capture the varied career paths of graduates especially in the humanities and social sciences.

- 2.3. Although the allocation of work amongst teaching staff appears to be considered fair by all staff, there is no formal workload allocation model. There are serious threats to the quality of teaching from the projected reduction in the number of teaching assistants. In some areas there is already pressure on staff-student ratios which must have a negative impact on the learning experience for students. There are also shortcomings in the data provided by the ISVU system for pass rates.
- 2.4. In most cases learning outcomes are clearly described and available to students. Nevertheless, there is further work to be done across the Faculty in standardising an approach to Learning Outcomes. The doctoral studies do develop strong competences across a range of disciplinary, methodological and research skills.
- 2.5. In most cases assessment of individual students is transparent and in line with the content of their study programme. However, there is no objective validation of the marking standards used by departments or even by individuals; there are no procedures to ensure that the full range of learning is assessed. As noted in the Recommendations for Improvement and in 3.4, this is a critical area for improvement within the Faculty.
- 2.6. There is no clear system to allocate ECTS values to study units, although these values are frequently adjusted to take account of student concerns. International experience suggests that there are objective limits to a completely effective and standardised ECTS allocation.
- 2.7. There are only limited formal procedures to ensure the standard of each study programme and no general system of curriculum review. However, staff are clearly able to ensure that in general the content and quality of the study programmes is up to date and of a high standard.
- 2.8. There is a wide and varied range of teaching methods which are appropriate for the subject matter of the different programmes; teaching encourages independent learning by students. However, there is no system of peer review of teaching to enable the general enhancement of Learning and Teaching
- 2.9. Almost all appropriate bibliographic resources are available to students who make good use of the very impressive Faculty library.
- 2.10. Across a wide range of departments there are some very good examples of internships and of other forms of practical experience within the study programmes (languages, psychology, sociology, archaeology). However, this is not universally implemented: there is a lack of systematically collected data on the effectiveness of such initiatives; there are no student placements involving business partnerships; there is no student community service.

3. Students

3.1. The Faculty analyses admission criteria and uses this to update the criteria.

- 3.2. The Faculty supports students in their extracurricular activities.
- 3.3. The Faculty offers psychological counselling which is valued by students and mentorship during their studies. The major weakness is the lack of any effective career guidance service.
- 3.4. The students are well aware of the assessment procedures and can appeal their results. However, individual marking and overall marking standards are not validated. Consequently the objectivity of marking cannot be assured. This places the Faculty out of line with international standards.
- 3.5. Individual departments do make an effort to maintain contact with their students after they graduate and some have begun to gather statistical data. However, there is no systematic policy at Faculty level.
- 3.6. In order to maintain its high public profile in Croatia and the wider region in the digital age, the Faculty needs to radically upgrade the public face of its website.
- 3.7. Students do express their opinions, but it is not always clear whether these views are able to influence the decision-making process.
- 3.8. Although the student survey is used to improve the quality of teaching, there is no feedback to the students.

4. Teachers

- 4.1. In spite of externally imposed restrictions on its staffing, the Faculty makes every attempt to ensure that the number of qualified teachers on each study programme is in line with state regulations and adequate to ensure the quality of teaching and learning. It is however not always successful. The situation will deteriorate with the noncontinuation of the junior research assistant programme.
- 4.2. The fact that appointments largely depend on State rather than Faculty decisions makes it particularly difficult to devise any adequate Faculty staffing policy that takes into account potential retirements and the sustainability of study programmes. From the point of view of individiual staff development, there appears to be no policy of professional development for teaching and indeed a doctorate is assumed to be an adequate qualification for third level teaching. The Faculty does however include the Teacher Training Centre which provides courses in third level pedagogy.
- 4.3. The Faculty takes account of the efficient teacher-student ratio, but this is seriously threatened because of external limitations on staffing.
- 4.4. There is no evidence of any policy for the formal professional development of scientific-teaching staff.

- 4.5. The Faculty makes successful efforts to ensure that the workload distribution is fair and equitable.
- 4.6. Teaching and research activities appear to be at an appropriate level and are not jeopardised by external commitments.

5. Scientific and professional activity

- 5.1. The Faculty has no explicit research agenda or research strategy.
- 5.2. Despite the lack of any explicit research strategy, the Faculty facilitates national and international cooperation.
- 5.3. Despite the lack of any explicit research strategy, there is an adequate number and profile of researchers for the implementation of research.
- 5.4. There are individual examples of globally significant scientific contributions, but these are exceptions.
- 5.5. There appears to be an informal encouragement for research activities. Promotion requires some minimal form of publication.
- 5.6. There are some examples of adequate publications to international standards, but this in not achieved overall; the lack of full bibliographic data makes it very difficult to evaluate the output.
- 5.7. The Faculty has a satisfactory number of domestic projects, but only a few international projects.
- 5.8. In terms of knowledge transfer and cooperation with non-academic organizations there are examples of activities by individuals, interdisciplinary groups and departments. This is an area which could be further developed.
- 5.9. On the basis of the self-evaluation document, as well as the site visit, the panel is not aware of any evidence of professional and commercial activities undertaken by the Faculty which could detract from its core mission of teaching and research.
- 5.10. The doctoral students are of a high standard and receive an excellent doctoral training in their discipline.

6. International cooperation and mobility

6.1. The Faculty does encourage mobility of students from other higher education institutions, but the existence of both the 3+2 and the 4+1 degree structure makes such mobility difficult; the proposed 5+0 structure would make the situation even worse.

- 6.2. Students have opportunities to complete a part of their programme abroad, and are supported in doing so. However in order to prevent problems during the exchange, Learning Agreements must be finalised before the exchange begins and students must adhere to them.
- 6.3. The staff do undertake international cooperation and mobility, but it is not clear to what extent they are actually encouraged to do so and there is little systematic analysis of their experiences abroad.
- 6.4. Individual staff and departments are part of international associations and exchange results of research, but there is no overall faculty policy for these activities.
- 6.5. The Faculty has adequate conditions for attracting students from abroad, although there are limitations with regard to postgraduate students. The Faculty could work on its international promotion (e.g. via website).
- 6.6. There is a considerable number of teachers coming from abroad and they are well supported by the Faculty's International Office.
- 6.7. The Faculty has various forms of inter-institutional cooperation, but there is a need for systematisation and strategic planning of this form of international cooperation.

7. Resources: administration, space, equipment and finances

- 7.1. Facilities are generally of a high standard and there is evidence of substantial investment (e.g. the Faculty Library), but there are some inadequacies for such a prestigious institution, such as Computer Assisted Language Learning (CALL), Geographic Information Systems (GIS) for archaeology, dedicated spaces for group study (especially in the library), modern laboratory equipment for psychology (EEG recording), and visual and spatial technology.
- 7.2. The overall ratio of teaching and non-teaching staff is very good. However, the distribution of administrative staff across different activities could be improved. This is especially the case with regard to research, since there is a lack of professional research support for research grant proposal preparation and for post-award administration. Many other universities have a Careers Office that helps students gain employment after their studies; other universities also have an Alumni Relations Office to build long-term relations with their graduates. Even if it does not create distinct offices, the Faculty needs administrative support in order to provide careers advice for students and to develop its alumni relations,
- 7.3. There appear to be no policies in place to ensure the professional development of non-teaching staff, but some training has been available on an ad hoc basis.

- 7.4. Laboratory equipment and relevant usage protocols comply with international standards, but some equipment requires modernisation.
- 7.5. Most equipment is adequate for teaching, but it is not always modern (see 7.1.)
- 7.6. The library is an impressive development for the Faculty which has been a step change for the learning environment.
- 7.7. The Faculty is financially sustainable in the short term. However, in the immediate future the combination of the reduction of state funding (contract end for junior research assistants) and the hiring freeze will seriously jeopardise the education of current and future students some students may not be able to complete their studies. This will also negatively affect research output. Although the Faculty's finances seem to be transparently invested in improving education and research, there are serious limitations on institutional financial autonomy.
- 7.8. The Faculty uses its limited funds very effectively.