



## **THE UNIVERSITIES PROJECT OF THE SALZBURG SEMINAR VISITING ADVISORS' REPORT**

**UNIVERSITY OF RIJEKA  
RIJEKA, CROATIA**

**MARCH 19-24, 2001**

### ***Team Members***

**Dr. Jochen Fried**, Director, Universities Project, Salzburg Seminar  
**Dr. Erita Hill**, Chancellor Emerita, Indiana University Kokomo  
**Dr. Bryce Jordan**, President Emeritus, Pennsylvania State University  
**Dr. Leopold März** (team leader) Rector, University of Agricultural Sciences, Vienna  
**Ms. Anna Glass**, Program Assistant, Universities Project, Salzburg Seminar

### ***Introduction***

This report is based on a series of meetings which took place at the University of Rijeka (RIU), Croatia from March 19-23, 2001. The visit took place under the auspices of the Salzburg Seminar's Universities Project, at the invitation of the Rector of RIU. The team members (hereafter "Advisors") met with the Rector, vice rectors, deans, professors and students of RIU to discuss a variety of issues of concern to the University leadership. In addition to these discussions with the university community, the Advisors met with two members of the local government, and gained from them an outside perspective with respect to how RIU could partner with local government and businesses and serve as a catalyst for economic development. The conversations throughout the visit were collegial, mutually engaging, and intended to bring new understanding to each participant. The report below reflects the findings of the Advisors. It includes observations and recommendations of possible steps to be made by RIU in efforts to reform the University and to adjust to the changes in the national laws and policy for higher education as well as to trends and developments in international higher education.

The first day's meetings covered the topics of University development strategy and structure, general management issues at RIU in light of the new law of higher education, challenges and possible approaches to the promotion of education within Croatia, tuition fees and the social needs in education. In the afternoon, the issues of research structure and regional cooperation were discussed with the representatives of the local government. The second day, the Advisors met with student representatives to talk about curriculum, student social life and the evaluation of faculty members. University autonomy and academic freedom were topics in the meeting with vice rectors and professors; in the afternoon, the Advisors visited the Maritime Faculty for a discussion on the internationalization of studies and the European credit and transfer system (ECTS). For the final part of the day, the

Advisors visited the Faculty of Tourism and Hospitality Management in Opatija where the role of the marketplace in teaching and research was the focus of discussion. On the third and final day of the visit, most of the Advisors went to visit the Faculties of Philosophy and of Economics and Tourism, and the Teachers College in Pula. One Advisor took this opportunity to visit the Faculty of Medicine in Rijeka. In the afternoon, the Advisors presented an oral version of the preliminary findings of this report to the Rector and vice rectors in Rijeka.

### **Context**

Prior to the visit, RIU provided excellent background materials for the Advisors' review, including extensive data on issues in higher education currently confronted by all universities in Croatia ["Science and Higher Education in Croatia," a report from a visit by Academia Europaea; a 1994 report by the Croatian Democracy Project on the Higher Education Collaboration Program for the University of Rijeka; a 1995 Council of Europe report, "Croatia: Report of the Advisory Mission on Quality Assurance," a 2000 booklet about the University of Rijeka], and also a thorough Self Evaluation Report of the University of Rijeka with tables for student enrolment and graduation in the different Faculties<sup>1</sup> and on the different campuses and a clear statement of the perceived issues and obstacles currently confronting the University.

We also received from the Salzburg Visiting Advisors Program (VAP) the report from an earlier VAP visit to the University of Zagreb. This report contained the following language, which serves as an excellent introduction to what we encountered in our visit to the University of Rijeka.

"The sector of higher education and its institutions exist in a political, economic, social and legal context, which determines to a large extent how they function and how they relate to the larger society" (see Visiting Advisors Report on the University of Zagreb, May 2000). This context has national and international dimensions and must be seen against the background of the recent history of the country. It is only very recently, after a time of war and struggle for independence, that Croatia could begin to stabilize itself internally and emerge from years of international isolation. Nevertheless, reforms of the higher education sector began as early as 1993 to lead the universities and other institutions from the typical Socialist to a more Western-type system. Since 1999 and the end of the isolation from Europe, more initiatives were taken to pave the way for the universities to enter the international academic community."

The Croatian government has set out to establish and implement a new Act for Higher Education. We applaud the anticipated higher education legislation that will remedy the very divisive and unwieldy system of semi-autonomous Faculties and will concentrate the budgetary power in the University administration in order to bring the whole institution forward. Autonomy is essential to enable the individual institutions to perform effective internal reforms. These changes become more urgent in view of the development of a European Space for Education and Research and the dynamically developing Bologna Process. The Advisors believe that the following aspects will be crucial to the success of a new legislation:

---

<sup>1</sup> "Faculty" indicates a unit or department of study, "faculty" the teaching staff.

- The universities are and will remain public institutions. Significant deregulation is essential; however, the fate of the universities cannot rely solely on the forces of the market economy. A delicate balance between university autonomy and government control must be created and maintained.
- There is a broad consensus in Western democracies on the usefulness of an intermediate level of management (buffer organizations or consultant bodies such as a Board of Directors) between the government and the academic institutions.
- Management decisions concerning personnel and allocation of resources should be left to the responsibility of the University management.
- The status of the Faculties as legal entities will have to be changed; part of the autonomy of individual units must be yielded to the university level to move from a fragmented to an “integrated university” in which the budgetary process is centralized.
- Facing the European process of integration and harmonization, the Croatian universities are well advised to develop and implement explicit international policies. To do so, they need to establish strong international relations units at the level of the University’s central administration.

### ***Stocktaking: Strengths and Challenges***

In addition to the current constraints from the lack of autonomy, constraints that should be alleviated under the new legislation, the advisors noted four major challenges for RIU: (I) geographic dispersion coupled with legal autonomy of Faculties, which leads to the absence of a unified identity or to a shared mission for the university; (II) following on this and compounding it, there is no coordinated strategic planning nor centralized budgeting; (III) duplication of degree and course offerings, accompanied by significant gaps in program offerings; (IV) under emphasis on the importance of teaching so that good teaching is not rewarded nor poor teaching rebuked, contributing to the very high attrition of students.

Our report will expand on each of these four challenges and provide recommendations for each, but it is appropriate first to note some outstanding strengths for RIU that will be the basis for its transformation and for meeting the four challenges as well as others that will arise in the future.

Our report will also include an attachment in which we discuss separately the controversial issue of tuition fees and provide an assessment based on our experience with this policy as it has been implemented in other countries and other universities.

### ***Strengths***

First among these was the presence of a committed, creative, and experienced Rector, Daniel Rukavina. Clearly his past success in nurturing the development of the Faculty of Medicine and of many outstanding scholars/teachers, some of whom remain in positions of leadership at RIU, empowers him now to fill the same role for the University as a whole.

Following on this, and not unrelated, is the presence of a strong and able team assembled by the Rector in the past four months and already working well and productively together as we saw from the excellent self-evaluation document they had prepared.

We also recognized and applauded the evident good will towards the Rector and his team from the leadership of the currently semi-autonomous Faculties. While understandable anxiety was expressed regarding the consequences of lessening the autonomy of individual Faculties and the establishment of a centralized administration, no one expressed hostility toward the University leadership. Without exception, the voices we heard indicated they would prefer to look to their Rector and the administrative team within the University for guidance and for the allocation of resources, rather than to an external force like the Ministry.

We observed loyalty and good will on the part of students toward the administration and the teaching faculty, even when they had concerns about the quality of teaching. It has often been stated internationally that students are the most valuable asset of a university. This is certainly true for RIU and its 12,500-student population. The Advisors were pleased to have the opportunity to meet with a group of student representatives from the Faculties of Law, Medicine, and Tourism and Hospitality Management for a discussion on a wide range of issues, including students' social living conditions, curriculum, evaluation of teaching staff and tuition fees. We found the students to be well informed and mature in their observations and comments, reasonable, articulate and concerned with the quality of their education. RIU is to be congratulated for having such sensible and loyal student representatives who care about the advancement of the University as a whole. It is also noteworthy that the students we met expressed complete satisfaction about the good and regular communication that they and their colleagues have with the Rector, the vice rectors and the deans of the various Faculties. This is by no means usual at other universities, and bodes well for RIU as a place that wants to be known for its special commitment to student involvement and student participation.

Finally, we noted the enthusiastic support for the University from representatives of local government including financial support and assistance with capital projects, and their view that RIU can be a catalyst for economic development in the area.

## **Challenges**

### ***I. and II. Institutional structure: no central identity and mission; no centralized planning or budget***

While the main administration of RIU and most Faculties are spread throughout the city of Rijeka, the third largest town (population 200,000) and biggest seaport in Croatia, several Faculties and Teachers Colleges are located in the towns of Pula, Opatija and Gospic." Pula and Gospic are each an hour or more distant from Rijeka by car. While the physical distance between Pula and Rijeka, for example, need not be a major obstacle in this age of information and communication technology, the current legal structure under which Faculties deal directly with the Ministry for funding rather than with the central administration of the University, seriously interferes with any unified and coherent planning. It leads to feudalism and a lack of involvement

with or concern for the University as each Faculty acts and plans only for its own unit. The new higher education laws should lead to a more centralized and unified structure, but the geographic dispersal will continue. There is, however, talk of a new site to bring together some key elements within the university at what is currently a military installation in Rijeka.

***Observations and Recommendations:***

We recommend that, at an appropriate time as relates to the implementation of the new Higher Education Law, the Rector and his staff, with consultation from the faculty, or at least the Faculty senates, plan and implement a totally new academic structure for the University. This structure should group the disciplines that are offered (both the teaching and research aspects thereof) into well-reasoned critical masses that are both academic and budgetary units. Each unit should be headed by an appropriately staffed dean or executive officer, who would report to the chief academic officer of the University. (While it is not the Advisors' place to specify an exact organizational structure, we could imagine the following schools or colleges: medicine; law; engineering; maritime and transportation studies; philosophy [or arts, humanities, and social science]; natural science; education [or teacher training]; business and economics; and hospitality management.)

In the interest of overall academic and fiscal cohesion, the various offerings at Pula and Gospić should probably be branches of the University's colleges or schools, and report to the appropriate deans. Each of these locations should be managed locally by an executive officer who would report to the chief academic officer of the University. The operation at Opatija should probably best be considered as the school or college of hospitality management, and be administered by a dean who would report to the chief academic officer of the University.

With respect to budget, preparation for autonomy and for centralized budgeting will require the University to evaluate and determine with precision the total cost of educating its students, not only the personnel cost for faculty and other personnel, but for facilities, maintenance and renovation of buildings, utilities, library acquisitions and services, information technology - hardware and software - and the essential replacement and updating of these new tools. Only after an evaluation can RIU fully understand what percentages of those costs are provided by the state, what will be provided by student fees, and what remains to be covered from other sources, public and private alike. Many models exist for this cost analysis of the education of university students per capita. Most public, or state supported (often known as "state assisted") universities in the United States have engaged in this important exercise, which must be recalculated each year to take into account inflation, changes in utility costs, enrolment figures, retention and graduation figures, as well as other factors such as new construction.

If one considers what an overall budget for the University should be, the institution is under-funded. Moreover, there appears to be little prospect in the immediate future for substantial improvement in that arena. Nevertheless, the administrative and faculty momentum and motivation that we sensed during our interviews would indicate that a number of new and reformative policy moves could go some distance

toward making the current funding position better serve RIU, its students, and the Republic.

To help address the under-funding, we recommend that the administration investigate the private gift or sponsorship campaigns that are now underway at universities in England, Germany and other parts of Europe. Such funding devices have long been used in the United States, but are relatively new in Europe. Once these investigations are complete, RIU should offer a public information program in order to make clear what qualitative improvements will take place as a result of the additional funding. After that, an intensive private gift campaign should be undertaken.

### ***III. Academic structure: duplication of degrees and course offerings and gaps in the program offerings***

Logical groupings of disciplines and course offerings are lacking. Further, there is a sizable and wasteful duplication of degree and course offerings within the city of Rijeka, within the Faculties in other locations, as well as between the Faculties in Rijeka and the various outlying Faculties. (A word of caution in this regard: while we believe the points made below are well taken, we understand that outside observers conducting only a brief visit cannot know all of the ramifications of the current structure. A complex institution such as RIU obviously requires certain academic duplication, particularly as concerns the outlying locations, where it is important to serve local constituencies in certain fields of study.)

For example the Faculty of Engineering, an administrative and budgetary unit, offers courses and degrees and conducts research in mechanical, electrical, marine, and computer engineering, as well as in naval architecture. That Faculty has, in addition to a research and teaching staff of seventy-nine, a nonacademic staff of fifty. Also in Rijeka, the Faculty of Civil Engineering, another administrative and budgetary unit, offers teaching and research in civil engineering. It has twenty-nine faculty members and a nonacademic staff of nineteen. Also in the engineering field within the city of Rijeka, the Department of Maritime Studies, with a research and teaching staff of thirty-one, offers a degree in maritime engineering, while the Rijeka College of Maritime Studies, with a research and teaching staff of forty-one and a nonacademic staff of thirty-five, offers a maritime transportation engineering degree. Further still, the Faculty of Medicine in Rijeka offers a degree in sanitary engineering. That curriculum appears to contain elements of both engineering (e.g., environmental surveillance) and public health. Given the scarcity of resources for higher education on both national and local levels, it would seem prudent to examine very carefully whether there is the possibility of a more integrated, consistent and cost-effective arrangement for the various engineering units and curricula at RIU. Another example of the duplication was found in the Faculties of Economics and of Philosophy, both of which offer degrees in computer science. A careful and strategic internal analysis could determine whether duplications are necessary or wasteful. Both Opatija and Pula offer degrees in the field of hospitality management and tourism. In Pula the course offerings seem centered largely on traditional business subjects, curricula undoubtedly needed *per se* in the region. One wonders, however, if the societal need of graduates in the field of hospitality management and tourism is such as to require the offering of degrees in two places. In view of the large enrollment at Opatija and

the potential overpopulation of the profession in the region, this is a question that seems to call for study.

Without information as to the extent of the need for kindergarten, primary and secondary teachers in the Republic, it is difficult for the Advisors to know if the demand is great enough for teacher training units in three different locations of the University, as well as a degree offering in pedagogy in the Faculty of Philosophy in Rijeka. Because of the dispersal and duplication in the University's work in this field, however, this is a question that should be explored.

When the entire academic spectrum of the University is considered, certain curricular gaps appear, especially in the social sciences and in the basic natural sciences of mathematics, physics, chemistry and biology. Very limited offerings in social science are found in the Faculties of Medicine and Law, with, no doubt, particular orientations toward the disciplines of the host Faculties. While basic science and mathematics courses are presently offered in the Medical and Philosophy Faculties, there seems to be a need for a major academic unit dedicated to teaching and research in those disciplines. It seems to us that a University with the dimensions of RIU should have a school or college that offers concentrated teaching and research in chemistry, physics, biology, and mathematics.

### ***Observations and Recommendations***

We recommend a thorough review of all programs in all sites to assess whether indeed there are wasteful duplications or necessary. Based on this assessment, decisions should be taken to combine or eliminate programs according to need and student demand.

If RIU were to decide to pool its natural science resources and form a new and free-standing science unit, it would seem prudent to consider alternative institutional models different from the classical Faculty. For a full-fledged Natural Sciences Faculty, RIU would have to make enormous investments, both financially (because experimental sciences at an advanced level require expensive equipment) and in terms of attracting new staff (because certain academic qualifications are missing in the existing spectrum.) Instead, RIU could consider the creation of a new and innovative institutional unit: a *Natural Sciences Center*, which, by combining the present resources and staff, would offer teaching services to the students of various Faculties, thus overcoming the existing duplications. At the same time, it would develop its own research profile with a strong emphasis on interdisciplinary work in areas like, for example, biomechanics, medical instrumentation or coastal environment issues. These areas are presently neglected due to the vertical (Faculty) structure of RIU, which discourages interdisciplinary cooperation, although the expertise and the potential are there. As far as the teaching function is concerned, the Center would not have its "own" students but would contribute to the undergraduate education of other Faculties. In terms of research, however, the Center would represent the "missing link," which could help explore the potential for innovative scientific work that is currently hemmed in within the individual Faculties. Clearly, the Center should also become home to advanced postgraduate training of the highest caliber. A new financing formula would be needed for an institutional

structure that overcomes the existing fragmentation of disciplines and transversally crosses the Faculty lines.

#### ***IV. The curriculum: under-emphasis on teaching; high attrition rates***

We noted with concern a very high student attrition rate, which varies for the different Faculties, but is high in each and very high for the University as a whole. Given the level of preparation of entering students and the admission standards both for fee-paying and subsidized students, we found this attrition and the low graduation rate (under 20%) very troubling and financially costly.

Students themselves noted the low faculty/student ratio (although this is not the case for all Faculties; the Faculty of Medicine in particular has much smaller classes) and also said that their education lacked enough practicum, emphasized the theoretical, and provided little hands-on experience, whether this was in law, medicine, engineering or tourism. When asked to identify the single most pressing issue or problem for them at RIU they cited this lack of “practicum,” by which they mean an overemphasis on “book knowledge” and rote learning. While complaints about the gulf between the world of learning and “real life” are common among students globally and are probably as old as the institution of the university, the reason for dissatisfaction on behalf of the students may be more acute in formerly socialist countries than elsewhere. To generalize, it may be said that the curriculum in these countries was often old-fashioned and inflexible as a consequence of “the primary requirement of meeting the personnel needs of a centrally planned (and, therefore, rigid and highly segmented) economy. Styles of learning and teaching, and of student assessment, were generally traditional (which may be attributable to the central role given to engineering and the natural sciences, neither of which—even in the West—are especially conducive to curriculum innovation). Novelty, of course, was inherently suspect.” (Peter Scott, “Higher Education in Central and Eastern Europe: An Analytical Report,” in: Ten Years After and Looking Ahead: A Review of the Transformations of Higher Education in Central and Eastern Europe, Bucharest: UNESCO-CEPES 2000, p.388)

#### **Observations and Recommendations**

The Self-Evaluation Report (p.26) states “[A] great number of teaching staff is not qualified to hold classes.” If this assertion is true— and some of the comments by the student representatives confirm this view—there is need for immediate action. While RIU cannot alter the criteria for academic recognition and promotion overnight, certain measures can be taken swiftly to improve the appreciation of teaching at RIU.

A. Open and transparent communication between students and teaching staff is the key to advancing a conducive learning atmosphere and stimulating the motivation of the student learner. Each department should make specific efforts to ensure that a sufficient number of consultation hours is offered to students, and that teaching staff are available to students at pre-arranged times. Modern communication technologies like e-mail offer new ways of interaction between students and professors, and could be used to supplement consultation hours (especially in view of the dispersal of Faculties in the region).



B. Creating positive incentives to spotlight excellence in teaching can be useful. Supported by the Rector's Office and the offices of the individual deans, the student organization could create a "Best Professor of the Year Award" at the level of the Faculties. This would help to focus attention on positive examples and provide an important feedback from students regarding their perception of and standards for "good teaching." Similarly, an award for "Best Teaching Innovation of the Year" could be established, concentrating less on the individual talents and achievement of professors than on curricular reform. Those awarded should be eligible for advanced promotion.

C. Award competitions cannot replace a methodic and regular **faculty evaluation**, which should be introduced at RIU in due course, drawing on the expertise of the new *Learning Resource Center*. Once the appropriate approach to this evaluation is in place, the Center should conduct periodic (5-year) reviews of the teaching/research performance of faculty. The Center should be entrusted by RIU Senate to prepare a study of the various models and modalities of faculty evaluation in different countries, to develop a multi-parameter scheme that meets the specific needs of RIU, and to devise a detailed procedure for the implementation of this scheme.

D. Inability or unwillingness to comply with minimum standards of teaching on the part of individual staff should be chastened. The ability to teach students effectively is not an innate quality but an art and a technique, and, as such, can be learned. Learning how to impart knowledge to students should not only be a concern of the individual teaching staff, but of the university as a whole. The Advisors, therefore, recommend that a *Learning Resource Center* be established at RIU to provide opportunities to faculty members and teaching assistants for professional development in teaching, and to enable them to promote student learning. The tasks performed by the Center would be to:

- assist faculty in developing more effective teaching methods based on a survey of current practices of teaching and learning at RIU, which takes into account perspectives both of teaching staff and students;
- offer mandatory seminars to new teaching staff;
- be of service to faculty in creating clear course syllabi and concise course descriptions as well as in designing new course materials that include active learning elements and self-study units;
- promote university-wide policies and programs that advance more "practicum" as part of the curricula by seeking cooperation with social and civic organizations
- within the Primorsko-Goranska region, thereby enhancing the learning experience of students through public work;
- serve as a showcase for "best practice" models of curricula reform and learning methods throughout the University;
- introduce regular teaching evaluation by examining the experience and various approaches at other universities, mainly abroad, and developing a format that suits the needs at RIU;
- submit an annual report to the Rector, the Senate and the Student Union, highlighting the progress made in advancing the quality of teaching at RIU and outlining the measures for further improvement within the upcoming year.

Providing a rich and challenging learning environment for students is a vital function of the University as a whole. Therefore, the *Learning Resource Center* should be established as a central unit of RIU under the Rector's Office with each Faculty and School contributing to its financial sustainability.

### ***Summary***

In spite of the four significant challenges we observed for the University and its leadership and within the context of the forthcoming changes in higher education policy and procedures, we are optimistic about the future of RIU. The strengths noted above are key to the effective leadership of RIU. Morale is high, confidence in and respect for the Rector are palpable. Our observations were of necessity quick and may be incomplete and even erroneous; our recommendations are made in good faith and in hopes that they may prove useful to the leadership of RIU.

## APPENDIX 1 - Tuition Fees

Through the Self-Evaluation Report and during the meetings at RIU, the Advisors learned about the plans set forth by the new draft Bill on Institutions of Higher Education to introduce tuition fees as a general principle of tertiary education in Croatia. We heard widespread skepticism regarding these plans and the government's trust in market economy solutions to existing problems. In particular, the students we met expressed their strong dissent with the idea to shift from what they saw as "free" (that is, entirely publicly financed) higher education to a system through which students or their parents contribute to the costs of obtaining a university degree.

In higher education systems across the world, there is a trend toward financial diversification in public institutions through the introduction of tuition fees and increased reliance on nongovernmental sources of funding (e.g., private gifts, research and consultancy income generation). Diversification *per se* is a useful budgetary precept since it helps to reduce the dependence on a single source of revenue. In the same way, tuition fees can be employed as an instrument to address some of the apparent shortcomings of the present system by:

- emphasizing the central role of students as the *raison d'être* not only of the academic making of the University, but also as an important source of income generation;
- empowering the students as "shareholders" of the University and making them more aware of the value of their education;
- acknowledging the fact that a university degree usually promises higher lifetime earnings and, thus, greater cost-sharing in higher education is economically justifiable;
- discontinuing a system that unfairly favors a redistribution of public wealth from the lower and less-educated strata of society to the middle and upper class that are more likely to send their children to university.

Charging tuition is not an unknown phenomenon in the present Croatian higher education system. As in other Central and East European countries, Croatian universities have a fixed quota of undergraduates chosen on the basis of their high test scores for whom the government is willing to pay on a formula-based per capita basis; but the universities accept, for a fee, surplus students beyond the pre-determined number (the official documents use a very curious terminology to categorize these surplus students as those who are "studying for their personal needs" —implying that the "regular" students are studying for non-personal, public needs and are hence eligible for public support.)

This admission system is liable to distortion and unfairness on various levels. As the Advisors observed during their visit at RIU, in some subject areas that are particularly popular among students (like economics, law and tourism), the number of fee-paying students is exceptionally high, which results in a decline of faculty/student ratios and raises questions concerning the quality of the courses, the effectiveness of the student experience, and the ability of staff to keep up with subject developments. Given the current state of affairs, it seems only logical that the RIU has a very

unfavorable record of student dropouts as indicated by the discrepancy of figures between incoming students and graduates.

We recommend that planning begin as soon as possible to optimize the introduction of tuition for all students. In our judgment, a carefully administered tuition plan, well prepared, buttressed with a comprehensive, need-based, low-interest loan program to permit access for qualified low-income students, can be an asset and not a threat to a university. Without such careful planning and without appropriate loans, the arbitrary imposition of tuition would of course be a disaster, but we are convinced that the time taken in implementing the new tuition system for universities in Croatia will permit the necessary planning to take place.

It must be emphasized that the “deregulation” (the term is used in the government documents) of the higher education market and the complete reliance on the regulatory wisdom of the “invisible hand” cannot be considered as a panacea to solving the existing structural problems of the current higher education system. There is obviously the danger of “throwing out the good with the bad.” From the point of view of the Advisors, the universities in Croatia are rightly concerned that a “shock therapy” approach (the imposition of tuition fees without explanation or preparation) might do more harm than good. But there can also be no question that fundamental changes in the provisions for governance, financing and academic structure of higher education in the country are necessary, and that the leaders of universities would be well advised to adopt a constructive and forward-looking attitude towards a comprehensive reform of the legal foundations of higher education in Croatia. Only in a serious and open dialogue can legitimate concerns and reservations be brought to bear.

It should also be noted that the introduction of tuition fees cannot become a substitute for the commitment of the government to a financially healthy and thriving higher educational sector. It would be an entire misconception to regard tuition fees as a means to relieve the burden on the federal budget and to allow for diminishing public support for higher education (a misconception that might be particularly common among governments in countries that confront structural adjustment, economic downturn and high levels of unemployment, all resulting in a weak federal budget.) There should be no doubt that higher education continues to be considered a “public good” and that its advancement remains a high priority on the agenda of the government. At a time when the “knowledge economy” is proclaimed to be the future engine of competitive success and social improvement, it would be completely counteractive to deprive the institutions of knowledge production of the necessary fuel, maintenance and upgrading to work efficiently and effectively.

As the experience in many other countries shows, it is an indispensable prerequisite for the introduction of tuition fees to have a sound and viable system of student loans and grants already in place. International experience also shows that it is an exceedingly complicated task to design a student loan scheme that both meets the requirements of a specific country and is financially sustainable in the long term. The draft Bill on Institutions of Higher Education defers an answer to this important issue to “a separate regulation:” (Article 81: “(3) The criteria and the manner of effecting students’ entitlement to the Ministry support in the form of scholarships, loans, financial aid, and tuition fees, as well as the manner in which other resources to

assist the students' standard of living and study are to be used, shall be determined by a separate regulation.") From the perspective of University leaders who care for the well-being of their students and their institution, it would seem advisable to engage very actively in the discussion about the various models of a student loan scheme and to try to contribute to the conceptualization of a workable scheme that reinforces the possible positive impact of tuition fees as a tool for higher education reform.

## **APPENDIX II – Visiting Advisors Team**

### **Dr. Jochen Fried     Germany**

Jochen Fried is director of the Universities Project of the Salzburg Seminar. Prior to joining the Salzburg Seminar in 1998, he worked as the head of programs at the Institute for Human Sciences in Vienna, and as a senior officer in the secretariat of the German Science Council in Cologne, Germany. After receiving a doctorate in German literature from Düsseldorf University in 1984, he was lecturer at Cambridge University and at the University of Ljubljana under the auspices of the German Academic Exchange Service. Dr. Fried's main area of professional interest is higher education and research policy. He serves as an expert for the Austrian Federal Ministry for Science and Transport, and is a member of the editorial board of the UNESCO-CEPES quarterly review "Higher Education in Europe."

### **Dr. Erita Hill                     USA**

Erita Hill is the former chancellor of Indiana University, Kokomo. Before joining the University in 1991, Dr. Hill spent twenty years at Lehman College, the Bronx campus of the City University of New York, where she first served as chair of romance languages, then as associate provost and finally as vice president for institutional advancement. As an administrator, Dr. Hill was an advocate of open admissions and access in higher education. She actively continues her scholarly career, writing extensively on French literature and thought in the Age of Enlightenment. Dr. Hill earned her B.A. and M.A. degrees in French from Cornell University and Middlebury College, respectively, and received her Ph.D. in romance languages from Harvard University.

### **Dr. Bryce Jordan                 USA**

Bryce Jordan has held numerous distinguished senior administrative positions in higher education over the course of his career, including president of The Pennsylvania State University from 1983 to 1990, executive vice chancellor for academic affairs for the University of Texas system from 1981 to 1983, and president of the University of Texas at Dallas from 1971 to 1981. He is currently active in a federal court-appointed Oversight Committee involving redistribution of funds to historically black public universities in Alabama. Dr. Jordan was awarded this position after acting as special advisor to the presiding federal judge in the historic case of *Knight vs. Alabama*. He has had consulting assignments at the Universities of Texas, Nebraska, North Carolina, Wisconsin and Arizona State, as well as at foundations and the Association of Governing Boards. He received his Ph.D. in history of music and comparative literature from the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, in 1956.

**Dr. Leopold März                      Austria**

Leopold März has been Professor of Biochemistry at the Department of Chemistry of the University of Agricultural Sciences in Vienna since 1983 and was appointed Rector in 1993. He is currently president of the Board of Trustees of ORF (Austrian Broadcasting Corporation) as well as president of the Danube Rectors' Conference. From 1986-1989 he was President of the Austrian Society for Biotechnology. He completed his post-doctoral work from 1972 to 1974 as a Fulbright Scholar at the Medical School of SUNY in Buffalo, USA. Professor März finished his first degree in Vienna 1969 in the area of food technology and biotechnology, and received his doctorate in biochemistry in 1972.

**Anna Glass                                      USA**

Anna Glass is Program Assistant for the Universities Project at the Salzburg Seminar where she assists with development and logistical preparations for several symposia per year.

***The Visiting Advisors Program of the Salzburg Seminar's Universities Project, including the visit to the University of Rijeka, has been made possible by a generous grant from the Kellogg Foundation.***

## **THE UNIVERSITIES PROJECT OF THE SALZBURG SEMINAR**

Universities throughout the world are undergoing systemic changes in their governance, academic design, structure, and mission. The Salzburg Seminar's Universities Project focuses on higher education reform in Central and East Europe, Russia, and the Newly Independent States as universities in these regions redefine their relationships with governments and try to become more integrated into the global intellectual community.

The Universities Project is a multi-year series of conferences and symposia convening senior representatives of higher education from the designated regions with their counterparts from North America and West Europe. Discussion in the Project's programs focuses on the following themes:

- University Administration and Finance
- Academic Structure and Governance within the University
- Meeting Students' Needs, and the Role of Students in Institutional Affairs
- Technology in Higher Education
- The University and Civil Society

## **OBJECTIVES**

Universities and other institutions of higher learning are seeking to reshape themselves in ways that will prepare them more fully for the twenty-first century. Even as these institutions are considering extensive systemic changes in their academic design, structure, and mission, all desire autonomy in governance and in their intellectual life. Accordingly, the Universities Project aims to promote the higher education reform process by inviting senior administrators to participate in conferences and symposia concerning issues of university management, administration, finance, and governance.

## **THE VISITING ADVISORS PROGRAM (VAP)**

The Salzburg Seminar launched this enhanced aspect of the Universities Project in the autumn of 1998. Under this program, teams of university presidents and higher education experts visit universities in Central and East Europe and Russia at the host institutions' request to assist in the process of institutional self-assessment and change. By mid 2001, twenty-eight VAP visits will have taken place to universities in East and Central Europe and Russia. A full schedule of visits is planned for 2001 and beyond. The addition of the Visiting Advisors Program brings to the Universities Project an applied aspect and serves to enhance institutional and personal relationships begun in Salzburg.

The Salzburg Seminar acknowledges with gratitude the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation and the W.K. Kellogg Foundation, which are funding the Universities Project and the Visiting Advisors Program respectively.



## **FOR MORE INFORMATION**

For more information regarding the Salzburg Seminar's Visiting Advisors program, the Universities Project, and Salzburg Seminar programs, please contact one of the Seminar's offices below.

Salzburg Seminar  
Schloss Leopoldskron  
Box 129  
A-5010 Salzburg, Austria

Telephone: +43 662 839830  
Fax: +43 662 839837

Salzburg Seminar  
The Marble Works  
P.O. Box 886  
Middlebury, VT 05753 USA

Telephone: +1 802 388 0007  
Fax: +1 802 388 1030

Salzburg Seminar website: [www.salzburgseminar.org](http://www.salzburgseminar.org)