



**The Universities Project of the Salzburg Seminar
Visiting Advisors Report**

**Re-Visit to the University of Rijeka, Croatia
April 7-11, 2003**

Team Members:

Prof. Leopold März (team leader), Rector, University of Agricultural Sciences, Vienna, Austria

Prof. Robin Farquhar, Former President, Carleton University, Ottawa, Canada

Prof. Emta Hill, Chancellor Emeritus, Indiana University Kokomo, USA

Dr. Jochen Fried, Director, Universities Project, Salzburg Seminar, Austria

I. Introduction and Overview

Rector Daniel Rukavina requested a Visiting Advisors Program follow-up visit to the University of Rijeka (hereafter referred to as RIU or “the University”) two years after the initial visit by the Advisory Team in 2001. With some exceptions, this was the same Team that performed the first visit: Bryce Jordan, President Emeritus of Pennsylvania State University was unable to join us and Anna Glass from the Universities Project was also unable to attend. Robin Farquhar was a new member, bringing fresh insights to our Team as he encountered RIU for the first time.

On this second visit, we were asked to pay particular attention to several new projects, in addition to reviewing problems and projects that had been identified prior to our visit in 2001. From the outset, we were met by an entirely different situation at the University. Whereas in 2001 the Rector had characterized the situation of RIU as being “in deep crisis” (and did so again in his report to Salzburg Seminar on the impact of our visit), RIU now enjoys stability and self-confidence. While Rector Rukavina himself was a new and still “acting” rector in 2001, he has subsequently been elected and has helped steer the University toward many of the goals we discussed only two years ago.

In order to prepare the Advisors for the visit, RIU submitted numerous background documents. These included the original University Self-Evaluation Report; both a questionnaire and a detailed report by Rector Rukavina on “The Impact of the VAP on the reform process of institutions of higher education in Central and Eastern Europe;” and two papers for presentations

to the European University Association's (EUA's) Quality Culture Project on "Institutional Collaborative Arrangements," prepared by Petar Bezinovic (the Rector's assistant for the promotion of quality culture), Pero Lucin (Vice Rector for Organization), and others, one paper from November 2002, the other from February 2003. All these documents enriched our appreciation for the work that has been accomplished by the University community in the past two years and for the centrality of the pursuit of quality at RIU.

The Advisory Team arrived late on Monday afternoon and met with the Rector over dinner that evening. Starting Tuesday morning and continuing until Thursday noon, we met almost continuously with professors, student representatives, and administrators. In particular, we had the opportunity to meet with the Dean or Vice Dean from each of the Faculties, and we visited the Faculties of Law, Medicine, Engineering, and Maritime Studies in Rijeka, as well as the Faculty of Philosophy and the Faculty of Economics and Tourism located in Pula.

We had several briefing meetings before starting with the discussions at the various Faculties. The first was with the Rector and Vice Rectors so that they could provide us with an overview of the changes during the past two years. We were also briefed during the first morning on the pending New Law on Higher Education, on curricular development, information technologies, and library resources. In addition, we received copies of a presentation on the "Quality Promotion at RIU," and, later, a copy of the new "Code of Conduct for Professors" developed by RIU. We discussed the student survey that detailed student responses to instructor's methods and attitudes. This survey, "Student Perspective on Quality in Higher Education—Assessment and Guidance for Change," had been administered to more than 1660 students and has been used to varying degrees by each Faculty. (The survey results were not available in English, so we could only listen to what we were told about the content and tone of these student opinions – see page 11.) Later during the week, we had a further briefing on the EUA's Quality Culture Project. Our meetings also included a two-hour discussion with students in order to gain their perspective, especially on the quality of instruction and on student life. Finally, we met with municipal and county representatives to learn about the cooperative programs between RIU and its local and regional community.

A. The International Context

In spite of the fact that Croatia is not yet a member of the European Union, the University of Rijeka has been working intensively on precisely those reform and renewal issues that inform the broad movements initiated by the Bologna Declaration of 1999. We will review these in order to show just where RIU is in this process.

1. The European Framework

The *Bologna Declaration* of 1999 describes four main avenues that lead to the formation of a *European Higher Education Area* (EHEA). The vision of the "Bologna Process" is:

- to create a system of easily readable and comparable degrees,
- to adopt a study architecture that consists of two main cycles,
- to establish a credit system to facilitate international recognition and exchange,
- to support the mobility of students, teachers and researchers;

and, furthermore, to promote

- European cooperation in quality assurance, evaluation and accreditation;
- the “European Dimension” at all levels of teaching and research.

The European Universities Association (EUA) has formulated four principles as cornerstones of a successful development:

- Autonomy with accountability,
- Education as a public responsibility,
- Research-based higher education,
- Organizing diversity.

The key issues for the future development of European universities into the EHEA are:

- Quality as a fundamental building stone
- Trust-building
- Relevance
- Mobility
- Compatible qualifications at the undergraduate and graduate level
- Attractiveness

2. The Croatian Academic Institutions and the Development of the European Union

In spite of the obviously positive political and economic development of Croatia and the documented ambitions to become a full member of the EU, Croatian universities are still not eligible to fully participate in important European programs of research and teaching. They especially suffer from not having access to ERASMUS/SOCRATES mobility programs, which have proven instrumental for full integration of academic institutions into the European development and for reaching the objectives defined by the Bologna Declaration and the vision of an EHEA. The Visiting Advisors Team strongly affirms that the unrestricted participation of Croatian universities in the European mobility programs is essential for effective curricular development within the European context and the implementation of the Bologna Process in Croatia.

Several multilateral mobility networks for students and researchers (CEEPUS, Tempus, COST, EUREKA, etc.) are accessible to Croatian academic institutions. The majority of international relations, however, still relies on

bilateral agreements. The University leadership of RIU is fully aware of the need to form a strong International Relations Office at the University level in order to support the process of internationalization and the formation of a "Corporate Internationalization Policy." In fact, in line with the recommendation in the first report of the Visiting Advisors Team from 2001, the International Relations Office has been considerably strengthened and its staff expanded. This is highly commendable because the University's participation in CEEPUS, TEMPUS, Framework 6, and Interreg projects promises to provide essential contributions to RIU's commitment to institutional reform and to fully meeting international standards that relate to structures and quality.

We note that RIU has taken advantage of all programs open to it, is one of the focal points for the Association of Universities of the Adriatic and Ionian Region, has signed agreements already in place with universities in eastern and western Europe and with the US, and is the only Croatian university to be part of a network of 50 European Universities engaged in the EUA Quality Culture Socrates-sponsored Project on Collaborative Arrangements.

B. The National and Regional Context

In the course of the first visit in 2001, it became obvious to the Advisory Team that the political process in Croatia is heading towards a legislation that is in full accordance with the basic principles of the European development (see pages 2-3). It is a political reality that the new legislation must take into account how the national university system has evolved over the recent decades, what structures currently exist at the university level, and how the competences are distributed within the university as well as between the university and the ministries.

The obviously imminent university legislation, seen in the context of the European development, opens a significant window of opportunity for universities in Croatia to decisively approach the goals mentioned above. In particular, it will enable RIU to put into effect the concept of functional integration of structural elements of a still heavily fragmented and geographically dispersed institution. A new University constitution that builds upon the accepted European principles will certainly facilitate the creation of a corporate identity of RIU and its members. This, in turn, will provide a solid foundation from which to adequately deal with key issues and to implement projects that are crucial to the positive future of RIU.

The current economic and societal developments in Croatia provide a good general basis for better funding and a positive public climate for the University, towards which the community and the region can play essential roles. In the course of the two years that have elapsed since the Team's last visit, the cooperation between RIU, the city government and the government of Primorski-Goranska Županija have developed to an outstanding level of quality. The impact of the University on the local and regional economy and the spiritual and cultural stimuli it provides to the community have obviously been recognized. In this regard, RIU can claim to be a model for other

universities in Croatia and beyond for how to establish meaningful and mutually beneficial ties to the environment to which it belongs.

II. Promoting a Culture of Quality and Functional Integration at RIU

Our report in 2001 is available, as is the Rector's recent report on the impact of the VAP visit, so we need only refer to them briefly. In the 2001 report, we noted the considerable strengths of RIU, even at that time of "deep crisis." At the same time, we noted a series of troubling problems or challenges. These included:

- severe under-funding over time in comparison with other universities in Croatia;
- structural and political fragmentation of the University as a result of the geographical distribution of its multiple Faculties, also as a result of the tradition of autonomous or semi-autonomous Faculties receiving direct funding from the Ministry;
- extensive and costly duplication both of degree programs and of dispersed rather than centralized administrative services (one product of the fragmentation problem);
- a very high attrition rate for students;
- a lack of attention to the quality of teaching, which results in poor teaching methods.

There are still on-going and serious challenges, as there are for all institutions. However, we take note of the huge positive achievements of the past two years and emphasize that these took place in a very short time and through very intensive effort on behalf of all members of the University.

From the list of challenges above, we have identified two principal unresolved issues as

1. the fragmentation of RIU, and
2. high student attrition.

We are aware that both issues are already being addressed by the University; therefore, in presenting our proposals, we limit ourselves to a few specifics that strike us as particularly promising. We hope these proposals will also be readily actionable and relevant to the two main themes or strategies that have guided the institution's recent evolution: **functional integration** to address the problem of fragmentation, and the promotion of **a culture of quality** to address student attrition and other quality issues.

A: Functional Integration

With respect to the fragmentation of the University, we applaud the approaches already begun toward instituting "functional integration" until such time as the new legislation achieves genuine integration and centralization of budgets and university services. However, even with the new legislation and with the new campus, there will be no guarantee of the attitudinal adjustments necessary for a truly integrated institution. Until and unless RIU develops a

shared sense of *institutional* identity, the University will be ill-equipped to cope with such issues as, among others:

- the emergent challenges of globalization in higher education,
- international reforms such as the Bologna Process,
- requirements for multi-disciplinarity in academic scholarship,
- inter-institutional collaboration in teaching and research,
- non-duplicative efficiencies with scarce resources,
- programmatic distinctiveness in a competitive milieu,
- increased mobility among faculty and students.

Recognizing the true nature of these deficiencies, RIU has chosen not to rely solely on structural amalgamation to resolve the issues, but rather to pursue functional integration through a variety of approaches designed to influence mentalities as well as operations, not the least of which is the inculcation of a University-wide culture of quality as discussed below (see page 8).

1. Interdisciplinary Programs and Centers

Two approaches that we welcome as having great potential to improve functional integration are the promotion of inter-Faculty cooperation in academic programming and the strengthening of central services for the entire institution. With respect to the former, we noted the interests shared by several Faculties in:

- environmental and ecological foci,
- maritime affairs and the tourism industry, and
- the natural sciences and mathematics.

There are also other areas that relate to particular strengths of RIU and to the national distinctiveness of Croatia. Focusing on these areas would create further possibilities for University-wide collaboration, if the motivation to pursue them can be generated. The effectiveness and efficiency of encouraging this motivation can be increased by developing and improving services that address needs shared by various components of the University, and this will also help advance a culture of quality. Services that promote student involvement, enhance teaching, and provide faculty supervision tend to be more successful (and palatable) when they are available and applicable equally across the institution. This is also true of other services that are best provided centrally, including:

- fund raising
- international affairs
- records management
- library resources
- information technology
- commodities purchasing
- public relations

Concerning this last, for example, institutional identity could be enhanced in the domain of public relations by introducing a policy that required all components of RIU to prominently display the *University's* crest or logo on all their stationery, business cards, publications, etc., not necessarily to the exclusion of a unit's own historical "trademark," but in a primary position on such materials.

2. *Communication*

Both of the above approaches to functional integration (cooperation among Faculties and strengthening central services) could be advanced by more productive communication among the leaders of different units. We were impressed by how much we learned from individual Deans concerning their respective plans and priorities, achievements and frustrations, strengths and challenges, and about the similarities among them in these respects. We concluded that, while it is useful for us as outsiders to know such things, it would be much more valuable in terms of functional integration if the other Deans could be aware of them as well. Accordingly, we recommend that the University inaugurate a periodic (perhaps annual) series of half-day seminars (including lunch) for all Deans and members of the Rectorate. At a given seminar, a Dean would serve as host at his/her facility and present a kind of SWOT-type analysis indicating the conditions and prospects, hopes and needs, priorities and potentials of her/his respective Faculty. If these "show and tell" sessions were convened monthly and conducted genuinely, it would be possible to cover the entire University each year (including the Pula campus) and new inter-unit synergies would undoubtedly emerge.

3. *Pula*

Finally, in the context of fragmentation and eventual integration, we wish to provide observations and a few suggestions specific to the Faculties at Pula, which is really a separate campus of the University. Pula represents a unique challenge in terms of functional integration because of its significant distance from the rest of RIU and the limited common interest among the units housed there. With the prospect of a proposal to establish a new University of Istria, we believe that the University of Rijeka needs to consider either:

- diminishing (or disengaging) RIU's presence in Pula, OR
- reinforcing and recommitting to the Faculties in Pula.

Given the importance of that region to northern Croatia and its great potential for major and unique contributions to higher education nationally, we recommend that RIU build upon the strengths that already exist at the Pula campus and introduce some distinctive new programming there. Among the strategies that might be pursued are the following:

1. Emphasize Pula's role as the University's "gateway" to that region. Offer courses from Faculties in Rijeka that are of particular relevance to the needs of the locality and the interests of Pula's inhabitants, both through instruction at Pula and via distance delivery from Rijeka. This

would help to supplement the capabilities of the teachers already in residence at Pula, thereby increasing the quality of instruction of the courses offered there. Similarly, the needs for research in the Pula region should be conveyed to Rijeka for response by scholars there, again in the fullest possible collaboration with their Pula colleagues.

2. Introduce some academic programming at the Pula campus that is not available in Rijeka, but should be part of a comprehensive university's offerings, especially in areas that can draw upon the strengths that already exist among the Pula professoriate. Examples that come to mind include:
 - currently neglected cognate social sciences like sociology and political science;
 - derivative professional specializations like educational administration and counseling, public and hospitality administration, social work and criminology; and
 - some unique interdisciplinary programs such as journalism, public relations, and communication studies.

Particular attention should be focused on offerings that are available nowhere else in Croatia, which would enhance the national profile, distinctiveness, and contribution of the University toward the State.

3. Actively foster inter-Faculty cooperation among the units currently housed at the Pula campus. Although they now reside in close physical proximity to one another, it is our observation that they operate quite independently of each other, and this does not contribute to functional integration. While the prospects of achieving this are not great at present (if they were, it would already have happened), implementation of the preceding two strategies could greatly improve the chances of its success. They would expand the campus' mission in ways that should attract the involvement of Pula faculty members in new endeavors that require the contributions of those from more than one of the existing Faculties there.

We recognize that this is an ambitious proposal, but we think it is justified in the interests of both RIU's future prosperity and its functional integration. The VAP Team understands that the RIU leadership has plans for placing more emphasis on the development of the campus in Pula. Accordingly, we strongly endorse the Rector's inclination to appoint a new Vice Rector in charge of (and on location at) the Pula campus.

B: The Promotion of a Culture of Quality

The culture of a university (like the personality of an individual) is a pervasive concept that is represented by countless behavioral patterns and physical artifacts reflecting an underlying value system. Thus, intended changes in institutional mentality (in RIU's case, toward a more quality-oriented culture) can be fostered by the promotion of behaviors and the introduction of artifacts that symbolize the activation of common values in a wide range of operational areas, among others:

- performance of faculty and staff,
- nature of facilities and equipment,
- involvement and expectations of students,
- effectiveness and efficiency of management,
- clarity and integrity of policies,
- information and communication systems (internally and externally).

Ideally, the kind of cultural change aspired to would be reflected in all aspects of the University's operation. It is hoped that eventually it will be, and this should be encouraged throughout the institution. But practically speaking, the leadership should focus its emphasis selectively upon those areas that are most fundamental to the quality culture it wishes to develop and are most amenable to the kind of adjustment required. This strategy should result in early, positive, and visible changes that will be noticed and emulated elsewhere within the University.

1. Faculty Performance

An example of a selective or targeted approach to a culture of quality is the preparation of an ethical code, with particular emphasis on faculty members' performance and behavioral norms; indeed, the Rector has inaugurated a special task force under the leadership of a member of the Faculty of Philosophy (the Faculty of Economics already has its own such code) that was about to publicly present a university-wide code of ethics at the time of our visit. While it is important to articulate these expectations, they must also be supplemented by a system of incentives and sanctions in order to have an effect on individuals' mentalities and actions. Rewards need to be conferred or withheld depending on compliance with the code. The rewards can be in terms of salary and promotion, but also in terms of other benefits, such as teaching reprieve for instructional development or research opportunities, travel funds for academic enrichment or conference presentations, special grants for equipment purchases or material acquisitions, awards for exemplary performance or innovative initiatives.

Mechanisms need to be established for students to lodge complaints against faculty members who do not comply with the code, with built-in guarantees of personal anonymity for the students and due process for the faculty. Provision needs to be made for faculty members who seek help in improving their teaching performance. The creation of the new Learning Resource Center will help professors learn new approaches through workshops, presentations, testing technologies, and the like.

The ethical code, which is a high aspiration, should be complemented by practical and specific job definitions and expectations for Heads of Departments and for Deans. These should include responsibility for ensuring that their faculty colleagues comply with the code, the authority to reward them if they do or discipline them if they do not, and the means of providing them with (or referring them to) assistance where it is needed.

Promoting a culture of quality in this way is genuinely a task for the central leadership of the University. It requires policies that receive university-wide recognition, as well as a constant effort to establish a common perception of and common strategies for advancing priority goals in terms of improving quality. We said earlier that the culture of quality is a pervasive concept; but to make it tangible and specific, it must be nurtured and shaped by those who are entrusted with safeguarding the overall mission of the University.

2. Financial Reforms

We applaud the resolution of the matter that appeared most insurmountable in 2001, the severe and long-standing under-funding of RIU in comparison to its sister universities in Croatia. Astonishingly, this historic and seemingly intractable problem has been overcome through the creative solution of a loan negotiated with banks and with the Ministry of Science and Technology for more than twelve million Euro. Moreover, to benefit from this new infusion of funds and to assure their commitment to change and reform, the various Faculties at RIU have had to invest 30% of their own budgets as a match. We learned that capital investments in 2002/2003 (altogether 22 million Euro) exceeded all investments in the preceding decade.

The financial reforms have made possible the improvements in physical facilities and in the living conditions for both students and younger faculty. One of the most productive uses of the new funds will help recruit and retain young professors and researchers by offering them 30-year housing loans at only 2.25% interest rates. This was done very efficiently, and in the time of our visit almost 170 requests for housing loans had been approved. The teaching staff has already increased more than 20% since 1999 with the bulk of the increase in young faculty, research “novices” under 30 years old. Two critical issues for all universities have thus been addressed through this single initiative: “brain drain” and the aging of the professoriat, with the ancillary problem of “old fashioned and inflexible” teaching also being partially remedied through the infusion of new young instructors. In addition, the entire campus has now been linked by fiber optic cable; we admired handsome new auditoriums and laboratories, new computers, LCD projectors, video-conferencing facilities, simulators, and other state-of-the-art technologies.

A substantial portion of the new investment was spent on improving the quality of student life through renovating dormitories and cafeterias. In fact, during this second visit, the Advisory Team was housed very comfortably in the rooms for visiting professors on the top floor of one of the renovated dorms. (In our conversation with students, we learned that while they recognized and appreciated this investment, they hope similar improvements will soon be made in Pula and Gospić.)

3. A Campus University in the City of Rijeka

The Team was struck by the potential for contributing to a culture of quality that is inherent in the plans for a new campus in Rijeka. As construction progresses and the campus begins to be occupied, it would be strategically

wise for the University to select its initial inhabitants from among those units that are most quality-minded and reform-oriented. In this way, a quality culture can be nourished at that location from the start, a culture to which later arrivals will have to adapt if they are to become comfortable in this new (and attractive) setting. And it is there where the culture of quality in other operational areas at the University (supplementary to faculty performance) can most easily be encouraged, thereby eventuating in a pervasive and sustainable mentality that values quality throughout the institution.

The willingness of banks and the Ministry to make this level of investment in the development of RIU speaks eloquently to the importance given to this regional university. The prospect of the new campus at such a prestigious and prominent downtown location provides clear evidence of this recognition. The establishment of the University Foundation as a joint project between the University and the city and district governments with the sole purpose of promoting activities of the University in science, teaching, and development is another powerful statement of this cooperation and mutual respect.

C: Curriculum and Teaching

The increased percentage of younger faculty (see page 10, under “Financial Reforms”) who can be expected to incorporate more modern, inter-active teaching methodologies and who should relate more positively to the students, will likely soon begin to improve student retention. At the time of this visit, however, attrition was still excessively high, with only 30-35% of students completing their studies in some of the Faculties.

To address this continuing hemorrhage of students, RIU has focused attention on

- communication between students and teaching staff,
- the teaching competence of the Faculty, and
- the recognition of students’ opinions on the education process.

We discussed the results of the student survey (see page 2) in each of our meetings at the separate Faculties and also in our meeting with students. Clearly, the students had freely expressed their dissatisfaction, although they were not yet convinced that appropriate corrective actions had been taken. It also became clear in our discussions with the Deans and Vice Deans that some Faculties had taken the results very seriously and intended to take action based on them, while others were trying hard to discount and ignore the results.

We applaud the multiple approaches taken to the on-going problem of student attrition and to the disconnect between the performance of professors and student expectations, but it is clear that the problem remains a serious one. We were encouraged by the freedom with which students expressed their concerns to us. We believe that this comes from their awareness that the administration has been trying to improve conditions, that the survey results will lead to appropriate changes, and that the renovated facilities indicate a promise of continuing renovation and improvement. As is often the case with

reform, the first steps open up a seemingly infinite “wish list” for improvements that have been long suppressed. Criticism from students and staff should be welcomed as encouragement that reform is in progress and that all members of the University community will be active participants in bringing about needed changes throughout the process.

Another major effort to address this problem, the “Quality Culture Project,” includes many positive elements that will, over time, remedy the underlying attitudinal factors contributing to the issue. In our discussions with students, we noted that certain areas are of particular concern. We offer several suggestions for steps that the University might take toward addressing these issues.

1. Student Perspectives

The word that the students used most frequently and negatively was “motivation,” and they stressed a lack of motivation both on the part of students and instructors. In addition, they want more inter-active teaching, more attention paid to problem-solving, and practical application of their courses of study. They perceived a discrepancy between courses offered, and sometimes between the texts selected for those courses, and the interests and practical needs of students. In 2001, the Team had noted that the English language programs were preparing teachers while many of the students would not and did not wish to become teachers. Most intended to use the language for other career purposes including translating or running businesses, and apparently this is still the case.

Another problem arises from the lack of resources available to students. Some instructors may give little consideration to the availability of the texts they require students to read; texts might be absent from the library, or there in only one copy. Students have had to make their own copies of texts, or, alternatively, locate the texts on-line and print them out, all at considerable expense and expenditure of time.

With respect to other resources necessary for student success, namely library and computers, even with the 353 new computers available to students, many felt that this still falls short of providing ready access for the bulk of the student body. Library resources, both books and periodicals, were also judged inadequate, even without the problem mentioned above of instructors who assigned texts without bothering to check whether these would be available through University libraries.

The “wish list” of improvements shared with us by the student leaders over lunch included:

- adjusting curricular programming to better accommodate students who must work part-time,
- improving student-teacher communication,
- seeking a closer connection between graduates’ competencies and available jobs,
- more careful monitoring of what is taught and how it is taught.

They feel excluded from such institutional reforms as implementation of the Bologna Process and would like an opportunity for more input into the design of the new campus to advocate for gymnasium facilities, handicapped access, centralized library resources, study and “workshop” areas, green space (a park), and Internet connections. Had they had more time with us, this list would undoubtedly have been still longer. We were impressed with their ideas and initiatives, also with their awareness of the Bologna Process.

2. Counseling

Clearly, RIU needs to attend to student interests and student morale. The opinion survey was an excellent project and will be repeated in two years, during which time Faculties are charged with remedying the problems previously identified. In addition to the survey, we recommend the creation and staffing of an Office of Student Counseling to address both academic and non-academic issues affecting student morale and student success. We were told there is only one fulltime counselor on staff and four volunteers. Trained student counselors would help counteract the lack of motivation, as well as the poor communication between instructors and students. Obviously, the staffing of this new office would require the allocation of scarce financial resources. However, if some of the duplication of services currently existing at RIU could be reduced, this should free more than enough resources to cover what we see as a serious lack in essential services at present.

3. Consultation with students

We would urge that other approaches to consultation with students be encouraged as well. This should be introduced at both the Faculty level (such as the Dean of Economics’ periodic conversations with his student leaders) and the institutional level, where we perceive a need to help strengthen the unity and influence of the University-wide students’ association, an outcome that would additionally contribute to functional integration. Regular student evaluations of teaching on a course-by-course basis should be promoted in those Faculties willing to introduce them. Certainly, much of relevance to quality can be learned from students.

III. Conclusion and Summary of Recommendations

Our overall reaction to the changes since 2001 is one of admiration for the positive initiatives and the rapidity with which the under-funding was corrected. The most dramatic future resolution to the current fragmentation and dispersion of the University, namely, the approved excellent site for the new campus, is extremely impressive.

We summarize here ten recommendations from our above narrative; the first five address the challenges of fragmentation and duplication through **strategies of functional integration**, and the latter five address the challenge of student attrition through strategies related to the **promotion of quality culture**. We hope that these ideas will be helpful in RIU’s efforts toward becoming a strengthened, more efficient, more unified institution.

A. Functional Integration

1. Complement the physically integrated new campus plans with integrated centralized services and staffing using technologies whenever possible, including:
 - information technologies,
 - library resources,
 - the Teaching/Learning Resource Center for all instructors,
 - student records through student information system technology,
 - financial records,
 - International Programs Office,
 - Development/External and Community Relations Office.
2. Identify areas for inter-Faculty, inter/multi-disciplinary cooperation and academic programming initiatives (such as the Maritime Ecology Project currently initiated through the Maritime Studies Faculty, or through bringing together the dispersed Faculties of Natural Sciences into one centralized location and establishing a Natural Sciences Center).
3. Encourage monthly meetings/seminars to be hosted alternately by and at each of the existing Faculties, including Pula, to provide an opportunity for each Dean to “show and tell” the current initiatives, achievements, and challenges of his/her Faculty and to create the opportunity for inter-unit synergies.
4. Focus on Pula. Encourage at Pula, as is done at the Rijeka campus, cooperation in inter-disciplinary, inter-Faculty initiatives. Introduce new distinctive academic programming to revitalize the campus and create a more cohesive and significant campus.
5. Pursue establishing a new position of Vice Rector to oversee the Pula campus and its integration and development.

B. Promotion of Quality Culture

1. Continue regular, biennial or, preferably, annual student surveys, and supplement these with course by course, professor by professor evaluations that can be electronically read and collated, and that protect individual student identities.
2. Charge Deans and Heads of Departments with the responsibility for monitoring the results and holding annual evaluation meetings with each professor. Charge them also with the responsibility for sanctioning professors who receive continuing (2-3 years) negative evaluations that indicate an inability or unwillingness to improve their teaching and impact on student learning.
3. Disseminate widely the Code of Ethics, including in all University printed materials, and post it in University and Faculty offices.
4. Create mechanisms for students to lodge complaints of violations of the Code that both protect the students from reprisal and protect professors from idle, unsubstantiated charges.
5. Create an Office of Student Counseling with adequate staffing by trained counselors.

These ten suggested action items include some that RIU has already embarked upon, some that are natural expansions of the existing initiatives, and some that are new and require either new resources, or the reallocation of existing resources. From both our visits, we know that the University of Rijeka will continue to move in a positive direction.

We have one final recommendation that exceeds our mandate, but that builds on our own collective experience in a number of different universities in different countries. When as much positive energy exists as does now at RIU and under the RIU leadership, when you are engaged in dramatic shifts and new initiatives, if possible it is best to continue in the same direction until the changes have become integrated into the University culture and tradition, until the critical stage of introducing and disseminating the new ideas is past and they have been fully assimilated. When structures and cultures are changing, when an institution is in transition, continuity of direction is as precious as the cornerstone in a gothic vault.

Visiting Advisors:



Leopold MÄRZ (team leader) 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 was president of the Board of Trustees of the Austrian Broadcasting Corporation (ORF) as well as president of the Danube Rectors' Conference (2001-2002). From 1986 to 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 at the University of New York in Buffalo, USA. Professor März received his first degree in Vienna 1969 in the area of food technology and biotechnology, and received a doctorate in biochemistry in 1972.



Robin FARQUHAR is professor of public policy and administration and served as president of Carleton University, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada from 1989 to 1996. He was vice chancellor and president of the University of Winnipeg, Manitoba from 1981 to 1989 and has chaired the Canadian Bureau for International Education. Dr. Farquhar is former president of both the Canadian Society for the Study of Education and the Commonwealth Council for Educational Administration. He received B.A. (honors) and M.A. degrees in English from the University of British Columbia and a Ph.D. in education administration from the University of Chicago, Illinois, USA. Dr. Farquhar is a member of the Universities Project Advisory Committee.



Emita HILL is former chancellor of Indiana University, Kokomo, USA. Before joining the University, 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. Since leaving Indiana, Dr. Hill has participated in three on-going international university development projects through the Indiana Consortium for International Programs, in Poland, Kyrgyzstan, and Macedonia; and is part of a team of advisors supported by the Ford Foundation and MDC, Inc (Chapel Hill, North Carolina) for strategic planning at the University of Namibia. She actively continues her scholarly career, writing extensively on French literature and thought in the Age of Enlightenment. Dr. Hill earned B.A. and M.A. degrees in French from Cornell University, New York and Middlebury College, Vermont respectively, and holds a Ph.D. in romance languages from Harvard University, Massachusetts.

Jochen FRIED is director of the Universities Project of the Salzburg Seminar. Prior to joining the Seminar in 1998, he worked as head of programs at the Institute for Human Sciences in Vienna, and as senior officer in the secretariat of the German Science Council in Cologne, Germany. After receiving a doctorate in German literature from Düsseldorf University, Germany in 1984, he was lecturer at Cambridge University, United Kingdom and at the University of Ljubljana, Slovenia 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 Education, Science and Culture, and is a member of the editorial board of the UNESCO-CEPES quarterly review *Higher Education in Europe*.



Schedule of the Visit:

| Monday, April 7 | RIU Representatives | Topic | Location |
|----------------------------|--|------------------|------------------------|
| 15:00 | | Advisor Arrivals | |
| 19:00 | Prof. D. Rukavina , Rector D. Štefan, IRO Head | Dinner | Yacht Club, Opatija |

| Tuesday, April 8 | RIU Participants | Topic | Location |
|-----------------------------|---|--|--|
| 7:45-8:30 | | Breakfast | RIU guest rooms |
| 8:30-9:00 | | <i>Transfer</i> | |
| 9:00-10:00 | Prof. D. Rukavina , Rector Prof. Kalogjera, Vice-Rector for teaching and student affairs Prof. Z. Lenac, Vice-Rector for Research and IR Prof. P. Lucin, Vice-Rector for organization and graduate Studies Prof. J. Peric, Vice-Rector for finances Assoc. Prof. P. Bezinovic, Rector's assistant for for promotion of quality culture Dr. H. Bezic, Rector's assistant for professional and development programmes R. Hlaca, Head of Administration D. Štefan, IRO Head | Welcome Introduction: Information about RIU today: changes in two- year period University development– an overview | Rectorate Trg brace Mažuranica 10, Rijeka |
| 10:00-10:15 | | Coffee break | Rectorate |
| 10:15-11:15 | Prof. P. Lucin , Vice-Rector for organization and graduate studies Assist. Prof. D. Čišić, Faculty of Maritime Studies Assist. Prof. E. Pernjak Pugel, Faculty of Medicine | New Law on Higher Education Information communication technologies system and new technologies at the RIU | Rectorate |
| 11:15-11:30 | | Coffee break | Rectorate |
| 11:30-13:00 | Prof. G. Kalogjera , Vice-Rector for teaching and student affairs Assoc. Prof. Marina Kovacevic, Faculty of Philosophy, Rijeka Assoc. Prof. Denisa Krbec, Faculty of Economics and Tourism, Pula Assist. Prof. Ivanka Živcic Becirevic, Faculty of Philosophy, Rijeka Assist. Prof. Snježana Prijic Samaržija, Faculty of Philosophy, Rijeka | Curricula development “Student Perspective on Quality in Higher Education – Assessment and Guidance for Change” | Rectorate |
| 13:00-14:15 | Prof. Z. Lenac , Vice-Rector for Research and IR | Working Lunch: Research profile of RIU | Rectorate |
| 14:15-14:45 | | <i>Transfer</i> | |
| 14:45-16:00 | Prof. B. Pavišić , Dean | Introduction: Faculty of Law | Faculty of Law, |

| | | | |
|-------------|--|---|--|
| | | | Hahlic 6, Rijeka |
| 16:00-16:15 | | <i>Transfer</i> | |
| 16:15-17:15 | Prof. S. Jonjic , Dean | Introduction: Faculty of Medicine | Faculty of Medicine, Brace Branchetta 20, Rijeka |
| 17:15-17:30 | | <i>Transfer</i> | |
| 17:30-18:30 | | Debriefing meeting for team members | RIU guest rooms |
| 19:00 | Prof. B. Rafajac , Dean of the Faculty of Philosophy Prof. I. Mencer , Dean of the Faculty of Economics | Working Dinner: Introduction: Faculty. of Philosophy Introduction: Faculty of Economics | |

| Wednesday, April 9 | RIU Participants | Topic | Location |
|---------------------------|---|---|--|
| 8:00-8:30 | | Breakfast | RIU guest rooms |
| 8:30-9:00 | | <i>Transfer</i> | |
| 9:00 –10:30 | Prof. B. Križan , Dean Prof. J. Dobrinic, Vice-Dean Assoc. Prof. R. Dejhalla, Vice-Dean Prof. Z. Prelec, Vice-Dean Prof. N. Fafandjel Assoc. Prof. I. Kožar , Dean | Introduction: Faculty of Engineering Introduction: Faculty of Civil Engineering | Faculty of Engineering, Vukovarska 58, Rijeka |
| 10:30-11:00 | | Coffee Break/Transfer | |
| 11:00-12:00 | Prof. B. Pritchard , Dean | Introduction: Faculty of Maritime Studies Role of marketplace in teaching and research | Faculty of Maritime Studies, Studenska 2, Rijeka |
| 12:00-12:15 | | <i>Transfer</i> | |
| 12:15-13:00 | Student Board | Student social life, and student role(s) at the RIU | Restaurant Index, Kešimirova 18, Rijeka |
| 13:00-14:15 | Student Board | Working Lunch: <i>Discussion</i> | Restaurant Index |
| 14:15-15:00 | | Transfer | |
| 15:00-16:00 | Assist. Prof. H. Bezic , Rector's assistant for professional and development programmes Prof. Z. Lenac , Vice-Rector for Research and IR, Assist.Prof.. M.Crnjar, Head of Institute for Development, Regional Planning and Ecology Assist.Prof. V. Vujic, co-ordinator of the County's commission for projects Dr. Nataša Zrilic, Counsellor of the Mayor of the City of Rijeka and co-ordinator of the City's commission for projects | Cooperation programmes with local and regional community and economy | Rectorate |

| | | | |
|--------------|---|--|-----------------|
| 16:00-17:15 | Assoc. Prof. P. Bezinovic , Rector's assistant for for promotion of quality culture Assoc. Prof. Mladenka Tkalcic, Ph.D., Faculty of Philosophy Rijeka Sanja Banov Burcar, B.A., Rector's Office | Quality culture programme at the RIU | |
| 17:15-17:30 | | <i>Transfer</i> | |
| 17:30-18:30 | | Debriefing meeting for team members | RIU guest rooms |
| 19:00 Dinner | Prof. Z. Ivanovic , Dean of the Faculty of Tourism and Hospitality Management | Working Dinner: Introduction: Faculty of Tourism and Hospitality Management | |

| Thursday, April 10 | UNIRI Participants | Topic | Location |
|---------------------------|--|--|---|
| 7:00-7:30 | | Breakfast | RIU guest rooms |
| 7:30-9:00 | | <i>Transfer</i> | |
| 9:00-12:00 | Assoc. Prof. A. Barbieri , Dean of the Faculty of Economics and tourism Assoc. Prof. R. Matijašić , Dean of the Faculty of Philosophy Prof. Barbara Buršić-Giudici, Vice-Dean Assist. Prof. Nevenka Tatkovic , Dean of the Teacher's College | Visit to the University facilities and sightseeing of Pula: Evaluation of the RIU institutions in Pula from the aspect of quality culture Discussion on future development of the RIU institutions in Pula | <i>F. of Economics and Tourism</i> <i>F. of Philosophy, Pula</i> <i>Teacher's College, Pula</i> |
| 12:00-13:00 | | Lunch | |
| 13:00-14:30 | | <i>Transfer</i> | |
| 15:00-16:30 | | Preparation of oral report | RIU guest rooms |
| 17:00-18:00 | Prof. D. Rukavina , Rector Prof. Kalogjera, Vice-Rector for teaching and student affairs Prof. Z. Lenac, Vice-Rector for Research and IR Prof. P. Lucin, Vice-Rector for organization and graduate Studies Prof. Peric, Vice-Rector for finances Assoc. Prof. P. Bezinovic, Rector's assistant for for promotion of quality culture Dr. H. Bezic, Rector's assistant for professional and development programmes R. Hlaca, Head of Administration D. Štefan, IRO Head | Presentation of oral report to Rector | Rectorate |
| 19:00- | Prof. D. Rukavina , Rector, Prof. Kalogjera, Prof. Z. Lenac, Prof. P. Lucin, Prof. Peric, Assoc. Prof. P. Bezinovic, Dr. H. Bezic, R. Hlaca, D. Štefan | Dinner | Restaurant Villa Kostrenka |

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 the end of 2002, more than fifty VAP visits will have taken place to universities in East and Central Europe and Russia. A full schedule of visits is planned for 2003. 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