EUA-Institutional Evaluation Programme

Ss. Cyril and Methodius University in Skopje

FOLLOW-UP EVALUATION REPORT

Final report

November 2017

Team:
Georg Schulz, Chair
Johanna Liljeroos
Lennart Olausson
Janis Vetra
Andrée Sursock, Team
Coordinator

Contents

1. Introduction

This report is the result of a follow-up evaluation of Ss. Cyril and Methodius University in Skopje (UKIM). European University Association's (EUA) Institutional Evaluation Programme (IEP) originally evaluated UKIM in 2015 with the report submitted to the University in April 2015.

This follow-up evaluation took place in the framework of the project "Skills Development and Innovation Support Project" (SDISP), implemented by the Government of the Republic of Macedonia[1] through the Ministry of Education and Science. The overall objective of the project is to improve transparency of resource allocation and promote accountability in higher education, enhance the relevance of secondary technical vocational education, and support innovation capacity in the country.

While the institutional evaluations are taking place in the context of the project, each university is assessed by an independent IEP team, using the IEP methodology described below.

1.1 Institutional Evaluation Programme and follow-up evaluation process

IEP is an independent membership service of the EUA that offers evaluations to support the participating institutions in the continuing development of their strategic management and internal quality culture. IEP is a full member of the European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA) and is listed in the European Quality Assurance Register for Higher Education (EQAR).

In line with the IEP philosophy as a whole, the follow-up process is a supportive one. There is no prescribed procedure, and it is for the institution itself to set the agenda in the light of its experiences since the original evaluation. The institution is expected to submit its own self-evaluation report, which will describe the progress made, possibly indicating barriers to change.

The rationale is that the follow-up evaluation can assist the institution in evaluating the changes that have been made since the original evaluation: What was the impact of the original evaluation? What use has the institution made of the original evaluation report? How far has it been able to address the issues raised in the report? The follow-up evaluation is also an opportunity for the institution to take stock of its strategies for managing change in the context of internal and external constraints and opportunities.

As for the original evaluation, all aspects of the follow-up process are also guided by four key questions, which are based on a "fitness for (and of) purpose" approach:
- What is the institution trying to do?

---

[1] This designation is used for the purposes of this project only and does not represent any formal position of EUA or IEP regarding the name of the country.

- How is the institution trying to do it?
- How does the institution know it works?
- How does the institution change in order to improve?

1.2 Profile of Ss. Cyril and Methodius University in Skopje

Ss. Cyril and Methodius University in Skopje (UKIM) was established in January 1949 and enrolled 989 students. Today, the university enrols about 37 000 active students, 31 270 of whom are in the first cycle. UKIM is a comprehensive university and the largest and oldest in the Republic of Macedonia.

The IEP evaluation team was informed that UKIM operates in a challenging environment. The region lost its heavy industry and large employers. Today, small and medium size enterprises predominate in the country and an unfavourable economic situation limits employment opportunities as well as the number of stakeholders that can support the University. There are persisting high rates of unemployment and having a higher education degree does not protect university graduates from either unemployment or underemployment. Many UKIM staff mentioned that the economic trends have resulted in outmigration, including brain drain.

The University, through its faculties, is able to generate good income flows but it can use only 40% of those funds; the rest is withheld by the Ministry of Finance. UKIM's financial situation was described plausibly as being challenging. Public resources are provided only for teaching and not for research but the University has the obligation to dedicate 40% of revenues from student fees to research. Salaries are low and have been frozen since 1999. Hiring new staff met with many obstacles.

A number of requirements further curtail the University's financial position. The IEP evaluation team was told that the University cannot dispose of the totality of its income and, furthermore, cannot decide on the use of what is at its disposal; it must abide by complex national regulations set by the Treasury as well as a very complex procurement process.

Legislation has changed frequently in the recent period and a new law is being discussed and expected to be passed before the end of 2017.

A new rector took office in September 2016 and a new Strategy and Action Plan have been agreed in September 2017 for the period 2017-2021. The mains goal of the strategy is as follows:

The mission of the University is to create, evaluate and maintain high quality of knowledge through a quality educational process, and scientific and research work. Therefore, we strive the University to continue to be a leading centre of science and education in the country and abroad. Our goals are:

- *Strengthening of the position of the best university in the country and one of the most significant universities in the region and wider with our leading research and teaching*

> *capacities, thus getting closer to the highest international standards;*
>
> − *Provision of the most quality surrounding for studying, teaching and researching, and most appropriate manners for distribution of our remarkable educational portfolio;*
>
> − *Creation of (graduated) staff with absorbing capacities for accepting and working according to the highest professional standards;*
>
> − *Provision of sustainable and socially responsible contribution towards the country, thus promoting a healthy economic development and well-being.*

1.3 The evaluation process

The self-evaluation process was undertaken by the standing Self-Evaluation Committee of the University, chaired by Prof. Vlatko Stoilkov. The Commission is composed of ten members: three students and seven academic staff from different faculties (including the chair). The group represents the diversity of UKIM, albeit with no administrative staff member, and worked diligently to write the self-evaluation report.

The Self-Evaluation Commission is in charge of producing a self-evaluation report every three years for the national accreditation body; this is done by asking all the units (central level as well as faculties and institutes) to provide the required data. The self-evaluation report (SER) produced for the IEP follow-up evaluation stemmed in part from that ongoing process, with the addition of two chapters from the 2014 SER that was produced for the previous IEP evaluation in 2015.

Lack of time prevented the Self-Evaluation Commission to tailor the SER to the specific nature of a follow-up evaluation; it did not comment systematically on obstacles and successes in implementing the 2015 IEP recommendations. Time was also short to consult broadly on a draft report. However, the Commission consulted the four vice-rectors, and the former and current rectors and plans have been made to discuss both the SER and this report in the Rector's Board and the Senate. Both reports will be posted on UKIM's website.

The SER was largely descriptive and did not integrate the latest Strategic Plan but it provided a helpful analysis of strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats (SWOT). The new Strategic Plan was developed as a parallel process and was finished at the same time as the SER. Therefore, the SER referred to the old mission statement but provided the new Strategic Plan as Appendix 26. The SER reflected the diversity of positions within the university and, helpfully, the report did not try to hide the differences of views across the units. Furthermore, the 27 annexes were very informative and well presented.

UKIM's self-evaluation report, together with the annexes, was sent to the evaluation team on 15 September 2017, a month before the site visit, as specified in the IEP Guidelines. The visit of the evaluation team to UKIM took place from 16 to 20 October 2017.

The evaluation team (hereinafter named the team) consisted of:

- Georg Schulz, former rector, University of Music and Performing Arts Graz, Austria, Chair
- Johanna Liljeroos, Master student, University of Tampere, Finland
- Lennart Olausson, former rector, Malmö University, Sweden
- Janis Vetra, Chair, Council of Higher Education of Latvia, Latvia
- Andrée Sursock, senior adviser, European University Association, Belgium, Team Coordinator

It should be noted that none of the above team members was part of the 2015 IEP evaluation; however, the team considered carefully the 2015 IEP evaluation report as a starting point for this evaluation. The team also took into account the Terms of Reference agreed between IEP and the Ministry of Education and Science for this coordinated evaluation exercise.

The team thanks the vice-rectors, the deans, the vice-deans and all the staff and students whom the team met (about 60 persons) for their willingness to discuss issues in an open and frank manner and for welcoming the opportunity of discussions with the IEP team.

Special thanks are extended to Rector Nikola Jankulovski for his support and to both Prof. Vlatko Stoilkov, chair of Self-Evaluation Commission, and Ms. Katerina Petreska Mihajlova for the excellent organisation of the site visit and for taking care of all practical details – big and small – which allowed the team to be focused on the task at hand.

2. Governance and institutional decision-making

2.1 Structures and decision-making bodies

At its creation, UKIM was composed of three faculties and employed 77 staff. Today, UKIM is composed of 23 faculties and 17 other units, including five research institutes and 12 "joining members"; it employs around 3500 staff. The University is located on five campuses in the city of Skopje (with the exception of the Faculty of Orthodox Theology, located in Ohrid).

Up to 2008, the faculties had legal personality. In 2008, a new higher education law changed a number of governance aspects, the most important of which was to reduce faculty autonomy and establish an "integrated university". Today it is the University that represents the faculties legally but the faculties continue to enjoy a large degree of autonomy compared to faculties of universities in Europe (cf. Section 2.2).

The two main decisions-making bodies of the University are the Rector's Board and the Senate. The Rector's Board, chaired by the rector, is a large body that includes the vice-rectors, the faculty deans, the directors of the scientific institutions and the Student Parliament president. Its main responsibility is to prepare the decisions of the Senate. It is organised in commissions that include academic staff and students, and deal with issues such as research; finance, investments and development; international partnerships; publications.

The Senate is described in the SER as a "management and expert body" and by many members of staff as "the highest decision-making body in the University". It is chaired by the rector and includes two representatives from each of the 23 faculties; one representative from each scientific institute, three representatives from "joining members" and ten students. The faculty members are elected in a secret ballot by the teaching and research councils of the faculties. The Senate decides on academic activities and policies, finance, statutes and regulations (faculty and university levels), criteria for selection and promotion of academic staff, enrolment policies, development of service to society, etc.

The equivalent structures at the faculty level have different functions. While the University Senate is both an expert and a management body, and therefore, has a decision-making role on governing issues, the equivalent body at the level of the faculties – the Council – has an expert role and is therefore advisory and decides only on academic issues, and the Dean's Board which is the equivalent of the University Rector's Board, has the decision-making role on governing issues (including finances).

UKIM works within a constrained environment (cf. Section 1.2). Nevertheless, it has adopted a very pragmatic approach to decision-making and has been able to find creative solutions in order to minimise the negative impact of the constraints it is facing, be they of a financial or legal nature. The leadership of the University has a clear vision of where to take UKIM and shows commitment and determination to ensure the further development of the University.

2.2 An integrated university

UKIM abides by the new legal requirements set by the 2008 law, and has taken a few more steps toward an integrated university. The requirements include proposing to the Ministry an integrated annual financial plan that combines those of each unit, but there are several additional ways by which this integration is demonstrated. UKIM established a single doctoral school in 2009, developed a university-wide information system (iKnow) and required faculties to go through the Rector's office for all international agreements. The University takes a 5% overhead on faculty income which is redistributed through two funds. The first is the "solidarity fund", which transfers some extra funding to the less endowed faculties. Therefore, faculties with less income receive in return more than they provide to the University, while faculties with more income support them via the solidarity fund.

Apart for that, there is much that happens in a decentralised fashion. The faculties have their own bank accounts and get money directly from the Ministry and from student fees. They manage their funds and develop their own study programmes. They decide on promotions and appointments of academic staff and go through the Senate only for the appointment and promotion of full professors. Their own management bodies decide on whether to prioritise research or teaching (SER, p. 10). As one senior officer described them: "they are like branches campuses".

UKIM has no central human resource office and no human resource management. The Ministry decides on the number and type of posts (e.g. professor of biology) on proposal of the University. All academic staff receive the same salary depending on their grade: about EUR 300 as take-home pay for assistants, EUR 400 for docents, and EUR 500 for full professors. Some faculties are able to top-up salaries for service extending beyond the normal teaching workload (for instance, for research activities).

The new Strategic Plan for 2017-2021 set out a number of actions to promote further the integration of the University (pp. 2-3). The following excerpt from the SER (p. 10) is symptomatic of the decentralised nature of UKIM but also of the realisation that this issue should be addressed better:

− *at small number of units there are funds allocated for training the academic staff to write appendices and for preparation of scientific and research projects. This practice should be extended to the other units as well, and there are possibilities for support by the University.*
− *networking in certain number of units in IRC networks has been exercised, but the need for networking of all units remains as such;*
− *reduction of administrative obstacles in the approval of financial plans of the units for which UKIM does not have the possibility and manner of influence;*
− *support for interaction between the units in the scientific and research activity is realised in small number of units. Likewise, initiation and promotion of common scientific and research activities at the other units is needed.*

The team found that UKIM does not fully use the opportunities offered by an integrated university; this is attributed to several reasons, some of which have to do with UKIM's organisational culture and others with the external financial and legal framework.

The organisational culture is still very much based on affiliation first to the faculty and second to UKIM. Significantly, the Senate seems to be conceived (at least by some senators) as the forum to represent the faculties' particular interests rather than the university's general interest. That perspective weakens the impact of the Senate as a university body. The weak affiliation to the University is evidenced in the business cards that were handed to the team, which displayed a variety of logos, colours and formats. The notion that the faculties' strategies should be aligned with that of UKIM as a whole is not broadly shared. Externally, UKIM is perceived by some partners as a federation of faculties rather than as one integrated university.

The central administration's capacity is limited and not staffed at the level required to run such a large and complex organisation as UKIM. Given the current financial position of both UKIM and the country, it is unlikely that this will change soon; however, more could be done to integrate the University at minimum or no cost (cf. Section 2.5).

The team met with several groups that represented the faculties (e.g. the vice-deans) and asked how often they were brought together, as is the general practice in truly integrated universities. The answer was consistent across the different groups: "it is too difficult to do so". As a result, there is limited cooperation across faculties and those are usually between naturally close partners (e.g. the sociology department of the Faculty of Law with the Institute of Sociology; the Faculty of Economy with the Institute of Economy).

2.3 A new Strategic Plan

A new Strategic Plan was adopted in September 2017 after consultation with the University community. It is associated with an Action Plan. In addition, each unit is required to develop its own action plan and provide an annual activity report, which goes to the Faculty Council and the rector.

The new Strategic Plan provides a new mission and vision statements, which are usefully focused on improving quality, but it lacks a sense of prioritisation as well as a definition of what characteristics UKIM would like to develop.

There are 10 priorities and multiple actions related to those priorities. It is not clear, however, that all the priorities can be achieved in four years and the associated Action Plan lacks implementation details. There is no precise timeline (it is often referred to as "ongoing"); the responsible persons who will execute a specific action are conflated with the reporting body such as the Senate; there is no indication of what resources will be available for each action, and what are the performance indicators that will measure whether an action has been properly executed.

Furthermore, the Action Plan mentions that UKIM will develop a risk management strategy (p. 15); that is a positive, first step but does not fully address the recommendation provided in the 2015 IEP evaluation, which noted the need to develop scenario planning and contingency plans.

2.4 Role of students, their rights and responsibilities

The law requires that students are involved in the governance bodies of the university and the faculties and regulates the percentage of student representation. For its part, UKIM provides funding to student associations and for their cultural and sports activities.

The IEP 2015 evaluation had flagged student participation in the university as being weak. This is still the case and the Student Parliament is not perceived by some students as their representative body. The University leadership is currently addressing that issue by fostering a discussion about the status of the Student Parliament.

The University and its faculties provide students with information but the team found that students were not aware of all opportunities available to them such as about exchange programmes or information on their rights and responsibilities. The latter is done orally on the first day of class and in writing in the Student Handbook. The team found, however, that students had little awareness of those issues, probably because they were discussed too early at the start of their student life. There is a need for continuous communication, interaction and information flow to the students. A culture of interaction should be developed from the central level so that it would not remain only as a good practice in some faculties, leaving students in other faculties in an unequal position.

The Senate appoints an ombudsman on a proposition of the Student Parliament. Students whom the team met had limited knowledge of the ombudsman's office and the team gained the impression that the role of the ombudsman was not clear to everyone. That was also the case two years ago and the 2015 IEP evaluation recommended that the university's senior management "work actively with the Student Parliament to ensure better promotion of the student ombudsman scheme amongst students". As mentioned above, the University is working to address first the issues related to the Student Parliament; only then could the ombudsman's issue be addressed.

There are regulations in place to deal with appeals and complaints although UKIM's Action Plan for the period 2017-2021 mentions the objective of developing further the appeals process for the students. The team received contradictory information regarding these processes.

Some staff members reported that if a student is caught cheating, the ombudsman is not involved and it is up to the professor to decide the case with no appeal possible. Others mentioned that a faculty commission is responsible for making decisions regarding such cases.

Students can oppose a grade that they think is unfair. Their first recourse is the dean. What happens next varied according to who informed the team. For some, the student is required to file an appeal within 24 hours and the dean is required to acknowledge this also within 24 hours. The dean, on the basis of a conversation with the teacher, makes a decision. If the student is not satisfied, s/he goes to the ombudsman or to an ad hoc commission of three professors who will re-administer the examination. For others, the dean appoints a commission of three professors who are knowledgeable about the topic of the examination and make the final decision.

2.5 Recommendations

The team makes the following five recommendations:

1. If the law allows, the responsibilities between the Senate and the Rector's Board should be reconsidered so that they mirror the respective responsibilities of the Faculty Councils ("expert", decisions on academic issues) and the Deans' Boards ("management", decision-making on governing issues). The first principle that should guide that reflexion is that the body or person making a decision should be the one who is responsible and accountable.[2]

2. The second recommendation is related to the concept of the "integrated university". In order to foster further the potential of an integrated university, the team recommends that the central level increases its capacity to provide a strategic steer rather than simply harmonise faculty traditions. That can be done through the following actions:

   ✓ Provide opportunities for faculties to interact, learn from one another and develop a feeling of common purpose across the university, for example, by organising periodic meetings of staff responsible for specific functions (e.g. the vice-deans responsible for research, teaching, international, quality assurance, etc., as well as administrative staff responsible for human resources, finance, Erasmus+ etc.).

   ✓ Increase the interaction of units by promoting cross-faculty research activities and redesigning "curricula to include common courses… extending double major and minor degrees across the university" as the 2015 IEP evaluation recommended.

---

[2] There are two options possible for the Senate: if it is considered as a *decision-making body*, the rector must chair it because s/he is ultimately legally responsible for the finance. If the Senate is considered as *an "expert" body*, then it must be focused on academic matters only (that is, no financial matters should be discussed) and could be chaired by an elected academic rather than the rector.

✓ Ensure that faculty strategies are aligned with that of the University by asking the faculties to develop an action plan that would show how they will contribute to UKIM's overall strategy and by organising yearly meetings between the Rector and each dean to review the activities undertaken during the year.

✓ Promote a sense of identification to UKIM of staff and students by organising university-wide events (for instance at the beginning and at the close of the academic year).

✓ Develop a communication strategy in order to ensure that UKIM is perceived externally as one university (e.g. standardise business cards and all communication media such as webpages, letterheads, etc.).

3. The team fully endorses a recommendation of the 2015 IEP evaluation that UKIM "focus only on the highest priorities as part of its strategic planning process whilst retaining sufficient flexibility to adapt to further changes in the external environment. This should include scenario planning and contingency plans." In addition, it would be useful to UKIM if the Strategic Plan is more specific about the future profile of the University.

4. UKIM should review, with the help of students, how students learn about their rights and responsibilities (student handbook, orientation day for new students) to ensure that they retain that information and take appropriate steps, at the central level of the University, to address students' lack of knowledge on those issues.

5. UKIM should develop better information about the appeal process and clarify the role of the ombudsman: is it an arbitrator, a mediator or an advocate for students?

3. Quality culture

3.1 UKIM's activities in internal and external quality assurance

Macedonian universities are required to undergo, every five years, both an external accreditation of all first- and second-cycle study programmes and an assessment of the quality of academic staff; the accreditation of doctoral study programmes takes place every three years. Those activities are carried out by the Higher Education Accreditation and Evaluation Board (HEAEB), an affiliate member of the European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA) since October 2011.

As mentioned earlier, UKIM's new strategy stresses quality as a core priority and UKIM strives to meet all the national external and internal quality assurance requirements. The internal quality assurance (IQA) requirements include the obligation to collect student feedback through questionnaires and for the university and its units to undertake a process of self-evaluation every three years. The University's self-evaluation process is coordinated by the Self-Evaluation Commission that was responsible for the self-evaluation report produced for this IEP follow-up evaluation (cf. Section 1.3). These triennial faculties' and university's self-evaluation reports as well as the semester results of the student evaluation questionnaires are sent to the Senate for discussion.

Student evaluations are considered in the promotion and re-election of academic staff. Those who get poor evaluations, including full professors, have a talk with their dean. They could be demoted, albeit this happens rarely.

In 2012, UKIM put in place an integrated information system (iKnow), which fulfils a number of functions and holds good potential for strengthening IQA processes. iKnow has two modules: one module manages enrolment and the other one, the "core module", stores all data about programmes, student results, etc., with different levels of permissions for access. All faculties use the enrolment module but not the core module because they already have equivalent systems and do not want to transition to the new one.

The central administrative units and a number of faculties have been ISO-certified. At the moment, there is no central quality assurance (QA) office but the Strategic Plan mentions it as an objective; the IEP team fully endorse this project. There are also no QA officers in the faculties; this function is filled by the vice-deans for education.

Thus, UKIM has a number of IQA mechanisms in place but the team found that two aspects require attention. First, the student questionnaires are problematic. Students, apart from some exceptions, report that the questionnaires are generally not answered seriously because students are concerned about such issues as the anonymity of the process, the length of the questionnaire, and the ambiguous wordings of some questions. Furthermore, they report (again, apart from some exceptions) that "nothing changes" as a result of the questionnaires and there is no transparent follow-up; that is, the students receive no

information on what measures have been taken to improve the areas identified in the feedback. Second, the use of ISO is more adapted to administrative processes than to teaching because it contributes to a quality culture that is more focused on control than on improvement, which means that it is not properly embedded across the University and there is no shared responsibility for quality improvement.

3.2 Recommendations

The following four recommendations would strengthen internal quality assurance:

1. To exploit systematically the iKnow data and information, which holds great potential for the analysis of patterns of student success and failures and for developing appropriate remedial actions. Faculties should be encouraged to use consistently the full functionalities of iKnow (i.e. the core module) to allow for more meaningful data analysis and opportunities for improvement across UKIM.

2. To develop alumni tracer surveys for quality improvement purposes; that is, alumni should be surveyed and asked about their career development at regular intervals (e.g., six months after they graduate, three and ten years later). The data should be analysed to understand better the need of graduates as they enter the labour market and develop their professional careers; ultimately, the analysis should lead to an adaptation of study programmes.

3. To develop a common understanding of which internal quality assurance mechanisms require developments and what type of quality culture should be developed at UKIM. The University is encouraged to organise frequent discussions across the faculties that would lead to better embedding and acceptance of internal quality assurance and to the promotion of internal quality assurance as a shared responsibility of the whole community: the leadership, the academic and administrative staff and the students. Such discussion should take into consideration available human and financial resources, in order to develop a realistic and non-bureaucratic approach to internal quality assurance.

4. To enhance the use of the student questionnaire by forming a committee that includes academic staff and students that would work on the following aspects:

   ✓ Is the questionnaire asking the right questions and in a non-ambiguous way?
   ✓ How can the feeling of insecurity that is widely shared by the students about the anonymity of the questionnaire be addressed?
   ✓ What other (formal and informal) mechanisms could be used to collect student feedback?
   ✓ How to publicise the results of the questionnaires and the ensuing actions that serve to improve quality?

4. Teaching and learning

4.1 Overview

At the rectorate level, the main objective for teaching and learning is to promote trust in the qualifications of its students. It intends to do so by developing student-centred learning, introducing e-learning, promoting more transparency in relation to quality, adopting new study programme approval procedures and developing a better partnership with students to make them active and creative citizens, and improve their engagement in the university. Teaching and learning, however, are the primary responsibilities of the faculties for all three cycles and of the institutes for the second and third cycles (cf. Chapter 5 for a discussion of the third cycle). Given the decentralised nature of the University, this means that each faculty sets its own priorities.

Admission criteria and associated process depend upon each faculty and is validated by the national accreditation process. Each faculty proposes the number of students to be admitted; this proposal goes through several university bodies (Committee on teaching, Rector's Board and Senate) and then to the Ministry, which has the final decision. Once the decision is taken, the faculty opens a call to students.

The common admission criterion across all faculties is the high school grade point average but some faculties have an additional criterion such as an entrance examination, the performance of the students on specific matura subjects that are particularly relevant for their disciplines, or the quality of the high schools.

Some faculties reach out to high schools. All must respond to the national obligation to admit special groups (such as Albanian, Turkish, and Serbian students) and social categories (students from mono-parental families or from those that were affected by the 2001 war), which should constitute 10% of the entering cohort. Those are additional places provided to qualified students. Monitoring is done by the Ministry. Three UKIM faculties teach in Albanian and Turkish in addition to Macedonian.

When students do not like their initial choice of major, the law allows them to study in an additional programme in parallel. Internal mobility is legally possible within a faculty or with a related field but not across faculties.

The IEP team met very committed and enthusiastic teachers and students who noted that 95% of their teachers are easily accessible. Academic staff must hold office hours but many go beyond this requirement and provide third- and fourth-year students with their email addresses, even their phone numbers, in case students meet with some difficulties.

Nevertheless, there is a need to improve the information flow and support to the students in a more structured way rather than simply relying on the good will of individual teachers. This is particularly important with respect to student support services, which are decentralised in the faculties. They are often grouped under a career centre and the students are not always

aware of what specific services are available there. UKIM is interested in opening a career centre located at the University central level. These offices are staffed by academics and the 2015 IEP report rightly observed that this form of staffing is unsustainable.

The faculties organise their own learning environment (labs, etc.) and that creates inequities across UKIM because faculty income varies widely. Some students are studying in attractive environments while others have to deal with substandard conditions (outdated labs, poorly maintained buildings). The students expressed the wish to see that the learning conditions are standardised across the university, that the technical equipment is updated and the construction of new buildings is accelerated. However, given the current structure and level of funding, it would be difficult to address those disparities through the solidarity fund, short of raising the University internal overhead to a higher level than the current modest 5%.

Since the last evaluation, UKIM has managed to improve the staff to student ratio, which went from 1:27 down to 1:22. That was done despite the financial restrictions by splitting students into smaller groups and hiring short-term teachers. Nevertheless, questions about having sufficient number of teachers were raised, notably because there soon will be a significant wave of retirements and because a number of teaching positions remain open.

There is a great number of study programmes on offer. The 2015 IEP evaluation recommended a simplification of the course offer. Instead the number of programmes have continued to increase for both the first and second cycles. The team questioned whether that resulted in first-cycle study programmes that were too narrowly focused and specialised. While some faculties have redesigned their curricula to offer broader degrees or a common core for the first two years, other faculties claim that students are attracted to the specialised degrees because they feel readier to enter the labour market. Others explained that the specialisation was a reflection of the teachers' research interests, or the result of interfaculty competition for students, which leads them to design specialised programmes in order to increase their attractiveness.

The team appreciated that many faculties are continuously updating their study programmes to improve the employability of students; the use of internships is widespread. Most students are able to go for a one-month internship, although there is a preference for a longer period but there are not enough internships to go around. Some companies, however, mentioned that students come back for a second internship period. The team was told that companies report back to the faculties on the focus of the internship and describe the procedures framing the internships as being strict.

The team fully endorses the significant effort being expanded to create an online repository for textbooks. There are now fifty textbooks in open access, for which academic staff have relinquished their copyrights against a payment from the University. This should solve such issues as requiring students to buy paper copies of their professors' textbooks (those are not available in the university library) or putting students in the difficult situation of being unable to access the teaching material.

Students who fail an examination twice are assessed automatically by an ad hoc commission. The faculties monitor the success rate of students. The University is not able to do so; this is related to the limited uptake of iKnow by faculties (cf. Chapter 3).

UKIM is interested in developing e-learning but limited funding requires a gradualist approach thus resulting in inequities across faculties. It seems that academic staff are reluctant to take up e-learning and lack the opportunities to get training in order to teach differently; this is a significant obstacle to further development in that area.

Understanding of the learning-outcome approach is limited and there is no shared agreement across faculties as to how to define student-centred learning.

4.2 Recommendations

In view of the above, the team has the following six recommendations:

1. The pervasive focus on employability should be balanced with "Bildung", that is, learning for personal development, learning to learn, developing a critical attitude and other generic skills.

2. UKIM should review student services to ensure that they are fit for purpose and standardised across the university.

3. The information flow to students needs to be strengthened through a variety of formats such as a regular newsletter, the website, emails, and social networks.

4. UKIM should develop criteria for approving existing and new study programmes.

5. The faculties should consider learning outcomes when developing study programmes and the associated assessment formats.

6. Student-centred learning needs further development. The ESG[3] provide a good framework for that. Consideration of student-centred learning includes promoting the following aspects:

   - ✓ active teaching methodology
   - ✓ better student support to develop their autonomy as learners
   - ✓ personalised and flexible learning paths
   - ✓ student self-assessment
   - ✓ e-learning and e-textbooks
   - ✓ ongoing pedagogic development for teachers

---

[3] *The Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area* (ESG): https://media.ehea.info/file/2015_Yerevan/72/7/European_Standards_and_Guidelines_for_Quality_Assurance_in_the_EHEA_2015_MC_613727.pdf

5. Research

5.1 Doctoral training and education

In 2009, UKIM established a single doctoral school for the whole university. The doctoral school offers two courses (on ethics and research methods) and a forum for student seminars. It is currently led by the vice-rector for teaching and a seven-member Doctoral Study Council (elected by the Senate on proposal of the Rector's Board). Administrative tasks are carried out by the staff of two vice-rectors (for teaching and for research). The Doctoral Study Council reports as needed to the rector or the Senate, depending on the issue.

The team found that the doctoral school is a good first step to enhance doctoral education and that the courses on methodology and ethics are excellent ideas that have become part of the standard provision of such schools across Europe.

The first three years of doctoral education are very structured, although there is no systematic orientation offered. This is done individually and upon request rather than through an orientation day. Doctoral candidates are required to select the topic of their doctoral thesis by the end of their first year. This is based on a literature survey. They are also required to take the two courses offered in the doctoral school: the course in research ethics (30% of general ethics and scientific integrity and the remainder is specific to their field) and the research method course. The students are able to take other courses if needed, including from any faculty but the students were unsure about that possibility. Opportunities to go abroad vary by faculty but there is no university policy on funding annual conference attendance or periods of mobility abroad.

Students are required to present their literature surveys and proposals of a research topic at the end of the first year to an audience in the student's field or cognate fields. The audience also includes the supervisor, a local expert and one of the seven members of the Doctoral Study Council.

During the next two years, the students work on their projects, and write one paper per year that is presented in a public seminar. The papers are reviewed by an external local expert. International experts are not called upon as a general rule. The two papers written in Year 2 and Year 3 must be published in peer-reviewed journals, with the candidate as the principle author. Some faculties have stringent rules about the type of journals that are acceptable.

When the supervisor feels that the student is ready to submit the thesis, a thesis committee is formed. It includes five members: four experts (one of whom is external) and the supervisor (exceptionally a co-supervisor). The thesis committee is approved by the faculty. The student defends the thesis in a public forum that includes the Faculty Board (i.e. all the professors).

Doctoral candidates must complete their work within six years. If they do not finish in six years, they must start a new thesis. Depending on the faculties, doctoral students can be supported financially as research or teaching assistants; or they work outside the university.

The team collected contradictory evidence about the possibility of doing research in industry and gaining a doctorate through collaborative provision.

The law requires the use of the Macedonian language for the seminars and the theses; English is used only when it is necessary. However, UKIM is interested in adding an extensive summary in English to the theses.

A 2012 amendment to the law introduced new requirements for supervisors. The law requires that supervisors demonstrate that they are research active by having published either two articles in the last five years in a ranked journal or six papers in a less prestigious journal. They can supervise a maximum of three doctoral candidates. The new requirements have caused some problems in the short run and some students have been admitted to a doctoral programme although no supervisor was immediately available in their field. Theoretically, this is a stopgap measure for the first year but the situation has not been resolved in some cases and some faculties lack qualified supervisors.

There is no supervision agreement between a supervisor and the doctoral student, but an agreement between the doctoral school and the faculty to ensure that common guidelines are enforced. Supervisors do not receive any training or any orientation but the IEP team received good feedback from students on the excellent support that they receive from supervisors.

Students can change supervisors, but the team was told that "they need to have a very good reason" and "it must be done with the agreement of the initial supervisor".

Students who are integrated in research groups seem to fare better than those who are left to fend for themselves and who can be very isolated particularly beyond the first, very structured three years. Students who are not part of a research group have to show a great deal of resolve and entrepreneurship in addressing some basic challenges, such as access to research databases (which they sometimes have to pay for themselves) and lab equipment. However, their supervisors seem to be very caring and attentive and the head of doctoral studies in their faculty provides additional advice and support.

5.2 Research

As mentioned earlier, universities are required to divert 40% of the student fees to research activities. Those funds go to one research project per department and financial incentives to stimulate publications in high-impact factor journals (20 articles are supported in this way). The University also bestows awards for best artists and researchers by scientific fields and a research and teaching life-achievement prize.

Data provided to the team (SER Appendix 22) shows some general increase in the number of publications, which is attributed to supervision requirements (cf. Section 5.1). The SER (p.10) also mentions that UKIM has increased the number of journals published by the university. The Macedonian academic diaspora is used as peer-reviewers.

The external obstacles to promote research are mostly financial. The SER (p. 19) mentions that 0.5% of GDP goes to research funding; and the team was told repeatedly that academic staff tend to think that their salaries are for their teaching activities and that any other activity must be remunerated with top-up salaries. Public procurement was mentioned often as a very complicated process that is based systematically on the lowest bid regardless of quality. This is a significant issue when purchasing research equipment. The capacity of UKIM researchers to compete for international research funding is limited further because of outdated equipment.

There are also internal obstacles to promoting research effectively. The University has decided not to have a research strategy. As a consequence, the available research funding through the University's "integrative fund" is sprinkled across the faculties and departments rather than used as seed money to bolster high-potential research projects. While this contributes to promoting a research culture across UKIM, it is unlikely to provide an opportunity to build on research strengths.

There is a small university unit that provides limited support in monitoring international calls and advising on writing grant proposals. Some faculties also provide this type of support. A question could be raised whether centralising this type of support might be more effective.

In addition, as mentioned in Chapter 2, the decentralised nature of UKIM leads to relatively little cooperation and only between naturally close partners who work in the same or in cognate fields (e.g. electrical and mechanical engineering and physics). There were very rare examples of multi-disciplinary research provided to the team and those were driven by the researchers themselves. As one interlocutor put it "people cooperate but not the structures". In fact, the structures stand in the way of cooperation as explained by another person: "The funding model is driving the faculties apart: they are competing for students. A research-active faculty would not attract students. Today some faculties are rich but not because of their research activities. Salaries are also different across the faculties and many teachers take on extra teaching loads."

The site visit meetings revealed that there is some pressure to rise in the rankings but that this goal is not widely shared and would not, in the view of the team, foster research quality. In fact, it could lead to damaging a university's reputation for scientific integrity.

5.3 Recommendations

1. Regarding the doctoral school, the team recommends the following:

    ✓ To provide an orientation day to entering students.

    ✓ To offer annual seminars to supervisors with the opportunity to exchange experience and hone their supervisory skills.

    ✓ To foster group work during the ethics and methodology courses that would allow students to deepen their understanding of those topics.

✓ To promote inter-disciplinarity and trans-disciplinarity by mixing students from different disciplines in the two courses and in the audience of the students' annual seminars.

✓ To support students' research by facilitating access to databases and to lab equipment, in other words, by providing students with more structured links (with faculties, institutes, hospitals, etc.) when they need resources outside their own faculty.

✓ To collect feedback on doctoral education by organising focus groups of students with the Doctoral Studies University Board.

✓ To break the isolation of some doctoral students by organising academic and social events.

2. UKIM should consider entrusting the doctoral school with the function of admitting doctoral students to ensure a common process. Short of that, the University should require that admission of doctoral students is dependent on the relevant supervisory competence and the capacity of a department to support the research of doctoral students. It should require that students are supervised by someone in their field and that there is a process for students to change supervisors without undue stress.

3. Thesis committees should involve at least one international expert and exclude the supervisor, as is the standard practice in much of Europe.

4. With respect to research activities in general, the next step for UKIM would be:

✓ to develop a research strategy that would support projects that have the potential for attracting European and international funds and would foster interdisciplinary research and to use the "integrative fund" as seed money to bolster the potential that has been identified;

✓ to strengthen provision of information on calls and support for grant writing, at central level; and

✓ to secure time for research activities, particularly for young researchers.

6.   Service to society

6.1 Overview

There are four vice-rectors at UKIM, for research, teaching and learning, internationalisation, and finance and development, but no vice rector responsible for service to society. Service to society is totally decentralised. Nevertheless, UKIM is interested in creating a Centre for Technology Tansfer to serve the University as a whole.

Some faculties have placed the third mission ahead of teaching and research but report that the Treasury regulations hinder their ability to respond to the needs of industry in an agile manner. There were good examples of knowledge transfer and maintaining contact with alumni, which could serve as best practice across faculties. As mentioned earlier (Chapter 3) career centres are decentralised; they are also staffed by academics, which is unsustainable. The University is aiming to establish one centrally.

The external stakeholders whom the team met were very positive about their faculty contacts and provided excellent examples of cooperation with them such as providing scholarships and internship opportunities to students, hiring graduates, contributing to redesigning curricula and proposing new ones. Some of those relationships are deep and enduring and all the stakeholders met by the team were UKIM alumni, who were very familiar with the structure of the University and knew how to navigate across the campus.

Many stakeholders mentioned that their company provides additional training to young hires to bolster their organisational skills and, depending on the company, knowledge of health and safety issues, or finance. The stakeholders did not seem to think that providing this extra training was an issue and were appreciative of the quality of UKIM graduates.

In summary, the team found good examples of links with industry, government, and cultural organisations and UKIM stakeholders who are supportive and positive about the University. The team thinks that developing a student-centred approach (cf. Chapter 3) will foster in alumni a strong sense of citizenship and commitment to serving their society.

6.2 Recommendations

The team endorses the three recommendations provided in the 2015 IEP evaluation report:

1. Increase further the collaboration between external stakeholders and UKIM by sharing good practice amongst faculties.

2. Provide better support for careers centres at both faculty and central university levels, including the introduction of professional careers staff and specific funding for the activities in this area.

3. The university should play an active role in restructuring alumni organisations to enhance the relationships between UKIM and its graduates.

7. Internationalisation

7.1 Overview

Internationalisation is the top priority of the University. The principal goal is to increase both the number of partners worldwide and the number of agreements. UKIM has 276 Erasmus+ agreements (80 were signed in 2017). An Erasmus+ traineeship programme is being used from this year and will provide opportunities to develop professional skills. For the first time, UKIM joined the Erasmus+ K107 programme. The geographical targets include Albania, Brazil, European Union, Japan, Kosovo, Serbia, the USA, etc. China is also a target and there are already signs of Chinese support on campus through China Aid and a Confucius Institute.

The University is committed to increasing incoming and outgoing students. The main obstacle to incoming mobility is the small number of study programmes and courses in English. The process of extending their number is complex and requires resources. The University has devised a step-by-step programme to reach the goal of three to four new courses in English per department, per year, but emphasises that there is no pressure on faculties and that the University is moving at deliberate speed. Teachers who accept to add an English version of their course receive some funding but there is no staff training to support them in making that change.

The capacity to enrol students is limited but UKIM plans to refurbish one student dormitory for the incoming international students. It should be noted that "free movers" (i.e. students who are not part of an exchange agreement) pay a higher fee than regular students: EUR 2500 – 3000 depending on the faculties, of which 65% stays with the unit and the rest goes to the University. Free movers apply to the central international office; if they have a degree it is certified by the nostrification office of the Ministry. They must have competence in the Macedonian language but the international office will provide support (course material in English until they can be mainstreamed). All international students have an appointed mentor.

The central international cooperation office plays effectively its coordinating role by meeting regularly with the Erasmus+ coordinators in the faculties to explain the details of the Erasmus+ programme and train them (they are academic staff). The processes of both selecting outgoing Erasmus+ students and placing incoming Erasmus+ students in appropriate departments are structured and coordinated between the central international office and the faculties. However, UKIM students mentioned that they are not fully aware of international opportunities.

Attention is also paid to staff mobility. The process is also well structured and coordinated with the faculties. After their mobility period, they are required to produce a report but the follow-up of the reports is at the faculty level and is not consistently done. As a result, the opportunity for "internationalisation at home" is not fully used.

For research, it is a European Union requirement to show evidence of an integrated university when applying for EU research funding. They international office checks the grant proposal, which must be signed by the rector.

In summary, the team found that there have been significant developments in increasing student and staff mobility and signing bilateral agreements and that international activities constitute an important integrative element of UKIM and contribute to internal quality and the University's reputation abroad.

While the team found that the international cooperation office provides coordination across the University in a very effective way, the internationalisation strategy is somewhat undeveloped. The main goal of increasing courses in English and staff and student mobility should be further refined. The University should be clear about the purposes of internationalisation, the target countries, the target institutions, the category of students and staff it wishes to attract or send out for mobility periods. As in other areas of the University, however, the decentralised organisation plays against developing such a strategy. While some processes are now well coordinated and, since 2008, UKIM has a shared database, faculties have their own strategies. In other words, the strategic process starts bottom-up, gets integrated and coordinated at the central level, to support the grass-root work. While grass-roots initiatives are important to preserve, the balance between the centre and the faculties seems to work well operationally but not in a strategic way.

7.2 Recommendations

The team recommends:

1. As a next step, a more strategic approach at university level should identify areas with high potential for attracting international partners and students. Thus, instead of supporting any teacher who is interested in an English version of his/her course, UKIM should deliberately target which study programme should be in English so as to be most attractive to international students.

2. Make use of student and staff mobility to foster "internationalisation at home".

3. Promote information flow to students about international opportunities.

8. Conclusions

The IEP team was impressed by the capacity of the University Ss. Cyril and Methodius in Skopje to work within its constrained environment and its very pragmatic approach to decision making. UKIM should be complimented for the clear understanding of its public service role in the Republic of Macedonia.

Given the available financial resources, however, the IEP team thinks that UKIM would increase its effectiveness if it centralised some key services (e.g. grant proposal writing) and if it could propose and implement a shared strategy for teaching and learning, research, internationalisation and internal quality assurance. Economies of scale and effective implementation would result from better central coordination and strategic steer and would reduce much of the disparities that can be observed across the University.

The visionary UKIM leadership, its commitment and determination to ensure the further development of the University are essential to the University's future development. A well-developed strategy, a detailed action plan, well-informed and engaged students, academic staff trained in new pedagogies, professional administrative staff and good internal quality processes would contribute to this development further.

Summary of the recommendations

Governance

1. If the law allows, the responsibilities between the Senate and the Rector's Board should be reconsidered so that they mirror the respective responsibilities of the Faculty Councils ("expert", decisions on academic issues) and the Deans' Boards ("management", decision-making on governing issues). The first principle that should guide that reflexion is that the body or person making a decision should be the one who is responsible and accountable.[4]

2. The second recommendation is related to the concept of the "integrated university". In order to foster further the potential of an integrated university, the team recommends that the central level increases its capacity to provide a strategic steer rather than simply harmonise faculty traditions. That can be done through the following actions:

   ✓ Provide opportunities for faculties to interact, learn from one another and

---

[4] There are two options possible for the Senate: if it is considered as a *decision-making body*, the rector must chair it because s/he is ultimately legally responsible for the finance. If the Senate is considered as *an "expert" body*, then it must be focused on academic matters only (that is, no financial matters should be discussed) and could be chaired by an elected academic rather than the rector.

develop a feeling of common purpose across the university, for example, by organising periodic meetings of staff responsible for specific functions (e.g. the vice deans responsible for research, teaching, international, quality assurance, etc., as well as administrative staff responsible for human resources, finance, Erasmus+, etc.).

✓ Increase the interaction of units by promoting cross-faculty research activities and redesigning "curricula to include common courses… extending double major and minor degrees across the university" as the 2015 IEP evaluation recommended.

✓ Ensure that faculty strategies are aligned with that of the University by asking the faculties to develop an action plan that would show how they will contribute to UKIM's overall strategy and by organising yearly meetings between the Rector and each dean to review the activities undertaken during the year.

✓ Promote a sense of identification to UKIM of staff and students by organising university-wide events (for instance at the beginning and at the close of the academic year).

✓ Develop a communication strategy in order to ensure that UKIM is perceived externally as one university (e.g. standardise business cards and all communication media such as webpages, letterheads, etc.).

3. The team fully endorses a recommendation of the 2015 IEP evaluation that UKIM "focus only on the highest priorities as part of its strategic planning process whilst retaining sufficient flexibility to adapt to further changes in the external environment. This should include scenario planning and contingency plans." In addition, it would be useful to UKIM if the Strategic Plan is more specific about the future profile of the University.

4. UKIM should review, with the help of students, how students learn about their rights and responsibilities (student handbook, orientation day for new students) to ensure that they retain that information and take appropriate steps, at the central level of the University, to address students' lack of knowledge on those issues.

5. UKIM should develop better information about the appeal process and clarify the role of the ombudsman: is it an arbitrator, a mediator or an advocate for students?

Quality culture

6. UKIM should exploit systematically the iKnow data and information, which holds great potential for the analysis of patterns of student success and failures and for developing appropriate remedial actions. Faculties should be encouraged to use consistently the full functionalities of iKnow (i.e. the core module) to allow for more

meaningful data analysis and opportunities for improvement across UKIM.

7. UKIM should develop alumni tracer surveys for quality improvement purposes; that is, alumni should be surveyed and asked about their career development at regular intervals (e.g., six months after they graduate, three and ten years later). The data should be analysed to understand better the need of graduates as they enter the labour market and develop their professional careers; ultimately, the analysis should lead to an adaptation of study programmes.

8. UKIM should develop a common understanding of which internal quality assurance mechanisms require developments and what type of quality culture should be developed at UKIM. The University is encouraged to organise frequent discussions across the faculties that would lead to better embedding and acceptance of internal quality assurance and to the promotion of internal quality assurance as a shared responsibility of the whole community: the leadership, the academic and administrative staff and the students. Such discussion should take into consideration available human and financial resources, in order to develop a realistic and non-bureaucratic approach to internal quality assurance.

9. UKIM should enhance the use of the student questionnaire by forming a committee that includes academic staff and students that would work on the following aspects:

   ✓ Is the questionnaire asking the right questions and in a non-ambiguous way?
   ✓ How can the feeling of insecurity that is widely shared by the students about the anonymity of the questionnaire be addressed?
   ✓ What other (formal and informal) mechanisms could be used to collect student feedback?
   ✓ How to publicise the results of the questionnaires and the ensuing actions that serve to improve quality?

Teaching and learning

10. The pervasive focus on employability should be balanced with "Bildung", that is, learning for personal development, learning to learn, developing a critical attitude and other generic skills.

11. UKIM should review student services to ensure that they are fit for purpose and standardised across the university.

12. The information flow to students needs to be strengthened through a variety of formats such as a regular newsletter, the website, emails, and social networks.

13. UKIM should develop criteria for approving existing and new study programmes.

14. The faculties should consider learning outcomes when developing study programmes and the associated assessment formats.

15. Student-centred learning needs further development. The ESG[5] provide a good framework for that. Consideration of student-centred learning include promoting the following aspects:

  ✓ active teaching methodology
  ✓ better student support to develop their autonomy as learners
  ✓ personalised and flexible learning paths
  ✓ student self-assessment
  ✓ e-learning and e-textbooks
  ✓ ongoing pedagogic development for teachers

Research

16. Regarding the doctoral school, the team recommends the following:

  ✓ To provide an orientation day to entering students.

  ✓ To offer annual seminars to supervisors with the opportunity to exchange experience and hone their supervisory skills.

  ✓ To foster group work during the ethics and methodology courses that would allow students to deepen their understanding of those topics.

  ✓ To promote inter-disciplinarity and trans-disciplinarity by mixing students from different disciplines in the two courses and in the audience of the students' annual seminars.

  ✓ To support students' research by facilitating access to databases and to lab equipment, in other words, by providing students with more structured links (with faculties, institutes, hospitals, etc.) when they need resources outside their own faculty.

  ✓ To collect feedback on doctoral education by organising focus groups of students with the Doctoral Studies University Board.

  ✓ To break the isolation of some doctoral students by organising academic and social events.

17. UKIM should consider entrusting the doctoral school with the function of admitting doctoral students to ensure a common process. Short of that, the University should require that admission of doctoral students is dependent on the relevant supervisory competence and the capacity of a department to support the research of doctoral students. It should require that students are supervised by someone in their field and

---

[5] *The Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area* (ESG): https://media.ehea.info/file/2015_Yerevan/72/7/European_Standards_and_Guidelines_for_Quality_Assurance_in_the_EHEA_2015_MC_613727.pdf

that there is a process for students to change supervisors without undue stress.

18. Thesis committees should involve at least one international expert and exclude the supervisor, as is the standard practice in much of Europe.

19. With respect to research activities in general, the next step for UKIM would be:

   ✓ to develop a research strategy that would support projects that have the potential for attracting European and international funds and would foster interdisciplinary research and to use the "integrative fund" as seed money to bolster the potential that has been identified;

   ✓ to strengthen provision of information on calls and support for grant writing, at central level; and

   ✓ to secure time for research activities, particularly for young researchers.

Service to society

The team endorses the three recommendations provided in the 2015 IEP evaluation report:

20. Increase further the collaboration between external stakeholders and UKIM by sharing good practice amongst faculties.

21. Provide better support for careers centres at both faculty and central university levels, including the introduction of professional careers staff and specific funding for the activities in this area.

22. The university should play an active role in restructuring alumni organisations to enhance the relationships between UKIM and its graduates.

Internationalisation

23. As a next step, a more strategic approach at university level should identify areas with high potential for attracting international partners and students. Thus, instead of supporting any teacher who is interested in an English version of his/her course, UKIM should deliberately target which study programme should be in English so as to be most attractive to international students.

24. Make use of student and staff mobility to foster "internationalisation at home".

25. Promote information flow to students about international opportunities.