University of Iași "Apollonia"

EVALUATION REPORT

January 2014

Team:
Prof. Tatjana Volkova, Team Chair
Erazem Bohinc
Prof. Elena Dumova-Jovanoska
Andy Gibbs, Team Coordinator

Table of contents

1.   Introduction

This report is the result of the evaluation of University of Iaşi Apollonia (AUI). The evaluation took place in 2013 in the framework of the project "Ready for innovating, ready for better serving the local needs - Quality and Diversity of the Romanian Universities", which aims at strengthening core elements of Romanian universities, such as their autonomy and administrative competences, by improving their quality assurance and management proficiency.

The evaluations are taking place within the context of major reforms in the Romanian higher education system, and specifically in accordance with the provisions of the 2011 Law on Education and the various related normative acts.

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

1.1.   The Institutional Evaluation Programme

The Institutional Evaluation Programme (IEP) is an independent membership service of the European University Association (EUA) that offers evaluations to support the participating institutions in the continuing development of their strategic management and internal quality culture. The 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).

The distinctive features of the Institutional Evaluation Programme are:
- A strong emphasis on the self-evaluation phase
- A European perspective
- A peer-review approach
- A support to improvement

The focus of the IEP is the institution as a whole and not the individual study programmes or units. It focuses upon:
- Decision-making processes and institutional structures and effectiveness of strategic management
- Relevance of internal quality processes and the degree to which their outcomes are used in decision-making and strategic management as well as perceived gaps in these internal mechanisms.

The evaluation is guided by four key questions, which are based on a "fitness for (and of) purpose" approach:

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

1.2. University of Iaşi Apollonia's profile

Apollonia University of Iaşi (AUI) is a private institution created at the initiative of Apollonia Foundation. The city of Iaşi belongs to the north-east region, the largest of Romania (at the east border of the European Union, neighbouring with Ukraine and the Republic of Moldova. The university commenced operations in 1990/1991 with curricula in the Faculty of Stomatology, later changing its name to the Faculty of Dentistry. AUI is currently organised with two faculties and six study programmes. The Faculty of Dental Medicine has four study programs: dental medicine, dental technique, general healthcare and balneophisiokinetotherapy and recovery; and the Faculty of Communication Sciences has two study programmes: communication and public relations and journalism. A number of recently introduced programmes are currently undertaking the accreditation process and have temporary authorisation. There are 967 students registered at the university. There are 84 academic staff members.

The university promotes an emphasis on practical training as part of the student's training as a future specialist. AUI has established a Practical Training Platform, which includes a TV and radio station to support the practical training of students from the Faculty of Communication Sciences and the Clinical Training Platform for practical skills of students from the Faculty of Dental Medicine.

1.3. The evaluation process

The self-evaluation report of the University of Iaşi "Apollonia" together with the appendices, was sent to the evaluation team on 27 April 2013. The visits of the evaluation team to University of Iaşi "Apollonia" took place from 21 to 23 May 2013 and from 23 to 25 September 2013, respectively.

During the first visit, the evaluation team had to repeatedly draw breaches and potential breaches of the evaluation guidelines to the attention of the university. The team also requested additional documents following the first visit. The university agreed to provide these, however, the documents were only provided on the last day of the evaluation and the

university, without explanation decided not to translate some of the documents. The team found these disruptive to the evaluation process.

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

- ▶ Prof. Tatjana Volkova, Former Rector of the BA School of Business and Finance, Latvia, Chair
- ▶ Prof. Elena Dumova-Jovanoska, Former Vice Rector Ss.Cyril and Methodius University, Macedonia
- ▶ Erazem Bohinc, Bachelor student, European Faculty of Law, Ljubljana, Slovenia
- ▶ Andy Gibbs, Subject Group Leader, SNMSC, Edinburgh Napier University UK, Team Coordinator

The team thanks the President Prof. Vasile Burlui and Rector, Prof. Dr Carmen Stadoleanu for their invitation to the university and the evaluation coordinator, Assoc. Univ. Prof. Dr Cristina-Emanuela Dascălu, for facilitating the visit.

2. Governance and institutional decision-making

According to the Self-Evaluation Report (SER), "the mission of Apollonia University Iaşi (AUI) is cultural, educational, and of scientific research, being accomplished with the participation of all members of the Academic Community. The mission and the objectives assumed by the institution individualize it in the national education system through: clarity, specificity, competence." The team reviewed the mission statement of the university, noting two differing versions in the documents which had been presented. The team also listened to the mission as expressed by the president, rector and various personnel in meetings. The team observed that there was an inconsistency in both the written versions and in its expression to the team during meetings, leading the team to conclude that the mission was so broadly stated that almost any activity could be considered as part of it. To this extent there was no clearly shared mission. The team considered that the mission statement as it is written is too long to easily summarise the distinctiveness of the university. This introduced a lack of clarity and a diversity of views on what actions would specifically support what the university was trying to do. In effect, based on the mission, the strategic direction of the university is not clear.

The team recommend that the university mission be reviewed, involving all staff members, with the aim of articulating it briefly and clearly, placing an emphasis on the unique positioning points of the university. The team heard that the university is attempting to be distinctive from traditional universities, primarily by having an emphasis on the practice and the practical elements of education that their students receive. These appeared to the team to be central to the university mission and pivotal to what the university is trying to achieve. The university could take the opportunity to further develop its strategic directions emphasising the unique characteristics and aspirations, creating a unique position in attempting to be distinctive and different. The strategic direction has to include vision, mission, values and strategic goals to be achieved.

This lack of clarity was also reflected in the strategic plan, which appeared to be more a list of tasks to be undertaken rather than establishing a strategic direction that contributed to the fulfilment of the mission. The team noted that goals and indicators are either absent or unclear and that currently institutional decision-making is not linked to strategic plan and budgeting. The team recommend that following a review of the mission, also defining the university's values, the strategic plan is written to include clear goals, key performance indicators and a time frame for achieving these goals. The plan should focus on developing an overarching quality management system that includes measures to further develop research, teaching and learning, internationalisation activities and providing service to society.

In a number of conversations with staff, the team were told that the university should build its brand locally and internationally. The team believe that the activities above will not only be useful in helping to produce a clearer, more differentiated strategy but also a guide in building the brand locally and internationally. The team suggest that once the above activity is completed the strategy should be communicated to all stakeholders as part of its brand building.

The team noticed that there was broad involvement of staff and an engagement of staff in planning the further development of the university. The team were impressed by the enthusiasm of the staff, many of whom were actively participating in university initiatives and decision-making. In most of the meetings, the team observed that university staff had many ideas, aspirations and initiatives. This enthusiasm and staff engagement would, in the opinion of the team, benefit from a clearly focused mission and strategy implementation plan which should include a role for all staff and have a staff development component.

The team reviewed the structure of the decision-making committees within the university, examining the SER, the university charter and other documents provided as appendices. The team also clarified the roles of various committees and commissions in their meetings with Senate representatives, the rector and other groups. The team concluded that there are unclear, overlapping staff and committee responsibilities. Additionally, given the relatively small numbers of staff in the university, the management and committee structures are top heavy. This means that whilst many staff were involved in collective decision-making, the responsibilities for action and implementation were not always clear.

The university is imbalanced in that one faculty is much bigger in terms of student numbers and stronger in terms of student demand for programmes than the other. Within the Faculty of Communication Sciences, some programmes seem financially unsustainable even based on the two differing sets of student numbers and the inaccurate summary of financial accounts that the team received. Staff explained that financial stability would be achieved by the introduction of new programmes. The team could not identify either a sound basis nor a rationale for this and considered that this apparently unsystematic planning of new programmes could be problematic as it was reported that unstable student numbers already create planning difficulties.

The team noted that there was a difference between the written University Charter and the Charter in action. Consequently, the remit of the Senate was unclear and their representatives could not articulate a shared purpose, for example, whether the Senate deals with planning issues related solely to academic issues or whether their remit involved decision-making related to wider governance issues. Additionally, the team heard that the Senate deals with operational matters/issues that could be dealt with elsewhere. The team

recommend that the university should revise the Charter to ensure that it reflects what actually happens and ensure it reflects what the university wants to happen in terms of governance. This may contribute to ensuring that the Senate deals primarily with strategic issues.

The team consider the above to be an essential first step in creating a structure focused on delivery of the mission and implementing the strategic plan. At the moment there are too many fragmented administrative departments, too many Senate commissions and too much bureaucracy. The university should review the number and functions of commissions and streamline the departmental structure to support the strategic direction and improve efficiency, effectiveness and communication. This would provide an opportunity to develop a middle management with executive powers to action operational issues. In doing this, together with actions recommended in section 6, the team believe that the university can make a concerted effort to reduce bureaucracy by ensuring that only what is necessary is delivered.

The team met with the Board of Trustees and noted that the majority of them were university employees. The team considered that a potential of conflict may exist between the two roles, which may hinder the potential to offer independent advice as a Trustee. In addition, the team felt that a Board of Trustees composed of a majority of members external to the university would increase the opportunity to not only build links with society but also to reflect their needs and aspirations within the university mission. The team recommend that the university reconsider the composition of the Board of Trustees to include prominent people who are external to the university and can provide independent advice and connections to society thus also building a stronger university brand.

3. Teaching and Learning

The team heard from both students and teachers that there is an emphasis on practical education assisted by modern equipment and methods. According to the SER:

> Currently the academic curriculum, which structures the training plan of the future specialists, includes itself subjects necessary for theoretical and practical grounding, focusing mainly on developing skills and shaping a practical thinking. The curriculum is updated annually and is adjusted according to the new information technologies, educational practices of national and European reference institutions and the labour market requirements. So, in order to increase the cognitive and professional relevance we permanently bet the introduction of new specialization subjects in the curriculum as well as the diversification of optional courses. Our close relationship with the employers ensures the compatibility of specific curricula applications with the requirements that students will meet with post-graduation.

The team requested a sample of curriculum documents, so that they could better understand this approach and were advised on the final day of the evaluation that "it was decided by the upper management involved in providing the documents that Curriculum Plans stay as they are, in Romanian, and shall not be translated. You can address the question why the Curriculum Plans are not translated to the Rector, Deans and University President." The team are therefore unable to comment on some of the claims in the SER.

Furthermore, the SER indicated that "objective and transparent procedures for the assessment of learning outcomes is met by respecting the following quality standards: students' assessment, quality of teaching and research stuff. Thus, within AUI, the EQAC monitors closely the examination and grading of students, by applying an operational procedure of assessment." The team was unable to form a judgment on this, however, in discussion with students and teachers, the team could find only limited evidence of an awareness of a learning outcomes approach.

The team met a number of student groups and were told that the teaching approach is excellent, the teachers are always available and the most modern techniques and methods are used. The team saw the facilities for dentistry students during their first visit and were advised that they were state of the art. Students also stated that they were taught entrepreneurial skills and offered career counselling during their education to support their career development. The team noted these positive aspects of the student experience.

Throughout the evaluation, the team found students to be wholly uncritical of the approach to teaching and learning and the students could not identify anything in their curriculum that could be improved or included to develop their position as graduates being able to work in the global employment market. The only issue identified by students was that the dormitories and canteen could be improved. The team found this surprising and were concerned that students whom the team met did not demonstrate the level of critical thinking skills necessary to contribute to university improvement and their own professional development.

In discussion with staff and students, the student centred approach to student learning was emphasised. The team were unable to ascertain what was meant by this; however, their inclination was that this had a meaning that was different from the one currently utilised in many European Higher Education Institutions. It is apparent that some steps have been taken towards addressing the European higher education modernisation agenda, however this did not appear to be as fully developed as indicated in the SER. In particular, the team noticed an emphasis on teaching whereas contemporary methods emphasise a learning approach in studies. The team found no evidence of an institutional move from an orientation on teaching towards learning and a contemporary student-centred approach. The SER mentioned learning outcomes, but teachers talked more about objectives and competencies. The university is encouraged to review and further develop a learning outcomes approach and to use such an approach to develop students' skills such as, for example, critical thinking. The low level of awareness of these issues also suggested to the team that staff would benefit from increased awareness of the European modernisation agenda including the use of learning outcomes.

The practical approach to teaching was highlighted as a particular approach within the university that created a distinctiveness and differentiated it from other higher education institutions. The team agreed that this could be of benefit to the university and suggests that it gather evidence to demonstrate excellence in practical education as a unique positioning point.

4.   Research

The SER informed the team that "scientific research is a fundamental structure within the activity of AUI having Acad. Ioan Haulică Research Institute at its core….the teachers and researchers of our University staff participate in fulfilling the mission of teaching and research".

The team read in the SER that "exploitation of research results is also achieved through its own publications" and "through participation in international scientific conferences, at home and abroad and in organizing congresses and scientific meetings with international participation".

The team were given a strategic plan for research, which was outdated, and were told that a new plan was due to be prepared. The team were told that the previous plan had succeeded in a number of ways: there is cross faculty cooperation; a themed approach was developed; there is internal funding directed towards research; internal projects are aimed at development; external projects for reputation building; partnership development and external environment scanning; the European projects office provides support for research; and there had been strong efforts and results in seeking external funding. Additionally a research institute was established.

Following the first evaluation meeting, the team requested a list of research projects and a summary with details of the amount and funding sources for the past three years including those accomplished and those currently under implementation. This was provided on the last evening of the evaluation and did not differentiate between bids, awards and neither did it identify funding sources. The team therefore found it difficult to estimate the current levels of research activity and the number of grants that had been awarded from external sources.

The team met with research leaders in the university including the research institute director, head of Senate and deans to discuss the research strategy. The team were shown individual research publications and heard in depth about processes for agreeing on research projects internally. Despite clear requests, the team were not informed of any overall strategic approach towards research nor of a clear picture of existing levels of research.

Taking all of these together, the university was unable to provide a clear purpose and vision of research activity in the university. In reading the SER and related papers and in various meetings with the senior leadership of the university, including research leaders from the Acad. Ioan Haulică Research Institute, the team could not discern any consistent view on the purpose and strategic direction of research activity. Nor could it see how the current research

activity benefited anyone other than the individual professors undertaking research. Given that research consumes 26% of the university budget, a higher level of accountability could be expected.

The team believe that if the university wishes to promote research as a fundamental activity, its presentation to external bodies needs to be improved. The relationship with the research institute was unclear to the team and detracted from rather than enhanced the university's research efforts. To this end, the team suggest that there should be a reconsideration of responsibilities and organisation of research at university level.

The team also concluded that the university may wish to develop a current research policy and strategy. In doing so, it should undertake a realistic assessment of research directions and give consideration as to who the intended beneficiaries of research activity are. The research strategy, according to the university, is intended to be an integral part of the university strategy and this will provide an opportunity to reinforce this point. In doing this, the potential to communicate results more widely with stakeholders and to build a brand could be maximised.

Additionally, whilst the university is proud of its publishing house and journals, this may deter university staff from seeking publication in the types of high impact journals which bring international credibility. The team recommend that the university plan for more publications in high impact international journals.

Finally, the team noted comments from less senior members of staff about the high teaching workload and the difficulty in finding time to undertake research activity. To ensure ongoing research activity the team recommend that the university engage in succession planning to build future research leaders with a focus on mentoring and guidance for younger staff.

5. Service to society

The team heard examples of the university's service to society and noted good practices in this area, including the involvement of students in elderly care, lifelong learning from the Centre for Continuous Education which provides education to the sector, and the production of English language textbooks for technical high schools, clinical services to society, etc.

The team noted that the university had not taken the opportunity to receive external input to its development and this issue is dealt with in section 2 (Invite prominent people from business to contribute to University development and monitoring will help in building brand and image) and section 7 (Develop further the Alumni Association to assist in internationalisation, branding – especially Faculty of Communication). In these ways the current approaches to service to society can be more closely linked with the wider aims of the university.

6. Quality culture

The team read in the SER and heard about many aspirations to develop a common understanding of the concept of quality culture and to develop a quality culture. The team took the view that the individual activities outlined were at the early stages of developing quality management activities, which were in themselves reasonable but overall they did not present a coherent and systemic approach contextualised within the European dimension.

The team recognised the individual efforts that had been taken by staff within quality units and faculties, but felt that this approach was limited by a lack of leadership and direction. External support would be helpful in developing the quality management system as would leadership from a senior member of university staff having responsibility and an overview for the development of quality systems. Such a role would enable the quality strategy to be broadened to include quality management.

The team agreed with the observation in the SER that "quality culture (joint values, beliefs, expectations, commitment) still requires a global effort, compromise and experience in strengthening the quality culture dimension. (There is a) need to develop a quality culture and ownership of quality through University dialogue and common understanding."

The team were advised that, following their request, additional documentation had been produced as "a result of many meetings, workshops, consultation of the whole University staff and especially based on input of those in charge of those areas and the University president, rector, deans, heads of the 2 Research Institutes: Haulica and ILMA." The team were somewhat surprised to hear this as the information requested was that which, it was assumed, would be collected routinely as part of quality management or monitoring of strategic aims. The team concluded that there is a lack of data and indicators to support quality activity and that much data that are collected and provided to the team are unnecessary and irrelevant. The team recommend the development of a coherent plan to support development goals which would help identify relevant data to collect. For example, various members of staff emphasised the evaluation of teachers, however, the team question whether it is the student learning experience which should be evaluated with teachers' capability being a component of this rather than the key measure.

The team felt that the quality of information provided to them, the low level of critical self-reflection both in the SER and during meetings, the advice to the team that recommendations from their first visit had been implemented (when no recommendations had been made) and emails which were sent to the team after meetings to offer agreement with perceived

criticism and assure the team that things would change, are illustrative of a university with a newly developing quality management system. The team concluded that both in the SER and during the meetings there was an overall lack of self-criticism based on reflection and focused on quality issues.

7. Internationalisation

The team read in the SER that "AUI has paid special attention to the need of the internationalization of the institution" both in terms of internationalisation at home and internationalisation abroad. The SER also indicated that (from an educational perspective) the main purpose of internationalisation is "to prepare students to become part of the knowledge society, based on multiculturalism and information, in order to open their cognitive universe and to familiarize them with all the integration opportunities on the labour market." Additionally the SER highlights the intention to "extend the cooperation with EU higher education institutions and research institutes to increase visibility and enhance international competitiveness" and that "accessing of external (national, European) funds will improve the existent material basis of the scientific-teaching process". Furthermore AUI "will meet its objectives of enhancing international visibility and prestige, increasing the capacity for research, development and innovation and of promoting services provided to the international community." Furthermore it outlined that it would create "more effective links through to the relevant national agencies and European Commission in Brussels in order to make the Erasmus and similar programs fit for the Romanian context. The SER also outlined a commitment for the university to "intensify its cooperation with international academic organizations (including EUA); increase international agreements; seek mobility grants for teachers and students; increase the number of foreign students completing their studies at AUI" and "continue to organize various scientific and cultural events."

The team felt that this was a rather ambitious agenda. In meetings with staff who had responsibility for international activity, the team heard of considerable planned activity across the university, some of which reflected the information in the SER and some which added to it. Activities included: receiving more visiting professors; participation in international seminars and congresses; delivering all programmes online in English within twelve months; preparing joint degrees; substantially increasing the number of overseas students; attracting international research and project funding; and developing Erasmus mobility for teachers and students.

These activities were all presented to the team by the individuals leading the activity as being important developments. Whilst the team would agree that these are important, it warns that there must be some prioritisation to increase the likelihood of success, as if all of the developments lead to growth, the university may lack capacity to keep pace and deliver expected results. Furthermore, as these activities are not complementary the university may also find itself stretched by diverse activities.

Firstly, the team noted that the activities described were led by individuals from various departments and areas across the university and lacked overall coordination and coherence. Secondly, the team considered the proposals and concluded that the effort involved in bringing just one, let alone all of these initiatives, to fruition has been seriously underestimated. For example, based on the confidence of staff in their language skills displayed by the majority of staff during the evaluation, the proposal to deliver all programmes online in English within twelve months is, in the opinion of the team, unachievable. Whilst this was probably the most clear example, the team felt that most of the proposals were unrealistic and lacked substantial critical thinking and strategic planning.

The team concluded that there was considerable activity but it was unconnected, lacked a complementary nature and that overall there were a number of simultaneous competing priorities with too many ambitious initiatives proposed. The team felt that, overall, these plans lacked realism and that even if they were all to come to fruition it was unclear how capacity to deliver could cope with the proposed pace of change. The team observed that whilst there was considerable international activity, it was not informed by an overarching aim for internationalising the university and that the university had not identified what it wished to achieve from internationalisation. Whilst the ambition of the university is recognised, the team would advise against trying to do everything at once and, instead, to develop a strategy to internationalise the University in a systematic and coherent way, starting with an identification of how internationalisation fits with the university mission and identifying the benefits the university wants to gain from internationalisation.

In terms of governance, the SER indicates that *"the internationalization process has been implemented especially through the constant efforts of the AUI Department of International Relations and the Vice Rector's Office"*. In its meetings the team could not identify such an office. The team discussed this during a meeting and shortly afterwards received an email which "agreed with the criticism and advised that *"the Department of External Relations should be named the Department of International Relations"*. This added to the impression that the team had gained: that policy in this area is reactive. Nevertheless, the team agree that a senior member of staff should be responsible for developing and delivering the strategy but counsel against creating more departments as mentioned in section 2 above.

Having said this, the team identified some activities which may have immediate benefit for the university in the short term. The SER states that "a special contribution may be assured by our graduates (Alumni), who may act as important ambassadors of the academic spirit, which is a dominant feature of the whole AUI activity; to this end, more should be done for monitoring and involving the graduates in the scientific and cultural activities organized in the University". The team would encourage the establishment of an Alumni association which

could provide support for internationalisation (and other activities) as well as providing insight and information about employment destinations, amongst other things.

The university is encouraged to continue its efforts in developing the level of English across the university of both staff and students. Alongside this, English should be more routinely used in written corporate literature (including website) and other activities as this is an essential component in gaining an international presence.

Finally, the team noted a desire from a number of areas to increase partnerships and would suggest that to avoid developing too many or expanding efforts on fruitless partnerships, the university should develop a preferred (or strategic) partnership approach and communicate it within the university thus supporting implementation of the mission and strategy.

8. Conclusion

UAI is a young and ambitious university with a desire to be distinctive in its approach to student education and, in particular, emphasising practical training and its student-focused approach. It has established a number of programmes and is further developing other programmes for full accreditation. The university is seeking to develop its approaches towards, inter alia, research, internationalisation and quality management, and benefits from a good vision and enthusiastic, motivated staff. The strategic planning engages staff and needs to ensure that capacity and capability, together with the structures in place to support planning, support the prioritisation of planned developments without compromising the quality of University activities. The recommendations in this report are intended to support the university's aspirations and their implementation will improve the evaluation teams' confidence in the university's capacity for change.

Summary of recommendations

Further develop the strategic directions emphasising unique characteristics and aspirations;

Review the university vision and mission, articulate it briefly and clearly through involvement of all staff members;

Communicate it to all stakeholders as part of university brand building;

Develop clear goals, key performance indicators and milestones;

Elaborate goals, key performance indicators and associated plans to attract more students, including branding locally and internationally;

Develop an overarching strategy of the university that includes plans to deliver high quality research, teaching and learning, internationalisation, etc.;

Implementation plan should include a role for all staff and have a staff development component;

Revise the Charter to ensure it reflects what actually happens/what the university wants to happen;

Ensure that the Senate deals primarily with strategic issues;

Reconsider the composition of Board of Trustees to include prominent people who are external to the university and can provide advice and connections to society;

Develop a middle management with executive powers to action operational issues;

Streamline the departmental structure to support the strategic directions and improve efficiency, effectiveness and communication;

Review the number and function of Senate commissions;

Make a concerted effort to reduce bureaucracy by ensuring that only the necessary is produced;

Gather evidence to demonstrate excellence in practical education as a unique positioning point of the university;

Increase staff mobility nationally and internationally;

Need to move from teaching to learning to get a contemporary student-centred approach;

Further develop a learning outcomes approach;

Further develop students' critical thinking skills to contribute to university development;

Introduce programmes in English to cope with declining numbers of students based on a realistic planning timeframe;

Continue to build on the English language learning provision;

Increased awareness among staff of the European modernisation agenda including the use of learning outcomes;

Use learning outcome approach to develop necessary competencies, including skills such as critical thinking;

Develop a research policy and strategy and undertake a realistic assessment of research directions;

Reconsider responsibilities and organisation of research at university level;

Develop a succession plan to build future research leaders with a focus on mentoring and guidance for younger staff;

Communicate results more widely with stakeholders to build brand of university;

Plan for more publications in high impact international journals;

Develop further the Alumni Association to assist in internationalisation and branding – especially the Faculty of Communications;

Invite prominent people from business to contribute to university development and oversight which will help in building brand and image;

Develop a quality culture and ownership of quality through university dialogue and common understanding;

Develop a coherent plan to support development goals. External support would be helpful in developing the system;

Quality strategy could be broadened to include development of quality assurance and management system;

Develop leadership and direction of university;

Student learning experience should be evaluated in addition to teachers' capability;

Develop further the university culture keeping in mind that critical observations are a component of change, innovation and development to be welcomed and considered;

Identify the benefits the university want to be gained from internationalisation;

Develop a strategy to internationalise the university in a systematic way;

Don't try to do everything at once;

Develop a preferred partnership approach and communicate it within the university;

Further develop levels of English across the university in written corporate literature (including website) and other activities;