

The review of internationalisation strategies of the Serbian partners in the SIPUS project was done by partners of Ghent University and the university of Pecs. We have read and evaluated the documents of the different universities and looked for the basic elements of a strategic plan (based on: <http://onstrategyhq.com/resources/how-to-write-a-strategic-plan/>), which can be summarized by the following questions:

- **Where are they now?**
This often refers to mission statements, values of the organisation and /or a SWOT: self-evaluation.
- **Where are they going?**
Organisation should look into their comparative advantages (where are they better at than other organisations) and elaborate their vision: where will the organisation be in 5 to 10 years?
- **How will they get there?**
Objectives, short-term goals, actions, resources needed to implement (financial, HR,..) as well as execution and monitoring

First of all we should state that we had only access to the documents available on the project website (in English). In most cases this was only the strategy without any accompanying action plans or mobility strategies. This made the review more difficult and abstract.

We have presented our joint findings during the final meeting of the project in Pecs, on Monday 7 November 2016. Enclosed you will find the individual reviews per university, drafted separately by UGent and Pecs. During the final meeting we presented an overview of the general elements of the different documents, and what was missing where.

An overview of the common general findings:

- **Selfevaluation (SWOT or other) is not included in the strategies.** We believe it is an important step to evaluate yourself: then you know what to reinforce and what to invest in without losing sight of what is realistic. Having this said, this evaluation might have taken place at the Serbian universities, but it was not verifiable in the strategies.
- The **consultation process** and discussions which lead to the strategy, are at least as important (if not more important) than the strategy itself => what was the support within the university, was there involvement of several stakeholders within the university? Ideally it is a mix of a top-down approach with bottom-up consultations. We had a short discussion during the final meeting which showed that in some universities this was done, in others it was still lacking.
- Many EU universities also struggle: a strategy is about knowing your institution and **making choices**, a hard thing to do even in a centralised university. Given the context of the **decentralised universities**, it is even more crucial to have the faculties on board for support and implementation of the strategy.
- Most strategies are **rather** concise and general and refer to action plans where the strategy will be developed in detail. We only had insight into some of these action plans, as mentioned above. When drafting action plans, we suggest to ensure coherence with the strategy and the objectives and goals formulated there (similar as in a Logical Framework Matrix approach: activities result in outputs/outcomes which lead to specific objectives

which contribute to a wider objective). Objectives should be formulated in a SMART way: specific, measurable, accurate, realistic and time-bound.

- Most of the objectives or goals are the same: more mobility, projects and curriculum development (*generally those items linked to core business of an IRO*).
- Terminology is sometimes confusing: objectives, goals, priorities, realisations... numbers or KPI's (*key performance indicators*) are often missing – ideally they should then be included in the action plans
- There is no **reference to the institutional development goals and objectives** - if there is an IDP (institutional development plan) the connection between the internationalisation strategy and the IDP is missing. The Serbian partners indicated in the meeting however that most of them do not have an institutional strategy. This does not imply that the internationalisation strategy is not of value, they chose not to wait for an institutional framework.
- The question of how to divide workloads in terms of the execution of internationalisation is not addressed: will it be within the Rector's Office, among the faculties and the IRO, new centre of coordination?
- There are **consultants or software** available which could help in fine-tuning this process (e.g. IAU). Even though the project is ending, this can still be considered for the future.
- We hope the universities will actually use their strategies as a **policy instrument**, rather than just a document (we sometimes perceive it as an administrative burden..). This entails regular monitoring, evaluation and updating, and transparency to all actors involved. The execution and monitoring part of the strategies are often missing.
- We encountered some positive elements which we would like to highlight:
 - rule book on student mobility and recognition (transparency towards the students)
 - reference to local context: unemployment, need for entrepreneurship/valorisation, the option to reach out to emigrants from former Yugoslavia worldwide (brain drain)...
 - mentioning of internationalisation at home in some of the documents

Peer review by:

Ghent University: Mrs. Delfien Cloet, Mr. Andries Verspeeten

University of Pecs: Mr. Gabor Czeh, Dr. Istvan Tarrosy

September – November 2016

Singidunum University in Belgrade

The Singidunum University was the first university to have all documents available, and everything was drafted in English. Not only did they provide an internationalisation strategy, but also action plans, mobility strategy etc. They should be congratulated on this effort. On the one hand, this made it easier to have a concrete and clear idea of their plans. On the other hand a lot of ideas are mentioned, not always linked to one another (link between different documents is not always clear).

The University of Singidunum provided us with:

- University strategy
- Internationalisation action plan 2014/2015
- Mobility strategy
- Action plan
- Protocol for Erasmus bilateral agreements
- Rulebook on student mobility & recognition of ECTS credits gained during the mobility period

Where are we now?

- Self-evaluation was not concluded in the document and could be added (SWOT or other)
- Mission statement is mentioned

Where are they going?

- 3 main objectives and 5 goals: they could be formulated in a more SMART way (cf. general remarks). Eg. some target numbers could be considered in terms of mobility.
- The links between the different documents are not always so clear: a goal mentioned in the strategy should be clearly linked to actions in the action plan and should further develop the ideas mentioned there (such as for CD: language courses, intercultural competencies, ..)
- As most of the universities, the main objectives are linked to curriculum development, more projects and mobility. It could be considered to also mention topics such as branding/recruitment, regional cooperation, strategic partners, networks, certain priorities
- Vision could be elaborated further and could be more specific

How will they get there?

- Annual evaluation is planned, achievement measurement techniques will be developed in due course, with annual modification. Given the rapid changes in the world around us this is positive, but has this proven to be realistic since 2014 when the plan was drafted? It was mentioned that a new plan would be drafted by February 2016.
- HR: 5 IRO staff are mentioned, the link to the faculties is not mentioned: will they be involved, informed, what is their task in the plan?
- Mobility strategy: the study referred to dates from 2009 and meanwhile the context of student exchanges in the Western Balkans has changed a lot due to the Erasmus Mundus Action 2 projects (the numbers going abroad went up quickly)
- The action plan/strategy for mobility contain many elements, but not always linked to each other and to the general strategy.
- Positive: rulebook for student mobility and the appointment of institutional contact persons, protocol for Erasmus bilateral agreements (remark though that equivalence is not a prerequisite for exchanges, it can be good to look for synergies or courses you cannot offer at Singidunum), I@H is considered

State University of Novi Pazar

The State University of Novi Pazar has worked on a general strategy, but also developed additional documents, which we welcomed. They provided us with:

- Strategy of internationalisation
- Strategy of academic mobility
- Rulebook on mobility and credit transfer

Where are we now?

- Self-evaluation was not concluded in the document and could be added (SWOT or other), this is the basis of a good strategy plan. This self-evaluation might have taken place, but is not included or referred to in the strategy.

Where are they going?

- As most of the universities, the main objectives are linked to curriculum development, more projects and mobility. It could be considered to also mention topics such as branding/recruitment, regional cooperation, strategic partners, networks, certain priorities
- Regulation of student mobility and transfer of credits: this is a good initiative, but does not contain detailed information about recognition, we feel this should be further developed. Recognition is also mentioned under the actions, but this is not clarified either.
- Strategy of academic mobility: this is rather general. There are 10 objectives, of which only 5 refer to the general strategy. Positive is the link to unemployment and the need for entrepreneurship in the region, as this is the real context in which the university is working.
- There are not much targets or numbers put forward, but it is for the number of international students: target of 10 %. Quantity should not be the only concern, but can help in shaping the goals and making them more concrete.
- Vision could be elaborated further

How will they get there?

- The actors in internationalisation are described: quality control office (monitoring), office for career development (including alumni, mobility and international cooperation) and the scientific research centre. The cooperation or division of tasks with faculties is unclear, as well as funding for resources. It could be considered to draft an action plan.
- Monitoring should be included in the strategy to measure progress and to adjust where necessary

University of Belgrade

The University of Belgrade already adopted the strategy in 2014. We had only the strategy to our disposal and no accompanying documents such as an action plan with more details. This made the evaluation more general and abstract.

Where are we now?

- Self-evaluation was not concluded in the document and could be added (SWOT or other), this is the basis of a good strategy plan. This self-evaluation might have taken place, but is not included or referred to in the strategy.

Where are they going?

- The strategy is rather concise, but mentions a diverse number of elements going broader than just mobility, curriculum development and projects: international recruitment is mentioned, alumni networks, marketing, facilities linked to mobility. It should be considered to include I@H as the majority of students is not going abroad.
- The aims or objectives could be elaborated in a more concrete and SMART way: the objectives mentioned are not really measurable or time-bound. Perhaps this was elaborated in an action plan, but this was not available in English. The strategy forms a good basis though to further develop an action plan where all details are worked out.
- There are not much targets or numbers put forward, but it is for the number of international students: target of 10 %. Quantity should not be the only concern, but can help in shaping the goals and making them more concrete. Key performance indicators are important for monitoring the strategy's implementation.
- Vision could be elaborated further

How will they get there?

- The strategy does not provide information about the resources needed (in terms of funding and available HR) and the division of tasks between rectorate and faculties
- Monitoring should be included in the strategy to measure progress and to adjust where necessary

The University of Niš adopted the strategy in 2015. We had only the strategy to our disposal and no accompanying documents such as an action plan with more details. This made the evaluation more general and abstract.

Where are we now?

- Self-evaluation was not concluded in the document and could be added (SWOT or other), this is the basis of a good strategy plan. This self-evaluation might have taken place, but is not included or referred to in the strategy.

Where are they going?

- The strategy is rather concise, but mentions a diverse number of elements going broader than just mobility, curriculum development and projects: international recruitment is mentioned, alumni networks, facilities linked to mobility. It should be considered to include I@H as the majority of students is not going abroad.
- The aims or objectives could be elaborated in a more concrete and SMART way: the objectives mentioned are not really measurable or time-bound. Perhaps this was elaborated in an action plan, but this was not available in English. The strategy forms a good basis though to further develop an action plan where all details are worked out.
- There are not much targets or numbers put forward, but it is for the number of international students: target of 3 and then 10 %. Quantity should not be the only concern, but can help in shaping the goals and making them more concrete. Key performance indicators are important for monitoring the strategy's implementation.
- Vision could be elaborated further

How will they get there?

- The strategy does not provide information about the resources needed (in terms of funding and available HR) and the division of tasks between rectorate and faculties
- Monitoring should be included in the strategy to measure progress and to adjust where necessary

University of Kragujevac

The University of Kragujevac adopted the strategy in 2015. We had only the strategy to our disposal and no accompanying documents such as an action plan with more details. This made the evaluation more general and abstract. The colleagues of Kragujevac informed us at the meeting that they did draft actions plans, but these were not available (in English) at the time of the peer review.

Where are we now?

- Self-evaluation was not concluded in the document and could be added (SWOT or other), especially given the fact that the colleagues of Kragujevac informed us that a self-evaluation was made. It would be good to include it or refer to it in the strategy.
- Kragujevac profiles themselves as “dispersed university”, turning this into an advantage

Where are they going?

- As most of the universities, the main objectives are linked to curriculum development, more projects and mobility. It could be considered to also mention topics such as branding/recruitment, regional cooperation, strategic partners, networks, I@H
- The actions listed under the 4 goals should be more concrete and formulated in a SMART way, there are no performance indicators (maybe this was done in the action plan). Putting some targets or numbers will also help monitoring the execution
- A vision for 2020 is formulated

How will they get there?

- The strategy does not provide information about the resources needed (in terms of funding and available HR) and the division of tasks between rectorate and faculties, we were told this is elaborated in the Action Plan
- Monitoring should be more concrete, it is mentioned briefly

University of Novi Sad

The University of Novi Sad adopted the strategy in summer 2016. We had only the strategy to our disposal and no accompanying documents such as an action plan with more details. This made the evaluation more general and abstract. The strategy refers to an action plan, to be adopted by the University Senate and with consultation of stakeholders.

Where are we now?

- Self-evaluation was not concluded in the document and could be added (SWOT or other), it would be good to include it or refer to it in the strategy.

Where are they going?

- The strategy is rather concise, but mentions a diverse number of elements going broader than just mobility, curriculum development and projects: international recruitment is mentioned, tech transfer, regional cooperation, networks, strategic partners. It should be considered to include I@H as the majority of students is not going abroad
- It is positive that the strategy refers to the local context and aims to attract emigrants from former Yugoslavia
- The objectives listed should be more concrete and formulated in a SMART way, there are no performance indicators (maybe this will be done in the action plan). Putting some targets or numbers will also help monitoring the execution
- A clear vision should be further developed

How will they get there?

- The strategy does not provide information about the resources needed (in terms of funding and available HR) and the division of tasks between rectorate and faculties. The strategy refers to a new centre for internationalisation which would focus on analysis and policy. It would be interesting to see the link with the current International Relations Office, which is responsible for the operationalization.
- Monitoring should be included in the strategy to measure progress and to adjust where necessary