

INSTITUTO POLITÉCNICO DE BRAGANÇA

FOLLOW-UP EVALUATION REPORT

March 2012

Team:

Bent Schmidt-Nielsen, chair

Erdal Emel

Alina Gavra

Michael Gaebel, team coordinator

Contents

1. Introduction.....	3
2. Governance	6
3. Teaching and learning	10
4. Research	11
5. Quality assurance	12
6. Regional focus	14
7. Internationalisation	15
8. Conclusion	16

1. Introduction

This report is the result of a follow-up evaluation of the **Instituto Politécnico de Bragança (IPB)**. EUA's Institutional Evaluation Programme (IEP) originally evaluated the institution in 2006/7 with the report submitted to the University in June 2007. In 2011 the University subsequently requested that IEP carry out a follow-up evaluation.

1.1 Institutional Evaluation Programme and follow-up evaluation process

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.

In line with the EUA's Institutional Evaluation Programme 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, the follow-up process is also 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 Instituto Politécnico de Bragança and the national context

The **Instituto Politécnico de Bragança (IPB)** is a non-university higher education institution. It is located in Bragança, in north-western Portugal, close to the Spanish Border. IPB consists of several schools or faculties. The four Schools of **Agriculture**, of **Education**, of **Technology and Management**, and of **Health** are located in Bragança. The School of **Communication, Administration and Tourism** is located in Mirandela, around 60km away. As a polytechnic in a

provincial surrounding with a rather weak economic structure, IPB has a central role to fulfil in contributing to the economic, social and cultural life of the region of Trás-os-Montes. With the exception of a small private higher education institution in Mirandela, IPB is the only institution of higher learning in the area. Geographically it is close to the Universidade de Trás-os-Montes e Alto Douro in Villa Real, the University and Polytechnic of Porto, and, across the border, the University of Salamanca.

At the eve of the first evaluation in 2006/7, the implementation of the Bologna reforms, including the introduction of the Bachelor-Master degree system, had just begun. In addition, the Portuguese government was considering major changes of the HE system, and an OECD report and an IEP country report were awaited to provide recommendations for this process. Since then, legal reforms have been undertaken and the governance system has been modified, aiming at enhancing the involvement of external stakeholders. However, autonomy of HEIs remains limited, and the status of a polytechnic has implications for the institution's ability to conduct research.

The IEP report from 2007 already described the fact that IPB is situated in the region of Trás-os-Montes as both a challenge and an opportunity. The financial crisis, in which Europe finds itself today and which has hit Portugal particularly hard, has also impacted the public HEI through cuts in salaries and an employment stop. But it also underpins the critical role of IPB for innovation, skills development and employment in the region. All this is further calibrated by internationalisation, which has been enhanced over the past five years, and can clearly be a strong driver for change, also and in particular for institutions in areas with weak economic structures.

In brief, institutional development and change prospects have to be considered in an external context that is significantly different from that of 2007.

1.3 The Self Evaluation Process

The institute used the occasion of the Self Evaluation Process and the drafting of the Self Evaluation Report in the most beneficial manner. It was undertaken by a large team comprising all parts of the institution.

The Self Evaluation Report (SER) is well written, and provides thorough reflection. It is the product of an open and collective process, that took place at the institution, and it clearly benefitted not only from the input of, but also from intensive discussion among, the members of the institution. It demonstrates both the growing cohesion of IPB and its enhanced ability to develop – as an institution – perspectives for change. The SER has been posted on the virtual IPB platform accessible for all IPB members.

In addition to the Self Evaluation Report, the IEP evaluation team received the Strategic Plan adopted by the General Council in 2010 and a recent paper named: 'Suggestions and Ideas'. A part of the Strategic Plan was included in the SER.

The Self Evaluation Team explained that the 'Suggestions and Ideas' paper included discussion outcomes produced during the Self Evaluation Process that somehow did not seem to fit into the SER. While both papers certainly stand in their own right, it was not entirely clear how these papers related to each other. Ideally, the SER should have referenced the Strategic Plan, and the 'Suggestions and Ideas' paper could have been integrated into the SER. This would not only have helped the IEP evaluation team to get a better understanding of the relationships between and validity of these documents, but also IPB and its members. The issue will be addressed from a more content-related perspective in section 2.3 on Strategic Planning.

N.B.: The documents of the 2007 evaluation and those related to this evaluation have been made accessible to all IPB members on an internal web site. The 2007 IEP report, which was fully disseminated within the IPB academic community, is nowadays public and available at the IPB web page (www.ipb.pt), under "IPB"/"Legislação e Documentação"/"Documentos" (or <http://www.ipb.pt/go/a381>).

1.4 Organisation of the visit

The visit at IPB and all the interviews were extremely well organised. The Team received well ahead of the visit a close-to-perfect visiting schedule. A small observation, which illustrates the diligence with which the visit was prepared: all interview partners were clearly identifiable through readable name signs that were put on the table at the start of each session. While this is a technical issue, it contributed to the success and efficiency of the meetings and was particularly useful in larger rounds.

During the visit the Team met staff and students from all parts of IPB and also the external stakeholders (municipalities, represented by the mayors of Bragança and Mirandela, and industry representatives).

All interview partners were informed about the purpose of the interview and were ready to share insights and opinions. These were not always unanimous, but expressed different and controversial views enabling the Team to get a differentiated picture of the situation.

1.5 The evaluation team (later Team)

The Self Evaluation Report of the IPB along with the appendices was sent to the evaluation team on 13 February 2012. The site visit of the Team to IPB took place in the period from 12 to 14 March 2012.

The Team consisted of:

- Professor Bent Schmidt-Nielsen, former Rector of the Royal Veterinary and Agricultural University, Denmark, Chair
- Professor Erdal Emel, Uludağ Üniversitesi, Bursa, Turkey
- Student representative Alina Gavra, Babeş-Bolyai University, Romania
- Michael Gaebel, EUA, Belgium, Coordinator

The Team would like to thank the President of IPB, Professor Joao Teixeira, and the liaison person Vice-President Professor Luis Pais for organising this excellent visit. The Team is particularly grateful to staff and students of the institute and all the external stakeholders, who took time and responded patiently and often also passionately to the many questions that were posed. All participants tried their best to provide as much information as possible, and the Team felt a high degree of openness and commitment.

2. Governance

2.1 Governance structures

A focal point of the follow-up evaluation has been **governance** and **strategic planning**.

IPB has made significant progress since the Team's last visit in 2007. Previously characterised by a high degree of fragmentation, IPB appears now as an institution with an enhanced collaboration between the constituting units, the five schools and the two campus-areas in Bragança and Mirandela.

The institution has a new governance structure based on strong leadership, mutual trust and commitment. It will be of core importance that the new structures are applied in a way that will ensure that further development and change is embraced by all members of the institution.

In this regard the reformed **Technical and Scientific Council** has to play an important role. While the law does not prescribe the inclusion of students in this Council, it also does not explicitly exclude their participation. The Team recommends therefore that students are consulted on all issues of relevance to them, in particular of course on learning and teaching matters.

The **Permanent Council** should continue its role as the driving force for internal planning and collaboration. The fact that this previously informal central management group has been officialised and reinforced is certainly an achievement. The Team had also the impression that its reinforcement through **pro-rector positions** has strengthened the leadership. Thus, leadership will have to assess from time to time whether the Permanent Council is in the best

position to fulfil its role as a leadership group, regarding its planning and working methods, its members and the skills and task portfolios represented.

The inclusion of external members in the **General Council**, which is prescribed by the law, should be very welcome to an institution like IPB. Beyond its function for accountability and sound governance of the institution, the chairman and the other external members can play a pivotal role in liaising between IPB and its regional and national environment. The Team gained the impression that this is a function that should be further explored over the next years. It will also give the external members a more active role, thus enhancing their interest in the institution and laying the ground for a constructive dialogue of the institution with the external stakeholder community.

These are early days and, while the Team is of course not in the position to fully assess the functionality of the new governance structures, it gained the impression that IPB has established them very well. Therefore any recommendation here is really just to support this positive development further in order to ensure that these relatively new governance structures are fit to structure and support the institutional dynamics.

Recommendation 1 Consider how to enhance further the performance of the new governance bodies, e.g. through active involvement of students at the Technical and Scientific Council, through using the full range of opportunities that external stakeholder representation at the General Council holds, and through a continued reflection of how the Permanent Council might best function as a leadership group.

2.2 Centralised services

The Team was pleased to see that its recommendation to enhance central services had been implemented successfully: the International Office, the Office to promote Entrepreneurship and the Image Office seem to function very efficiently, and also achieve tangible results. What is more, they have won the acceptance of IPB members, thus demonstrating that centralisation – applied prudently – can actually lead to improvement and tangible benefits throughout the whole institution. This seems not to have been evident during the first visit in 2007, and judging from the discussion among staff, for quite a few it is still a sensitive issue.

As the activity of the other two offices is mentioned further on in this report, we would like to single out here in particular the Image Office, which seems to represent a real success story. The team of the Image Office under the leadership of the pro-rector has managed not only to develop the brand of IPB and to design and implement a wide range of activities, but also to establish a spirit of communication and collaboration throughout the institution, promote voluntarism, ownership and identification with the institution among students and staff. Thus, it contributes in multiple ways to enhancing the identity of IPB.

The Team was impressed by the enthusiasm of the Image Office staff, but also would like to take the opportunity to inquire whether their contribution is sufficiently acknowledged and rewarded, given that the focus points at faculty level seem to contribute to the workload of the office on a regular part-time basis but still have their full teaching load. IPB should have a key interest to ensure the sustainability of its newly established service offices.

IPB should also seek to draw benefit for their further strategic development, given that the centralised services work with colleagues in different parts and at different levels of the institution, thus staff and leadership of these offices gain insights and views that are highly complementary to those of faculties and departments.

The Team would like to underline that the success of the three offices should not be understood as an invitation to ever more centralisation. IPB, like every institution, will have to consider and reconsider carefully which structures are best allocated at central and which at faculty or departmental level. However, the case of these three offices provides good case studies for this.

Recommendation 2 Consider sustainability and strategic value of recently enforced central services, and draw lessons learned for further reforms.

2.3 Strategic planning

During the visit, the Team had occasion to discuss the issue of strategic planning with IPB leadership and members. Generally it was found that compared to the previous visit, strategic planning had improved, not only regarding the actual results that are achieved, but also regarding the processes through which planning is developed. The Team gained the impression that IPB has established a culture for collaborative planning efforts.

Nonetheless, it found that there are good opportunities for further enhancing this trend. To take a concrete and in some respects probably symptomatic example: the IPB Strategic Plan was originally developed as a vision paper of the current rector and was adopted by the General Council in 2010, but has, as the Team sees it, not been further developed.

Through strategic steps and guidelines, it provides a description of future initiatives, including both ideas for upcoming and already established activities. In order to serve as a Strategic Plan, it would require a more precise presentation of goals and means to reach these goals.

In order to illustrate this point, the Team would like to refer to the table named *Consolidated Strategic Map*, which as part of the Strategic Plan attempts to translate the strategic steps and guidelines into concrete actions.

Consolidated strategic map (strategic plan of the IPB 2010-2014).

Steps and strategic guidelines	Regional importance and dimension	Internationalization	Employability	Quality and efficiency of processes
Step 1: To consolidate the IPB's dimension and recognition as a quality higher education institution at both national and international levels.				
1	To adjust and innovate the academic offer, upholding the institution's scope.	XX	X	
2	To increase quality of the academic offer and implement quality assurance systems.		X	XX
3	To internationalize the institution and its academic offer.			XX
Step 2: To strengthen the research capabilities of the IPB and enhance its regional, national and international relevance.				

Step 1, point 3 refers to '*internationalisation of the institute and its academic offer*'. While it goes without saying that this is important for the internationalisation process, the table does not consider, e.g., the relationship between internationalisation and regional development, employability and quality.

This is not just a matter of cosmetic value, so it is not about ticking yet another box, but rather about developing a comprehensive view on how the different goals and priorities are to be interlinked, and to display what synergies can be established, but also to point to potentially contradictory or competing goals and priorities.

This also has very practical impacts on governance and management: the Team would like to emphasise that this is not about having a better plan as a goal in itself, but that it is of key importance for the actual implementation, and thus for a coordinated and transparent process of institutional change and enhancement. It will help to ensure a joint vision and a shared understanding of what is to be achieved collectively and what are the roles or tasks of the different parts of the institution. Therefore, with regards to the previous section on governance structures, planning is of crucial importance to let staff members understand and communicate their tasks, and take responsibility and ownership for their actions.

The following methodology for strategic planning is proposed:

- A clear mission statement, comprising
 - A vision for further development
 - underpinned by clearly identified and described goals
- This should be followed up through a precise action plan,
 - allocating means and resources
 - comprising time schedules and milestones, assumptions and indicators,
- A process for progress monitoring has to be put in place.

Recommendation 3 Further enhance the institution's capacity for strategic planning, involving the relevant parts of the institution, with a clearly defined methodology, carefully considering means and resources, and by defining ambitious but also feasible goals.

3. Teaching and learning

When the Team visited IPB in 2007, it had just started to implement the **Bologna Process reforms**. The present visit shows that this has been continued successfully: both staff and students affirmed that learning paths were more flexible, international mobility enhanced, and recognition of study terms abroad improved.

In addition, IPB has been awarded in 2011 the **European Commission's ECTS label**, confirming excellence in implementing and administering the ECTS and the related mobility exchanges. The establishment of a strong **Master programme portfolio** is clearly a success. At the same time IPB might wish to **conduct a full evaluation of its course offer**, given that it currently offers 103 programmes for 7000 students. The Team also found it difficult to understand the **allocation of courses to departments and individual staff**, and assumes that this traditional set-up could be one of the causes for the relatively high number of courses.

The interviews also suggest that a considerable and probably very dynamic part of the IPB staff would be in favour of **better collaboration and exchange in teaching across department and faculty borders**. The question is whether every department has to run, for instance, its own maths and science courses. Thus, and without having had the opportunity to explore this in more detail, the Team assumes that – similar to what has been recommended during the first evaluation regarding streamlining central services – there is scope for a more centralised planning of resources and more collaboration and exchange between the schools and departments. It invites the leadership of IPB to assess carefully the potential for this, and to consider the possibility to improve quality of teaching and a better management and use of resources. In particular, it should consider the introduction of a modular set-up.

The Team was impressed by the open and cordial relationship between staff and students. It is therefore even more regrettable that there is low **student involvement** at central level on educational issues. As already mentioned above, the Team suggests consulting students systematically at the level of the Technical and Scientific Council on issues relating to education and immediate student interest. The Team perceives this as fully in alignment with the main ethics of IPB as an inclusive institution with a focus on student engagement.

The initiative of developing **Technical Specialisation Courses** contributes both to regional labour market needs and to widening participation in higher education – as it is open to professionals who could not enter regular studies, but now get a chance to enhance their skills at IPB and even to study in a degree programme. These are very good initiatives, and this also demonstrates the potential that lies in an intensified cooperation between IPB and its regional environment. Very much in line with Bologna, but also with its regional mission and with our recommendations, IPB established an **Entrepreneurship Promotion Office**, which has succeeded in supporting the establishment of 18 companies employing more than 50 people. This is a success that will also have to be systematically considered and evaluated in the learning and teaching approach.

The Team proposes therefore that IPB should assess first results and commence, in close collaboration of IPB staff and external stakeholders, to develop a **dedicated strategy around the issue of education, labour market needs and entrepreneurship.**

Recommendation 4 Carefully assess the educational offer regarding possibilities to enhance quality and management and better use of resources.

Recommendation 5 Assess the results of labour-market and employment related initiatives and develop, in close collaboration with external stakeholders, a dedicated strategy on the issue of education, labour market needs and entrepreneurship.

4. Research

Research is of crucial importance for IPB's national and international standing: it should be perceived not only as a purpose in itself, and a means to enhance the institutional reputation, but also in view of the benefits that it creates for the IPB's teaching mission and for its role as a local agent for social and economic innovation and development.

Its Strategic Plan states that IPB will focus on both applied and basic research and hopefully a symbiosis can be developed. A challenge is of course that there is no national framework for applied research. Therefore, IPB has to follow the academic research imperatives, but also engage in knowledge transfer and application. In this regard it is highly appreciated that IPB uses ISI publication criteria to have a comparable research performance. IPB's efforts to establish a research basis with PhD students that have **an adviser both at IPB and at the awarding university** is a proactive approach. These partnerships should be further developed under careful consideration of how to ensure that the institution carrying the main responsibility receives a fair share of the credentials and benefits.

Currently, three **Research Centres** are affiliated with IPB. The fact that they host PhD students seems to be advantageous for IPB's research capacity. Its **European and international research collaboration** has been enhanced. The establishment of a **Research Support Unit** is a very good initiative to further ensure this development.

However, the capacity for research must be enhanced and it is of crucial importance that this cannot be done by simply enhancing quantity, as this is not just about more research, more researchers and more publications. Notwithstanding the progress IPB has made in this regard, the Team would like to reiterate its recommendation that IPB needs to **better define its research priorities** and align its school and departmental resources for **multidisciplinary approaches**, bridging different disciplines to focus on regional and national development

needs, and developing the complex responses required by its environment. IPB should also consider how to **link research and external stakeholder collaboration better to its educational mission** and how to encourage spin-offs and the entrepreneurship of IPB graduates. Difficulties in establishing joint projects due to the limitations linked to its status as a polytechnic should not withhold IPB from **seeking national and international academic partners**. The Team is convinced that IPB has the ability and potential not only to respond to demand, but also to play a key role in attracting national and international companies into the region.

The **Technopark**, which will be established, provides an opportunity to test-drive approaches as described above, and IPB should develop a clear strategy for its engagement in the Technopark, which could be used as a model for future activities in other areas. To give some examples, it could bring together engineers from different disciplines, and also economists, managers, PR specialists, specialists for tourism and other social and natural science areas. It could also be the place for student projects and problem-based learning, internships etc. It is also suggested that IPB continues to be proactive in promoting the Technopark to national and international business and research partners.

The Team strongly believes that – given also the emphasis put currently in Europe on the application of research and knowledge, on innovation and collaboration between HEI and industry – there is a bright future ahead for IPB, provided that regional and municipal goals are shared by the IPB community and supported by external stakeholders.

Recommendation 6 Further develop research priorities and build critical mass in institutional research, through encouraging inter- and multidisciplinary research, considering regional needs, but also how to ensure benefits for the institutional education mission.

Recommendation 7 Seek opportunities to link research activities to external stakeholder collaboration.

Recommendation 8 Enhance international research collaboration in consortia with other HEI, but also public and private sector partners.

5. Quality assurance

Quality assurance (QA), both as a process and as a concept, is definitely of great importance for IPB, and therefore the need to establish a **functional QA system** is mentioned at several occasions in the Strategic Plan (see under Step 1, guideline 2; and Step 4, guideline 9).

QA procedures at IPB are in line with national regulations (A3ES methodology), and in addition, IPB has followed **ISO9001 standards** to enhance the institutional management.

Regarding the quality of education, the Team took note that **student feedback questionnaires**, are now – unlike in 2007 – implemented in a standardised manner at all schools. The collected data is processed and then discussed at school level in the **Pedagogical Council**, which also involves students.

However, **collection of feedback and evaluation of teaching quality should not only take place at school level**. The **central e-platform**, that has been established to collect numerical data from the schools, is a good initiative, but there is not yet a system in place that would allow for assessing this data, and drawing conclusions for the institution.

It has to be mentioned that since 2007, a **Planning and Quality Management Unit (PQMU)** has been set up at institutional level. This unit has taken up the responsibility of assuring and enhancing quality in terms of the professional evaluation of the professors. However, so far QA has been understood rather as a professional evaluation issue, and, as the Team sees it, not enough in terms of the quality of the education process.

A key recommendation is therefore to establish a **fully integrated QA system**, comprising a **quality assurance policy and strategy at IPB level**, which would be in charge of providing measures for **ensuring and enhancing the quality of learning and teaching, but also of services**. This should clearly put the **students at the centre**. The Team has been reassured that such a system is on the way to being implemented by 2013.

The Team would like to emphasise the benefit of having a **senior leadership person** in charge (e.g. a vice-rector or a pro-rector) and to ensure that **QA is represented at the Permanent Council** and at the **Technical and Scientific Council**. It also recommends that IPB consults **European and international good practice, via literature or participation in events**, such as the European Quality Assurance Forum, as a source of experience and inspiration for developing a comprehensive quality concept. This would help to develop a quality culture, which would suit very well the goals laid down in IPB's self evaluation report.

Recommendation 9 Build an internal QA system, that would do justice to the complex concept of QA. It should generate strategies and policies, but also a concrete mechanism for the entire institution and its various areas of activity, including data collection and evaluation, central monitoring of progress at school level etc.

Recommendation 10 Consult European and international good practice in QA, via literature or events such as the European Quality Assurance Forum.

6. Regional focus

The regional mission of IPB has already been addressed at several occasions in this report. That IPB is situated in the region of Trás-os-Montes has been rightly described as both a challenge and an opportunity for developing its distinct mission. The Team strongly believes that over the years this will become IPB's competitive advantage.

Good progress has been made since 2007: over the past years, IPB has enhanced its relationship with the region and its contribution to economic and social development. This has been demonstrated in the report, but also through the testimonials of the external stakeholders, among them the mayors of both Bragança and Mirandela, who took the time to explain to the Team the important role that the institution plays today in the region.

The Team would like to acknowledge the progress made, but also to encourage IPB to further compound its efforts. Rather than being only a contributor, IPB should, in collaboration with its external partners, become an **agenda-setting player** in the region. Its activities around the Entrepreneurship Office have to be enhanced and strategised. It should be proactive in developing opportunities like the Technology Park or the overall strategic economic and environmental development plan of the region (see also the suggestions made in Section 4. Research).

IPB's strength lies in the **diverse knowledge that it can offer to its partners**, as it comprises not only the expertise of natural scientists, engineers and economists, but also of specialists in community development from the social sciences, media experts with the skills to develop information and promotion campaigns, and educationalists who can develop information materials, channels of communication and interaction with stakeholders beyond the region. And even if it did not possess the competences and qualifications required, it would be able to acquire them, e.g. through its international partners, or even to develop the necessary education programmes.

The Team would like to stress the enormous potential of IPB in this regard: it is an excellent example of how learning and research do not stop at the door of schools and departments, but allow for inter- and multi-disciplinarity. It would also like to reassure the institution that a clear commitment to regional development is not in contradiction with the more academic mission that IPB also cherishes. On the contrary: today's leading research universities are committed to both academic excellence and scholarship and the urgent need to contribute to societal and economic development. A recent EUA publication¹ provides examples for institutional good practice in this regard.

IPB should not only become aware of its potential and its value, but also communicate this to its external partners, and encourage them to understand the partnership as a relationship of

¹ Engaging in Lifelong Learning: Shaping Inclusive and Responsive University Strategies - www.eua.be/pubs/Engaging_in_Lifelong_Learning.pdf

mutual benefit. The Team gained the impression that while all external partners were very pleased with what IPB does for them, the question of what they could do for IPB to support it and contribute to further enhancing its capacities has probably not yet been discussed.

We believe that this is also one of the factors that make IPB visible and attractive at national level, where IPB leads the collaboration of the Portuguese polytechnics, but also at international level, where it reaches out to partners in Europe and around the globe, and among them are also universities. Its ability to link the region of Bragança to partners from the European Union, but also from Brazil and China, is certainly not yet fully explored in IPB's strategy.

Recommendation 11 Further enhance IPB's role as a proactive agenda setting actor in the region, and develop this profile in parallel and where possible in synergy with its academic mission.

7. Internationalisation

IPB's internationalisation is yet another major success that has been realised over the past years. IPB has followed the Team's recommendation and **centralised and reinforced its international office**. The **increase and diversification of its international activities** at the level of staff and student exchanges, and the number of projects and partnerships seems to prove that this was the right decision. It also demonstrates once again to the members of IPB that the enhancement of central services can generate enormous benefits for the entire institution. However, given also the general boost that internationalisation of higher education has witnessed over the past years, and the in some respects challenging geographical situation of IPB, at the present stage, it will be of key importance to strategise internationalisation.

Currently, IPB's internationalisation is mainly **driven by input and funding opportunities**. IPB should **critically assess achievements and think of how to achieve multiple benefits**. It should also consider how international activities link to IPB's other missions; e.g., how do the relations with Brazilian or Polish universities contribute to IPB research priorities, or improve the learning opportunities for its students or the prospects for PhD candidates, or bring benefit to the region? This implies that an **international strategy** has to be further developed, with the goals to **streamline internationalisation, but also make strategic choices**. For the future, IPB will have to choose its initiatives and its partners carefully, and not take every initiative for which funding is available.

The Team would like to close this point with a very practical remark: the current **English website presence of IPB** seems to target students but, although it could also be of much use for e.g. potential partners, there is little information about the institution and its mission and profile.

Recommendation 12 Develop an internationalisation strategy, as an instrument for further enhancing internationalisation, streamlining international activities in ensuring reciprocal benefits with IPB's other missions, and also for strategic choice of initiatives and partners.

Recommendation 13 Further enhance the English language website, to ensure better international visibility.

8. Conclusion

IPB has made significant progress over the past five years, thanks to the commitment of leadership and staff, and their ability to develop and implement institutional reform. The Team was very much pleased to find not only that most of its recommendations from the 2007 report have been addressed, but also that this has contributed to the tangible benefits for the institution. It sees this also as a further proof of the IEP methodology.

Through this report, the Team provides IPB with a new set of recommendations, certain that the institution will know how to make best use of them. The Team would like to attest IPB increased capacity to change and develop, not only in response to external evaluations and assessments, but through its own analysis in developing strategies, which link the different parts of the institution with its research, teaching and third mission activities into a diverse profile which is attractive for students and partners in the region, but also at national and international level.

The Team would like to congratulate the institution, and wish it success for its further mission.