

UNIVERSITY OF PRIMORSKA

EVALUATION REPORT

December 2010

Team:

Maria Helena NAZARÉ, chair

Philippe ROUSSEAU

Erdal EMEL

Sime VISIC

James P GOSLING, team coordinator

Contents

1.	Introduction	3
1.1	Institutional Evaluation Programme.....	3
1.2	University of Primorska and the national context	3
1.3	The evaluation team (later Team).....	5
1.4	The Self Evaluation process	5
1.5	The evaluation visits.....	6
1.6	The context of this Report	6
	<i>The international context relevant to UP.....</i>	6
	<i>The present situation of UP.....</i>	7
2.	The University and its future.....	8
2.1	Ambitious objectives	8
2.2	Governance and centralisation	9
2.3	Planning	9
2.4	Quality and performance	10
2.5	Internationalisation	11
2.6	Research	11
3.	Recommendations	12
4.	Conclusion.....	14

1 Introduction

This report is the result of an evaluation of the University of Primorska (UP), Koper, Slovenia. The evaluation took place in 2010 with visits by the Evaluation team on 2–4 June and 8–10 November.

1.1 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 distinctive features of the Institutional Evaluation Programme are:

- A strong emphasis on the self-evaluation phase
- A European and international 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 Primorska and the national context

Established in 2003, the University of Primorska (UP) is the third public university in Slovenia after the University of Ljubljana (established after the First World War) and the University of Maribor (established in 1975). The central administration of UP and much of its facilities are located in Koper with some member 'faculties' in Izola and Portorož, all seaports located on the short Adriatic coast of the Slovenian littoral Region of Primorska. The new university was (and is) seen as a major project in the Region and grew from relevant facilities established in the period between the country's independence in 1991 and 2002. Most were established

with the intention that they would be members of a new university. There were seven founder institutions, three faculties, two university colleges and two research institutes.

As an indication of the close connections that are characteristics of all small countries, the present (second) Rector of UP, then a minister in government, was associated with the early initiatives to establish research and higher education in the Primorska Region, and the first rector, also as a minister, was associated with the legislation leading to UP's establishment in 2003.

UP has five faculties, Education; Humanities; Management; and Mathematics, Natural Sciences, Information Technologies and Tourism Studies Portorož – Turistica, and one college, the College of Health Care Izola. There are two separate research institutes, the Science and Research Centre of Koper and the Primorska Institute for Natural Sciences and Technology (also located in central Koper).

Although with just 6800 students spread across its six 'faculties', the overall administrative structure of UP has evolved to correspond broadly with the highly decentralised structures of the large Universities in Ljubljana (64,000 students) and Maribor (26,000 students). The fourth, smallest and newest university in Slovenia is the University of Nova Gorica, which is a 'non-state founded university institution', and also in the Primorska Region. There are also recognised private professional colleges and arts academies that provide additional competition for the falling numbers of high school graduates.

Traditionally, the basic unit in Slovenian higher education has been, in many important respects, a faculty, academy or university college that may be a member institution of a larger conglomerate such as one of the universities. This system is a legacy of the Yugoslav federation and legally, it is still the member institutions that provide study programmes. In addition, most research was located in institutes separate from the universities, but as the universities themselves became more research-active in the last 20 years, research centres were established in faculties. UP has been different in this respect from its foundation, as most research is located in separate research 'centres' that are also members of UP; although now there are also research groups in some faculties.

Therefore, many of the distinguishing characteristics of the organisational structures of UP were inherited indirectly from socialist Yugoslavia. Strong independent faculties, especially in the larger universities, have been committed to their independence and have been able to influence successive national governments. The result is that national legislation governing universities and their study programmes is still complicated and constraining, especially for the emerging 'university of the littoral'. In addition, university managements may be much more reluctant to test or 'stretch to the limit' legal provisions that their equivalents in countries with longer liberal legacies might have found ways to neutralise.

However, the real solution may be the approval and implementation of already drafted, but much delayed, key reforms of higher education in Slovenia. Although changes in the provisions of these reforms are still possible, their key features are known and may be taken into account in making plans for future developments. Hopefully these reforms will also increase flexibility in the management of human resources.

While due to relatively wise government and regulation, Slovenia has avoided the worst excesses of the global crisis economic crisis exhibited in some countries, negative consequences have inevitably occurred, making for uncertainty in future higher education funding.

1.3 The evaluation team (later Team)

The IEP Evaluation Team consisted of:

- Professor Maria Helena NAZARÉ, former Rector of the University of Aveiro, Portugal (Team Chair)
- Professor Philippe ROUSSEAU, former Rector of the Charles de Gaulle University – Lille, France
- Professor Erdal EMEL, former Vice Rector for Student Affairs, Accreditation, International Affairs and Computing Services, Uludağ University, Bursa, Turkey
- Mr Sime VIŠIĆ, former President of University Student Council, University of Zagreb
- Professor James P GOSLING, former Director of Quality, National University of Ireland – Galway, Ireland (Team Coordinator).

1.4 The Self Evaluation Process

The Self-evaluation report (ISER) of UP along with appendices was sent to the Evaluation Team on 11 May 2010. The self-evaluation process was undertaken by a 15-person workgroup coordinated by Assistant Professor Dr Ernest ŽENKO. The group included both vice rectors, the head of Quality Assurance, the Rector's cabinet advisor, representatives of the faculties and research centres, and two members of the Student Council. The workgroup, which sometimes met as two specialist groups chaired by the vice rectors, was charged with preparing the ISER and other required documentation. The Team was told that compilation of the final ISER from the outputs of these two groups was difficult and that the faculty deans were responsible for the (uneven) feedback that was used to adjust the final drafts of the ISER.

The Team found the ISER to be a very useful and informative document that gave a comprehensive picture of UP, its history, present situation and general plans for the future. The ISER represents a huge amount of work and cooperative effort by the self-evaluation workgroup. However, the Team felt that insufficient data was provided to support the sections on mission, vision and goals, teaching activities, research activity, human resources and investments. There was also too little hard evidence about the actual processes of quality assurance and the pertinence and use of the performance indicators listed in appendix 7. Additional data and information were readily supplied before the second, main visit of the Evaluation Team, filling most, if not all, of these gaps.

Also, from the Team's meeting with the self-evaluation workgroup, it was clear that the elaboration of the ISER was not sufficiently "bottom-up" to ensure widespread participation and identification of staff with all of its depictions and conclusions. From this and other meetings it was very clear that there were very different perceptions of the self-evaluation exercises at central and faculty levels (and between faculties), and some scepticism. However,

given the tensions related to centralisation/decentralisation, full participation would have been an enormous challenge.

1.5 The Evaluation visits

The first visit of the Team to UP took place on 3—4 June and the second visit on 8—10 November 2010. The Chair and members of the evaluation Team thank the Rector, Professor Rado BOHINC, for his warm welcome and hospitality, and wholehearted support for the evaluation process. Meeting the University Senate in full session, with full and frank discussion of strategic issues, was an unusual privilege and opportunity. The Team also thanks the vice rectors, Roberto BILOSLAVO, Rado PIŠOT & Aleksander PANJEK (appointed Vice Rector with responsibility for internationalisation since the first visit), the General Secretary, Astrid PRAŠNIKAR, the faculty and college deans, the research centre directors, other directors, academic staff, administrators, the impressive external partners and the many articulate students involved, for their frank and open engagement.

The Team conveys special recognition and heartfelt thanks for efficient efforts of the Liaison person, Professor Ernest ŽENKO, Rector's Cabinet Advisor, Frenk MAVRIČ, the members of the Self-evaluation workgroup and all others who supported the Team in so many ways.

1.6 The context of this Report

The international context relevant to UP

Universities in all European countries and in most countries worldwide are facing rapidly changing expectations and circumstances, and national higher education systems and individual universities are responding to meet the resulting challenges. The major changes include:

- National expectations that universities will create and drive new opportunities for economic development — the knowledge economy
- Overt competition among universities, including from new private institutions
- Growing restrictions on public funding
- Demographic trends resulting in significant fluctuations in numbers of new high school graduates
- Substantial changes in student diversity, with increases in older entrants and in foreign economic fee students (that is students from outside the EU).

From country to country, worldwide, the responses of national systems and individual institutions to these changes are varied and may include some or several of the following:

- New national legislative frameworks, often increasing autonomy and flexibility but also accountability
- Adoption of new governance models that facilitate responsive planning and rapid decision making
- The development of distinctive profiles with respect to targeted areas of excellence in research and study programme offerings

- Mergers, associations and rationalisation to create critical mass and improve effectiveness – particularly in Scandinavian countries
- National and international alliances (networks of excellence, knowledge regions)
- Planned diversification of income, leading in public institutions to reduced reliance on public funding
- Recognition of the importance of inter-disciplinarity in teachings and in research.

The present situation of UP

It is the Team's opinion that within Slovenian higher education UP is perceived as a young, dynamic and modern university. Unlike the older universities, UP is a legal entity at university level and it has loyal and enthusiastic students and external stakeholders. Motivated and loyal leadership exists at all levels and is supported by competent and well-qualified staff (many with international qualifications and experience) who take pride in belonging to this University. Most are aware of the dangers of reinforcing and replicating older structural models that could lead to institutional ossification, and are ready to act as agents, or seeds, of change.

Location is always important and UP's location on the Adriatic Sea at the intersection of Roman and Slav culture is one of its strengths that is greatly appreciated by students from the interior and the Slovenian minority in Italy. UP's origin and history ensure that it has a strong emphasis on research and this has been reinforced by the links maintained between research and education. The potential for research breakthroughs is supported by structures that promote integrated interdisciplinary projects encompassing several faculties. Several of the UP's study programmes at both undergraduate and postgraduate levels are also interdisciplinary.

Strategic planning processes, that are regularly monitored and updated, are already established at UP with the close and regular involvement of the Senate. International orientations are being pursued vigorously and this is supported by substantial foreign language proficiency among staff and students. Of particular importance are the establishment of the postgraduate school with its partner universities in many countries, and of the new Vice Rectorate for international affairs.

Inevitably, there are also weaknesses. UP is still more a confederation of member institutes rather than a coherent institution with a strong corporate identity and mutual solidarity. Individual faculties enjoy an excessive degree of autonomy, incompatible with the agreed ambitious goals of UP. Since its foundation, legal provisions and the familiar model of the University of Ljubljana (alma mater and even former employer of most of the senior staff) have constrained UP's development as a unitary institution, in spite of the vision of at least some of its progenitors and the unsuitability of a dispersed model to such a small ambitious institution. In many domains, decision-making structures and processes are slow and too dependent on the arrival at 100% consensus; in others, developments may be overly dependent on 'bottom-up' initiatives. As with most public universities internationally, UP has a very narrow range of funding sources, all prey to changes in national budgets and policies.

A major consequence of the current structure is the multiple replications of basic administrative services and supports, representing a significantly inefficient use of human, financial and physical resources. For example, the great majority of administrative staff is located in the faculties, with significant differences in administrative resources between faculties. It is even difficult for available teaching space in one faculty to be used for classes of

another nearby faculty. In addition, although the Team encountered some teachers who contribute in two or more faculties, there also appears to be overlapping and duplication. Greater centralisation could also facilitate greater provision of pedagogical training and supports for all teachers in the University. Finally, while UP is clearly research orientated and many of its ambitions are totally dependent on expanding and improving research outputs, UP has no list of priority research areas or explicit research policies that have been defined and agreed by the Senate and apply to the whole university.

2. The University and its future

2.1 Ambitious Objectives

The strategic goals of the institution under review are a major focus of the IEP evaluation process. Being part of the UP Strategic Plan 2009–13, the goals of UP (Section 3.4, page 11 of the ISER) were considered and approved by the University Senate in which all of the faculty deans serve. They are repeated here each followed by the Team's comments in italics.

1. To become an excellent Research Institution

This may be much too broad as an objective. While respecting existing nuclei of research excellence and allowing for new ideas that may lead to important initiatives, explicit prioritisation and focused planning is a prerequisite for the establishment and maintenance of substantial programmes of research of high international standard.

2. To become a constitutive part of the national structure of knowledge with excellence in teaching and learning

This is a worthy but, perhaps, limited ambition as 'a constitutive part' does not say very much. Identifying relevant performance criteria could be difficult.

3. To become a [reference] University for the Mediterranean [] and [SE] Europe

The exact meaning of the term reference (or referential) is not clear, but it may be a synonym for 'well-known', 'recognised (see below)', or even 'impossible to ignore'. In any case, being realistic, this worthy objective is only achievable in specific but essentially limited areas with respect to research, and (most importantly) to associated unique or 'best of kind' study programmes. Quite a few potential areas were mentioned, or are evident in documents supplied, such as the linguistics of south eastern and central Europe, olive growth and quality, behaviour and motor function, or combinatorics, graph theory and their applications, tourism and the environment, and others.

4. To achieve material standards comparable to the [Universities of Ljubljana and Maribor]

Substantial diversification of income sources may be very important in this respect.

5. To establish an effective model of an asymmetrically integrated university

Such a model could well represent a future highly successful UP, but only if the emphasis is on integration (and effectiveness) and that any significant 'asymmetry' retains or confers important benefits.

6. To become a recognised factor in local development

An important objective to be tracked carefully.

7. To become a recognised university in Slovenia, the Mediterranean and [wider region].

Repetitive of Objective 3.

2.2 Governance and centralisation

There seem to be three possible structural models for a future UP:

- Centralised (to a degree that is common in successful small universities [5000 to 10,000 students] internationally)
- Centralised with some asymmetry
- A relatively weak central administration with limited support services and with a growing number of strong independent faculties.

Which structural model is the best for the future success of UP should be decided upon on the basis of which will give the best combination of excellent teaching and student supports, substantial research capability of international standard, and the effectiveness and efficiency of the university taken as the sum of its parts.

It was clear to the Evaluation Team that the University of Primorska can already be viewed as being on its way to becoming an integrated university. The Strategic Plan, which was approved by the Senate, depicts UP as an ambitious institution that aims to achieve international recognition as a single entity with much to offer. Key financial processes have been standardised and centralised (with some staff transfers), human resources are currently being consolidated and further initiatives are in train. For example, the new Vice Rectorate for Internationalisation has great potential in many important areas. However, the significant cost savings and improvements that can arise from consolidated and new services can only be achieved with:

- Careful planning by central administration and faculties working together
- Phased transfer of staff for each substantial initiative
- Training and clear guidance for service providers and users
- Constant monitoring of costs and user satisfaction to justify change and to continuously improve services

Governance also needs to change. Consensus decision-making may be effective in some circumstances but defined majorities with safeguard (and with the application of pilot programmes and phases to test substantial changes) may be much more appropriate for UP and its objectives. There should also be a full debate as to the roles of senators and of the Senate. Clearly, it is undesirable for senators to have the perhaps short-term interests of their constituencies as *sole* criteria for the decisions they take.

However, the performance, reputation and traditions of the faculties and research institutes, some of which existed before the University was established, are themselves among UP's greatest assets. Therefore, while their status and roles in a strengthening university may change, the value of their essential contributions to UP must continue to be acknowledged explicitly.

2.3 Planning

The current Strategic Plan applies to 2009–14 and it is recognised at UP that it may be in need of revision at about the mid-point of the five years. Therefore, 2011 may be an appropriate time to examine again future potentials and possibilities for UP. Proposals for substantial reform of Slovenian higher education have been in the background for some years now and they may in fact be passed into law in the next year or so. In any case, the major elements of the proposed reforms are known and the revised plan should take these into account fully,

always allowing for a last minute 'loss of courage' by the government on contentious issues. Being a new and small university, these upcoming reforms may suit UP much more than its main competitor institutions.

The Evaluation Team was informed that the Faculties and the Rectorate prepare annual reports and updated annual operational plans and that these are discussed, debated and, as appropriate agreed by the University Senate.

One issue of particular importance to UP as it expands its range of study programmes to serve better its students, is whether or not new faculties are necessary as 'homes' for some of these. While one rationale for the creation of new faculties may be related to present national legal requirements, there may be others related to how proposals came into being and to geography. There are also the proposals for two new campuses. All concerned may need to stand back and take a long-term view of the University's development if good resolutions to such issues are to be achieved. Questions to be asked may include:

- Would a new faculty have the potential to achieve a critical mass in the medium term, with >1000 to 1500 students including substantial postgraduate courses and a cohort of research-active staff?
- Would creation of a new faculty be of critical strategic importance in attracting regional support and prospective students?
- Would inclusion in an existing (perhaps renamed) faculty bring significant benefits?

It also struck the Team that both of the new universities in Slovenia are located in the Primorska Region and that the geographical advantages of UP overlap with those of the University of Nova Gorica. Apart from a single reference in the Self Evaluation Report, the Team heard of no significant cooperation (or plans for cooperation) between these two relatively small institutions, perhaps representing opportunities, not lost but yet to be exploited fully.

2.4 Quality and performance

Clearly, UP has given significant attention in recent years to the development of structures and procedures to implement and support quality assurance and quality improvement, particularly with respect to learning and the student experience. The range of quality related activities described in the Self Evaluation Report is extensive and includes provision for systematic student surveys and periodic external evaluations of individual faculties. External evaluations have been initiated for the College of Health Care and the Faculty of Management.

While an apparently comprehensive mechanism to collect and analyse student feedback on teaching is in operation, and students met by the Evaluation Team reported instances where negative aspects were improved because of the system, there appears to be great diversity in how it may be implemented. While some deans and faculty senates may have good information on local situations, this makes it impossible to construct an accurate picture of teaching quality across the University. Revision of the University guidelines in this area, on the basis of experience already gained (including perhaps rationalisation in the number of options for obtaining feedback), could bring significant further benefits.

UP has also participated in a national project that formulated a comprehensive set of key performance indicators that may be used to estimate progress in achieving strategic objectives. However, there appears to be a need to consolidate this system nationally, including revisions based on experience to date. The scope and detail of the available KPI data for UP and its constituent faculties and research centres is very impressive and maximum use should be made of them in decision-making and in the evaluation of growth and improvements.

Even though the inaccuracy and quiriness of universities' ranking systems are regularly highlighted, many people and organisations (including governments) take them seriously. New systems (and revisions of existing ones) will appear that attempt to be more accurate, perhaps by partitioning academic sectors. However, 'reputation' (included in all systems, although measured in different ways) is usually 'weighted' very heavily, and this puts very new, smaller institutions like UP at a huge disadvantage. Against this background, it may be most useful for UP to aim for listing (including outside the official total number published) and improvements in ranking in *any* of the international ranking systems.

2.5 Internationalisation

To the foreign visitor, UP feels like an institution that has a strong sense of its situation internationally and of its potential in relation to its neighbouring countries and the greater Adriatic area. Recent strategic initiatives to support and extend internationalisation with respect to both research and teaching are proofs that it is taken seriously by the University

Koper, with its region, has a significant Italian-speaking population, and tourism ensures that competence in English, and to a lesser extent, German and French, is widespread. While the continuing vigour of Slovenian as the dominant language of a strong and coherent country is guaranteed, it (unlike Dutch, for example) is very much a minority language without any significant extra-national bases. Therefore, all possible initiatives that facilitate communication for inward and outward movements of students and staff should be considered seriously and a wide range of new measures adopted. (Although the Team met one satisfied Slovenian-speaking student from Italy, we are not aware of any related policies or measures.)

In particular, faced with falling numbers of domestic candidate students, UP should better exploit the high levels of language proficiencies among its academic staff to offer more courses suitable for students from other former members of the Yugoslav federation (some perhaps delivered in the Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian language), Italy or from further abroad. It was clear to the Team that incoming students would also benefit greatly from extended induction courses and social, sporting and other activities to promote much greater integration with Slovenian students.

2.6 Research

UP came into being seven years ago with a much greater emphasis on, and competency with respect to, research than new universities in most countries; 'to become a research university was already a major objective. Even in 2003 UP had staff with strong international profiles in their own areas, and the research centres could already provide some infrastructural support and advice to aspirant researchers. Progress in research and development continues, including the establishment of the 'Incubator of Primorska' (UIP) and the proposed UP Technology Park.

The Team had opportunities to visit both of the main research centres, the Science and Research Centre of Koper (ZRS) and the Primorska Institute of Natural Sciences and

Technology (PINT). The Team were impressed by the range of active programmes and projects, and by their openness to new members without obvious criteria that favoured certain disciplines and excluded others, thereby encouraging and nurturing interdisciplinary projects. The organisational capacity of the larger ZRS to support both national and international projects appeared to be substantial. However, it was not clear that there are significant benefits in having two separate multi-disciplinary research centres located quite close to each other in the centre of Koper.

The Team also noted that, while UP's strategic objectives with respect to research were ambitious, they were general without specification of areas that would be prioritised to achieve high international standards and widespread recognition. While earlier in UP's development, it may have been wise to encourage all 'seedlings', now may be the time to identify some of the strongest and most advantageously situated for applications of scarce 'fertiliser'.

A very effective policy, employed in research universities worldwide, is the allocation of new senior academic appointments to priority research areas. Such initiatives have given rise to professorships of, for example, social gerontology, glycoscience, nanotechnology, child and family research, biomedical engineering, that in turn have attracted (or invigorated) high performing researchers and established a basis and capacity for expansion and development. However, implementation of such policies is most feasible in universities with clear research priorities, and where human resources can be reallocated easily across disciplines and faculties.

3. Recommendations

In this Report, the Evaluation Team have outlined an external view of UP and its context. The staff and management of UP already have views of UP that have built up over the years and in most respects are much better informed than the quickly developed opinions of the Team. However, some internal views and opinions may be overly biased towards individual constituencies or in other ways assess the University from too narrow a perspective. It is the hope of the Team that careful consideration of this report, both the broader discursive sections above and the following more discreet recommendations, will help the University significantly in the achievement of its high ambitions.

1. UP should continue with and, where appropriate, accelerate its centralisation, rationalisation and expansion of support services to faculties, staff and students. While the 'final' centralised administrative structures may have 'asymmetries' related to geography and special circumstances or competencies, all significant duplications should be completely phased out.
2. UP should act decisively to enhance its 'brand image' across Slovenia and internationally. All members and staff (and their contributions and outputs) should be readily identifiable as being of the 'University of Primorska'. To this end all websites, signage, literature, advertisements, notepaper and business cards should accord with standard formats that give the University name and logo appropriate prominence.
3. UP should use the allocation of academic appointments, facilities and space to support the achievement of strategic goals and to facilitate or incentivise integration. For this to be possible and effective, better integrated management of the human and physical resources of the University are required.
4. Within agreed guidelines, there should be no impediments to the cross-faculty use of teaching facilities and resources.

5. When continuing to plan strategically and operationally, UP should take into account the state of progress of national reforms of higher education, and include relevant options in all elements and timelines. However, UP should not delay internal reforms because of delays in national initiatives.
6. UP should establish a substantial on-going benchmarking exercise with 3-4 other equivalent universities/higher education institutes worthy of emulation in 3-4 other European countries; eastern, central and western.
7. Continue the development of data handling and analysis (academic and financial, including 'data warehousing' and analytical accountancy) to facilitate and to maximise the effectiveness of university and faculty decision-making.
8. Give more prominence to, and expand as necessary, pedagogical training and supports for all teachers in the University, in line with good practice internationally.
9. The basic framework for student feedback on teaching should be standardised with respect to the 'questions' posed, possible responses, sub-categories of students reported on, and reporting formats. Greater standardisation and centralisation can promote unified educational standards, even when not all data elements are transferred to the centre.
10. Building on its 'Research Competencies' initiative, UP should initiate a review of its total research efforts to examine:
 - a. Possible priority research areas and to decide on a limited number (say three to six) to be adopted formally by the Senate
 - b. The benefits that could be obtained from bringing together existing research centres/institutes and groups to form a single overhead structure to maximise administrative and technical supports, including for submissions to national and international funding bodies
 - c. The roles of the Vice Rector for Research and the director of a unified research centre, and recommend complementary job descriptions
 - d. How to facilitate the active participation of greater numbers of academic staff in research, including possible transparent criteria for staff to join research centre(s)
 - e. The best way to provide a unified service to support all doctoral studies
 - f. How to expand initiatives such as the 'Research Excellence Fund' to enable and reward exceptional research output.
11. If the recent reduction in the number of optional courses in the Faculty of Humanities has had the result of making the remaining electives more or less obligatory, a full review of the educational consequences should be carried out.
12. UP should act creatively to maximise the exposure of its students to international experience. Outgoing students need more encouragement (e.g. talks by returning students), briefing and support. With respect to incoming foreign students, UP should:
 - a. Increase further the number of courses taught in English and other languages
 - b. Provide intensive Slovene language and culture courses
 - c. Make fully transparent the mechanisms used to allocate places in the University residences
 - d. Establish a continuous programme of social and cultural activities designed to promote interaction between and visiting and Slovenian students

- e. With the other universities, or alone if necessary, lobby the government to have restrictions removed on courses in international languages and on employing staff from abroad.

4. Conclusion

The staff of UP should not find that this Report identifies issues or includes recommendations that are completely novel to them. UP's ISER already contained discussions of, or mentioned, all the important areas covered here. The Team intends the above discussions and recommendations to be supportive of the continued growth and maturation of UP as it becomes a very important part of Slovenian cultural and economic life.

The overall impression of the Team is that the University of Primorska is an excellent example of a young, dynamic and modern institution full of potential. UP is capable of anticipating the future and not just adapting to the new circumstances but becoming a leader of change.