



Evaluation

*of Higher Education
Programmes in Nicaragua and
South-East Europe 2005–2009*

*Annex II:
Country Report Serbia*

Imprint

Austrian Development Agency (ADA),
the operational unit of the Austrian Development Cooperation
Zelinkagasse 2, 1010 Vienna, Austria
Tel.: +43 (0)1 90399-0
Fax: +43 (0)1 90399-1290
office@ada.gv.at
www.entwicklung.at

The evaluation was commissioned by the Directorate-General for Development Cooperation of the Federal Ministry for European and International Affairs and the Evaluation Unit of the Austrian Development Agency and conducted by

Centrum für Evaluation



Center for Evaluation

Dirk van den Boom
Klaus-Peter Jacoby
Stefan Silvestrini

May 2010

This is an independent evaluation report. Views and conclusions expressed do not necessarily represent those of the contractors.

Content

1.	Executive Summary	1
2.	Acknowledgements	2
3.	Purpose and objective of evaluation	2
3.1	Composition of expert group and course of evaluation	3
3.2	Methodology of the Evaluation	3
4.	Program context in Serbia	4
4.1	Strategic plans and concepts.....	4
4.2	The situation of the higher education sector in Serbia.....	6
5.	Program/project portfolio in Serbia.....	8
6.	Relevance	9
7.	Effectiveness.....	11
8.	Sustainability	16
9.	Outcomes and impact	19
10.	Three scenarios for future activities in Serbia	22
11.	Conclusions	24
11.1	Conclusions in regard to the strategy	24
11.2	Conclusions in regard to relevance	24
11.3	Conclusions in regard to effectiveness	24
11.4	Conclusions in regard to sustainability	24
11.5	Conclusions in regard to outcomes and impact.....	25
12.	Lessons learnt.....	25
12.1	Lessons in regard to strategy	25
12.2	Lessons in regard to relevance.....	25
12.3	Lessons in regard to effectiveness	26
12.4	Lessons in regard to sustainability.....	26
12.5	Lessons in regard to outcomes and impact	26
13.	Summary of recommendations	28
14.	Annex.....	31
14.1	List of interviewees	31
14.2	Schedule of field-trip	32
14.3	List of documents and publications.....	34

Abbreviations

ADA	Austrian Development Agency
ADC	Austrian Development Cooperation
AEI	Agency for European Integration and Economic Development
BCC	Balkan Case Challenge
BGP	Brain Gain Programme
BMeiA	Außenministerium Österreich <i>Austrian Foreign Ministry</i>
BMWF	Bundesministerium für Wissenschaft und Forschung <i>Federal Ministry of Education and Research</i>
CDP	Curriculum Development Programme
CEP	Centre for Education Policy
CEEPUS	Central European Exchange Program for University Studies
CEval	Center for Evaluation at the Saarland University
DAC	Development Assistance Committee (OECD)
EC	European Commission
ECTS	European Credit Transfer System
ENQA	European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education
EZA	Entwicklungszusammenarbeit <i>Development Cooperation</i>
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
HE	Higher Education
IRDp	Integrated Regional Development Program
MoU	Memorandum of Understanding
MSDP	Master Studies Development Program
NARIC	National Academic Recognition & Information Centre
NGO	Non-governmental organization
ODA	Official Development Assistance
OECD	Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development
PCM	Project Cycle Management
R&D	Research and Development
SIDA	Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency
SMART	Specific Measurable Attainable Realistic Timely Achievable
SOE	Region Süd-Ost-Europa <i>Region Southern and Eastern Europe</i>
TOR	Terms of Reference
VET	Vocational Education and Training
WUS	World University Service
ZDF	Zoran-Djindjic-Foundation

1. Executive Summary

Purpose of this evaluation

The purpose of this evaluation is to scrutinize higher-education-support programs financed by Austrian Development Agency (ADA) in Serbia, with a specific look into recommendations for future activities, especially an exit-strategy.

Program context and strategies

In Serbia, no HE-strategy exists. A research program has recently been announced. The country-program for Serbia does not state specific goals in regard to HE, but uses HE-activities as interventions to reach other goals like e.g. employment creation. The link between the current HE-strategy – which again has been written later – and the country-program is weaker than in Kosovo.

Program portfolios

The activities in Serbia can be differentiated between a general WUS-program with a number of components, an internship-program run in cooperation with the Zoran-Djindjic-Foundation and a language-program run by the "Österreich-Institut".

Relevance

In Serbia, WUS-activities are geared partly towards the strengthening of individual capacities of applicants and their staff, partly towards the strengthening of institutions as such. No contribution to capacity-development on the ministerial level is made. Basic principles of capacity-development, as outlined by ADA in relevant documents, are not always adhered to.

Effectiveness

Activities in Serbia are not really program-based but additive. Like in Kosovo, most of the components have yielded the planned quantitative results. Donor-coordination is non-existent at this time. Donor-communication lacks in certain areas. Coherence within the Austrian system has not emerged as a problematic issue.

Sustainability

In Serbia, the impact is more visible on the level of individual departments, with the exception of the only integrated university in Serbia, in Novi Pazar. Also, positive impact of the internship-program as well as the language-course can be assumed. Again, the indicators chosen are not always up to current standards and the LogFrame-method is not well used.

Outcome and impact

Activities will not only fail to curb the brain-drain-effect, they will inevitably support it. Aside from the gender aspect, issues of inclusion of ethnic minorities and people with disabilities are not apparent in many of the activities. In regard to the link with the labour-market, employability-aspects are clearly in the focus. ADA-activities have contributed positively to the integration into the EU-education and research policy, but political obstacles remain.

Recommendations

The report recommends an exit-strategy of another three years with a clearer focus on capacity-development on an administrative level, especially in regard to capacities for project-implementation and financial administration of donor-funding. WUS Belgrade should be given the task for an exit-phase. Some components should either not be continued – like the coordination platform – or changed in their focus – like the support of the accreditation-commission. The activities in Novi Pazar can now be more focused on employability-aspects by supporting the establishment of a career-service-centre. Cross-cutting issues like gender etc. have to be more visible. Donor-coordination should concentrate on activating other donors to take up some activities of ADA after the withdrawal of support.

2. Acknowledgements

This evaluation took place with the support of a multitude of stakeholders. Staff of Austrian Development Agency in Vienna and World University Service in Graz has been most helpful in the preparation of this evaluation and has given valuable information leading to the Inception Report. The office of ADA in Belgrade lent tremendous support in making the plans for the field-trips. During the trips, the local consultant, Ms. Jadranka Dimov, has assisted and participated in the evaluation and has given important advice, reflection and information, not least organizational support. The author of this report would like to express his sincere thanks for the input of the local consultant. As the local consultant has not been part of report-writing, all mistakes and shortcomings are solely in the responsibility of the author.

The partners and international donors have been most supportive during the field-trips and have established an enabling environment for open discussion also of critical issues. A common interest in learning and improving has transcended every interview. Without their support, this evaluation report would not have been possible.

3. Purpose and objective of evaluation

This report is part of an evaluation of higher education support programs financed by Austrian Development Cooperation in Kosovo, Serbia and Nicaragua. The findings of this report will be included in an overall final report to be submitted later in May. In case of Kosovo, the major purpose was to evaluate key issues in regard to the programs conducted in the time between 2005 and 2009, but also to make recommendations on a strategic level for future

activities, as those programs will end either end of 2010 or beginning of 2011. In regard to Serbia, the focus of the evaluation shifted somewhat from the time the tender has been published until today. Reason for this shift is the political decision by the responsible ministry to end project-activities in Serbia (as in some other states) with the closure of the ADA-office in the foreseeable future. Therefore, the focus of this part of the mission has been on the issues of an “exit strategy”, which enables partners in Serbia to continue at least some of the activities by themselves or with the support of other donor-funding and to seek ways to ensure sustainability. In both cases, a critical assessment of outputs, outcomes and impacts is asked for. As this evaluation is not supposed to be a detailed project evaluation – one is planned for Serbia – not all activities are reflected upon up to the smallest detail. A more strategic approach, mixed with pragmatic recommendations and based on comprehensive lessons learnt is the focus of this report.

3.1 Composition of expert group and course of evaluation

Dirk van den Boom, Ph.D., has been the team-leader for the evaluation. He has been supported by Ms. Jadranka Dimov as local consultant and resource person. In addition, back-stopping has been provided by Mr. Stefan Silvestrini of the Center for Evaluation (CEval) of the Saarland University.

For this report, the following steps have been taken:

In the 1st phase, desk-research and a first workshop at ADA-office in Vienna has laid the basis for further elaborations. These and interviews with desk- and program-officers in the office in Vienna as well as a telephone-interview with WUS Austria have led to an Inception Report provided at the end of February 2010.

The field-phase took place between the 14th and the 25th of March 2010, with eight working days in Belgrade, Novi Sad, Novi Pazar and Kragujevac (Serbia). During the field-phase, a de-briefing took place with officials of the ADA-offices.

The final phase of this country-report consisted of drafting and submitting this report. It will lead – together with the reports about the field-trips to the Kosovo and Nicaragua – to an overall report to be submitted in May.

3.2 Methodology of the Evaluation

Generally, the methodology followed the terms of reference on which the bid of CEval has been based and the discussions made during the kick-off workshop in Vienna in February 2010. The inception phase leading to the Inception Report was meant to clarify all outstanding issues and to prove that the evaluators have a clear understanding of the needs and interests of ADA in regard to this mission.

Following data collection methods have been used in preparation of this report:

- Desk-research in regard to documents and material provided by ADA Vienna and material collected during the field-trips (please see annex for a full list)
- Telephone-interviews in preparation of the field-trips

- Exploratory interviews based on a semi-structured guideline with ADA-staff in Vienna
- Interviews with key stakeholders, international donors, project-leaders and other relevant interviewees during the field-trips.
- Site-visits to the universities supported

The exact time-plan of the field-trips and the list of institutions and individuals interviewed can be seen in the annex of this report. Despite the limited time available, it has been the desire of the evaluators to visit as many project-sites as possible to get a comprehensive overview and gather as many opinions as available in order to triangulate information on all critical issues that emerged. From the documentation of the interviews with the different stakeholders and continuous reflection with the local consultant, triangulation has been possible. Therefore the author of this report is confident that the information and the assessment provided here are both valid as well as supportive for further strategic decisions.

4. Program context in Serbia

4.1 Strategic plans and concepts

At this point in time, the Republic does not have a Higher Education Strategy. The “Council on Higher Education”¹, a professional body elected by the parliament, is supposed to develop such a strategy in due time. Currently, some guidelines about the general content of a strategy are available, which does not say anything about the direction the HE-sector should take. As the mandate of the current Council will cease by the middle of the year, it is not expected that any strategic paper of value will be available this year.

Aside from that, there is nearly no university strategy available. This has to do with the weak central structure of universities, which are normally not integrated (with the notable exception of the new university in Novi Pazar, where a process for the development of a university-strategy is well underway). As universities in Serbia are not much more than relatively weak organizational umbrellas for powerful and quite autonomous faculties, university strategies either do not exist or are of a more declaratory nature.

A very recent development is the formal declaration of a Research strategy for Serbia. After a lengthy consultation process with national and international stakeholders, the strategy has been approved at the beginning of 2010, therefore it has not yet been implemented. The Serbian government identifies seven priority areas for R&D for the foreseeable future:

- Biomedicine and human health

¹ The Council consists of members, mostly professors from state-universities, who are elected for a four-year-period to oversee the development of the HE-sector and to nominate members for relevant institutions, notably the Commission for Accreditation. Its task is to prepare and propose concepts and strategies in regard to HE and to steer the process of coherence with the Bologna-Declaration by setting norms and standards. Generally, it oversees the implementation of the current Higher Education Law of 2008. It approved Standards for Accreditation of Higher Education Institutions and Study Programmes, Standards for Self-certification and Assessment of Quality of Higher Education Institutions, and the Standards and Procedures for External Quality Assurance of Higher Education Institutions.

- New materials and nano-sciences
- Environment protection and countering climate change
- Agriculture and food
- Energy and energy efficiency
- Information and communication technologies
- Improvement of decision making processes and affirmation of national identity

With a plan to raise R&D-investment up to 1.05% of GDP up until 2015 and the support of a big infrastructure program for R&D within the IPA-program of the EU, the ambitious goals of the strategy are supposed to be implemented. As the new strategy involves a component in regard to human capital, especially in view of the Serbian diaspora, and includes the establishment of centres of excellence and research centres, a total amount of 33 Mio. € is supposed to be spend on these interventions. Here, the biggest possible overlap with activities of ADA in Serbia might be expected, as especially the diaspora-program resembles the impetus of the BGP in many ways.

In summary, ADA-activities cannot rely on or refer to national HE-strategies at this point of time. The only official document available is a Law on Higher Education (promulgated in 2005), which gives the legal framework (like e.g. minimum requirements for accreditation of universities and courses etc.), but does not reflect on any political vision or strategic goal. The research strategy is very new and has not been implemented yet, therefore it is difficult to estimate if it will be a real point for orientation or not.

Unfortunately, the goal structure of the ADA-country program 2006-2008 (which has been continued de facto until today) is also relatively weak in regard to higher education. Basically the country program states targets in regard to the labour-market and employability-issues, under which support for higher education is more a means, less a goal itself.

The country program says (on p. 12):

“ADC’s country program for Serbia aims at assisting the country in its efforts to increase overall levels of employment. In this regard, ADC seeks to stimulate and support economic activities expected to have a measurable impact on the labour market.”

And a little bit later:

“Furthermore, ADC aims at improving overall employability of persons or groups of persons aspiring to be or being part of the labour market. Acknowledging that a globalised economy is increasingly knowledge based and competitive, it is of utmost importance to develop people’s capacities (especially assets) to enable them to obtain and maintain productive, fulfilling and rewarding employments.”

In the following, higher education is mentioned the first time as a means to fulfil this goal:

“(...) reforming existing educational subsystems, especially VET and higher education; towards better catering for the requirements of a market economy; and building linkages between the educational system and the labour market.”

Aside from some comments in regard to activities and remarks in connection to capacity development in general, no more reference in regard to higher education can be found in the country program. Therefore, no distinct goals with regard to the higher education sector in particular are formulated. This is at least strange, if we consider the fact that Austria is not only the biggest bilateral donor in the sector in Serbia, but, alongside with the European Union, also nearly the only one.

4.2 The situation of the higher education sector in Serbia

Serbia has a well established and generally functional higher education system, consisting of six public universities and seven private universities, all accredited. The biggest university is the University of Belgrade; the youngest is the one in Novi Pazar. In addition, a high number of Colleges of Applied Sciences exist, which offer three-year-programs on a more practical basis, comparable to Austrian “Fachhochschulen”. This part of the higher education sector is not targeted by ADA-programs.

Because of the political problems in the aftermath of the Balkan-War and the issues in regard to the recognition of Kosovo’s independence, Serbia has started relatively late with the implementation of the Bologna process. In addition, the autonomous role of the universities in their relationship to the responsible ministries – of Education and of Science – and, as has already been mentioned, the even more autonomous role of the faculties with quite powerful deans made the implementation of nation-wide reforms difficult.

Still today, Serbia’s universities have a good reputation on a theoretical level. Lamented by everyone, also much less by the professors themselves, inasmuch they are still adherents of a more classical and conservative model of higher education, is the limited connection to the labour-market. Generally, the University of Novi Sad is regarded as the most progressive in this context, especially with the Faculty of Technical Sciences, also the biggest recipient of donor-funding in all the higher-education-sector in Serbia.

The number of students in Serbia is relatively high. This is only partially due to an “education ethos”, but more because of the fact that the pervasive concept of “having a diploma” in order to get “settled” within the public sector is still visible in the young generation and especially their parents (which still entertain a dominant influence over the educational decision-making of their children). Since the value of a university-degree does not have a very high reputation, students have the tendency to enter the courses which will lead them to any degree in a short time (and easiest). Accordingly the Bologna-process has not been welcomed positively as especially the Bachelor degree is still regarded widely as useless. All students strive therefore to achieve the Masters degree, as this is seen roughly equivalent to the former “Magister”-diploma in the old system. Student mobility is relatively low, despite the existence of Erasmus and other programs. A dedicated policy for receiving foreign students does not exist and structures for this are feeble.

In the current political atmosphere in Serbia education is not one of the major priorities of government policy. The educational system is regarded as underfunded and the Ministry of Education lacks dedicated and strong leaders. Capacity within the Ministry and its related agencies – like the already mentioned Council – is low and a certain lack of vision is discernible. Sometimes the Ministry’s policy is even obstructive in regard to increasing the mod-

ernization and international visibility of the Serbian Higher Education system. Conflicts between the universities and the ministries exist, but it seems that the Ministry of Science plays a more constructive and cooperative role. All in all, it seems that the Serbian HE-sector is in need of a very profound reform, but without the necessary stakeholders in the driving seat able to provide it. In this context, the withdrawal of ADA's support for the sector is problematic, as therewith the last remaining supporter for advocacy of change within the sector will disappear without anyone apparent who might take over that role. This is especially problematic as Serbia's economic future as a relatively small country in the European context will be closely connected to the development of a knowledge-based economy and less on a production-oriented one. To identify and support change-agents who are willing to carry the flag of a future-oriented education policy also in the HE-sector would and should be a task of development cooperation and will be needed for the foreseeable future.

A specific problem of the HE-sector in Serbia is the lack of integration within the universities. Faculty deans are "little kings" within their university and rectorates are less influential. Until today, the budget is paid to faculties, not universities as a whole, which supports the strong role of deans. On the other hand, the lack of integration poses challenges in regard to multi-disciplinary activities, to the sharing of funding and to develop a comprehensive development strategy on university-level. In addition, at this point of time, the financial rules and regulations make it impossible to transfer Euro-funds from one university to the next, which makes it very difficult to manage inter-university-networks with foreign funding, as the losses through fluctuating exchange-rates can be considerable. This poses a problem as Serbian universities, since last year, are eligible to be grant-holders in EU-funded programs. It has been apparent that, with some notable exceptions, the capacity in financial and management administration within the universities is not very well developed and applying professors have to fulfill multiple roles beyond their original responsibility in order to ensure successful implementation.

Special consideration is necessary in regard to the University of Mitrovica. While this University belongs geographically to Kosovo, the Serbian government is funding Mitrovica through its own system as it does not recognize the independence of Kosovo. This leaves the university in a limbo: ADA cannot support the institution from Belgrade, as Austria has recognized Kosovo's independence, and it cannot support it from Pristina, as the Serbian side in Kosovo does not cooperate in any activity which even indirectly might recognize the validity and legitimacy of the Kosovar government. Finally, Mitrovica is more or less left to its own devices.

Recommendations: As this evaluation recommends to continue the support of the HE-sector in Serbia for an exit-phase of three years, the following components for an exit-strategy, if approved, would be important:

- Sustainability of given activities should be in the forefront. As this report will show, there are certain areas where institutional capacity can be strengthened with a good perspective on sustainable success. New activities should only be launched with a view on supporting already established structures in a specific way, especially with focus in issues like employability and labour-market orientation.
- Donor-cooperation and -coordination should be geared towards finding, if not a replacement for ADA, but at least another donor willing to continue the discussion in the

HE-sector with the government and to support small activities where EU-funding is simply "too big".

- Activities in Novi Pazar can be lead to a successful conclusion. The focus here is worth to continue as the university is fully integrated and therefore an easier access point for successful interventions than the more disintegrated "traditional" universities in the rest of the country.
- It might be worth considering the continuation of scholarship- and language-schemes on a more permanent basis, which will both help as a good argument against criticism in Serbia in regard to the exit as well as a "foot in the doorstep" in Serbia, especially for labour-market oriented and business-promotion-activities.

Please refer to following recommendations for more details.

5. Program/project portfolio in Serbia

The HE-program in Serbia consist more or less of three distinguishable parts: a program run and implemented by the Belgrade office of WUS Austria, a program run in cooperation between WUS Austria and the Zoran-Djindjic-Foundation and a program run by the "Österreich-Institut".

The **WUS-activities** center on the following components:

1. **The establishment of a coordination platform** for Higher Education and the Labour Market. This was supposed to be a precondition for the successful implementation of the Master Studies Development Program (MSDP) to foster cooperation between institutions of HE and the business world. It should be mentioned already at this point that this component failed.
2. **Master Studies Development Program.** The support for Master Studies in different faculties with a clear focus in issues of the labour-market and employability, all with a twinning and an e-learning-component.
3. **Brain Gain Program plus (BGP+).** The BGP+ targeted at creating an avenue for Serbian scholars in the diaspora to come back to Serbia and to teach needed and special courses at the universities. A "plus"-component allowed stays of up to six months, including aside from teaching also obligations in mentoring and research.
4. **E-learning/life-long-learning.** This component was again a support measure for the e-learning-component in the MSDP.
5. **Support for the University of Novi Pazar.** In this component, support for the management of the new university, also in a limited regard infrastructural, was supposed to be given, with a special emphasis on quality assurance.
6. **Support of Accreditation Agency².** WUS supported the "Commission of Accreditation" of Serbia through some study-visits. Because of the fact that the Commission

² Actually, there is no Accreditation Agency in Serbia. It is a Commission appointed by the Council of Higher Education, and only with a mandate of four years and without an institutional structure.

had a very busy schedule – it had to conclude accreditation for all state-universities and a number of private institutions in the period under review – the cooperation was only based on a small number of study-visits, especially to accreditation-agencies in Austria and Eastern Europe.

The **“Experiencing Europe”-program** in cooperation with the Zoran-Djindjic-Foundation provides a scholarship scheme for young Serbian professionals for internships in Austrian companies.

The program of the **“Österreich Institut”** provides a 4 year-German language-course for young Serbian students.

6. Relevance

As there are no national HE-strategies in Serbia, it has not been possible to plan and implement alongside a specific HE-strategy in the country. The general policy to follow the Bologna-process is the main guiding-light for ADA-activities and therefore they provide the major legitimacy e.g. for the support of Master Studies or the Accreditation Commission. All of the components run by WUS are very demand-driven, as both the MSDP as well as BGP+ follow an open application-system forcing the faculties or departments with the intention to participate to formulate their plans and needs very carefully and be clear about their strategy. Ownership is visible at least with those professors, who act as “change agents” and take the opportunity of ADA-programs to implement change and modernization in their field. Aside from that, there is the observation that in many faculties, these professors are relatively alone and do not enjoy institutional support. In all major issues, from planning to implementation up to administrative issues connected to the MSDP (like purchase of equipment) they have to be self-organized. This surely strengthens their individual capacity and is a sign of good ownership on an individual level. Only in some faculties – like that of technical science in Novi Sad or, as a whole, the University of Novi Pazar – a certain degree of institutional ownership is visible (this is clearly centered on a very pro-active rector – a visible change agent – in an integrated university, whose steering-capacity as well as strategic vision seem to be very supportive for an innovative approach; therefore external support for capacity-building is actively sought after). While WUS Austria is providing continuous support and is regarded by all interviewees as very cooperative and helpful, the major work of development or integration of visiting professors (in the case of MSDP and BGP) is done by the partners (i.e. the faculties or departments applying for funding from WUS). The least involvement is visible in regard to the cooperation with the Zoran-Djindjic-Foundation, which only provides a more or less “political umbrella”, with execution solely in the hands of WUS Austria. The same goes for the activities of the “Österreich Institut”. In both of these cases, involvement of local partners is at best low and ownership cannot be expected, or, in other words: If both programs would cease to exist, no one on the Serbian side would bother to take something similar up by themselves, mainly because of lack of funding.

Currently, the capacity of the partners in regard to the application for not only ADA-programs, but also for EU-funding like e.g. Tempus or IP7 can be regarded as relatively high. The application process for WUS-programs is comparatively easy to handle and many applicants who are familiar with dealing with donors do not see a big challenge. Major issues of capacity

development are, on the other hand, not addressed by ADA. The biggest obstacle in accessing foreign funding right now is not a lack in ability to apply, but to implement, especially financially, but also in regard to modern PCM-techniques. This problem has been mentioned by nearly all stakeholders and vivid examples of this inability have been presented many times during the course of this evaluation³. As WUS does actually not ask for a lot of capacity in this regard from their partners, they also do not necessarily contribute a lot in strengthening them. The application-processes for the MSDP and the BGP-programs are very simple and much less "bureaucratic" than comparable programs initiated by the EU (especially for Master development). While the partners are praising the much easier and smoother cooperation with WUS, it does also not prepare them for the much more formalistic and complicated funding lines provided especially by the European Union. This is understandable, as in the current program this is not a task of WUS, as different capacities are targeted (the capacity to teach, to have and develop a modern curriculum, to orient towards the labour-market etc.). If we consider a possible exit-strategy for Serbia, this specific problem has to be addressed nevertheless.

The activities in Serbia do not contribute to the capacity development of the Ministry for Education, but only to universities, or, to be more precise, with the notable exception of the University of Novi Pazar, to the faculties. Not all factors necessary for an assessment of proper intervention in regard to capacity development are established. Issues like the lacks in administrative power or the missing integration of universities are mentioned, but are not documented and are not part of the planning documents. Therefore, the LogFrames do not include all necessary factors as well, especially motivational ones. Here, in planning a final program for an exit-strategy, it might be necessary to assess these more convincingly in order to identify the proper level of intervention. This evaluation will make some recommendations in this regard in the course of this report, but further elaborations by experts on the ground will be necessary.

Recommendations:

- For an exit-strategy, a component should be included in the program which addresses basic administrative lacks in the implementation process of foreign funds in some universities, especially in regard to financial administration and project-management by the administration. The establishment or support of a project-management-unit at rectorate-level would also support the badly needed integration of Serbian universities. Here, capacities in these issues could be bundled and then made available for faculties and departments. This is necessary as an exit-strategy would result in the need for the universities to access alternative funding more aggressively. To ensure sustainability, support in this area is needed and would be advisable. In order to implement this, a survey in regard to the administrative capabilities should be made, as the degree of quality varies from university to university.
- From a practical point of view, any exit-program should be implemented by the WUS-office in Belgrade. This recommendation would look different if ADA would continue the activities in Serbia for a longer period. But in this case, any effort to include the

³ In the case of the biggest university – the University of Belgrade – it might suffice to simply mention the fact that within its financial administration not one person is able to communicate in English, which doesn't bode well for the effective financial implementation of donor-funding.

WUS-activities within a given Serbian structure would be a big challenge, mainly because of the non-integration of universities but also because the responsibility for the sector is divided among two ministries in Serbia. No agency presents itself or is discernible which could replace activities now done by WUS, and for an exit-strategy the process of identification and selection of a new partner would be non-efficient.

7. Effectiveness

The activities of ADA (through the implementing agencies) in Serbia do not follow a visible holistic approach, and interconnection between the various components is not based on a coherent, interlinked strategy but is more or less accidental. The fact that e.g. one Master Studies program in Novi Pazar – in cooperation with the University of Novi Sad – is supported, is surely connected to the fact that WUS is supporting the University of Novi Pazar and has an excellent relationship to the rector. However the application came somewhat unexpected and has not been a comprehensive part of the support-strategy for that new university. The fact that participants from the program of the “Österreich Institut” took also part in the “Experiencing Europe”-program is due to the fact that the language course provided is beneficial for the EE-participants, but not in any case a planned effort to connect these activities. The Brain Gain Program finally is running more or less separately from the other components as well. Sure, a number of departments involved in the MSDP has had experience with BGP before and during the development of the Master course, but to the knowledge of the consultant this has not been used in a conscious way to support Master Studies development with expatriates invited through BGP+. All in all, the activities are additive and parallel, but not holistic and activities are not bundled strategically. If they are bundled, then more by chance than based on a plan.

Indicators and LogFrames are not always helpful in considering the success of outcomes of the program in Serbia. Still, a general assessment will be made, component by component:

1. **The establishment of a coordination platform** for Higher Education and the Labour Market. This component has failed. Main reason for this failure is a specific time-constraint, as the initial steps to establish the platform took quite some time, while the MSDP had to start at a specific point in time in order to proceed smoothly. While the platform was supposed to be a stepping stone for the MSDP, it was not possible to wait with the start of the MSDP until the platform was finally established. The reason for the delay had to do with the coincidence of a 4-month-power vacuum in the public administration after the last elections. Within these 4 months, cooperation with the Education Ministry was not possible. Input was ceased accordingly, with no output to be expected.
2. **Master Studies Development Program.** A total number of seven master programs has been supported and was, with one delay, implemented according to time-schedule. In all cases, the Ministry for Science and Environment co-financed the Master courses by support for equipment. In all courses, the envisaged number of students was either enrolled or more than expected applied. At this point of time, the

Master courses are still running and no information exists in regard to the outcome (e.g. passed examinations, quality of thesis etc.).

3. **Brain Gain Program plus (BGP+).** More than 70 scholars from abroad have been invited to Serbia through the current BGP+-program, many of them coming a second or third time. From the information gathered during this evaluation, the input provided by these scholars has been both viable as well as needed, especially in regard to secondary skills. Examples in how far different styles of teaching, closer relationship to requirements of the labour-market and a different attitude towards students – beyond the old-fashioned "ex-cathedra"-style of many Serbian professors – have impacted the departments were discussed. No information was available in how far the BGP worked as an entry-point for Serbian diaspora to connect strong enough with universities to consider a permanent return to the country. Only some very few examples of such return could be discerned.
4. **E-learning/life-long-learning.** The e-learning component has been fully implemented in all supported master courses. It has to be mentioned that this component is not necessarily e-learning in its "pure" form, but a combination of traditional learning methods and an e-learning component. Complete e-learning is at this time not possible in the Serbian system. Not in all cases it was possible for the Master courses to rely on the e-learning-centres formerly established with the support of WUS. In the case of the University of Belgrade, for example, it was discerned that the centre is non-existent anymore. In these cases, the e-learning component had to be supported on a faculty- or departmental level. It should be noted that for the e-learning component, no provision whatsoever has been made for the access of these platforms for blind students (see also chapter 8).
5. **Support for the University of Novi Pazar.** The support has been considerable especially in advice in setting up a quality-assurance-office within the rectorate, which is supposed to be more efficient than in other universities as the University of Novi Pazar is fully integrated. The office has been established and is fully functional.
6. **Support of accreditation agency.** The input for the Accreditation Commission consisted mainly in support for some study-visits, especially to accreditation agencies in Austria and Romania. While the claim is that these examples of successful agencies have supported the work of the Commission, no proof for this claim was visible. It is the impression of the consultant that the intervention has taken place on the wrong level and has not necessarily lead to any capacity development worth mentioning. This is especially worrisome as it has been reported to the consultant that the EU – through a related Tempus-project – financed additional study-trips for the members of this institution, which made the WUS-effort indistinguishable. Judging from the narrative, another support in order to reach membership of ENQA is planned. Part of the explanation for the overall small impact of WUS-support for the Commission is the fact that the current Commission had the task to accredit all state and a number of private universities in a quite short time and therefore the capacity for additional activities has not been there.
7. **Zoran-Djindjic-scholarship-scheme "Experiencing Europe".** The program has been implemented successfully, with a total number of 133 interns sent to Austria at

the time of reporting. While the feedback of the companies has been quite positive and the integration of interns within the companies was generally successful, no information about the final whereabouts of the former interns is yet available, as many of them are still at the university. A comparison to the German program, from which the Austrian has been copied, indicates a high probability for a considerable labour-market impact. From the German program, around 30% of participants have found jobs in German companies with subsidiaries in Serbia. Another 40% found occupation in Serbian companies with business-ties in German-speaking countries. The rest is pursuing post-graduate studies. There is no reason why the Austrian program should not achieve the same level of success⁴. In addition, the program has been very important in regard to the visibility and image-building of Austrian support in Serbia. The Foundation has a very good, state-of-the-art alumni-network with additional activities provided (like seminars, conferences, online-platform etc.).

8. **Österreich-Institute.** Currently, 80 students participate in the 4-year-language course. As the course will not end before 2011, results cannot be seen. Motivational problems which occurred in between have been overcome by providing additional incentives like e.g. scholarships or study-trips to Austria, not paid out of the budget of the program but acquired elsewhere. At this point of time, any statement in regard to outcome or impact would be highly speculative.

In summary, the activities of ADA in Serbia have generally been successful. Still, in regard to many of them a final assessment cannot be made because the activities are ongoing. The potential for success is considerable for most components. Still, in regard to an exit-strategy, one or the other component needs to be reconsidered if sustainability is supposed to be the major goal of a final period.

Recommendations:

For an exit-strategy, and with view on the existing components, the following adjustments are proposed:

- The efforts in establishment of a coordination platform should be discontinued. For an exit-strategy, it is not advisable to start something really new which would need follow-up that cannot be provided.
- The MSDP should be continued, but with the following reservations:
 - Only faculties or departments which have already been supported should benefit from a second MSDP. The goal is not to spread activities, but to deepen them.
 - Applications with a multi-disciplinary approach should be given prominent consideration. This should be part of the tender-announcement for a new program.
 - Current plans to open the Master development for PhD-support should not be followed upon. First, a phase of another maximum of three years might be to

⁴ The CIM-staff employed for the German program at the Foundation indicated that the German program, whose current phase will run out end of this year, will most likely be continued, as the success of the individual interns has been clearly visible.

short and the danger that PhD-students will be left in limbo is too big. Second, conditions for PhD-studies in many universities are not conducive and ADA-activities cannot solve these problems in a short time. It is better to deepen the Master development – to add diversity – than to start any activity in regard to PhD-level.

- The support for the University of Novi Pazar should be continued in issues which both combine the role as a role-model of an integrated university as well as issues of labour-market and employability. In this respect, after the quality-assurance-office has been established, support should be given to the establishment of a career-service-center at the rectorate. This is totally feasible within a three-years-period.
- Before any further support for the Accreditation Commission should be given, a donor-analysis has to be made in how far especially through the Tempus-program sufficient support is available. If that is the case, the support should be discontinued. If not, the recommendation is to shift support from the members of the Commission to its technical staff, as, while the members will change all four years after the mandate expires, the staff will most probably stay.
- The Zoran-Djindjic-scheme has both economical as well as political benefits. Despite the fact that it does not have visible impact in capacity-development at this point of time, and despite the fact that ownership by the Foundation is low and will continue to be so, labour-market and employability-potential is very high. If possible, the program should be continued for another period, especially, as the German partner program will most likely do so accordingly.
- The program of the Österreich Institut will run until 2011. Together with the ZDF-program, this activity has the highest potential to be continued after the withdrawal of ADA-support in the future, as it combines both cultural as well as developmental aspects and works relatively cost-efficient. Before any recommendation can be made, and as comparable programs on the German or Swiss side do not exist, further scrutiny about the future success of participants is necessary. Unfortunately, the project design itself does not include additional monitoring of the whereabouts of the participants after the conclusion of the program.

Aside from this, the consultant reiterates the recommendations made in chapter 6.

Donor-coordination is, at this point of time, non-existent in the case of the sector of higher-education. Until the end of 2009, Swiss Development has had the role of a focal point or lead-agency in the education-sector in general. This role was mainly to facilitate regular meetings. Since the beginning of this year, the Ministry of Education has taken over and has organized a number of meetings, most of them concentrating on a specific topic, so far without consideration of higher education. The staff of the Ministry in charge of donor-coordination has expressed no interest in the sector of HE at all and the issue might only be taken up upon suggestion of ADA.

On the level of the Ministry of Finance some donor-coordination exists insofar as the Ministry is supposed to have a running database about all donors in Serbia and their focus and scope of activities. Experience shows however that the database is not maintained well – both be-

cause donors are not forthcoming with the necessary information but also because of capacity problems within the Ministry – and that information-requests are not replied satisfactory. Therefore, donors still maintain their own internal overview about what the others are doing and organize meetings among themselves to ascertain that their knowledge is up to date.

On the other hand, the fact that ADA is more or less the only bilateral donor of significance in the whole HE-sector does not bode well for donor-coordination. The European Council has ceased its activities since the end of last year; the remaining actor of significance is the EU-Commission. Some bilateral activities of low-level are visible, especially in regard to scholarship-programs (e.g. by France) or the facilitation of one or the other conference on the matter (e.g. by the German University-Rectors-conference). Actually, keeping an exit-strategy in mind, the major task at hand might be to identify another donor who is willing to invest in HE like ADA did to fill the gap. So far, and based on the interviews during this mission, no alternative partner seems to present himself.

Donor-communication is, nevertheless, needed, at least between ADA/WUS and the EU-Tempus-Office. The Tempus-program is supporting activities very close to the activities of WUS, especially in Master Studies development. The staff of Tempus-office showed little knowledge about the role of WUS in the context of Austrian Development Assistance and were not informed about the scope and partners of the MSDP. They voiced interest in an exchange of information in order to avoid possible duplication in application, as some departments in some of the universities became quite versatile in accessing foreign funding, increasing the danger of double-funding. If in consequence of this report the decision will be taken to prolong the MSDP for another round, regular communication between at least WUS and the Tempus-Office seems to be advisable.

Of course, this leads to the general question if a continuation of MSDP is feasible, having the wider range of TEMPUS-support in view. This question cannot be answered easily, because the thematic focus of TEMPUS changes regularly and therefore, if a faculty or department "missed out" in a given TEMPUS-period, it might not have the chance to try again with the same topic as the focus of the next period might have shifted. Therefore, the Austrian MSDP, as it is not subject to these regular shifts of focus, can intervene where TEMPUS' approach might not be adequate. Unfortunately, as cooperation between WUS and TEMPUS is, so far, non-existent, this "gap-filling-function" has not materialized until now, at least not with intent.

The Austrian BMWF does not appear as a distinct actor very visibly in Serbia. None of the interviewees has been able to clearly point to any distinct activity. Programs are known in a general way – like the CEEPUS-exchange-program, where Serbian participation has nearly been cancelled because of negligence on the side of the Education ministry. In general, as cooperation in specific projects doesn't take place, coherence issues are here of a much lesser concern. Information flow between ADA and the BMWF does not always seem to be up to date, but as activities are not really complementary, only additive, this is hardly a problematic situation. Coherence is of higher interest in regard to e.g. the Integrated Regional Development Program (IRDP) in the Vojvodina which has some components including the HE-sector, namely the University of Novi Sad. The currently supported Master course in Regional Development from that university is linked to support by the IRDP, but communication between WUS and the IRDP is either non-existent or weak. Aside from that, lack in coherence was voiced by any interview-partner on any level of the Serbian HE-system.

Recommendations:

- If the MSDP will be continued, initiate regular contacts between the WUS-office in Belgrade and the Tempus-office for communication about supported Master courses and departments.
- Propose to the Ministry of Education a special meeting on higher education with the participation of all stakeholders, including the Ministry of Science. As the news about the exit of ADA will be spread by that time, this meeting can be used to ask the other donors for their willingness or preparedness to replace ADA-activities after the end of a phasing out-program.

8. Sustainability

For Serbia, there will be most probably only an "exit-strategy", as the office will be closed by 2012 and the current activities are already gearing towards a phasing-out. Albeit, the question, in how far issues like capacity-building should and could be implemented into a final program of maybe another three years is valid, as the problem of sustainability is especially important for an exit-strategy. While a new effort in regard to impact-orientation might be suitable on a higher level, the most important impact to be achieved in a phasing-out will be to enable the universities to access other donor's funding effectively and efficiently. Recommendations for activities gearing towards these goals have already been made in chapter 6 and will therefore not be repeated here. Strategic considerations for a longer term are not applicable to Serbia.

The indicators used within the LogFrames of the programs in Serbia pose some challenges. Unfortunately, some serious deficits are discernible:

1. Quantifiable indicators are not quantified at the right place in the LogFrame. For example, the indicator "number of successfully implemented study programs" lacks a concrete number – therefore the indicator is quite useless as the quantity is not defined. More examples like this are evident in the LogFrame. A quantifiable indicator must set a mark to be achieved – the correct indicator would have been "Seven successfully implemented study programs". The additional problem here is that "successful" is a goal, not an indicator and might need an additional indicator to describe the level of "success". More advisable are, again, qualifications which can be quantified: "Seven accredited study programs" for example would have been a better indicator. Interestingly, the amount of programs – seven – is found in the column "how to measure", where it does not belong. It is clear that whoever made the LogFrame was not very familiar with this planning method.
2. Some of the indicators chosen are not SMART. A good example is the indicator: "constant and sustainable cooperation". This is a goal, not an indicator. As this needs further description through an indicator, it cannot be one. The chosen method of measurement – "constant interest" – is not a method of verification; it is again a goal that needs an indicator. This is just another example which clearly shows that the

planners had only a very general understanding about the correct use of indicators and their formulation.

3. Some indicators do not describe the goal sufficiently. In the “Experiencing Europe”-program, we find the indicator “implementation of the two modules”. This is the description of an activity, leading to an output – but far away from any outcome or even impact. Mere output indicators have to be avoided, as they are too closely linked to an indirect description of activities done and therefore not helpful in ascertaining the results of an activity. The indicator “results of analysis and evaluation”, which is not even a proper means of verification, as it is too “hazy”, is another example for the fact that the basic understanding about indicators and their proper place within a Log-Frame has apparently not been present.

It is not known to the consultant in how far internal quality assurance within ADA headquarters is available to check planning-LogFrames in regard to proper methodical setup, consistency and application. From the consultant’s view, any proper internal monitoring should have found these grave and serious mistakes in indicator-formulation already with a very cursory glance. It is assumed that the capacity of ADA to cross-check LogFrames has improved in the meantime. The consultant is not quite sure if the ability of WUS to develop proper LogFrames has grown accordingly. As it has not been the task of this evaluation to make a capacity-analysis of WUS, this question remains to be unanswered. But if ADA-headquarters has indication that the general capacity in using planning-tools properly has not increased, additional effort has to be made to cross-check any LogFrame presented by WUS for a final phase in Serbia⁵.

The activities by WUS, especially the MSDP, have clearly contributed positively to the capacity of professors or groups of professors to initiate and execute new Master courses. Still, this capacity development comes with a price in Serbia, keeping the already mentioned deficiencies in financial and general administration in mind. Therefore, capacity-development took place on an individual basis within certain departments. This has positive influence insofar as role-models are formed and best practice can be established. Still, a good number of teaching staff is as yet unconvinced to follow the same path. As future Master development will have to be done either with their own resources or with much more complicated funding instruments e.g. of the EU-Commission, the relative easy access to WUS-funding is in the end detrimental, as the positive experience with WUS-support cannot be compared to the much more stringent demands of other donors. Consequently, professors less interested in taking over all the administrative duties by themselves will have apprehension in regard to start anything different solely based on the direct or indirect experience with ADA-programs. At this point of time, universities as institutions are still not well capable in the implementation of activities, especially donor-funded ones. It is individual professors or groups of professors whose capability to do so have been enhanced. The University of Novi Sad might be an exception, at least to a limited scale, as it is seen as the vanguard in these activities within the Serbian HE-environment. The University of Kragujevac also seems to be a more positive exception.

⁵ Of course given the precondition that WUS will be asked to implement the final phase. As has been said, it is not feasible to change the implementing agency for a final phase, therefore it is assumed that WUS will be asked to propose a LogFrame for another three years, if an exit-phase of this length will be decided upon.

To ensure sustainability in regard to the capacity to access further external funding in the future – which is a very important ability for universities all over the world, not only in Serbia – the already proposed capacity-development in regard to administrative issues is a basic pre-condition.

In regard to other programs, especially the “Experiencing Europe”-program and the one run by the “Österreich Institut”, sustainability in the execution of such activities without external aid is not to be expected. For those participants who will be able to directly link their new knowledge with their career, individual sustainability will probably be apparent. The only possible alternative in view of an exit-strategy might be the inclusion of at least the “Experiencing Europe”-program into the “1000 young leaders”-initiative located with the Serbian Prime Minister. For this, a lot of work in adjustment and – especially in regard to the “1000 young leaders”-program – stronger focus would be necessary. But aside from that alternative, the consultant does not see any viable sustainability in regard to a future implementation of these kinds of exchange- and language-programs without external funding.

The indicators are oriented towards the distinct project-activity. Therefore, they do not illustrate the general impact on the further development of the HE-sector in Serbia. Judging from the interviews and the assessment of other donors, it can be stated that the ADA-program has indeed supported the development of the HE-sector in general, especially as it is the only bilateral donor of significance in Serbia. Still, the activities are quite spread in a relatively big country, and some activities – like the support of the Accreditation Commission – have been superficial and probably not complementary to e.g. the Tempus-program. While WUS can work more exactly and to the needs of the different departments and faculties, and is more attractive because of its smaller administrative requirements, it has to be said that in the end in crucial issues like master studies development, the quantitative effect of programs like Tempus is surely bigger and more visible. It is to be expected that everyone involved in the MSDP is afterwards fully capable of implement other, additional Master studies, which has been proven by the fact that the same applicants are often also involved in Tempus-projects, which require a lot more coordination and administrative effort. Sustainability in regard to those individuals and departments involved can surely be expected, as they will continue to apply successfully to EU-funding even after ADA-activities have ceased to be. Sustainability in institutional development is more questionable, as major challenges – like the lack of integration of Serbian universities, the lack of multi-disciplinary approaches and the lack of administrative capabilities – have not been addressed by ADA-activities.

Recommendations:

- Proposals for an exit-strategy with a focus on sustainability have already been made in the course of this report.
- As it will be wise to give WUS also the exit-phase to implement, ADA should encourage WUS to get more familiar with the proper use of planning-tools like the LogFrame and to understand the different levels of development results as described in an impact-chain better. ADA should scrutinize the LogFrame more diligently and comment on lacks and room for improvement.
- While there is serious need for political advice and lobbying for change at the ministe-

rial level, WUS is not well placed to embark on such an activity. In addition, with no MoU in place and an exit-strategy in mind, ADA will not be able to perform this role as well. Donor-cooperation might be the only way to address some important issues, if other donors will agree to carry the torch.

9. Outcomes and impact

Activities to enhance the quality of the HE sector in Serbia will always enhance the brain-drain-effect. During the course of this evaluation, the interviewees at the different faculties who enjoyed support through ADA-programs have reiterated repeatedly that the best graduates will have and enjoy already easy access to the international labour-market and many examples of careers outside Serbia have been given, especially in the technical faculties. As the visa-regime has been liberalized, labour-migration of Serbian professionals is likely to increase beyond the current level and there is nothing aside from a healthy economic growth within Serbia which will prevent it. ADA-interventions in the HE sector will inevitably lead to a higher degree of out-migration of professionals as long as availability of adequate employment in the Serbian labour-market isn't high. Currently, the big push towards the EU is prevented by the fact that student-mobility is relatively low, many students have – because of the years of relative isolation of Serbia in the era of sanctions – a more inward-looking approach and many are afraid that they will not be able to meet the demands of the international labour-market. Still, it is to be expected that this will change in the foreseeable future and that a better HE-system with a higher degree of quality of education will support this process in due time.

Therefore, the question is not if the qualification of the graduates can be used in the Serbian economy – they could, if the overall economic situation will improve – but more, who will pay more for it. With an average household-income of 400 €/month in Serbia, the answer to this question is easy.

Neither ADA nor the Serbian government have any clear concept of managing migration in and out of Serbia, especially in the direction of the European Union. Concepts of "circular migration" are likely to meet the individual demands of graduates to improve themselves as well as the desire of EU-countries to manage migration effectively. This is well in line with the ADA-HE-strategy, which talks about "brain circulation". "Fighting" brain-drain is generally a futile effort in social engineering. The more promising strategy is to use migration for the benefit of everyone involved instead of wasting money to prevent it with inadequate tools.

The three target groups for non-discriminatory activities have to be reflected upon differently. First, gender issues are the easiest aspect to deliberate upon. This has to do with the fact that – coming from the tradition of education policy in former Yugoslavia – the equal representation of women and men in nearly all faculties, including the technical ones, is a common feature throughout the Serbian HE-system. Still, in order to preserve this advantage, WUS Belgrade uses a positive scoring-system in regard to applications for its programs, giving female applicants a slight favor in comparison to male ones. Women are also well represented in all higher administrative offices in Serbian universities; up to the level of vice-rector (currently there is no female rector). Generally, gender balance is quite advanced even in

comparison with the Austrian or German situation and there seems to be no urgent need for additional consideration of this matter.

In the case of people with disabilities, the situation is more complex. While the University of Belgrade has specific services established for students with mobility restrictions – from a special dormitory to a car-service for wheel-chairs –, other universities have not taken this into consideration. This might change with the new law for disabilities coming into force in Serbia soon. Still, people with disabilities are generally stigmatized in Serbian society and not well integrated. Unfortunately, also the ADA-programs do not consider these issues where they could. The best example is the MSDP, which has a required e-learning-component. Neither the application-form nor the implementation of this component takes the needs of students with impaired vision into account. Questions to interviewees from the universities in regard to this were answered in a way that made lack of awareness clearly evident.

The special challenge in Serbia is the ethnic minorities. First, classes in Serbian universities, and that includes the University of Novi Pazar, where students from Serbian ethnicity are a minority, are held in the Serbian language only. No special provision for other languages, with the exception of classes in English in some advanced courses, is given. Secondly, the issue of ethnic minorities is highly sensitive after the independence of Kosovo. The current policy is to centralize as much as possible and to withdraw even the slightest hint of regional power, despite the official "decentralization"-process. The fear for another break-up is evident in the political leadership. Therefore, it is very difficult to discuss these issues. In addition, no statistics at all exist in regard to the representation or even the size of ethnic minorities in Serbia, as many official statistics are not allowed to ask for ethnic origin. For the most marginalized ethnic groups – like the Roma – estimates vary between a total of 400.000 to 1.000.000, without any clear evidence to support the one or the other. Without any clear empirical data, it is very difficult to make a clear-cut policy for the inclusion of ethnic minorities into the HE system. In addition, the majority of minorities has "its" state to rely on. Bosniaks in Bosnia, Hungarians in Hungary, etc. Their avenues for education are not restricted to Serbian institutions and they have external countries on whose support they can rely. It is the most marginalized minorities, like the Roma, where the problem of inclusion is the biggest. Here, again, the issue is less access to the HE sector, but more to primary and secondary education⁶.

The connection between the activities of ADA in Serbia and the needs of the labour-market is strong, mainly due to a clear-cut focus of the MSDP towards this issue. MSDP-applications have to include a strong labour-market component, with a labour-market survey and the inclusion of a private company in development and execution of the course. This has forced many participants to actively – and for the first time! – employ the resources of alumni to gather information about the labour-market and to search for potential partners in the business-community. This has been a very healthy development, as generally the relationship between universities and the labour-market is feeble. Only in some dedicated faculties – like of technical sciences and economics – are stronger relationship with the business-community is apparent. Furthermore, the "Experiencing Europe"-program as well as the lan-

⁶ The Serbian government is quite aware of this challenge and has introduced a mentorship-program with Roma-teachers in primary and secondary schools for special support of Roma-pupils in order to encourage enrolment as well as prevent drop-outs. Many donors, like the Swiss, have programs directly targeted at the Roma-minority, but none in the area of higher education.

guage-courses of the "Österreich Institut", which include company-presentations and the mediation of internships and scholarship-schemes, have a clear and strong labour-market orientation.

Serbian universities are on different levels when it comes to the preparation of their students for the needs of the labour-market. Generally, the tradition of career-service-centers has developed only recently and with varying impact. While the center at the University of Belgrade is very active and provides advice and training for a multitude of students, including company presentation and internship-programs, and the same in Kragujevac seems to be very active as well, the University of Novi Pazar still lacks such an office completely and the one at the University of Nis seems to be inexperienced and underfunded. Within the curricula, the teaching of secondary skills necessary for the labour-market – from CV-writing to self-presentation to team-work to project-management – is hardly apparent. Graduates have to look for other sources of this knowledge actively and by themselves. Furthermore, the connection between the universities and the National Employment Service is weak as well, partly due to the structural inability of the NES to provide effective services for graduates at this time. Generally, knowledge about the international labour-market is limited, at least for those faculties where there has been no strong tradition in seeking employment abroad.

Serbia's integration into the EU-structures of HE has been hampered by a long period of relative isolation due to international sanctions. Both the entry into the Bologna-process as well as the subsequent activities, especially the start of accreditation processes, has been relatively late. Therefore, Serbia is still struggling in doing the necessary steps towards a deeper integration. On the other side, Serbia is ranking very high in the number of successful applications to EU-funding. There is a visible eagerness on the side of the Serbian universities to reconnect to the strong tradition of international cooperation that has been apparent in the former Yugoslavia. The establishment of networks with other universities has been ongoing for some time, and since the Serbian universities have been allowed to be grant-holders of EU-funding from last year, their role has been strengthened. The liberalization of the visa-regime has encouraged exchange, which is normally only hampered by lack of adequate funding, especially for student mobility⁷.

Generally, the impact of ADA-activities has been most visible where through the BGP and partly also the MSDP international cooperation has been strengthened. It has been less visible in regard to e.g. the work of the Accreditation Commission, whose very structure will prevent it from effectively enter any European network, not to speak of membership in ENQA. The lack of integration of Serbian universities is another challenge not well in line with the requirements of the Bologna-process. As WUS Belgrade – and the ADA-office – have obviously not engaged themselves a lot in political lobbying in this regard and donor-coordination has been on a low level in HE-matters, this is not really surprising. Before a MOU between the Ministry for Education and ADA is not signed, any activity in this direction might be difficult. Now, as the work is coming to an end, it will be more or less futile to be actively involved in political lobbying for basic changes in the Serbian HE-system. Still, the major impediments towards a greater inclusion of Serbia into the EU-research and academic area is related to political decision-making, not to individual program-interventions so far facilitated by WUS.

⁷ Or by the lack of capacity of the universities to access the funding, like in the case of the University of Nis, which has been suspended full partnership of Erasmus/Mundus because of its inability to fill all available scholarships allotted to them in time.

Unfortunately, no evidence was discernible that ADA-activities were embedded in any wider networks or long-term partnerships in Serbia. No twinning-component on a permanent basis has been supported. The desire of the Commission for Accreditation to participate in ENQA has been supported indirectly through study-visits, but obstacles remain. Surely, individual faculties or departments have their own networks, but any effort to link these to activities conducted through WUS has not been visible. Activities in regard to "Experiencing Europe" and by the "Österreich-Institute" are so far embedded into networks as they use resources and contacts they have – e.g. to invite lecturers from companies for presentations – and try to continue these contacts for the benefit of participants. It would be difficult to characterize these efforts as long-term partnerships of a more stable nature.

Recommendations:

- The "Experiencing Europe"-program should be continued if possible. While it does not contribute to the capacity-development within the HE-sector, it has a strong labour-market focus and has positive impact on Austrian visibility and political image. Especially in preparation to the end of the current economic crisis, strong and good connection with the German-speaking economies is of high interest for Serbia and its neighbouring countries.
- In line with the proposal to add a component for capacity-development in regard to project-implementation on rectorate-level in Serbian universities, funds should be made available for capacity-development of career-service-centers where they do not exist or are weak. This would both contribute to sustainability of institutions but also to a strong labour-market-focus. In the cooperation with the University of Novi Pazar, this would be a logical next step instead of venturing in uncharted areas like PhD-development or such.
- Cross-cutting issues like gender and inclusion of people with disabilities should be included in proper form in the application-forms of all relevant activities, like e.g. the MSDP. Gender-analysis and an effort to analyse the readiness of applying departments for students with disabilities should be made obligatory in the application process.
- For activities in regard to ethnic minorities, ADA should first confer with those other donors who specialize in these issues in the lower tiers of the education system in order to analyze in how far activities in the HE-sector are feasible. From the consultant's view, it will most probably be futile to start a new discussion in an exit-phase. This issue can predominantly be addressed through the continued support of the University of Novi-Pazar as a multi-ethnic university.

10. Three scenarios for future activities in Serbia

Exit scenario 1: Cease all direct WUS-activities with the current program. Continue the language-program of "Österreich Institut" beyond 2011 and prolong the "Experiencing Europe"-program for another period.

Rationale: The two programs outside the direct WUS-activities are sufficient to "ease out" ADA-activities in Serbia while keeping a strong activity in regard to the labour-market, the interest of Austrian businesses and some political leverage which will benefit the probable negative repercussions of the withdrawal at least a little bit. In addition, it is the most cost-effective way of exit, which will make funds available for other activities in a shorter time-period.

Challenges: The sudden withdrawal of ADA-activities might impact the relationship to Serbia negatively and will surely disappoint many stakeholders in Serbian universities. In addition, the chance to add some activities in a final period to increase the general sustainability and contribute wisely to capacity-development to make the change smooth will be missed. Especially in regard to the new university in Novi Pazar, where cooperation is relatively new, a second period of added activities is advisable. In addition, identification of other donors who might be willing to engage themselves in the HE-sector in the future will become more difficult, if not impossible.

Exit scenario 2: Continue with all activities as before without major changes or different focus for another three-year-period.

Rationale: In order to smoothen the exit of ADA-activities in Serbia, the continuation of current programs will alleviate fears of a sudden withdrawal and make added work especially in Novi Pazar, but also with selected universities possible. In addition, the search for other donors who might be motivated to at replace ADA's activities in parts will be easier, as a clear time for an exit, not too soon in the future, will be available for planning.

Challenges: The simple continuation of programs as they are is not necessarily conducive for an exit-strategy which should focus on sustainability-issues. The danger is that in the end activities will cease with some obstacles towards future activities by other donors or by Serbian institutions still in place.

Exit scenario 3: Current activities will be continued for another three-year-period by WUS Austria, but with more focus and additional activities in capacity-development added. Some elements, like the support for the Accreditation Commission, might be ended. Possible extension of the ZDF-activities and/or the program of the "Österreich-Institute" beyond another three-year-period will be scrutinized.

Rationale: In order to ensure sustainability, activities will be more focused and needs for capacity-development identified. Activities in Novi Pazar can be lead to a successful conclusion. It might be worth considering the continuation of scholarship- and language-schemes on a more permanent basis, which will both help as a good argument against criticism in Serbia in regard to the exit as well as a "foot in the doorstep" in Serbia, especially for labour-market oriented and business-promotion-activities.

Challenges: Depending on the activities of other donors and the amount of budget available for ADA, even another three-year-period might not be sufficient to tackle basic sustainability-problems connected to the HE-sector in Serbia. The question is, in how far, after a MOU with the relevant ministries is concluded, political lobbying will be possible, especially with the knowledge that ADA will withdraw its activities. As the political leverage will diminish, the chances are not likely to be high.

Recommendation: Follow scenario 3, and emphasize the search for other donors who might be willing to invest in focused activities in the HE-sector. From the information gathered in this evaluation, Serbia will need at least another ten years of support for its HE-sector before the Serbian government and the universities will be able to take over the responsibility completely.

11. Conclusions

11.1 Conclusions in regard to the strategy

1. Activities in Serbia are well embedded in the general desire by Serbian authorities to follow the Bologna-process. A distinct HE-strategy does not exist at this point of time.
2. The current country-program for Serbia has a weak goal-structure in regard to the HE-sector, which does not reflect Austria's role in the sector well.

11.2 Conclusions in regard to relevance

1. In Serbia, no alignment with national strategies is possible as they do not exist in written form yet. Still, the general drive towards the implementation of the Bologna-process is full in line with ADA-activities. Programs are clearly demand-oriented. Ownership is difficult to achieve where the structures of not well-integrated universities pose a challenge. It is easiest with the new, integrated University of Novi Pazar. Institutional ownership of other partners – like the Zoran-Djindjic-Foundation – is weak. Capacity development so far concentrated either of applying departments or professors or, in the case of Novi Pazar, on certain basic administrative structures. Capacity development of the Ministry of Education does not take place. Not all essential criteria for successful capacity development are met.

11.3 Conclusions in regard to effectiveness

1. The program-approach in Serbia is not visible. Components work in an additive, not necessarily interconnected and holistic way. The different components have been implemented with a varying degree of success, with one complete failure (coordination platform) and one big question mark (accreditation commission). Donor-coordination in the HE-sector is non-existent.

11.4 Conclusions in regard to sustainability

1. In Serbia, impact can be assumed on the level of departments and individual professors, institutionally most in regard to the University of Novi Pazar. Indicators and the LogFrame presented are not on the level of common quality standards. Individual impact of the internship-program in cooperation with the Zoran-Djindjic-Foundation can be assumed as high, but empirical data is not available yet.

11.5 Conclusions in regard to outcomes and impact

1. The brain-drain-effect will not be combated successfully through the ADA-programs in Serbia, the opposite is more likely the case. Non-discrimination in regard to gender is relatively well established within the activities, while inclusion of both people with disabilities as well as ethnic minorities is not visible at all. Like in Kosovo, for the most marginalized minorities, entrance into primary education is already a challenge. Links to the labour-market are stronger, especially in the MSDP as well as the "Experiencing Europe"-program. Integration into the EU-HE-sector, especially the Bologna-process, has started late, but is in full swing. ADA-activities have increased the links to universities abroad especially through BGP+.

12. Lessons learnt

12.1 Lessons in regard to strategy

The discrepancy between the fact that Austria is the biggest bilateral donor in the HE-sector and that the country-strategy does not address this fact adequately illuminates the lesson that obviously the importance of the engagement in the HE-sector is not weighed sufficiently in comparison to other activities. It is an important lesson to be learnt that strategies are supposed to reflect the priorities set in one country and this has to be done both in quality and quantity. Additionally, strategic development on the side of the Serbian partners is burdened with inertia and inadequate structures. The management-capacity of the partner to develop a vision has to be considered.

12.2 Lessons in regard to relevance

1. In regard to capacity-development, the absence of knowledge about the basic principles of ADA-capacity-development in planning and implementation of some of the activities shows that ADA might have a communication-problem with its implementing agencies. In order to implement the activities up to the current standards, it is necessary to reflect on them on a continuous basis. Producing a guideline or list of principles which afterwards is not inserted into the activities of implementing agencies is not very effective. This leads to serious contradictions.

2. The case of Serbia teaches the lesson that intervening on the level of universities without keeping the political and legal framework in mind leads to the fact that interventions have only a limited impact and are not embedded well into a greater strategy. The lack of this strategy in the country-program comes into mind again. WUS as an implementing agency is obviously not good at working on the political level in the partner country or has never been asked to do so. Capacity development without trying to tackle the underlying problems – here foremost the lack of integration of Serbian universities – can only lead to limited results. Either ADA-office or implementing agency have to cooperate to have coherence in political advice and practical application or the goals of development cooperation have to be very modest, if not too modest.

12.3 Lessons in regard to effectiveness

2. Aside from the lessons learnt mentioned in 11.2, no additional important lessons are visible under the chapter of effectiveness.

12.4 Lessons in regard to sustainability

1. A major lesson learnt is that using planning tools in a formalistic way without the deeper understanding of the various elements and without the "threat" that commitments formulated in these tools – like the indicators filled in the LogFrame – will one day be scrutinized or even regularly monitored, the whole implementation of planning tools is not an inherent part of the process, but the execution of an obligation, not filled with life. For evidence based planning tools, a major lesson is that both sides – the implementing agency as well as the funding agency – have to have a common and full understanding of the tool used, how it is used, how far its results are supposed to influence implementation and how it will be monitored (especially in regard to the degree of diligence). If the perception is evident that an activity-based reporting and negligence of indicators can actually "work", tools are meaningless.

2. Again, the lesson learnt in 11.2. is of the highest importance, especially in regard to sustainability.

12.5 Lessons in regard to outcomes and impact

1. Any activity geared at enhancing the HE-sector in a small country like Serbia will inadvertently lead to a higher probability in brain-drain-processes. When a HE-policy is focused, especially in times of economic crisis, to keep a substantial number of young people out of the labour-market in order to contain the rising number of unemployed and not artificially strengthen the informal sector, any activity in managing migration is bound to failure. Issues of brain-drain in small countries have a very different perspective from big countries, as they will never be able to absorb their graduates even in times of economic booms.

2. The major lesson in regard to labour-market-issues is that no one can expect any link to the labour-market – and subsequently to poverty eradication, as this is the rationale behind it –, as long as knowledge about the very topic does not pervade all relevant institutions. In a country with a very high degree of volatility in the economy, profound knowledge about the local, the regional and the continental market is a precondition for effective targeting the labour-market for graduates. If this knowledge only exists with few, and is not used in any systematic way – as it is to be feared for the new university in Prizren –, any labour-market-orientation will remain to be lip-service.

3. Awareness about cross-cutting issues is always difficult to spread, even within implementing agencies. They have the tendency to be seen as formalistic obligations. It is therefore necessary to emphasize the need for them and to communicate them differently from other, more subject-specific issues. The major lesson here is that just mentioned cross-cutting issues as such will not develop into any meaningful consideration by either partner-institutions or implementing agencies. Cross-cutting issues need permanent and specific monitoring and repeated, insisting. If the political fears are too great to even address the issue of ethnic balance and inclusion in a systematic way, small interventions in specific sectors cannot and will

never yield any meaningful result. With a certain degree of "political paranoia" in regard to these issues, as it is apparent currently in influential quarters of the Serbian polity, development cooperation is not well placed to press issues like the inclusion of ethnic minorities. As long as political decision-making is guided by fear, constructive solutions are not easy to be achieved.

13. Summary of recommendations

#	For whom?	Recommendation
1	ADA Office Belgrade and ADA country desk Serbia	<p>For a general exit-strategy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Current activities will be continued for another three-year-period by WUS Austria, but with more focus and additional activities in capacity-development added. Some elements, like the support for the Accreditation Commission, might be ended. Possible extension of the ZDF-activities and/or the program of the "Österreich-Institute" beyond another three-year-period will be scrutinized.
2	ADA Office Belgrade, ADA country desk Serbia	<p>In formulation of an exit-strategy for a phasing-out-program of approximately another three years, it should be considered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> that a component should be included in the program which addresses basic administrative lacks in the implementation process of foreign funds in some universities, especially in regard to financial administration and project-management from the site of the administration. The establishment or support of a project-management-unit at rectorate-level would also support the badly needed integration of Serbian universities. Here, capacities in these issues could be bundled and then made available for faculties and departments. This is necessary as an exit-strategy would result in the need for the universities to access alternative funding more aggressively. To ensure sustainability, support in this area is needed and would be advisable. In order to implement this, a survey in regard to the administrative capabilities should be made, as the degree of quality varies from university to university. From a practical point of view, any exit-program should be implemented by the WUS-office in Belgrade. This recommendation would look different if ADA would continue the activities in Serbia for a longer period. But in this case, any effort to include the WUS-activities within a given Serbian structure would be a big challenge, mainly because of the non-integration of universities but also because the responsibility for the sector is divided among two ministries in Serbia. No agency presents itself which could be centrally strengthened to implement activities now done by WUS, and for an exit-strategy, any lobbying into that direction will most probably yield any results. ADA should encourage WUS to get more familiar with the proper use of planning-tools like the LogFrame and to understand the different levels of development results as described in an impact-chain better. ADA should scrutinize the LogFrame more diligently and comment on lacks and room for improvement. The efforts in establishment of a coordination platform should be discontinued. For an exit-strategy, it is not advisable to start something really new which would need follow-up that cannot be provided. The MSDP should be continued, but with the following reservations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Only faculties or departments which have already been supported should benefit from a second MSDP. The goal is not to spread activities, but to deepen them. Applications with a multi-disciplinary approach should be given prominent consideration. This should be part of the tender-announcement for a new program. Current plans to open the Master development for PhD-support should not be followed upon. First, a phase of another maximum of three years might be too short and the danger that PhD-students will be left in limbo is too big.

#	For whom?	Recommendation
		<p>Second, conditions for PhD-studies in many universities are not conducive and ADA-activities cannot solve these problems in a short time. It is better to deepen the Master development – to add diversity – than to start any activity in regard to PhD-level.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The support for the University of Novi Pazar should be continued in issues which both combine the role as a role-model of an integrated university as well as issues of labour-market and employability. In this respect, after the quality-assurance-office has been established, support should be given to the establishment of a career-service-center at the rectorate. This is totally feasible within a three-years-period. • Before any further support for the Accreditation Commission should be given, a donor-analysis has to be made in how far especially through the Tempus-program sufficient support is available. If that is the case, the support should be discontinued. If not, the recommendation is to shift support from the members of the Commission to its technical staff, as, while the members will change all four years after the mandate expires, the staff will most probably stay. • The "Experiencing Europe"-program has both economical as well as political benefits. Despite the fact that it does not have visible impact in capacity-development at this point of time, and despite the fact that ownership by the Foundation is low and will continue to be so, labour-market and employability-potential is very high. If possible, the program should be continued for another period, especially, as the German partner program will most likely do so accordingly. • The program of the Österreich-Institute will run until 2011. Together with the ZDF-program, this activity has the highest potential to be continued after the withdrawal of ADA-support in the future, as it combines both cultural as well as developmental aspects and works relatively cost-efficient. Before any recommendation can be made, and as comparable programs on the German or Swiss side do not exist, further scrutiny about the future success of participants is necessary. Unfortunately, the project design itself does not include additional monitoring after the conclusion of the program at this point of time. • In line with the proposal to add a component for capacity-development in regard to project-implementation on rectorate-level in Serbian universities, funds should be made available for capacity-development of career-service-centers where they do not exist or are weak. This would both contribute to sustainability of institutions but also to a strong labour-market-focus. In the cooperation with the University of Novi Pazar, this would be a logical next step instead of venturing in uncharted areas like PhD-development or such. • Cross-cutting issues like gender and inclusion of people with disabilities should be included in proper form in the application-forms of all relevant activities, like e.g. the MSDP. Gender-analysis and an effort to analyse the readiness of applying departments for students with disabilities should be made obligatory in the application process. • For activities in regard to ethnic minorities, ADA should first confer with those other donors who specialize in these issues in the lower tiers of the education system in order to analyze in how far activities in the HE-sector are feasible. From the consultant's view, it will most probably be futile to start a new discussion in an exit-phase. This issue can predominantly be addressed through the continued support of the University of Novi-Pazar as a multi-ethnic university.
3	ADA Office Belgrade/ WUS Belgrade	<p>In regard to donor-coordination:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the MSDP will be continued, initiate regular contacts between the WUS-office in Belgrade and the Tempus-office for communication about supported Master courses and departments. • Propose to the Ministry of Education a special meeting on higher education with the participation of all stakeholders. in-

#	For whom?	Recommendation
		<p>cluding the Ministry of Science. As the news about the exit of ADA will be spread by that time, this meeting can be used to ask the other donors for their willingness or preparedness to replace ADA-activities after the end of a phasing out-program.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• While there is serious need for political advice and lobbying for change at the ministerial level, WUS is not well placed to embark on such an activity. In addition, with no MOU in place and an exit-strategy in mind, ADA will not be able to perform this role as well. Donor-cooperation might be the only way to address some important issues, if other donors will agree to carry the torch.

14. Annex

14.1 List of interviewees

1. Antic, Slobodan (Vice Rector, University of Nis)
2. Bokan, Neda (Vice Rector, University of Belgrade)
3. Bugarcic, Zivadin (Pro-Rector, University of Kragujevac)
4. Bursac, Bojana (int. relations officer, University of Belgrade)
5. Cerovic, Radoslav (Assistant Minister, Ministry of Science)
6. Cirkovic-Velickovic, Tanja (Professor, University of Belgrade)
7. Dolicanin, Cemal (Rector, University of Novi Pazar)
8. Djindjic, Ruzica (Director, Zoran-Djindjic-Foundation)
9. Dukic, Sofija (Tempus-office)
10. Filipovic-Ozegovic, Marija (Tempus-office)
11. Grozdanovic, Miroljub (Rector, University of Nis)
12. Grujovic, Nenad (Professor, University of Kragujevac)
13. Guggenberger, Christian (IRDP)
14. Halilagic, Fikret (student)
15. Honic, Esma (student)
16. Jankovic, Dragan (Professor, University of Nis)
17. Jovicic, Dubravka (Dean Musical Faculty)
18. Kapper, Klaus (ADA-office)
19. Kovacevic, Branko (Rector, University of Belgrade)
20. Kovacevic-Vujcic, Vera (Commission for Accreditation)
21. Krneta, Radojka (Professor, University of Kragujevac)
22. Kurtanovic, Amina (student)
23. Lazarevic, Gordana (Ministry of Finance)
24. Lopicic, Vesna (Vice Rector, University of Nis)
25. Licina, Mirsad (student)
26. Malbasa, Veljko (Professor, University of Novi Sad)
27. Markovic, Sasa (CIM-staff, Zoran-Djindjic-Foundation)
28. Marunic, Bozidar (former BCC-participant)

29. Matijevic, Milan (prodekan, University of Kragujevac)
30. Meyer, Beatrice (Swiss Development Cooperation)
31. Minc, Branislav (pro-rector, University of Novi Pazar)
32. Mitrovic, Radivoje (State Minister, MEST)
33. Mossberg, Björn (SIDA)
34. Nedovic, Viktor (Assistant Minister, Ministry of Science)
35. Ostojic, Goran (WUS)
36. Pavlovic, Tomislav (Professor, University of Nis)
37. Pekic-Quarrie, Sofija (Professor, University of Belgrade)
38. Polak, Milan (ADA-office)
39. Ponjavic, Ivana (former BCC-participant)
40. Radomirovic, Milena (Ministry of Finance)
41. Santrac, Peter (Professor, University of Novi Sad)
42. Sekerus, Pavle (Prorector, University of Novi Sad)
43. Sijaric, Dzemil (student)
44. Stojanovic, Jelica (EU-Delegation)
45. Subotic, Milica (University of Arts, int. relations officer)
46. Turajlic, Srbijanka (CEP)
47. Wagner, Wolfgang (Austrian Embassy)
48. Wiesinger, Barbara (Österreich-Institut)

14.2 Schedule of field-trip

So – 14 March				
Arrival in Belgrade				
13.00-15.00 Briefing with local consultant				
Mo – 15 March				
	09.00 – 10.30	Kobü Belgrade	Meeting	Klaus Kapper
	11.00-12.00	University of Belgrade, Rectorate	Meeting	Mr. Branko Kovacevic, rector
	12.30-13.30	University of Belgrade	Meeting	Bojana Bursac, int. relations officer
	19.30	Restaurant Madera	Dinner	Representatives from Slovakiaid, GTZ, SIDA, Czech embassy, Kobü Belgrade
Tue – 16 March				
	11.45-12.45	Ministry for Education	Meeting	Radivoje Mitrovic, State Minister
	13.00-	Swiss Development Cooperation	Meeting	Beatrice Meyer, director

	14.00			
	14.30-15.30	University of Belgrade	Meeting	Tanja Cirkovic-Velickovic, professor
	16.00-17.00	University of Arts, Belgrade	Meeting	Dubravka Jovicic, Milica Subotic, dean and int. relat. Officer.

Wed – 17 March

	9.00-10.00	Ministry of Finance	Meeting	Gordana Lazarevic, Milena Radomirovic
	10.30-12.00	WUS Belgrade	Meeting	Goran Ostojic, director
	12.00-16.00	WUS Belgrade	Document study	
	16.00-17.00	University of Belgrade	Meeting	Sofija Pekic Quarrie, professor

Thu – 18 March

	7.30	Trip to Novi Sad		
	9.00-10.00	University of Novi Sad	Meeting	Petar Santrac, professor
	10.15-11.15	University of Novi Sad	Meeting	Pavle Sekerus, prorector
	11.30-12.30	University of Novi Sad	Meeting	Veljko Malbasa, professor
	14.00-15.00	Hotel Aleksandar	Meeting	Christian Guggenberger, consultant, IRDP

Fri – 19 March

	9.00-10.00	Austrian Embassy	Meeting	Wolfgang Wagner, vice-ambassador
	10.30-11.30	CEP	Meeting	Srbijanka Turajlic, director
	12.00-13.00	Accreditation Commission	Meeting	Vera Kovacevic-Vujcic, head
	13.30-14.30	Tempus-office	Meeting	Marija Filipovic-Ozegovic, Sofija Dukic
	15.00-16.00	EU-Delegation	Meeting	Jelica Stojanovic, project manager
	16.30-17.30	KoBü Belgrade	De-briefing	Klaus Kapper

Sa – 20 March

Report writing

So – 21 March

Report writing, trip to Novi Pazar

Mo – 22 March

	9.00-10.00	University of Novi Pazar	Meeting	Cemal Dolicanin, rector Branislav Miric, prorector
	10.00-11.00	University of Novi Pazar	Meeting	Students
	11.30-12.30	Lunch		Cemal Dolicanin
	12.30	Departure to Kragujevac		
	14.30-15.30	University of Kragujevac	Meeting	Zivadin Bugarcic, pro-rector
	15.30-	University of Kragujevac	Meeting	Radojka Krneta, professor

	16.30			
	16.30-17.30	University of Kragujevac	Meeting	Milan Matijevic, prodean Miladin Stefanovic, professor

Tue – 23 March

	9.00-10.00	University of Kragujevac	Meeting	Nenad Grujovic, professor
	10.00	Departure to Nis		
	13.00-14.00	University of Nis	Meeting	Tomislav Pavlovic, professor
	14.00-15.00	University of Nis	Meeting	Miroљub Grozdanovic, rector
	15.00-16.00	University of Nis	Meeting	Dragan Janovic, professor
	16.00	Departure to Belgrade		

Wed – 23 March

	9.00-10.00	Ministry of Science	Meeting	Viktor Nedovic, assistant minister Radoslav Cerovic, assistant minister
	11.30-12.30	Österreich Institut	Meeting	Barbara Wiesinger, director
	14.30-15.30	Zoran-Djindjic-Foundation	Meeting	Ruzica Djindjic, director Sasa Markovic, CIM staff
	17.15-18.15	Hotel Majestic	Meeting	Former participants BCC

Thu – 24 March

	9.00-10.00	University of Belgrade Career Service	Meeting	Dejana Lazic, head of office
	10.30	Departure		

Cancellation Serbia:

16.03.2010 10.30 – 11.30 Mrs. Ivana ALEKSIĆ, World Bank, due to illness

14.3 List of documents and publications

General Documents

ADA: Leitfaden für Projekt- und Programmevaluierungen, Wien 2008

ADA: Higher Education and Scientific Cooperation. Strategy. Wien 2009.

ADA: Umsetzungsmatrix zur Hochschulstrategie 2009

ADA: Formatvorlage Country strategies (02b Formatvorlage Länderstrategie 20090116.doc)

ADA: OEZA – Qualitätskriterien Glossar. Wien o. J.

ADA: OEZA – Qualitätskriterien Armutsminderung. Wien o. J.

ADA: OEZA – Qualitätskriterien Bildung. Wien o. J.

ADA: OEZA – Qualitätskriterien Gender-sensitive Entwicklungszusammenarbeit. Wien o. J.

ADA: OEZA – Qualitätskriterien Kapazitätsentwicklung. Wien o. J.

ADA: Allgemeininformation zur Österreichischen Entwicklungszusammenarbeit (OEZA) bzw. Austrian Development Agency (ADA), Power Point Presentation, Wien o. J.

ADA: Allgemeininformation zum OEZA Bildungssektor. Power Point Presentation, Wien o. J.

ADA: Ausschreibungsunterlage (Aufforderung zur Angebotsabgabe) für das Verhandlungsverfahren nach dem Bundesvergabegesetz 2006 zum OEZA-Projekt „Evaluierung Hochschulbildung in Nicaragua und Südosteuropa 2005-2009“. Wien 2009.

ÖSB Consulting/ L&R Sozialforschung: Bildungssektorevaluierung 2007 (inkl. Länderberichte)

Serbia

Short project descriptions and short internal comments are not documented here.

ADA: Serbia Country Programme 2006-2008, Vienna 2006

ADA: Länderinformation Serbien, Wien 2008

ADA: Strategie Hochschulbildung, Wien 2009

ADA Kooperationsbüro Belgrad: Quartalsberichte 4/2008, 1-4/2009, Belgrad 2009/2010

ADA: Projektdokumentation Bosnien und Montenegro (inkl. Evaluierung)

KEK/CDC: Country Programme Evaluation 2006-2008, Zurich 2008

Ministry of Science and Technological Development: STRATEGY of Scientific and Technological Development of the Republic of Serbia 2010-2015

Österreich-Institut: LEISTUNGSBESCHREIBUNG / PROJEKTDOKUMENT

zu EZA-Vertrag, o. O., o. J.

Verhandlungssicheres Deutsch für Studierende der Ökonomischen Fakultät der Universität Belgrad

Österreich-Institut: "Verhandlungssicheres Deutsch", Zwischenbericht, Wien 2009

ÖSB/LR: Evaluation of the Education Sector of Austrian Development Cooperation and Cooperation with South-East Europe, Wien 2007

WIIW: Positionierung der österreichischen bilateralen Ostzusammenarbeit 2008-2015, Wien 2007

WUS: Support to the Higher Education in Serbia and Montenegro. Project proposal 2005 – 2007, Graz 2005

WUS: Experiencing Europe: Serbian Young Professionals in Austria – The Zoran Djindjic Internship Programme, Application, Graz 2007

WUS: Experiencing Europe 2008-2011, Application, Belgrade 2005

WUS: Experiencing Europe 2008-2011, Zwischenbericht, Graz 2008

WUS: Support to universities in Serbia and Montenegro 2005-2007, mid-term-report, Graz 2006

WUS: Support to universities in Serbia and Montenegro 2005-2007, final report, Graz 2008