STAND – Analysis of the State of Play Workshop

WORK PACKAGE	WP1 – Activity 1.3. Workshop on adaptation of methodology for Autonomy Scorecard Assessment in WB partners
TYPE OF MEETING	Training - Seminar
FACILITATOR	POLIS University, Tirana, Albania
NOTE TAKER	Alfia Urazaeva
INSTITUTION	IBC-M
PRESENCE	Virtual

Agenda topics

10:00 – 10:10H	**WELCOME**	**MIHONE KEROLLI/IBC-M ELONA KARAFILI/POLIS**
DISCUSSION		

Flora Krasniqi welcomed everyone and opened the event.
Elona Karafili/Deputy Rector welcomed the participants and introduced the topic of the event: University Autonomy.
University Autonomy is very important, we are looking forward to work on effective models of university autonomy, which will suit all the needs. We look forward to the workshop, to understand the scorecard and standards to meet the requirements.

Mihone Kerolli/Project Manager thanked POLIS for hosting the workshop and greeted all the participants of the event, expressing satisfaction with the Western Balkans partners who were able to arrive to the workshop physically and thanked who joined online. Hybrid version seemed the only possibility now to proceed with the project activities, without delaying them. Elona has already stressed the importance of the project, we thank Enora and Thomas for the detailed Agenda.
Partners introduced themselves.
(Attached presence list).

10:10 – 10:30H	**INTRODUCTION TO THE SEMINAR OVERVIEW OF THE PROCESS: FROM METHODOLOGY DEVELOPMENT TO POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS**	**ENORA PRUVOT THOMAS ESTERMAN/EUA**
DISCUSSION		

The European University Association welcomes the STAND consortium to a training seminar on university autonomy analysis, hosted by POLIS in Tirana, Albania. The seminar will address the rationale for university autonomy, including benefits and structural conditions, in a comparative perspective based on European benchmarking. Consortium partners will be trained in regulatory framework data collection and analysis in order to achieve a detailed overview of institutional autonomy of universities in STAND countries, structured according to the EUA University Autonomy Scorecard. The seminar will enable participants to become

multipliers and raise awareness about and communicate on the benefits of university autonomy in their institutions and in the sector. Capacity building and dissemination are therefore two core objectives of the seminar, with the perspective of enhancing ownership and take-up of the reform process within the STAND countries university sector.

EUA: We will show everyone key elements of the autonomy. Second objectives: get familiar with the state of autonomy in Europe, so you understand where your institution fits.
At later stage, we will discuss methodology, we will go through different elements and structure.
Tomorrow we will get familiar with the data collection process, where this data collection will lead, to better describe the state of play of your institution autonomy.
We will discuss the quality related aspects as well. This is a rough structure of the workshop.
First part will be presentation, questions, and we will have workshops.
The structure we foresee is based on university autonomy scorecard. In the last 15 years we worked on this. Scorecard is a toll that was used in many occasions and purposes, but we want to discuss 2 key success cards:
It makes institutional autonomy and accountability making it more concrete, scorecard and structure allows to go beyond discussion do we have autonomy and accountability or not, but allows deeper discussions and exchanges. Looking back at 15 years of work we see lots of achievements.
Second key success is that we used it in many different reforms in the higher education, on national levels EU level. Process where you don't just look at development and legal structure, but you look at it from different aspects. We have experience at looking at systems which a bit different from EU (Kazakhstan, Moldova experience).
STAND project, this workshop is a basis of WP2. To understand what is the state of play in your instutuions and what are the key reform elements you need to achieve.
We will use experience from methodology we have with some adaptations.
This is a process that takes several years to reach. We will not go into detailed scoring.
We will do simplified version.
Second thing we will do differently, we will not do evaluation from our side, but all partners will carry it out themselves. And this is where we step in showing you methodology on how to do it.
This will allow you to understand approach and reform agenda.
We will have several other activities to come to this evaluation.
Enora started the presentation: happy that participants compositions is so different
Some ideas will be repetitive, but we do this on purpose, to ensure proper understanding
The Autonomy Score card presentation:
I (Presentation attached), discussions on why University Autonomy is needed.
Do we need university autonomy? Maybe better to control?
Correlation between autonomy and:
- Performance
- Quality
- Degrees of income diversification
- Successful internationalization

Autonomy will not do it, but will lead to it.
Institutional autonomy:
Enables universities to determine and pursue strategic priorities according to their strength;

Requirements for increased autonomy:

- Strong and informed leadership
- Appropriate organizational structure
- Appropriate institutional governance and involvement of stakeholders
- Staff professionalization

The EUA University Autonomy Scorecard
A unique tool covering 29 higher educational systems across Europe:
-Development supported by the EU
-Monitoring university autonomy in 4 dimensions
-Scoring and ranking systems for public universities
-Country specific comparison and benchmarking
-Structured policy dialogue, high level events
-Long term projects (i.e ATHENA, TRUNAK)

Erasmus and Tempus projects can go so far, but we can give clues to the Ministries.
The scorecard is only the beginning of the journey for STAND.
You will need to work move along the road map. To actually equip universities with what they need.Ministries support is especially needed from the Ministries side.

We give attention to 4 elements:
-Organization dimension (leadership, governance, structure, ability to create legal entities (spin offs etc.)
-Financial dimension (how is the funding allocated, do institutions have move to maneuver, do you have your own buildings, tuition fees (who decides, public authority, can you collect or not).
-Staffing dimension (which sometimes make up to 60% of costs of the HEI), recruitment procedures, are they civil servants like in many EU countries, or hired, dismissals etc.
-Academic autonomy (it is not so much about academic freedom, its more about students' admission, language of instruction, quality assurance, selecting QA mechanisms, study programs content design).

Key Enablers:
-Organizational (strategic performance, strategic planning, leadership engagement etc.)
 (refer to presentation)

Organizational Autonomy
We will discuss from different aspects so we start thinking where your university stands.
After each dimension we will have a discussion on how it is in your HEI.
Question to discuss why we chose these key enablers, why we chose them, this was based on long discussions with the representatives from HEIs, education sector.

We will present each dimension separately, but there is a link between each dimension.
Across Europe we have different structures, with some dimensions stronger, some weaker.

Discussion of the first indicator:

-Executive head selection criteria
-In 10 systems it is up to university, in 19 it is up to set qualifications
-The law specifies selection criteria in 65% of HEI.
-Executive head appointment

-Public authorities intervene with different of formality in 40% of the systems. In 17 no external validation (internal appointment) in 12 formal validations for an external authority
-Selection of the leadership
The selection procedures for the rector are usually set in law but are essentially internal to the university
-Elected by a specific electoral body
-Elected by the senate-type governing body
-Appointed by the council/board
-Appointed throw two steps

Executive leadership accountability
-Towards university governance bodies
-Usually option for governance bodies to express no-confidence and call for selection/election of new executive leader according to process set out in university

There are different governance structures
Three models co-exist in Europe
1. Unitary governance structure
2. Dual governance structure "traditional model"
3. Dual governance structures "asymmetric model" (development in some structures, where they were transformed, one government body which makes decision)
(add from the presentation)
Board type bodies are twice more frequent

Composition of governing bodies:
-different kinds of regulations, possibly cumulative
-the type of governing body/bodies maybe prescribed-still a common feature in most higher education systems of Europe

University inclusiveness (refer to presentation)
Selection of external members in governing bodies
How do external embers get into governing bodes, not a question should they be there or not, but how they are appointed.
There are variety of models (6 models):
1. University can appoint external members
2. University cannot appoint external members themselves but make proposals
3. Universities can appoint part of external member
4. Universities do not control the external members appointment processes
5. Other appointment processes
6. Universities cannot include external members

Types of external members

Most frequently represented group comes from industry and businesses
But not necessarily highest share
Followed by national and local authorities(requirement or tradition, with or without voting rights)
3rd group: academic staff from other universities
Alumni are least often represented

<u>External members roles and competences:</u> they provide input into strategic development, they provide from other sectors, they build bridges with the partners (networking); accountability aspect (people who represent societies, for example governments who give autonomy, but still want to have a government representative).
They should have university knowledge, skills, etc

Organizational Autonomy is changing throughout countries (some have it increased, some decreased, stable).

Ranking is done within 4 groups:
High (100%)
Medium (61 to 80%)
Medium Lo2 (41 to 60%
Low (0 to 40%) (Luxemburg, it has only 1 university, so it is very regulated)

Financial Autonomy
How money gets into HIE and what you do with it.
Internal funding allocation: Nearly, half of the systems are still imposing restrictions, limiting the scope for strategic resource allocation
Majority (16) have no restrictions in allocating funding
9 have limited /no possibility to shift funds across broad categories
3-line item budget and block grant type

Other aspect: can you borrow money? How can you get additional funding? Mostly government dont like this. Some systems in Austria, Estonia or Finland it is possible to borrow.
Normally they can borrow but with restrictions.

Ownership of real estate: universities generally can own their buildings in principle vs Universities cannot own (22/7)
Capacity to sell real estate (many won historically significant buildings, so of course there are restrictions). Only ¼ of systems do not impose restrictions to universities on the sale.

Tuition fees for national Bachelor students (strongly regulated area but different models)
-Majority may not charge fees
-Fees set up externally
-fees set up freely
-Universities cooperate with external authorities
-Universities set fees under an extremely set ceiling

Tuition fees for International students (Bachelor and Masters): more diversity, evolving picture and policy experimentation

Financial autonomy trends:
-More systems resort to multi annual financial planning, although maintain annual allocation of funds
-Worrying trends linked to allocation of scarce resources
-Increased earmarking of public finds, budget cuts reducing university autonomy
-Persistence of measures taken in the context of the economic crisis-more constrained regulatory framework

Financial Stability from 2010 (majority are stable).
Financial autonomy scoring (majority is medium low (41to 61%)

Staffing Autonomy
Complex dimension, there are 4 indicators (staff recruitment, staff salaries, career development, staffing autonomy trends)
Staff Recruitment (recruitment of senior academic staff remains heavily regulated).
Staff salaries) universities are rarely able to decide autonomously on salaries, especially for academic staff).
Career Development (restrictions often apply for promotions-higher posts must be available, the composition of the committee is prescribed by law).

Staffing-autonomy trends (rather stable dimension, restrictions most often in salary setting or dismissal, half of the systems have civil servants statuis for a majority of senior university staff).

Staffing autonomy since 2010 in majority of countries is stable, in some has increased and in small amounts j-has decreased.
Switzerland is one of the example with the high score in staffing dimension.

Trends:
-Rather stable dimension
-Restrictions most often in salary setting or dismissal
-Half of the systems have civil servant status for a majority of senior university staff, but tendency of phasing out in several countries
-Employment modalities of senior academic staff tend to be more regulated than those of senior administrative staff
-The economic crisis continues to affect staffing policies

Academic autonomy dimension
Students admission, programs, quality assurance mechanisms.
Overall students' numbers (continued plurality of models, pressure on free admission, negotiation most frequent option)
-Exclusive decision of the universities
-University decide on the number of free-paying students while external authority defines the numbers of state-funded study practices
-University negotiate the numbers
(add from slide)
Admission criteria at Bachelor level (universities are exclusively responsible for admission in less than 1/3 of the systems)
Admission criteria at Master level (great autonomy for universities in students selection).
Introduction of new degrees programs (some are engaged in a transition away from program accreditation): (8) quarter of Universities can do it without accreditation,
 9 have to accredit.

Language of instruction (are universities free to choose their language of instruction?) generally speaking there is a freedom for universities to introduce programs in different languages. Flemish for example can introduce in French or English language, but they have to follow regulations.

Choice of quality assurance provider: the creation of national QA agency in some countries limits previously existing options for universities (majority (21) universities cannot choose the quality assurance agency.

Academic-autonomy trends:

-Different models to determine overall student numbers; pressures on free admission
-Accreditation systems are in transition in a series of countries
-Greater number of positive developments in comparison to the other autonomy dimensions
-Universities in Europe still have little freedom in choosing QA mechanisms or providers

MINUTES   06 MAY 2021   TIME: 12:00 – 13:30   LOCATION: TIRANA

WORK PACKAGE	WP1 – Activity 1.3
TYPE OF MEETING	Training - Seminar
FACILITATOR	POLIS University, Tirana, Albania
NOTE TAKER	Damir Gashi
INSTITUTION	IBC-M
PRESENCE	Virtual

Agenda topics

12:00 – 13:30H	ADAPTATION OF METHODOLOGY TO STAND NEEDS & OBJECTIVES	EUA DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF GOVERNANCE, FUNDING AND POLICY DEVELOPMENT, MS. ENORA BENNETOT PRUVOT PRUVOT, THOMAS ESTERMANN/EUA

DISCUSSION	

EUA (European University Association) Director of Governance, Funding and Policy Development, Mr. Thomas Estermann began the session by discussing how the EU partners are set in different dimensions in terms of institutional autonomy, saying that there is not just a single model, but rather different models depending on the context of the region and that it is expected from universities to maneuver and find their way through.

In order to successfully engage in an autonomy reform, HEIs need a well-defined plan with clearly defined responsibilities. it is also important to involve the whole university community as it will have an important impact on the implementation process later on. Another important element or to say crucial is the leadership commitment as the institutional leaders need to engage on both system and institutional level. Another important aspect that we need skilled human resources in this process is, and the capacity of different systems, such as ownership of the property/buildings and its relations to the

staff aspects. Also, it is important to evaluate and review procedures, see what works out the best for each partner institution, and a communication and coordination throughout the project.

Why are all of these elements important? Well, that's because the autonomy and governance reforms are a major change process, a transformation, even though in some cases it comes down to fine tuning but still, this may not be not be seen as a good thing for many universities and their employees, because many won't be satisfied with the changes, there will be some sort of resistance for various reasons, due to different expectations, fear of losing positions, statuses etc. and therefore it is very important to have a transparent reform process.

People within the community need to know what's in it for learning, teaching, research activities, would it help improving the quality of education, and therefore we need to set out the vision, timeframe, explain what are the benefits of transformation, what are its aims and procedures that need to be taken during process.
Who is responsible, and who are the actors in this process? Leadership, key agents, researchers that are well connected and have good standing within the institution. Also, there are so called multipliers, which in the STAND project are those who are involved in the project but also those outside who can help in establishing other communication channels.

Mr. Thomas Estermann emphasized that the coordination is very important because the autonomy and governance reforms take more than just a day, it takes some time for HEIs to reform their processes with lots of actors and elements involved. Legal changes at system level are one aspect that needs to be looked at, but also there needs to be changes at the institutional level, like changes of the institutional statute, and changes in management itself.
Implementation here is the key, of course, not right now at the beginning of the STAND project, but according to our experience this is the challenge many partner institutions encountered.

Mr. Thomas Estermann provided an example of what should STAND local partners look in for when identifying the key aspects of reform processes:
1. Who are the actors at national level?
2. Who are actors at sector level?
3. Which reform processes are ongoing?
4. Are those shaping the reform processes involved in STAND? Who from outside needs to be involved?
5. How can you achieve a coordinated sector view?
6. How can you engage at institutional level?
7. What are the elements to communicate at institutional level?
8. How can each partner communicate internally?
9. Communication/dissemination strategy

All these elements are supposed to coordinate, communicate and provide a strategic plan on where you want your institution to go, and it will be important to have it in mind throughout the process.

EUA Deputy Director of Governance, Funding and Policy Development, Ms. Enora Bennetot Pruvot further discussed the methodology on how to get to a clear path in adoption of framework for the STAND project through a questionnaire.

The survey on autonomy indicators will be conducted in 2 stages. First of all partner institutions will have to contact their respective Ministries and discuss from their point of view the legal framework. Also, we will have to ask the universities about their practice for each of the indicators mentioned. We will have two sets of responds per country: ministries' response and the average universities' response.

In the next stage, we will assess whether there is an alignment between the framework and the practice or not, because our past experience tells us that there may be a discrepancy between the framework and the practice.

Then finally we have to assess the level of autonomy the university has in the given system per each indicator.

Ms. Enora Pruvot then presented an Excel Dashboard document, which the partner institutions will use during the data collection process. There will be a document per country, as per indicators, the idea is that indicators are divided into dimensions, and every dimension has questions with the response options.

Step 1 - concerns the "selection criteria for executive head" where both ministries and the universities will have to respond to this question.

Step 2 – is about description of regulatory provisions, for example "*Rector must hold an academic position, have higher education (but no PhD requirement) and must have work experience in senior positions for 5 years".*

Step 3 – is about the institutional practice, where universities get together and discuss the indicators and answer.

Once we collect the data and check for inconsistencies, we then go to the next step:

Step 4 – This is where you will have to assess whether the practice and regulations are aligned or not.

Step 5 – In this step we have to provide a comparative assessment on regulations: whether the regulations allow the autonomy or not, or the framework needs to be adapted.

Datasets need to be collected on national level for Kosovo, Albania and Montenegro.

We will have to liaise with the Ministry and explain them what we are trying to achieve and get a response from them.

A University Task Force per country will be established whose purpose will be to collect data on university institutional practice, where universities will meet and assess on alignment between regulations and practice and provide coordinated response. The aim here is for us to get one coordinated response per country, and identify differences in institutional practice, when universities do things differently even though they are not supposed to and the regulations are very clear, but universities approach things slightly differently. So, the university task force groups will have an insight into issues and see what matters, what is relevant or not. The descriptions should be as clear and honest as possible, and we as partners involved in this project, need to understand when there will be a real mismatch between regulations and the practice.

Time is limited and its up to participants to decide how to approach the Ministries and maybe at the same time run it in parallel with your institutions, or sequentially, it would be up to you to manage your time.

Ms. Enora Pruvot said that she will share the dashboard as a Word document to the participants, but the dashboard in Excel will be sent to group coordinators. Surveys should be filled in by June 2021. We are going to assist in understanding the questions and provide previous examples of similar actions with other countries.

Online meetings will also be organized so that we are in line with the progress and up to date with the quality assurance standards. We can ensure the quality of this whole process by involving the ministries, because in the past we involved only universities in institutional level but we understood that it is important to involve ministries as well, then through regulatory provisions and legal documentation, to a so-called source documentation.

On the universities side, since we'll be working in groups it will be easier to coordinate the responses and to get the realistic ones. Then we have the collection and validation, and we'll be at your disposal for all of your questions throughout the entire process.

Tomorrow we'll go through the questionnaire in details, to show you its structure, focusing on the 3 elements of organizational autonomy, and the important things is that this morning Mr. Thomas and I have decided to present you with lots of data including qualitative information that actually weren't in the survey, and here we are going to focus on what the regulatory framework says about this element.

We have added two extra components, because we wanted to have a complete picture of the situation, and you'll notice that we asked for some contextual information, because in case we have under-resourced universities and you give them lots of autonomy, still they might not be able to thrive. So, this contextual information is to be filled by the universities. The second component is the information about governance, and this is where we discuss about your universities, whether you have a senate or a board, how many members in those etc.

Second part of the day is reserved for the actual workshop and the group work, so that we can integrate these information, make decisions etc.

Mr. Thomas Estemann then asked the participants if they have any questions about what was said so far.

Vice-rector of POLIS University Ms. Elona Karafili said that obviously EUA is very experienced with this matter, and that they have developed a systematic approach to it, and expressed the concern that the ministries might respond in uniformed manner, reluctantly providing sincere answers to our questions. Ms. Elona Karafili also asked the EUA representatives to share their experience on the legal framework in Eastern Europe, and have they ever witnessed that a legal framework actually supported the autonomy of HEIs.

Mr. Thomas Estermann responded by saying, yes, there are different levels and different degrees of autonomy in Eastern Europe, but that doesn't necessarily mean a lack of autonomy in staffing, but on the other hand, and especially in the Eastern Europe, there are systems that are underfunded making it difficult to implement. In theory, one can offer higher salaries to researchers for example, but in practice you can't provide such salaries because you don't have the enough funding at your disposal.

Ms. Elona Karafili emphasized that in Eastern Europe HEIs need to find a balance and usually there is not much time to find this equilibrium, and this discussion and a need for reforms came just in time. As far as she was aware, in terms of reporting on HEI current status in Albania and Kosovo, there's been lots of development and discussions lately, and this topic of the autonomy is considered as valuable.

There are laws and legal framework but when it comes to implementation of laws, this is where the problems appear.

Mr. Thomas Estermann mentioned that this is crucial, and that's why we have this discussion and exchange of experience, there are variety of laws developed over a substantial period of time, and different developments took place that we've witnessed in many systems, and this is not the case only in the Western Balkans, but also with other

parts in Europe. So, it is important to develop a roadmap, to have something as a starting ground, something to work with and go back if needed.

Mr. Thomas Estermann provided an example of their cooperation in drafting a roadmap with partners in Armenia, who developed a roadmap with very long perspectives, and in two weeks he'll be going back to Armenia to check on the progress, where, so far, several aspects have been addressed, while many others are still being open. This is in fact a very common ground.

EUA Deputy Director of Governance, Funding and Policy Development, Ms. Enora Bennetot Pruvot said that by her previous experience, for instance Poland is going through a reform process, with their system being enormous, and they are doing interesting thing, but also similar size systems in Slovenia and Estonia, reforms into benchmarking, international advise and opinions etc.

Prof. Jelena Djokic from IBC-M asked the EUA representatives to clarify for participants about the overview of the methodology, precisely the part titled "Description of practice by sector"? What is implied by "sector"?
EUA Deputy Director of Governance, Funding and Policy Development, Ms. Enora Bennetot Pruvot replied that what they meant here by sector was in general the university sector representatives, so it is a terminology that originates from the fact that the scorecard was developed with national rector conferences of each country, the highest universities bodies comprised of university leaders, knowledgeable enough to discuss in an anonymous way to get a response on how each indicator is addressed by universities in general.
We are looking to stay at the level of general university practice. We are aware that there are systems in which the faculties are almost autonomous within universities, and that they might have different practices, but we won't be going into that much details, because it could become extraordinary complex than draw conclusions. University sector means universities together.

Mr. Thomas Estermann added that partners in the workshop today should also think about who can they bring on board to be able to provide answers to different dimensions for the different indicators, as you may need a group of several persons to provide you with information requested in different topics, such as for example the dimension on financial autonomy, where specifically you may need someone from the Finance department to clarify and provide answers.
It is an iterative process, and the challenge here is obviously the timeline, but we will address it in the afternoon.

Prof. Bujar Pira from Ferizaj University posed a question to EUA about the alignment between the universities and the legal framework, how do they consider the fact that many universities' statutes were adopted by the parliament, not internally adopted by the institution itself, and as such those are a sort of legal document.

Mr. Thomas Estermann replied that what is important here is that we have a detailed description of these processes, we have a diversity of systems where the universities statute is a document drafted and adopted only by an institution itself, that doesn't need to be verified or approved by an external body, if this is the case then we can safely say that this institution is autonomous in that regard. We need to see the extent of involvement of external bodies, a parliament in a case you provided, and there is no clear answer in how to deal with such situation, and the best way would be for you to describe and evaluate your

current autonomy situation, what is the level of control you have as an institution on the aspects included in the university statute, and what is the level of external influence and control.

Ms. Enora Pruvot added that in case there is a severe influence and control coming from outside then your statute is considered as almost equivalent to a legal regulation, then of course the alignment issue might disappear, and that might basically just simplify the assessment.

Head of Scientific Research Unit at the University of Tirana, Ledjon Shahini expressed a concern that the differences in institutional autonomy within each country will be too high, creating a space for discrepancies between indicators or concrete metadata required for indicators.

Mr. Thomas Estermann replied that the important part will be how do partners provide information, the survey has ticking options and description section in details, both from legal and practice aspect, and this is where we would understand whether the practices are different for institutions, even though they are under the same legal framework. This is something that I would suggest that once you have everything defined, that you address it all back to us so that we could give you feedback on what looks good and solid and what needs to be improved. This is a process that will last, we certainly won't be able to define it all today at this workshop, we need to witness how the project will develop and be part of the process.

MINUTES   06 MAY 2021   TIME: 14:30 – 16:30   LOCATION: TIRANA

WORK PACKAGE	WP1 – Activity 1.3
TYPE OF MEETING	Training - Seminar
FACILITATOR	POLIS University, Tirana, Albania
NOTE TAKER	Gresa Ferri
INSTITUTION	IBC-M
PRESENCE	Virtual

Agenda topics

14:30 – 16:30H	ORGANISING THE DATA COLLECTION PROCESS: DEFINING ROLES, PROCESS AND TIMELINE & GROUP WORK DISCUSSION	EUA, ASSISTED BY BUJAR GALLOPENI, JELENA DJOKIC, MIHONE KEROLLI, FLORA KRASNIQI

DISCUSSION	
- Group Work discussion Group from Albania led by Flora Krasniqi Group from Montenegro led by Jelena Djokic Group from Kosovo led by Bujar Gallopeni	

- Discussion on the separate systems, how those systems can be organized within institutions.

For each system, proposed questions for discussion:

Step 1. Liaison with the Ministry
Who is responsible to liaise with Ministry and collect responses?
Who should be contacted in the Ministry?
Who is responsible to collect relevant legal document?

Step 2. University Taskforce
Who is part of the University taskforce? Who is responsible to coordinate the taskforce?
Who outside of the consortium should be included?
Who is responsible to set up taskforce meetings? Separate meetings for each dimension? + Geneal consensus meetings to validate the response?

Step 3. Overall process
Who is responsible to collapse the data for each system in the dashboard?
Who is responsible to check that everyone is on track with their tasks?

The idea is to discuss and decide on the responsibilities, in the cases where participants present can't take decisions right away, they will have more time to coordinate with their institutions.

Another aspect, to be decided who is going to collect the legal documents. It is also interesting to discuss the approach towards the ministries, if it is important for the EUA to join the meetings with the ministries or not.

University Autonomy taskforce: TBD who is going to be part of the group, ideally the partners of that country.
One person should be responsible to coordinate groups.
Timeframe should be decided and scheduled, Consensus final meeting to be scheduled to make sure all agree on the final picture.

Important: Names and deadlines do be set. Deadlines do not have to be the same for each three countries: Kosovo, Albania and Montenegro.

Feedback from discussion:

Montenegro Group presented by Jelena Djokic:

Step 1: Liaison with Ministry

Vice rector for academic affairs is responsible to liaise with Ministry and collect response.

Director of the Directorate for higher education should be contacted in Ministry.

Vice dean for academic affairs will be responsible to collect relevant legal documents. 12.05.20121

Step 2: University task force

Vice rector for academic affairs, Vice rector for science and research, The head of Finance, General Secretary of the University and the head of Scientific Board, are part of the university Task force.

Vice rector academic affairs will be responsible to coordinate the task force. Members of the Supervisory Board from external stakeholders should be included as well, The head of Scientific

Board. He will also call for the Task force meetings, on 15.06.2021. As the University of Montenegro is the only public university, general consensus is not under question.

Step 3: Overall process

The office for international affairs will fill the data, under the supervision and responsibility of the Vice Rector. As a Task force coordinator, he will also check that everyone is on track with their tasks. 10.07.2021.

Kosovo Group presented by Bujar Gallopeni:

Step 1: Liaison with Ministries

IBCM to coordinate the process with the ministries.
Proposed date for meetings to be coordinated with the ministry. Approx: Mid June

Step 2: University Task Force

Facilitator for the provess: University of Prishtina

Vice Rectors from each university will be responsible
General Secretary
Student Representative
Representative of Parliamentary Commission for Education

To be included: 5 partners that are part of the project, plus 3 more who are not part of the project one student representative from each partner.
Procedure:
1.Each representative of partner university will fill out the first draft of needs assessment at university level, latest by 30th of May.
2. The coordinator/ facilitator will merge a single draft, deadline 10th of June
3. A joint workshop to validate the dashboard - 15-16th of June in UASF.

Step 3. Overall Process
IBCM Team (Bujar, Mihone, Alfia) will be responsible for monitoring and coordinating the activities for Kosovo's assessment process.

Deadlines: Step 1: TBD (Mid June)
             Step 2: 20th of June
             Step 3: 30th of June
             Final Draft: 15th of July, 2021

Albania group:

Step 1: Liaison with Ministry
Polis University will be responsible to liaise with the Ministry and collect the responses

Step 2: University Taskforce
Albanian taskforce will consist of one representative from UT (Ledjon Shahini, head of Scientific Research and Projects Unit) and ose representative from UMAD (Renata Tokrri, Vice Rector for Academic Affairs) Ledjon will be responsible to coordinate the task force.

Albania would be willing to include in the process other public universities, such as University of Elbasan, University of Shkodra. Hopefully they will accept the invitation and provide the required information.

Ledjon is responsible to set up taskforce meetings. We plan to organize organize meetings to discuss about all four dimensions and not separate meeting for each dimension. Also, we think of holding a general consensus meeting if the collected responses do not met with one another.
a. Deadline for the first meeting: June 15th
b. Deadline for the 2nd meeting: June 22nd
c. Consensus meeting (if necessary) June 29th

Step 3: Overall Process

1. University of Tirana (Ledjon Shahini) responsible for collecting the data into the dashboard.
2. University Aleksander Moisiu (Renata Tokrri) is responsible to check if all are on track with the tasks.