

MINUTES *from* Second Steering Committee Meeting

Date: October 30, 2018

Venue: University of Bihac, Bosnia and Herzegovina

Participants: Amra Tuzovic, Selma Seta (University of Travnik); Marko Antonio Brkic (Herzegovina University); Mirjana Stojanovic (Independent University Banja Luka); Nijaz Skender (University of Bihac); Vesna Susac (University of Mostar); Ljiljana Kovac (Association of Preschool Employees); Karolina Kardas (Manchester Metropolitan University); Zuzana Lynch (Matej Bel University); Dan Grigore Iordachescu (University of Alba Iulia)

The Second Steering Committee Meeting (SCM) was held on October 30, 2018 at the University of Bihac, Bosnia and Herzegovina. According to the Agenda of the Meeting, registration for participants was between 11.45 – 12.00 hours.

The Meeting officially started at 12.00. At the beginning of the meeting, project coordinator Selma Seta welcomed all participants and shortly presented the Agenda of SCM. She suggested to slightly change agenda and firstly to discuss Mid Term Report, so there would be enough time for discussion on WP 5 and Accreditation Process.

1. Mid Term Report

She said that feedback from Brussels was officially received on October 1, 2018. According to the categories of qualification, TEACHER project and its implementation has been qualified as GOOD. The project progress is in accordance with its original work programme and timetable but some improvements could be made. The overall implementation of the

project is good and, on a track, but the achievement of the project results and main objective is jeopardized by external factor. The process of accreditation of the study programs in Bosnia and Herzegovina has not yet started and there is no information as to when this process will start. As a result, the study programs developed in the framework of the TEACHER project are put at risk. This is main reason why the implementation of the TEACHER project is not on the top level.

She stated that the project was assessed through four categories: Relevance, Quality of project design and implementation, Quality of the project team and cooperation arrangements, Impact and dissemination. She presented each category, comments and recommendations from EACEA on TEACHER project implementation.

2. Accreditation Process

Due to the fact that implementation of the project is put at risk, rest of the meeting was dedicated to the implementation of the WP 5 and the Accreditation process. Considering that the EU partners were not included enough when it comes to the accreditation (this activity mostly connected to BH partners), Project Coordinator explained to EU partners all accreditation activities undertaken in the previous period.

She explained to the partners that based on the report, Brussels wanted further consideration of the Accreditation because they considered the project to be endangered. After several emails and telephone conversations with Project Officer from Brussels, it was concluded that the Quality Assurance Committee should address the acceptability of the accreditation issue. A few days later, a meeting of the Quality Assurance Committee was held where BH Partners had adopted an Action Plan to address this situation. The same plan was submitted to the EACEA, and today it should be adopted by the Steering Committee Board.

The Coordinator then presented and shared the Action Plan with the present partners, in order to be put to the adoption.

Then there was a discussion.

Marko Antonio Brkić from the University of Herzegovina, addressed the present members and said that accreditation is certainly a very important outcome. However, accreditation as a process has not yet started in our country and it creates certain blockages. In addition to another meeting with HEA, it is necessary to inform the competent Ministry to resolve the situation as soon as possible. Mirjana Stojanovic from the Independent University Banja Luka said that it is necessary to take care of who is in this case competent. She certainly believes that the involvement of another body outside of our country is necessary, which will carry out the accreditation of the new curriculum. Vesna Susac from the University of Mostar has stated that the risk of accreditation is already foreseen by the project application itself. From the moment the project was written, there was a risk.

Marko Antonio Brkić said that different options should be taken into account. His proposal is that accreditation carried out by agencies in EU partners. Zuzana Lynch with Mate Bel Belge said that the accreditation process is currently changing in Slovakia. Certain changes are in procedure. But can check with the competent authorities. Marko Antonio Brkić asked representatives of the Manchester Metropolitan University, what their situation is. Karolina Kardas from Manchester said that taking into account the current situation in the UK would make it much more difficult. Amra Tuzovic from the University of Travnik said she contacted HEA. The current situation is complicated and difficult. The accreditation process stands. There was a meeting of the Steering Board at HEA, but nothing changed. We need to find another solution.

There was a long discussion between the partners. In the end, the following conclusions were made:

- **Organize a meeting with HEA**
- **Organize a meeting with the Ministry of Civil Affairs**
- **Organize a meeting with the Erasmus office**
- **Adopt the Action Plan. In accordance with the plan, partners will explore bilateral agreements with other states and their accreditation agencies**
- **Give the EU partners a proposal for their expert teams to evaluate the study program**
- **Develop a project sustainability plan**

On 30.10.2018. in Bihac

Minute taker: Selma Seta