

Annex 6 – Comments of the guest lecturers to the question 6: „What do you think should be improved in the programme?“

- More acceptance from host institutions professors. There is a lot of work to do to convince the benefit for the students. To improve things it could help to encourage the local professors to visit international universities around.
- More faculty/local instructors should be involved (as of now, only one faculty member is sufficient to invite the visitor). Local lecturers should be encouraged to attend guest lectures (not only students). A requirement for a summary meeting with several faculty members/entire department could be introduced. This meeting could be used to plan out future cooperations and discuss changes and improvements in the local teaching and research activities.

I wish I had a chance to be a visitor earlier (I didn't hear about the program until 2009 and I have been a member of the scientific diaspora of Montenegro since 2003). Also, there is at least one other member of scientific diaspora (Sergej Djuranovic) that has expressed interest in participating but has not been invited through BGP.

- The programme is very well constructed, and in my experience it must have let to very positive results overall.
If there is only one point to improve that would relate to doctoral studies in the spirit of Bologna Agreement that is used at European level. Namely, it is my experience that smaller universities (and even top universities in smaller countries) do not have a 'critical mass' of active researchers to organize the regular studies in doctoral program. Hence, further increase in support should definitely be oriented towards this particular goal.
- In my opinion, the most important aspect in education of our students is practical experience. They do not have the chance to gain such experience in Serbia (limited funds, limited number of laboratories). Therefore, small scholarships for 1-3 months research visits of laboratories of guest lecturers, for selected students, would be nice opportunity. Alternatively, small funds may be donated (and probably not exceeding the above mentioned proposal) to organize practicals that normally could not be funded by University (due to lack of reagents and/or instruments).
- infrastructure support
- In my opinion the programme overall idea should be supported, modified where necessary and continued if possible. There is a big gap in resources, but opportunities are there thanks to enthusiasm of WUS Austria staff
- I don't think that there are any parts of the project that should be improved and this is a good opportunity for students and professors to help each other and to exchange experiences with other colleagues.
- Overall i am very satisfied with the program, and i think that the best for the students and for the host institution would be to continue to implement such kind of programs where the students will benefit the most.
- It would be useful if the lecturer from the host institution and perhaps 2 or 3 students could get funding to pay a short visit to the guest-lecturer's institution.
- I cannot suggest any improvement beyond individual level.

- To involve more institutions in Bosnia. In that sense could be good to offer different courses proposed by participants in brain program to all universities in Bosnia.
- Supporting introduction on a Semester to support better the doctoral candidates in Bosnia and Herzegovina
- I think that one semester is too short time to do any serious research project as a part of BGP+ With Extended Period of Stay. A full-year option should be offered to the participants of this program.

Based on my own experience, one semester is not enough for establishment of any sort of serious research that would result in significant research outcomes for the scientific community. Research that has been performed during my one-semester stay at host institution was maximum that could have been done in this short period of time. On the other side, an extended stay would bear outcomes that would far more exceed the accomplished results.

- It would be nice to involve more people and institutions from both host and origin countries: universities, industry companies, government education institutions etc. On this way a network(s) could be built that support sustainable cooperation and knowledge exchange. A step to this aim could be informal meetings/workshops for all participants of BGP programs.
- A research stay for up to 4 months could be extended to 6 months.
- I see BGP programme in very positive light, as mutually beneficial to host institutions and guest lecturers. However, it could be improved in two aspects: (1) it should be made more flexible and diversified in order to accommodate various needs of universities and their guests in regards to the type of collaboration (not necessarily lecturing), the length of the stay, off site monitoring and advising, introduction of innovative non ex-cathedra methods etc.; and (2) it should, in some cases, offer a support for a long standing cooperation between host institutions and guest lecturers (renewable on annual bases, of course). These improvements, I think, could motivate a larger participation in the programme.
- 1. Continuity,
 2. Options of Collaboration
 3. Workshops
 4. Disponibility and "open mind" of hosting Institutions
- BGP should concentrate on:
 - mid-term activities/programms with clear defined goals
 - interdisciplinary and interinstitutional cooperation of host institution
- More networking, more possibilities for students to stay in contact with the guest lecturer - through seminars, e-learning platforms etc. Especially on my university everything was focused on a guest lecture, and after I went back, students were partly not supervised. Mail contact with me was not sufficient for some of them. Establishing a learning platform online where lecturers could actively be in contact with the students could enhance student's success in this particular subject.
- The programme is good as it stands. It helped me connect with B&H Universities and increased my chances of getting permanent post in BiH. The programme also increased my skills for teaching in different academic environment. The greatest benefit was for students who took a great interest in new topics, lectures and practical work. Some of the concepts they never heard about, but found them to be very applicable in their future work. This is

one of the best, and a very straightforward way to organise academic exchange and knowledge transfer.

- Additional funds for some minor equipment expenses should be established. In some cases the efforts to improve the local situation are hampered by the fact that the local colleagues are not in the condition to convince their directors that it is important to purchase some minor equipment to improve the local situation. Often the lack of the equipment is the problem. Lack of the appropriate equipment is logically connected to the lack of knowledge how to use and when to use that equipment. This could definitely be improved by introducing some new appropriate minor funds.
- Nothing
- The attitude of the host university's staff towards the visiting professors.
- University lecturers are quite busy, so a fast response from WUS and less paperwork would be welcome.
- After five years of being involved with the activities of the Brain Gain Programme in Serbia and Bosnia-Herzegovina, I don't have any doubts that this is the only program that is closely involved with and can take credit for the improvement of graduate programs in social sciences, and gender studies in particular. The situation of master's and Ph.D. programs in gender studies is everywhere in the region still quite precarious, and any continuous funding for international cooperation/ guest lecturing is invaluable.

I would like to stress and recommend, as I believe I already have done before, that WUS-BGO funding should include donations for purchasing books/journal database subscriptions/ visual materials for social science/gender studies departments.

The second item where I would recommend additional funding is housing. It is a common knowledge that most of us coming from various countries to teach with the BGP must stay with relatives/parents/friends since host universities don't have any funds for accommodating guest lecturers. I think that it is not feasible to expect new social science departments to have such resources. Hence, I would suggest that WUS-BG revise its requirements, and make some modest allowance for housing for BGP guest lecturers.

Finally, I would also suggest that WUS organize a workshop/small conference, on the regional level, where BGP guest professors would meet with the local counterparts and student representatives (beneficiaries of the programme), to discuss the achievements of the BGP so far, problems and future improvements.

- It is good programme and should be continued.
- To support more these subject which have been introduced.
- I think that programme is already working very well and helps the students a lot.
- I think that the University of Pristina needs of new academic staff, with European culture and work practices. The problem of our recruitment, as guest lecturer BGP Programme, is that the University does not have a personnel section to develop according to European standards, but here employment usually made according to political preferences rector, deans of relevant faculties and relations based on nepotism.
- Interaction between guests and host institution.
- Encouraging host university for further cooperation with guest lecturer and for introducing new courses.
- I hope the program continues in the future. It would also be great if WUS Austria could come up with another program or a version of it and perhaps cooperate with the government to

help local universities develop and fund adjunct professorships so that this activity can continue in a more permanent manner.

- The programme and the cooperation with the hosting university of Novi Sad and WUS and bgp Serbia was perfect. No improvement necessary from my point of view.
- Support of the local WUS office
- Support for Research program and Help for Curriculum development
- The program is OK, but access to other universities is very much restrained.
It looks like the database is not really used by hosts of that nobody really wants to use it
- I think the programme is very well organised and the idea of connecting the host universities and the "Diaspora" is essential for the future development of this area. I only hope this programme will last as long as possible to create a bit of fresh oxygen for the students!
- short term visits - 2 or 3 days; quick decision making
- The programme should have its site with robust facilities for on-line courses and communication. Beside making the courses more interactive, it would give to every lecturer and participant a better idea about all activities of the programme.
- More continuity and long term planning
- Organization could be a bit less complicated (many forms...)
- Overall, the program is excellent. Perhaps, it should also be extended to shorter visits
- Undergraduate students belonging to a particular program (e.g. molecular biology, physiology and biophysics, etc) should be required to take WUS courses that pertain to their area of study. In other words, WUS courses should be mandatory for undergraduate students.
- In my opinion, this is an exquisite programme that is very well organized. Thus, I do not feel that there is need for any major improvement.
- No suggestions
- I don't know
- Adapt the BGP+ project to the existing teaching programs at the host universities.
- everything appears ok
- The programme has fully met my expectations. Everything went smooth, it was well organized and the people from the BGP Office Belgrade have done their part of the job very well.
- The format is already very good.
- I was very much pleased with the program and the support by WUS officials (as well as the host institution). I think the program is excellent.
- Include funding for collaboration between host institution and North America. Especially for research projects and curriculum development.

My biggest challenge was to leave students with the framework, so that the host institution could continue with the program of study I brought without me being present there. This was impossible, since I come from Canada and there is no support for the host institution to collaborate with North America. Even with great interest from students and I found myself in the situation where students could not really develop their skills beyond the bgp course. Many students tried to apply what they learned with no success because they did not have access to basic technology, software and materials, and the host institution did not have extra funding to invest in necessary cutting-edge technology. The biggest challenge was the technical resources, i.e. computers, software etc. necessary to support my course. I always

had to bring my own equipment for students to be able conduct the course, however when i leave the resources leave with me.

- The presenting program seems to be very useful for the developing country and for visiting professors giving them the chance to improve teaching method and clinical work at the local university as well as to give new ideas and high motivation for the students. Therefore the program should be supported furthermore. Without this program the host countries will lose connection to the new research and clinical development.
- The overall impression is that the lectures are rather singular events, rather than a solid basis for a lasting collaboration between the lectures and the home institution. I wonder if, ideally in collaboration with the Serbian ministry of science, one could fund "visiting chairs" for scientists from abroad for spending short periods (up to one month) at Serbian universities, but on regular basis (e.g. shortest 3 years in continuation. These chairs would be selected on the strong competitive basis and with help of international committees. They could be accompanied with one to two fellowships for the best students at the host University for spending some time (say 6 months) at the lecturer's institution.
- Frankly, not much. Perhaps, you could extend your support to purely research projects.
- I think it would be more beneficial if there was continuum to this instead of ad-hoc lectures. But it's understandably more expensive to fly people into other countries. Maybe lectures can be held during the annual visiting faculty's trip to home country thus avoiding to pay for overseas ticket and instead paying the faculty some fixed amount of money, like 300-500\$ so it covers the time necessary to prepare lectures etc, but not the full air ticket plus daily allowances. Also, more preparation on the side of hosting university in terms of having the lecture announced and promoted amongst students and host faculty.
- The program should be more broadly advertised both among the students and lecturers
- nothing specific, excellent program and great management of the implementation.
- Better organization of the WUS office in Austria (more competent people).
- The program is very good as it stands.
- I think there is no need for improving anything.
- Possibility for lectures/seminars to be published for the host institution.
- the whole calendar year should be included in the programme not just an academic year.
- I think the program is really good as it is. It offer different possibilities and it seems very flexible.
- The pay for the extended program (one semester) is insufficient.
For the 1-3 weeks program, the pay is OK. A guest from US would typically cover much of the cost from research grants.
For one semester stay, the guest must take a sabbatical, and so needs to cover typically 1/2 standard salary. The pay for such stay needs to be 3 times larger then it is now.
I would consider one semester stay if the pay was adequate.
- Everything went fine, I don't have further suggestions.
- the programme would need more professional organisation and management by the host institution. due to the fact this was the first cohort, understand that there were difficulties but for the future the university should communicate and interact with students and lecturers in a better way.
- More visible to faculty that are outside of country.

- In my experience everything had been executed well, from the WUS office in Belgrade, host institution, colleagues and students. I would only hope for a repeat experience at some point.
- Less ad-hoc and more on-going nature of the programme. For example, an academic gets funding for 2-4 weeks for 3 years. This would strengthen the programmes within the host institution, mentoring processes, involvement in other projects etc.
- I think the programme works fine
- I think BGP+ has been a very good modification of the original BGP program. Giving visiting faculty an option to extend their stay has every potential to deepen the ties visiting faculty may forge with their students and colleagues.
- More transparency about the availability of funds and their distribution to different institutions and research/educational sectors.
- The lack of continuing funding is the real problem. One short trip can start the cooperation, but meaningful longer term cooperation requires investment in time and effort beyond casual.
- The current structure of the program has worked very well
- I found the programme very good.
- We should like to see the other professors in our host institutions.
Also we would like to participate in other lectures in the foreign countries.
- The program is good as it is.
- TO avoid travel from other cities to Belgrade to complete the paper work.
- I hope, we have to perform make permanent contact with WUS before and after our performed courses (like Humboldt Foundation in Bonn) organised by AvH Foundation in October 2010 in Belgrade). I propose one common workshop of WUS-participants in Austria or in former Yugoslavia in order to better define new achievements and possible cooperation (like Humbolt-Kolleg held in Belgrad between Oktober 28 und Oktober 31, 2010)
- I do not know.
- training in small groups
- Establishment of host laboratory for independent experimental work.
- The program as it is is very good, maybe it would be beneficial for both host institution and students to advertise more the lectures.
- It is fine as it is now.
- This program should include as small start-up grant associated with the successful initiation of the collaboration to be able to support follow-up activities. This grant shared between Montenegrin institution and foreign visitor should include funds for travel associated with the collaboration, initiation of the joint grant applications and funds for joint project development.
- A longer term collaboration (over 3-5 years) should be established, so that both the host institution and guest lecturers can plan in advance.
- Financial support of the host universities for sending students/teachers to the guest lecturers institutions.
- At any rate continuing with this most important and beneficial programme, otherwise no special comments
- i think the way of promoting this project should be improved.

- A two-week intensive course I found to be maximum from the didactic point of view. The courses covering the same dynamics of teaching and seminars within three weeks - I would find not to be an optimal solution in didactic terms.
- The programme was run very well. One improvement that can be made, if financially possible, is to have equipment such as projectors, etc, that can be loaned to faculty as teaching aids. The local university had very little visual aid equipment that could be used in teaching students.
- The project is quite complete so there isn't any particular issue that should be improved.
- The application procedures should be more simple.
- More should be done in the field of PR.
- Only the application procedures should be shorter.
- The UP should give more space to guest lecturers to participate in the Curriculum development.
- Everything went perfectly. My only suggestion is to continue with the same project in the future too.
- The project should be implemented in the future because only in this manner the UP will move towards European integration.
- I think that the UP should institutionalize guest lectures and support them in the future.
- The period of cooperation should be longer
- Since information about the programme was not really offensive, I cannot comment.
- The goal of programme is excellent, I found the application procedure easy to follow, perhaps the only little improvement is to help the host university improve the publicity about the lecturing of their guest
- It does quite well it set out to do.