

THE ACADEMY OF CRIMINALISTIC AND POLICE STUDIES

196 Cara Dušana Street, 11080 Belgrade – Zemun

The Republic of Serbia

Date held: 20.12.2017.

Minutes from the Kickoff meeting with partners on the project ImprESS (Improving Academic and Professional Education Capacity in Serbia in the area of Safety & Security, by means of strategic partnership with the EU)

The Academy of Criminalistic and Police Studies, December 20th, 2017

Present at the meeting were representatives from:

1. The Academy of Criminalistic and Police Studies, Belgrade (KPA)
2. University of Defense, Belgrade (UNID)
3. University of Belgrade, The Faculty of Security Studies, Belgrade (UBFB)
4. University Educons, Sremska Kamenica (UES)
5. University Metropolitan, Belgrade (UMB)
6. ATRISK, France
7. SGSP, Poland
8. Steinbeis Advanced Risk Technologies Institute, Berlin (SHB)
9. University of Stuttgart (USTUT)
10. Steinbeis Advanced Risk Technologies Institute doo, Kragujevac (SHB KG)
11. Sant' Anna School, Pisa, Italy (SAS) (Skype call)

Attachment: List of participants

Agenda

Aims of the Meeting:

- Presentation of the members of the consortium (Defining their roles, duties, obligations and tasks)
- Apointing of the leaders and managers of work packages
- Determination and constitution of the Steering (SC) and program executive committee (PEC)
- Consideration of the draft Statute for SC and PEC and Consortium contract

- Consideration of the non-disclosure agreement
- Promotion of the Overall manager and Quality champions
- Discussion about changes of the proposal and programs
- The output of the project - levels, inclusion of specific accredited study programs such as the specialist studies
- Discussion about financial plan issues such as no teachers from ACPS in job shadowing and study visits for of programme countries

At the beginning of the meeting, acting Vice dean for science at The Academy of Criminalistic and Police studies, Biljana Simeunović-Patić, on behalf of the Acting Dean and Coordinator of the project (at this moment ill and not able to be present at Kickoff) welcomed present representatives of the consortium, and said that the Academy has the mission to improve and create quality programs, and that the expectations of this project team are high. She briefly explained the goals, role and intentions of the Academy at this project and wished the team a successful job.

In the first part of the meeting, all the partners in the consortium held a brief presentation in which they spoke about the institution from which they came, as well as their roles and goals on this project.

First of all, Mr. Zvonimir Ivanović, PhD, as a Overall manager (OM) for the coordinator of the project (KPA), spoke about the role of the Academy on the project as well as about the project tasks that should be achieved, some already fulfilled and future tasks and bodies and documents that will be discussed more (at this meeting) and, finally, established during the meeting.

After him, presentations were held by Mr. Ivica Radović, PhD, Dean of The Faculty of Security Studies, Belgrade; Mrs. Mirjana Radovanović, PhD, University Educons, Sremska Kamenica; Mr. Dragan Domazet, University Metropolitan, Belgrade; Mr. Nenad Filipović, PhD, Steinbeis Advanced Risk Technologies Institute doo, Kragujevac; Mr. Goran Šimić, PhD, University of Defense, Belgrade; Mr. Bertrand Weckel, ATRISK; Mrs. Katarzyna Tetlak, Steinbeis Advanced Risk Technologies Institute, Berlin and University of Stuttgart; Michal Sowa, SGSP, Poland; Mr. Massimo Battaglia, Sant' Anna School, Pisa, Italy.

In the following minutes of the meeting Mr. Saša Jovanović, (SHB) emphasized the importance of precisely determined tasks and goals. All attendees agreed that all should go through the work distribution table together and try to determine tasks, deadlines and modes as precisely as possible. Also, study programs, modules, and number of students required were discussed among the partners, as one of the main objectives of the project.

In that matter by Mr. Zvonimir Ivanović opened last version of the work load distribution table, which should be the basis of changes of the Grant Agreement (GA) and possible future Annex of the partnership agreement. The WP 1 did not have any changes or proposals for deletion and Mr. Šimić from UNID had comment for 1.4 which was

explained by OM that SHB KG – by Mr Nenad Filipović, has already done screening of all institutions from Serbia and their available software and hardware. Mr Šimić comment (based on centres from UNID experience) was related to issue of careful thinking and planning of software and hardware requirements in relation to capabilities and already existing software at centre and consortium wide. Also there was report done by SHB KG for available and possible software.

After that first proposals for changes and suggestions came for WP 2. Rector Domazet of BMU pointed out point T 2.4 and it is said there that every partner should have minimum two agreements. He pointed out question of what type and what kind of agreement. On that Overall manager said that there should be different types of agreements for exploitation of TESS center, and even those which should be basis of future model for other institutions. Also Petar from FS BU, said that those points are just minimum two, and that there could be more agreements but just two. That should be the possibility to settle more issues between partners through those instruments and to adjust model for other possible parties to access to it.

While WP 3 was analyzed T3.3 popped up and was raised by Mr Domazet of BMU. Issue was about why the BMU is the leader of that task since they aren't experts in the area. It was pointed out by OM that there were more non experts in the tasks, and that there were possibilities to point out other possible leaders of the specific task, but that it is very important to understand that we all have to take a part in leading the tasks. Very simple put someone has to be accountable for all of the tasks in the project. Also Domazet had question about 5 materials (as minimum) why, which materials, issues of IPR and also question of other materials, and over all question of some 15 materials, and in some parts of the Project proposal it was mentioned 20 and on the other parts 40. Petar answered that those are the minimum, divided through whole partnership on all partners evenly, and that yes, those discrepancies between 20 and 40 were also spotted by evaluator of EACEA and that those should be 20 not 40. In the point 3.5 also issue of other training materials Petar envisaged that those could be any other materials done by HEIs. Stefan Jovanović and rector Domazet of BMU also pointed out that there were problems with sending teachers and students to EU HEI, and that proposed courses attendees in number of 30 was too much for private universities (Mirjana Radovanović of UES agreed to that also – it is a point of T 4.1 and it will also be mentioned there). It was mentioned by the OM that the planned budget for those staff and students mobility was oriented to the mobility strand and that the proposal was that all of our partners should adjust that according to the rule already disseminated to all partners. Also it was mentioned that if some of our partners do not want to use financial capacities proposed for staff travel and stay abroad, it is possible to be transferred by the decision of the Coordinator (OM) to another partner. It has been done by few of ERASMUS + projects, for example K – force, but nevertheless it should be carefully thought and only if no other possibilities done that way. Many of partners were included in this elaboration and there were different forms mentioned like 5 teachers for 5 days, or 5 by 4, or even 4 by 4, and that it should be proposed very precisely how many days for how many participants. Specially that unit of measurement must be

established, and to precisely define is it going to be train the trainer course or not or something else, and what are follow – ups for it and it has all to be followed by budget predictions.

About T 4.1 issues were risen about definition of program executions, course execution already mentioned 30 participants of the course (for example BMU did not have 30 master students and this is very problematic for private institutions in Serbia). On that was answered that already was prepared glossary to define all needed terms so that partners do not have issues with terminologies. For FB UB it is not important was that 30 or 60 or even 100 participants Petar said for that. It is proposed to lower the needs for course attendees for private institutions, also.

Mr. Bertnard Wreckel, ATRISK, said that a software analysis was done and in that order ATRISK would organize a workshop, with which the coordinator agreed and asked to be informed about the term and agenda when determined.

At next session after the lunch break organized by KAP, which was held at other hall, all partners pronounced the names of their representatives for Steering committee (SC), quality and financial management and working packages leaders for Project executive committee (PEC). Steering and program executive committee members were appointed by reading their names, and by this way it is to be considered that those were constituted, but it was agreed to organize further activities of those project bodies through an online meeting.

Mr. Zvonimir Ivanović, PhD, OM, apointed Zorica Vukašinović-Radojičić as Quality champion manager, and proposed to partners to create Quality control committee (QCC) as just advisory body (as it was already predicted by proposal but not in that name). OM asked Zorica to present Quality control plan draft. She invited all partners to read that draft in detail, consider and comment in order for proposal to be adopted and implemented in the best possible way. She added that the February 2018 is deadline for establishment and that team have enough time, but it should still be expeditious. She also explained the importance of this document, for management, reporting and quality control of all activities, and added that the plan was made in accordance with European rules and recommendations.

Mr. Zvonimir Ivanović, PhD, said that all partners will get documents such as Management Guidelines, Quality control plan, Administration Guide, templates for reporting etc. in electronic version and that all documents are proposals, possible to change according to needs and possibilities.

After intro done by OM about statutes for SC and PEC and that some of our partners (SHB and USTUT) had proposals for additional articles such as right of veto for some partners. He had called proposing parties to explain their proposal. Mrs. Katarzyna Tetlak expressed proposal for the right of veto in deciding in Steering committee, which means that if one partner does not agree with a decision it can not be made. After that OM called voting by partners about this issue and present partners voted that the veto right is not



good for the project and that the majority should decide on everything, as it was proposed in proposal. Also the USTUT and SHB representatives proposed to plan consensus conditioned decisions in cases of very important issues, and OM gave them possibility to send proposal with such article and to explain it in essence in following days after the Kickoff.

All of the meeting, with few small cuts out, were included and involved representatives of SAAS Mrs. Nora Annesi and Mr. Massimmo Bataglia.

Done in Belgrade,

09.01.2018.

Administrative assistant

Anđela Pavlović

Overall manager

Prof. dr Zvonimir Ivanović