



Centar za građansko obrazovanje  
Centre for civic education

Podgorica, 28 November, 2012.

## **BJELICA SHOULD PROVIDE SPECIFIC ANSWERS**

**Centre for Civic Education (CCE) is shocked by the reaction of the President of the UoM's Administration Board Duško Bjelica where there were not only very generalized and unsubstantiated comments on our work, but insults against the academic community, threats to the CCE itself, and, which is not of less importance, there were no answers to questions that we persistently raise.**

**CCE has no personal relation with anyone from the UoM.** Our activities and reactions are professional and wishing that this academic institution becomes of high-quality and more transparent in its work. We are concerned when any of its managers behaves as if it is his/her property for whose management does not have to be accountable to anyone, which could be concluded from the reaction of the President of the UoM's Administration Board.

Let us start from the beginning: CCE was the first to speak about corruption in high education back in 2009, when we started implementing the project "Corruption in Higher Education," along with the Centre for Monitoring (CEMI), which has been financed by the German Ministry of Foreign Affairs through the German Embassy in Montenegro. Back then we have initiated a number of issues at the UoM, to which, unfortunately, there aren't enough answers, and first reactions were aimed towards denying the existence of corruption in higher education in general. Progress has been made, at least today there is no doubt that corruption in the education system exists and we are pleased when the relevant institutions are dealing with it. We have opened a Pandora's box which is why we have provoked wrath of many, but precisely everything what is happening today indicates the rightness of these actions, and we believe that we are going to be able to appreciate it in the foreseeable future for the activities that we are implementing now as well.

Should Bjelica visit CCE's web-site and carefully read the Home section, and related records that contain all press releases, he could see that we have dealt thoroughly and continuously with numerous issues of the UoM's work, not to mention the administrative disputes with the UoM, that we have won, and whose decisions UoM never complied with. Many years of practice has shown that with the administration of the UoM and some faculty units one could communicate only like that, particularly with regard to the Law Faculty. That is why we are publicly present, and always with valid arguments. If Bjelica was a true major for justice and legality of the UoM's work, he would have already known all of this, commended it and perhaps tried to cooperate with us in order to make joint efforts towards solving accumulated problems at the UoM.

**Existent problems at the UoM have not neither started, nor will finish during Bjelica's term of office, because they are systemic and lasting for decades, and substantially an expression of no political will that the UoM becomes a genuine autonomous unit which would value quality, develop critical reflection and influence strategies for society development, and one of the sad indicators of non-existence of such at the UoM is practical absence of the UoM from relevant international rankings for universities.**



**Let us return to the current facts and specific issues, which Bjelica is trying to avoid, in a manner of a politician, with classical theory replacement and by discrediting.**

- Why do the UoM's authorities ignore numerous questions that EEC sets and why the key information required by the public interest is concealed at the UoM, which CCE regularly sought from the UoM under the Law on Free Access to Information and processed towards the secondary organ - the Ministry of Education and Sports in the consequence of the administration silence?
- Why the Administration Board has never published and distributed lists of all incomes of associate professors, teaching assistants and demonstrators employed at its organizational units?
- Why are some professors formally engaged in three or four faculties or their "sections" when really receiving astronomical fees for work that often they haven't even performed?
- Why are there intangible professors at the Law, Economics, Mechanical Engineering, Faculty of Political Sciences, Faculty of Tourism and Hotel Management, Faculty of Maritime Studies and the likes, who are not accountable for their work to anyone nor is there will of these authorities to deal with the problems that students are facing with for years?
- Why are salaries for deans in numerous cases still a secret, when they must be public and accompanied by a detailed property records?
- Why is there such a dissipation on one side and on the other side there are high tuition fees which are justified by UoM's budget being reduced by the Government, which is why students were rightly protesting?
- How is it possible that some professors became rich at the expense of the high tuition fees, while parents and students themselves struggle with existential problems, and simultaneously the UoM scores a minus greater than 10 million euros for this non-savings behavior, and is there any other country where no one bears responsibility for this situation?
- Why the management of the UoM does not address the problem of illegal dual employment of professors, to which we have pointed out, and which is significantly damaging the UoM's budget, and establishing a category of privileged professors, and thereby enhancing allegations of various inappropriate influences at the UoM? And here we were talking about specific cases referring to professors Miloš Bešić, Srđan Vukadinović and Dragan Lajović regarding which the media have repeatedly reported, and for which there are arguments as well as evidence, because our labor law do not recognize the principle of dual employment on a full-time job. In addition, the fact is that it is physically impossible to be in two places at the same time in one, let alone, miraculously, in two different countries. And what is not physically possible, it can hardly be legitimate, and one doesn't have to be a legal expert in order to see that these professors are being protected in favour of someone's interest and this interest most certainly couldn't be a public one.
- Why are double standards being applied for employees at the UoM even during this time of Bjelica's term of office and what kind of commitment to law should this be? Again, specifically, why is the same working documentation of associates at the Law Faculty being analyzed in different ways – those of Simović and Vuksanović, on the one hand and Lakićević, known to the public as Mujović assistant, on the other hand; that is, why are first two publicly



*Centar za građansko obrazovanje  
Centre for civic education*

charged with inaccurate documentation but when it comes to third, public remained silent even though they all have the same status?

**We could continue to reiterate in this way everything we were pointing out, and leave the the public to determine who is speaking on the particular facts and irregularities, and who is inefficiently trying to avoid them.**

I addition, Rector recognizes repeatedly presented argument of the CCE that other academic units “exceeded in employing new teaching-associetes” as well, so if Bjelica evaluates our statements as unfounded then he is in a conflict with the Rector too! Moreover, we got a recognition from the Rectorate that it is well known that professor Bešić’s contract expired at the end of August this year, and that he continues receiving a salary entirely legally, stating that “the procedure requires from Rector to transfers the funds for the gross salaries to each faculty on monthly basis, according to the pay-roll which is being confirmed and verified by the dean of the university unit”, and this admission was our guidance when we mentioned that the Law Faculty is currently applying double standards, because that is why there can not be questioning of the employment status of teachers or associates at the Law Faculty who are these days being referred to in public.

Finally, since the establishment of CCE various inspections payed us a visit, and during the last week we have been visited by one of them, perhaps even by request of Bjelica himself, so there is no need to threaten us with that now. Also, for the purposes of projects funded by international donors there are external audits and evaluations being implemented, and their continual support certainly indicates a high degree of confidence in our professionalism, legal and transparent work. We have no information that is the same case with NGOs in whose establishment and operation Bjelica participated and which were funded by institutions which were influenced by Bjelica. But for Bjelica who is now identified as a man of double standards, this is not unusual.

Snežana Kaluđerović  
Legal Advisor