Network for Evaluation of One Health

cost EUROPEAN COOPERATION IN SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

# Sabina Šerić – Haračić - STSM Report

**REFERENCE: Short Term Scientific Mission, COST TD1404 NEOH**


**Beneficiary**

| | |
|---|---|
| Full name of grantee | Sabina Šerić-Haračić |
| Current position | assistant professor |
| Affiliation | University of Sarajevo Veterinary faculty |
| Country | Bosnia and Herzegovina |
| Email | |
| Phone (including cou | |

**Host**

| | |
|---|---|
| Name of Host | Jože Starič |
| Current position | assistant professor |
| Affiliation | University of Ljubljana Veterinary faculty |
| Country | Slovenia |
| Email | |
| Phone (including count | |


**Period:** from 20.11.2016. to 25.11.2016

**Reference code:** COST-STSM-ECOST-STSM-TD1404-201116-081432

## 1. Purpose of the visit

Regarding my role in NEOH, I selected to participate in the work of the working group 2, which tasks were to nominate case studies that include integrated One Health approach and to evaluate them using the Evaluation framework developed by the working group 1 of the NEOH. Since I participate as well in another project (Tempus project titled „PUBLIC HEALTH IN THE WESTERN BALKANS – IMPROVEMENT IN THE FIELD OF PUBLIC HEALTH AND DEVELOPMENT OF A "ONE HEALTH" EDUCATIONAL AND SCIENTIFIC ARCHITECTURE IN WESTERN BALKAN COUNTRIES (1HEALTH)"), jointly with other NEOH and TEMPUS colleagues we nominated one of the outputs of the TEMPUS project (international and interdisciplinary One Health master program in WB countries) as a case study for NEOH evaluation.

The aim of my STSM to Ljubljana was therefore to jointly work with my host (case study leader) and other case study contributors (Prof.dr. Valeria Grieco UNIMI and Prof.dr. Nihad Fejzić VFS-UNSA) in applying tools from the NEOH handbook for evaluation of our case study and to draft report of our evaluation, as a precursor of presentation we will have on MC meeting in Malta, January 2017. We also made plans for future steps in amending/completing our evaluation report, distributed tasks and set timeframes.

## 2. Description of the work carried out

Upon arrival, I had a meeting with Dr. Starič to review our progress so far in describing our case study according to the NEOH handbook requirements. We agreed on future actions and shared our conclusions and plans with other case study contributors (via e mail). The NEOH handbook suggests several tools for evaluation of OH-ness of the project (case study) as well as guidelines for general project evaluation, down the line to be compared with results of the OH-ness evaluation. Since work on these tools is still in progress, we communicated several members of the WG1 of the NEOH to receive the most updated version, and also searched document data bases at Alfresco. During next 3 days I worked on improving our case study description by adding new information, data, graphs, etc. simultaneously ensuring that our report is in line with NEOH handbook recommendations. In this time there were a several informal meetings with Veterinary faculty Ljubljana teachers, as well as electronic communication with case study contributors. Progress of my and other colleagues work on case study evaluation report was shared among each other on daily basis. I also had a formal meeting with Dr. Ivan Toplak, professor and researchers who works in comparable disciplines at Veterinary faculty Ljubljana, as I do at Veterinary faculty Sarajevo (veterinary epidemiology). By the end of the day 3 of the visit, I started to apply tools for evaluation of OH-ness from the NEOH handbook (chapter 3 and its appendixes). Within our case study group we decided on course of action when we were in doubt about how some tool are meant to be used and particularly quantified, simultaneously making remarks to share with WG1. From day 4 to 5 of the STSM we completed the evaluation of OH-ness of our case study including calculation of OH index and OH ratio. Remaining time of my visit was spent on refining the report for case study evaluation, sharing with colleagues with inquires for their suggestions, and planning further steps. Decision was made to do a process evaluation if possible, or at least to set key elements including defining evaluation questions. Remaining work on evaluation and possible publication preparation from our case study will be continued among out team and shared on future TC meetings of case study representatives.

## 3. Description of the main results obtained

The main outcome of my STSM was a draft report of our case study NEOH evaluation that contains completed evaluation of OH-ness as per guidelines from chapter 3 of NEOH handbook and laid out framework for continuance of evaluation process. The report is written on almost 15 pages of singe spaced text, with 5 figures and 10 tables, The organisation of the report follows organisation of chapter 3 of the NEOH handbook (subchapter titles etc.) and all tools used are referenced by author/s and where they can be found in the Handbook.

## 4. Future collaboration with host institution (if applicable)

Many previous formal and informal links exist between my home institution and this STSM host institution including ongoing TEMPUS project and NEOH COST action. Future

collaboration discussed during STSM includes mobility of teachers, joint publications and joint research projects.

## 5. Projected publications resulting or anticipated to result from the STSM

Possibility has been recognized to publish results of the NEOH evaluation of our case study, depending on available options and funds for publishing. If published the paper will surly refer to NEOH COST action and this STSM in particular.

## 6. Confirmation by the host of the successful execution of the mission

I confirm that dr. Šerić-Haračić STSM was carried out successfully. She completed in most parts a case study about evaluation of post graduate masters study One health, organized via TEMPUS project at the University of Sarajevo. It was my pleasure to work and engage in discussions with dr. Šerić-Haračić as she has excellent overview of the master study we are evaluating and ability to critically assess strengths and limitations of evaluation process. The case study is going to be presented at the Malta meeting and published in peer-reviewed journal.

## 7. Financial summary

| Expenses | Total expenses in EUR | % covered by NEOH grant (EUR) |
|---|---|---|
| Travel | 300 EUR | 100% (300 EUR) |
| Accommodation | 456 EUR | 100% (456 EUR) |
| Consumables (meals) | 300 EUR | 50% (150 EUR) |
| Other | 20 EUR | 0% (0 EUR) |
| **Total** | **1076 EUR** | **84,2% (906 EUR)** |

## 8. Other comments (if any)

## Signatures

Date (5.12.2016.)

Grantee: Sabina Šerić-Haračić

Host: Jože Starič