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Highlights

**Student body**

1. Rapid increase in HE coverage:

* From 29% in 2007 to 39.4% in 2010.
* For female part of student population even bigger increase – from 31% in 2007 to 44% in 2010.
* 55.6% of all students are female .

2. Social background

* There are no statistical records on student`s family socioeconomic status. Some indirect indicators, including surveys, suggest that relatively small number of students come from poor families.
* Among students almost none has a parent that finished less than high school.
* 38% of all students` fathers have more than high school education. (In the general population the percentage is at least 2.5 times less.)

3. Regional differences

* Proportion of students within the student age cohort is higher among the ones living in university centers.
* The differences increase with the level of higher education. They are the least at the undergraduate and the largest at PhD study level.

4. Roma students

* Roma people are the least educated segment of Serbian population. Less than one in thousand university students comes from Roma population whereas their proportion in the general population is more than 1.5%.
* A half of all Roma students are enrolled in HEI in Vojvodina (Northern region of Serbia)

5. Students with disabilities

* There are no statistical records on people with disabilities, neither in general population nor in student body.

1. Students from vocational schools (3 year) channeled to polytechnics
2. Mature students

**Higher education in national statistical office and statistical publications**

* National statistical office (RZS) collects, analyzes and publish data on HE institutions, stuff employed by these institutions, and on HE students. In spite of recent improvement, some data relevant for social dimension of HE are still missing:
  + there are no data on student`s family wellbeing;
  + some data are incompletely collected
  + sometimes coding hinders the use of data
  + sometimes data for the student population cannot be compared with the cohort at large (except in census years)

**Regulation**

* There is no transparent, easy accessible, unified information on available student support schemas.
* There is no a clear legal framework for affirmative action related to enrolment of the first year students from underrepresented groups.
* There is no regulation making assistive technologies mandatory for universities
* Lower level legal regulation is delayed
* Insufficient regulation on data collection.

**Policies**

* Fees are paid by the state for 42.8% of the students. The rest pay tuition fees.
* Stipends and loans (6.100 RSD monthly) receive 12% of the students
* Student dormitories use 7% of the students
* 28% of students who applied did not get the place in student dormitories
* Most student dormitories and cafeterias are not adjusted for students with disabilities
* Subsidized meals in student cafeteria use 20% of the students
* 80% of students have not used any of the policies
* 60% of students do not qualify
* Municipalities give scholarships to some students, mostly based on merit. No systematic data on how many students receive these scholraships.
* Most of the cost of study is covered by student families
* Policies are not targeted (except for the affirmative action)
* Entitlement is based on merit
* No data on policy effects
* Not enough assistive technologies