

BOLOGNA beyond 2010

Draft of 24 July 2008 and comments submitted by 9 October 2008

General remarks:

In general, we propose to up-date the report over the time regularly as far as the work of the different working groups is concerned so that the different reports do not contradict each other (Austria).

The evolution towards a market of HE and research is somehow presented as something nobody can't really go against, and the role of the State, of public authorities is only presented as something which can compensate negative effects from such an evolution;

The building up of a specific EHEA is not much put forward, and we think the European dimension should be really strengthened up if we want the EHEA to be really attractive and thus different, if we want linguistic and cultural diversity to be maintained and promoted towards the rest of the world ;

The link between HE/Research should be better enhanced and not only for doctoral programmes, as the link between HE and Research is a core value for us and for our universities in Europe ; the idea of a separate EHEA and EER should give way to a genuine EHERA

Interdisciplinarity is rightly pointed out, but there is a major obstacle to it since Professors' careers are based on subject areas (and competitive exams to become a Professor, a Researcher as well).

As HEI are diverse in Europe, the generic term of HEI should be developed, wherever possible, beyond the mere reference to Universities.
(France)

The text as it is now is quite long already. We should try to be as short as possible and avoid any redundancy because (as experience from drafting the London communiqué suggests) there will be a tendency towards adding more sentences anyway. Some of the deletions suggested have to be seen on this backdrop.

We are not quite sure about how to interpret the paragraphs written in italics. Are they suggestions where we need further discussion in BFUG - or are they short summaries? Or do they contain new suggestions? Depending on their function within the text we will have to decide what to do with them.

Another point we will have to discuss in Paris is the relation of this text and the next communiqué. (Germany)

Our suggestion to drop the Bachelor/Master terms and stick to the Bologna cycles is due to the fact that such terms, derived from English-speaking educational systems, are often used with different meanings in other systems and do not translate easily in other languages. Three cycles is what all Bologna HE systems are converging to and cycle is the most unambiguous term in all languages. We suggest that Bologna official documents use this term consistently. (Italy)

We recognise the document "Bologna beyond 2010" dated 24.07.2008 as clear, which well summarises the present period and well indicates challenges for the future (especially important degree structure and qualifications frameworks; quality assurance; employability etc). We accept the proposals for the organisation of the work for the next period. (Poland)

I know the intention is that we look at who might do what after we have agreed the action lines. But, I do think we need to take care to differentiate clearly at this stage what we might undertake at the European level (as highlighted in the foreword) and what might more appropriate to be done at national or even institutional level - albeit based good practice that could be shared on a European level. There are lots of references to curriculum design, for example. This is clearly a matter for institutions and I think it would be helpful to make this clear very early in the discussions. This was, for example, a point that was made in no uncertain terms by one of the institutions that responded to my request for comments on the current draft.

The other general point that struck me is that there seemed to be a suggestion that legislative changes were the yardstick by which we were assessing progress. I know that the UK is a bit different in this respect from other countries. But, as many of the changes we are attempting to promote are as much cultural as structural, I do think we need to avoid any tendency to equate legislation with progress. I suggest that many of the refs to legislation could be dropped without altering the meaning. For example, perhaps the text could refer to the need for a new "governance" rather than regulatory" framework? (UK/Scotland)

We understand the need for a short and concise report. However, we detected many paragraphs that address topics in a superficial way and contain vague considerations subject to multiple interpretations. ESU suggests that the report is built around paragraphs that extract conclusions and issue recommendations. That way, the document can conciliate its concise size, the relevance of its content and serve as a guide for the definition of a future agenda.

The report neither discusses the different responsibilities of the stakeholders nor and has no chapter on that. However, if this is to be the case, it would be expected that when identifying the action needed to complete or develop an action line or topic the report would also identify clearly to which stakeholder(s) this is being assigned to and in which terms this action should be developed. A roadmap for actions, concrete goals and responsibilities should be added to the report, replacing the current vagueness of many of the suggestions. (ESU)

EUA considers that the text is too long and there are too many details that at times make it difficult to identify the many good ideas developed and important points made. In particular in Section 2 many issues are addressed that will influence the context in which Bologna will continue

to develop over the next 10 years and that go far beyond the specific action lines addressed hitherto. These are, however, not reflected in Section 4 that draws conclusions and seeks to define an “action plan”. The link between these two sections needs to be clarified and discussed in the BFUG if this text is to be considered as a first draft of a report to Ministers.

The final recommendations in Section 4 are very much in line with the EUA statement which has now finalised after a broad consultation of discussion with Europe’s national Rectors Conferences and university associations (also attached) that took place in July this year.

Finally, there is need for considerable editing and attention to details of drafting in order to clarify some of the statements made and/or ensure that conclusions drawn are underpinned by the necessary arguments, data or other evidence.

Section 1 – finalising the agenda: substantially the text addresses the correct issues even although there are many detailed comments and questions related to the ordering of the issues.

Section 2 – future challenges: our view is that the entire first chapter on globalization and competition needs to be rethought as it starts from the over narrow concentration on the issue of ‘borderless’ higher education. Detailed comments and suggestions for a possible alternative structure are made in the text.

Section 3 – EUA endorses the recommendations made.

Section 4 – conclusions & master plan: the priorities indentified are very close to the priorities EUA has set out. Specific comments are made in the text in particular concerning mobility issues. The link between sections 2 and 4 requires further discussion.

Missing issue: it is suggested that one element missing is any reference to a broad communication strategy which will allow all those concerned to be able to explain the main features of and communicate more effectively to all concerned the benefits for society of the reforms currently being undertaken, in particular for prospective students and their families. (EUA)

Original text	Comments submitted by 9 October 2008	Revised text
<p>Foreword</p> <p>In the London Communiqué dated May 18th 2007, the ministers for higher education of the Bologna Process asked “BFUG as a whole to consider [...] how the EHEA might develop after 2010 and to report back to the next ministerial meeting in 2009.”</p> <p>The structure of this report was agreed upon at the BFUG meeting in Brdo on March 13th-14th 2008. It was to contain three main parts. Part 1 relates to the initial Bologna objectives that will require further attention after 2010. Part 2 deals with new challenges for the next decade. Part 3 fleshes out the</p>		<p>A new draft will be prepared after the BFUG meeting in Paris</p>

Original text	Comments submitted by 9 October 2008	Revised text
<p>future arrangements for the decade to come.</p> <p>A number of issues were mentioned for each part of what was then called a non paper. This had been done in order to indicate the kind of issues that would need identifying in the different stages leading up to the finalizing of the report.</p>		
<p>The Ghent conference of May 19th-May 20th 2008 led to a more precise definition of those issues and added new ones. The extraordinary BFUG meeting held in Sarajevo on June 24th and June 25th 2008 gave further precision to the areas identified and suggested a number of focal points.</p> <p>As a result of this process, a fourth chapter has been added summarising the conclusions.</p> <p>Part 1 considers the present policy areas and action lines of the Bologna Process. The underlying assumption is that not all the action lines will have been completed by 2010. The Ghent conference as well as the Sarajevo meeting corroborated that assumption and strongly warned of a two-speed implementation of the Bologna Process. The independent assessment which will be available for 2010 will still give a clearer indication as to what extent these action lines will need completion.</p> <p>Part 2 is based on the assumption that if the Bologna Process is to be continued it will need to provide relevant, concrete and operational answers to issues affecting higher education in the second decade of the 21st century. The challenges mentioned tend to be global ones. The question that the Bologna Process needs to address is what the specifically European response is going to be.</p>	<p>The Ghent conference of May 19th-May 20th 2008 led to <u>attempted</u> a more precise definition of those issues and added <u>raised</u> new ones. (ESU)</p>	

Original text	Comments submitted by 9 October 2008	Revised text
<p>Part 3 discusses the follow-up structure required to support this cooperation.</p> <p>Part 4 summarises the conclusions and proposes a master plan for future objectives and actions.</p>		
<p>The perspective from which this proposal has been drafted is a thematic one so that there is no chapter on the stakeholders. Indeed the Bologna Process has by definition rested upon a co-operation between the various stakeholders (Governments, academic community, society at large) and this should also be the case in future. Therefore, what matters most is identifying the challenges and finding the appropriate answers before specifying the role each stakeholder should play.</p>	<p>(Governments, academic community, <u>students and social partners as well as</u> society at large) (Austria)</p>	
<p>BOLOGNA BEYOND 2010</p> <p>The contribution of European higher education to the global public good</p> <p>Introduction</p> <p>In many respects, the Bologna Process has been revolutionary for cooperation in European higher education. Four education ministers participating at the celebration of the 800th anniversary of the University of Paris (Sorbonne Joint Declaration, 1998) shared the view that the segmentation of the European higher education sector in Europe was outdated and harmful and thus signed the Sorbonne Joint Declaration. The decision to engage in a voluntary process to create the EHEA was formalized a year later in Bologna by 29 countries (The Bologna Declaration, 1999). It is now apparent that this was a unique undertaking as the process today includes</p>		

Original text	Comments submitted by 9 October 2008	Revised text
<p>no fewer than 46 participating countries, out of the 49 countries that ratified the European cultural convention of the Council of Europe (1954). This means that, eventually, the joint declaration signed by four ministers in Paris mobilized numerous (higher) education ministers and high-ranking civil servants, as well as many thousands of rectors, deans, professors and students who contributed to the conception of the project and, in particular, to its implementation. No other initiative has mobilized so many people, apart from the creation and development of the EU in 1957. Moreover, the process has aroused growing curiosity in other parts of the world, as well as fear and envy.</p>	<p>...out of the 49 countries that ratified the European cultural convention of the Council of Europe (1954). (Germany)</p> <p>...the European <u>Cultural Convention</u> ... (CoE)</p> <p>Moreover, the process has aroused growing curiosity <u>and interest but also uneasiness</u> as well as fear and envy in other parts of the world. (Austria)</p> <p>as well as fear and envy (Germany, Italy)</p> <p>Moreover, the process has aroused growing curiosity <u>and diverse reactions</u> in other parts of the world, as well as fear and envy. (ESU)</p>	
<p>The process has also been successful, because it has given an important role to higher education institutions and their representative associations as well as to the European Students' Union. It involves employers' representatives and trade unions in its decision making bodies. The process also encouraged many countries to ratify the Council of Europe-UNESCO Lisbon Recognition Convention (1997).</p> <p>In this report the terms "higher education institutions" and "universities" will both be used as generic terms to cover the diverse establishments providing higher education.</p>	<p>It involves employers' representatives and trade unions in its decision making bodies <u>as well as the quality assurance agencies, UNESCO-CEPES, Council of Europe and the European Commission.</u> (Commission)</p> <p>It involves <u>international institutions</u> [<i>reflecting the role of the CoE, the Commission and UNESCO/CEEPS as well as the fact that the Commission considers itself an institution rather than an organization</i>] as well as employers' representatives... (CoE)</p>	
<p>At its inception the Bologna Process was meant both to strengthen European integration and the competitiveness of European higher education through the introduction of a system based on undergraduate and postgraduate studies and to foster student mobility through easily readable programmes and degrees. Quality assurance has played an important role from the outset, too. The various ministerial meetings since 1999 have</p>		

Original text	Comments submitted by 9 October 2008	Revised text
<p>broadened this agenda and have given greater precision to the tools that have been developed. The undergraduate/postgraduate degree structure has been modified into a three-cycle system, which now includes the concept of qualifications frameworks with an emphasis on learning outcomes – what people know, understand and can do – as well as how different qualifications articulate. The concept of the social dimension of higher education has been introduced and the recognition of qualifications is now clearly perceived as central to European higher education policies.</p>		
<p>The Bologna Process has created a number of instruments that have given European higher education greater coherence and have placed it on the worldwide map. Besides, the instruments put in place are multipurpose instruments serving various objectives.</p> <p>At the same time, though, some overall goals can also be looked at in terms of instruments. Mobility is both a means and an end. It strongly contributes to the European dimension of higher education, but it is also a goal worth pursuing in itself.</p>	<p>The Bologna Process has created <u>used and further developed</u> a number of instruments... (Austria)</p> <p>At the same time, though, some overall goals can also be looked at in terms of instruments, <u>such as mobility</u>. Mobility is both a means and an end. It strongly contributes to the European dimension of higher education, but it is also a goal worth pursuing in itself. (Austria)</p>	
<p>Progress over the years has been uneven, as can be seen from the various stocktaking exercises. Perceptions differ between countries, between institutions as well as between disciplines. An independent assessment has been asked for to clarify what has been really achieved and to what extent this has been done. This report is to be ready for 2010. However, we should be prepared for the eventuality that not all participating countries will have implemented all policies and reached all stated goals by 2010.</p> <p>Moreover, prior to the publication of the independent</p>	<p><i>The introduction should also recognize that even in countries that adopted formally the tools and instruments of the Bologna Process, especially by creating new legal frameworks, concrete and real implementation beyond the surface remains a challenge, partly because it requires a mentality change (ESU).</i></p> <p><i>Perceptions are not the only thing differing but also the level of stakeholder involvement at the national level (it has been identified both by Trends reports and the BWSE) and that also impacts on the depth of the understanding and quality of the implementation (ESU).</i></p> <p><i>Many researchers have also identified that the working methods of the Bologna Process at the European level (sometimes not using measurable and concrete goals) and of the implementation (that is multilevel from national level to department level in an institution and interacting with multiple stakeholders with different interests)</i></p>	

Original text	Comments submitted by 9 October 2008	Revised text
<p>assessment the ministerial meeting of 2009 is to give political orientations for the future of the Bologna process. The present report proposes the possible main foci these orientations could take.</p>	<p><i>immediately implies these difficulties in the implementation (ESU).</i></p> <p>This report is to be ready for 2010. However, we should be prepared for the eventuality that <u>We are aware of the fact that, for different reasons,</u> not all participating countries will have implemented all policies and reached all stated goals by 2010. (Austria)</p>	
<p>Chapter 1. Finalising the initial agenda</p> <p>Not all the objectives will have been reached by all the participating countries by 2010; it is, therefore, necessary that the Bologna Process should continue after 2010 so that its implementation can be finalized. First priority for the future should be given to completing the existing action lines.</p> <p>In the following chapters and for purposes of clarity, a distinction has been made between action lines with clearly defined operational outcomes and underlying policy areas.</p>		
<p>1.1. Action lines</p> <p>This category comprises the degree structure, qualifications frameworks, recognition, and quality assurance.</p>		
<p>1.1.1. The degree structure and qualifications frameworks</p> <p>The European Higher Education Area is structured around three cycles, bachelor, master and doctorate, with a possibility of intermediate qualifications within the first cycle, and with proper progression from one cycle to the next; each cycle is defined in terms of generic descriptors based on learning outcomes. The first two cycles are also defined by ECTS credit ranges and student workload. The bachelor programme typically contains between 180 and 240</p>	<p>The European Higher Education Area is structured around three cycles bachelor, master and doctorate, <u>first, second and third cycle,</u> with a possibility of intermediate qualifications within the first cycle, and with proper progression from one cycle to the next; each cycle is defined in terms of generic descriptors based on learning outcomes. The first two cycles are also defined by ECTS credit ranges and based on <u>student workload.</u> The bachelor first cycle programme typically contains between 180 and 240 ECTS, while the master second cycle programme typically carries 90-120 ECTS, at least 60 of which should be at master second cycle level. (Italy)</p> <p>with a possibility of intermediate qualifications within the first cycle.-(Germany)</p>	

Original text	Comments submitted by 9 October 2008	Revised text
<p>ECTS, while the master programme typically carries 90-120 ECTS, at least 60 of which should be at master level.</p>	<p>...at least 60 of which should be at master level (Austria)</p> <p>It might be helpful to add a reference to the Framework for Qualifications of the EHEA at the end of the section. (UK/Scotland)</p>	
<p>Qualifications frameworks certified against the overarching Qualifications Framework for the EHEA and designed to encourage mobility as well as employability are currently being implemented. In most countries self certification procedures will be completed after 2010 and the self certification reports will only then be made accessible to partners.</p>		
<p>It is undeniable that the implementation of the degree structure and the focus on quality assurance are the most visible outcomes of the Bologna Process and for non specialists these two outcomes are what the Bologna Process stands for. Yet, the structural reform amounts to more than a re-labelling of previously awarded diplomas. Degrees are increasingly defined in terms of learning outcomes and the introduction of credit points has led to a focus on student centred learning. While much of the structural reform is already in place, the key challenge is to move from structure to practice. Further work and associated resources will be required to improve understanding of learning outcomes and development of curricula based on learning outcomes. This will involve a better understanding of the nature of learning outcomes as well as a greater focus on subject areas. As a result the way teaching is conducted will change, which in turn will have organisational implications.</p>	<p>...what the Bologna Process stands for. Both are meant to increase transparency and confidence and thus also to encourage academic mobility. Yet, the structural reform... (Austria)</p> <p>Yet, the structural reform <u>is accompanied by more fundamental changes</u> amounts to more than a re-labelling of previously awarded diplomas. (Germany)</p> <p>Degrees are increasingly defined in terms of learning outcomes and the introduction of credit points <u>workload-based credits</u> has led to a focus on student centred learning.</p> <p>... the key challenge is to move from structure to practice content. (Germany)</p> <p>...the key challenge is to move from structure to practice <u>structural reforms to the implementation of curricular reforms.</u> (Italy)</p> <p>"greater focus on subject areas": <i>By whom? To which goals? Achieved by when? It would be preferable to be much more clear in each section of the report when defining the future developments of the Bologna Process (ESU)</i></p> <p>... which in turn will have organisational implications. <u>A better understanding of workload is also needed in order to design realistic curricula that can be completed in time.</u> (Italy)</p>	
<p>1.1.2. Quality Assurance Maintaining the quality of European higher education at a high level and raising it even further has been one of the major goals of the Bologna Process.</p>	<p><i>I'd suggest starting this section with the statement about institutional ownership of quality, then some new text noting the role of external agencies to provide review or accreditation; then the current text on the register of such agencies. This order would make clear that ownership of quality rightly lies with institutions,</i></p>	

Original text	Comments submitted by 9 October 2008	Revised text
<p>The European Quality Assurance Register for Higher Education (EQAR) is about to be fully operational and national quality assurance agencies have started implementing the European Standards and Guidelines, which will be a requirement for agencies to be included in the register.</p>	<p><i>rather than with external bodies.</i> (UK/Scotland)</p> <p><u>...one of the major goals of the Bologna Process. All over Europe, national frameworks for external quality assurance have been developed. External quality assurance varies between the countries as well as between higher education sectors.</u> (Austria)</p> <p><u>... to be included in the register. The register is owned by the relevant stakeholders in higher education. It will provide transparency and consequently help to increase confidence in a growing number of quality assurance agencies.</u> (Austria)</p> <p>The European Quality Assurance Register for Higher Education (EQAR) is about to be fully operational, and national <u>systems are undergoing reform</u> and quality assurance agencies have started implementing the European Standards and Guidelines, which will be a requirement for agencies to be included in the register. <u>The creation of a European system for quality assurance aims at increasing the level of trust between stakeholders, institutions and society at large in the quality of the education provided and is expected to mature in the upcoming years and to cater for these objectives.</u> (ESU)</p> <p><u>... to be included in the register. From an institutional perspective and in order to enhance the European dimension of QA it would be desirable that national legislation increasingly makes it possible for higher education institutions to select from among agencies included in the Register to meet their requirements for external evaluation.</u> (EUA)</p>	
<p>Furthermore, the ownership of quality assurance is embedded in the world of academia. Internal quality assurance is the responsibility of the institution and a clear link has been made between the development of a "quality culture" inside institutions and the degree of institutional autonomy.</p>		
<p>However, beyond these operational goals the issue of quality and excellence remains of paramount importance. How you define quality is influenced by the topic of the selection or non selection of students and by the diversification of providers.</p>	<p><i>I am not sure what point is being made about quality and the selection and non selection of students. Perhaps this could be clarified.</i> (UK/Scotland)</p> <p><i>It is not the definition of quality that changes according to the selection/non selection of students, rather the level of the intended learning outcomes may be higher or lower depending on the entry level of students. Similarly, the diversification of</i></p>	

Original text	Comments submitted by 9 October 2008	Revised text
	<p><i>providers, i.e. different resources, approaches, learning contexts are another variable to be considered in defining the level of the learning outcomes of a given programme. It may be said that there is more quality where more progress is made within the programme regardless of the entry level of the students. (Italy)</i></p> <p>However, beyond these operational goals the issue of quality and excellence remains of paramount importance. How you define quality is influenced by the topic of the selection or non-selection of students and by the diversification of providers. <u>Quality is defined by the achievement of goals. It is also influenced by the availability of financial resources, the access to higher education and the professional perspectives of graduates and university staff.</u> (Austria)</p> <p>However, beyond these operational goals the issue of quality and excellence remains of paramount importance. How you define quality is influenced by the topic of the selection or non-selection of students and by the diversification of providers. <u>The definition of quality should not be restricted to a number of set indicators but rather against the concrete missions and objectives of the institutions. Excellence in different areas should be therefore supported by quality assurance systems that are flexible and avoid demands for conformity.</u> (ESU)</p> <p>However, beyond these operational goals the issue of quality and excellence remains of paramount importance. How you define quality is influenced by the topic of the selection or non-selection of students and by the diversification of providers defined is directly related to the mission, profile and strategic aims of each institution: institutions strive for excellence in related to their own stated goals and in line with their increasingly differentiated missions.</p>	
<p>Furthermore, the effects of the changes made within the Bologna Process on quality need investigating. There has been a proliferation of quality assurance and accreditation agencies and this trend is likely to continue into the future with the advent of more subject based accreditations. The accumulation of accreditation labels, often as a means of branding, carries the risk of having too many of them as well as the danger of bureaucratization.</p>	<p>Furthermore, the effects of <u>quality assurance on</u> the changes made within the Bologna Process on quality need investigating. [...] The accumulation of accreditation labels, often as a means of branding, carries the risk of having too many of them as well as the danger of <u>could have the effect that the labels lose their meaning and could lead to</u> bureaucratization. <u>Therefore the trustworthiness of quality assurance agencies needs to be guaranteed.</u> (Austria)</p> <p><u>...danger of bureaucratization, while sending a confusing message regarding the overall quality of the education system to students, families and employers.</u> (ESU)</p>	

Original text	Comments submitted by 9 October 2008	Revised text
	<p>Furthermore, the effects of the changing <u>quality assurance landscapes</u> es made within the Bologna Process on quality need <u>investigating</u> in Europe requires further analysis. In addition to the establishment of national QAs across Europe other accreditation <u>agencies are increasingly appearing on the scene</u>. There has been a proliferation of quality assurance and accreditation agencies and this trend is likely to continue into the future, for example with the <u>growing interest in with the advent of more subject based accreditations</u>. The <u>impact of the accumulation of accreditation labels, often as a means of branding has to be evaluated</u>. There <u>may be a carries the risk of having too many labels thus causing them to lose their value</u>. There may also be a danger of <u>over of them as well as the danger of bureaucratization of these processes</u>. (EUA)</p>	
<p>What should be borne in mind is that the ultimate goal is to enhance the quality of teaching and research; quality assurance mechanisms are not an end in themselves, but should act as a support for the institutions in their continuing development.</p>	<p>...the ultimate goal is to enhance the quality of teaching, and research, <u>services, and organisational structures</u>; (Austria)</p> <p>...the ultimate goal is to enhance the quality of teaching <u>education</u> and research; (Poland)</p>	
	<p><u>Alternative text for 1.1.2 proposed by ENQA</u></p> <p>Maintaining the quality of European higher education at a high level and raising it even further has been one of the major goals of the Bologna Process.</p> <p>The European Standards and Guidelines for quality assurance in higher education (ESG), developed by ENQA and its E4 partners, are now being implemented in higher education institutions and quality assurance agencies. Their influence is spreading and they are gaining acceptance as a shared reference point for all actors in European higher education. They have also been adopted by the new European Quality Assurance Register for Higher Education (EQAR) as appropriate criteria for the inclusion of quality assurance agencies. But they remain challenging for many countries and institutions.</p> <p>The fundamental responsibility for quality rests within the world of academia. Internal quality assurance is a duty of the institution and a clear link can be seen between the development of an effective "quality culture" inside institutions and the degree of operational autonomy they enjoy.</p> <p>External quality assurance fulfils a different need: at its best it combines both accountability for the reassurance of the public and an objective and developmental commentary for institutions.</p>	

Original text	Comments submitted by 9 October 2008	Revised text
	<p>Because of their pervasiveness and importance, the effects of the changes linked to quality made within the Bologna Process need to be examined. Quality assurance and accreditation agencies have grown considerably in number and this trend may continue into the future if there are more subject based accreditations (though the current movement appears to be towards quality audits and institutional level accreditations). The accumulation of accreditation 'labels', often as a means of branding, without proper controls, carries the risk of confusing the public as well as increased and unnecessary bureaucratization.</p> <p>There are new and developing areas affecting quality assurance in the EHEA. These include how to balance accountability and improvement; how to make real the roles of different stakeholder groups (students, the business world, etc); how to handle the increasing diversity across higher education (diversity of pedagogies, of institutions, of students, of expectations, of missions); how to react to the internationalisation of higher education, often in combination with growing commercialisation and competition; and how to prevent the bureaucracy and cost of quality assurance from growing.</p> <p>What always needs to be borne in mind is that quality assurance mechanisms are not an end in themselves and that their ultimate goal is to enhance the quality of teaching and research. They should act as a support for the institutions in their continuing development but, equally, should not forget their key role as the protectors of the public interest.</p>	
<p>1.1.3. Recognition Recognition of qualifications has been a cornerstone of the Bologna Process since its very beginning and the Lisbon Recognition Convention is the only legal document that the Bologna Process relies on. It increasingly ensures that all learners are given fair recognition of their qualifications.</p>		
<p>However, there is a general perception that recognition practices are not yet coherent across the EHEA and that variations in programmes are defined as substantial differences and thus as impediments to recognition. Furthermore, there is inconsistency between recognition for academic purposes and recognition of professional qualifications.</p>	<p>However, <u>at the same time, each higher education institution has the final responsibility and takes the decision on the recognition of programmes and degrees in relation to further academic study.</u> There is a general perception...(EUA)</p> <p>However, <u>while clear progress has been made</u> there is a general perception that recognition practices are not yet coherent across the EHEA and that variations in programmes are <u>too easily</u> defined as substantial differences... (CoE)</p>	

Original text	Comments submitted by 9 October 2008	Revised text
	<p>"recognition of professional qualifications" <i>How is this to be understood? By potential employers?</i> (Germany)</p> <p>Furthermore, there is inconsistency between recognition for academic purposes and recognition of professional qualifications for entrance in the labour market, including professional qualifications. (Italy)</p>	
<p>The key point is to ensure that there is more transparency about how the Lisbon Convention is implemented, the processes involved and the criteria for decisions.</p>	<p>...decisions. <u>Not least, there are still different "recognition cultures" throughout Europe, one of which takes a broad view of what differences may be valid reasons for non-recognition and the other defines these differences quite narrowly. One of the biggest challenges we face is to develop a common understanding of the concept of qualifications.</u> (CoE)</p>	
<p>It is expected that there will be more agreements on automatic recognition once the degrees and diplomas are related to the qualifications framework. In this sense the establishment of qualifications frameworks and recognition are closely linked; the existence of quality assurance mechanisms should also contribute to greater trust in issues of recognition.</p>	<p><i>Where is the evidence for this; the lack of progress on the QFs front also needs to be taken into account</i> (EUA)</p> <p>It is expected that there will be more agreements on automatic <u>standard</u> recognition once the degrees and diplomas are related to the qualifications framework. In this sense the establishment of qualifications frameworks and recognition are closely linked. <u>The qualification frameworks should help to foster recognition of formal, non-formal and informal qualifications.</u> The existence of quality assurance mechanisms should also contribute to greater trust in issues of recognition. (Austria)</p>	
<p><i>Generally speaking, as far as these action lines are concerned, the degree structure and qualifications frameworks, recognition and quality assurance are those that have led to structural reforms and to the institutionalization of the Bologna Process. It is worth recalling that the European register for quality assurance agencies, which is the very product of the Bologna Process, is a legal structure. The degree structure and the qualifications framework have direct legal implications for the participating countries. The Bologna Process has thus had direct implications on the way the participating countries organise their own systems. At this stage there is no felt need for new measures or new rules, but what is called for is a proper understanding and implementation of these action lines, especially at</i></p>	<p>Generally speaking, as far as these action lines are concerned, the degree structure and qualifications frameworks, recognition and quality assurance are the <u>action lines</u> ose that have led to... (Germany)</p> <p>The degree structure and the qualifications framework have direct legal implications for the participating countries. The Bologna Process has thus had direct implications on the way the participating countries organise their own systems, <u>e.g. regarding the degree structure and national qualifications frameworks.</u> [...] what is called for is a proper understanding and implementation of these action lines, especially at institutional level, <u>and to ensure transparency regarding degrees in further education.</u> (Austria)</p> <p><i>Could we drop the ref to "legal" implications in the text in italics at the end of this section?</i> (UK/Scotland)</p>	

Original text	Comments submitted by 9 October 2008	Revised text
<i>institutional level.</i>		
Policy areas	<p><i>EUA's general comments on the following sections:</i></p> <p><i>The report would benefit from being considerably shortened; many of the cursory or partly over categorical statements are not underpinned by any relevant data and do not add anything to the final statement in each paragraph that summarise the key issues;</i></p> <p><i>The conclusions of the Sarajevo meeting could perhaps be better integrated into the different sections.</i></p> <p><i>Considerable EN editing is still necessary.</i></p>	
<p>The social dimension, employability and the Bologna Process in its global dimension are defined as policy areas in the sense that they define objectives that have not yet been translated into a regulatory framework.</p>	<p>The social dimension, employability, <u>lifelong learning, enhancing the attractiveness of European higher education, and mobility</u>, and the Bologna Process in its global dimension are defined ... (Austria)</p> <p>...are defined as <u>dealt with under the heading</u> policy areas... (Germany)</p> <p>"has not yet been translated into a regulatory framework". <i>This is an example of the general point I make above. I would suggest deleting this introductory para.</i> (UK/Scotland)</p>	
<p>1.2.1. Social dimension</p> <p>The definition given to the social dimension is one that includes all provisions needed for having equitable access into, progress and completion of higher education. By emphasizing the social characteristics of higher education, the political objective aims at reducing social gaps, at providing equal opportunities to quality education and at strengthening social cohesion.</p>		
<p>The Bologna Process has increasingly heightened its policy attention on the social dimension. The policy messages are manifold:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In a knowledge-society higher education is important to the development of successful economies and in providing opportunities for all individuals to participate in and benefit from a successful economy; • Equity and social justice issues are imported into higher education, which becomes a driver 	<p><u>In its goals and policies</u>, the Bologna Process has increasingly heightened its policy attention on <u>emphasized</u> the social dimension. The <u>key</u> policy messages are manifold [you can't use the term "manifold" if you essentially have two points...]:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In a knowledge-society higher education is important to the development of successful economies and in providing opportunities for all individuals to participate in and benefit from a successful economy; • <u>Higher education plays an important role in furthering equity and social justice</u> issues are imported into higher education, which and hence becomes a driver for social cohesion and social citizenship. (CoE) 	

Original text	Comments submitted by 9 October 2008	Revised text
for social cohesion and social citizenship.	social <u>active</u> citizenship (Italy)	
<p>While participation rates vary considerably between European countries, measures to expand enrolments have not necessarily increased social equity. Inequalities remain large. The reasons given can be found both inside and outside the higher education sector. It is argued that universities come far too late in a system where choices have to be made earlier on in a pupil's career. Institutions of higher education thus cannot overturn a student's former social and cultural experience. Barriers to equitable access within the higher education sector include the cost of participation, entry qualification requirements, a lack of flexible learning opportunities, limited availability of support services and an "institutional culture".</p>	<p>While <u>The</u> participation rates vary considerably between European countries <u>and its increase has been identified in many national debates as an urgent need for ensuring the creation of a true and sustainable knowledge society, with potentially more conditions for widening participation.</u> But measures to expand enrolments have not necessarily increased social equity. (ESU)</p> <p>Institutions of higher education <u>can however contribute to and thus cannot</u> overturn a student's former social and cultural experience <u>by embedding the responsibility for widening participation and lifelong learning as part of their core missions. Validating prior experiential learning, designing specific programmes and methodologies, and keeping counselling structures that are adequate for different publics is only a part of the actions urgently required.</u> (ESU)</p> <p><u>In some countries there were attempts to overcome barriers by removing the <i>numerus clausus</i>. But it is increasingly recognised that additional measures are required to adequately face these challenges. The barriers to equitable access within the higher education sector include the cost of participation, entry qualification requirements, a lack of flexible learning opportunities, limited availability of support services and an "institutional culture". In Europe generally speaking the challenges on access are coupled also with diverse but significant failure and drop-out rates. For achieving the objective of equity within higher education and society, there will be a need for articulating strategies to address access, participation and completion of higher education and for a shared responsibility for action between universities and public authorities.</u> (ESU)</p> <p>The reasons given can be found both inside and outside the higher education sector. It is argued that universities come far too late in <u>Higher education is part of</u> a system where choices have to be made earlier on in a pupil's career. <u>Considerations of equity in higher education therefore cannot be divorced from considerations of equity in other parts of the education system and can only be solved through a coherent approach to the whole education system.</u> (CoE)</p> <p>... a student's former social and cultural experience. <u>Nevertheless, within the higher education sector there are several barriers to equitable access within the higher education sector yet to be dealt with. They</u> include the cost of participation, ... (Italy).</p>	

Original text	Comments submitted by 9 October 2008	Revised text
	<p><i>I am not sure what "institutional culture" means (UK/Scotland).</i></p>	
<p>The vision of higher education as contributing to social cohesion is part of the welfare state model of social cohesion. Education and more specifically higher education institutions act as public instruments for the re-distribution of wealth through investing in social mobility and above all through public investment in the younger generation. This welfare state model defines and measures how far the university has met its obligations of social cohesion in terms of groups defined by social background or relative disadvantage.</p>	<p><i>If this section – which has never been debated – is maintained, then it should not focus on the state but on society and the contribution of universities to society and societal development. (EUA)</i></p> <p><i>...defined by social background or relative disadvantage. <u>While understanding the diversity of challenges and models of supporting the student population in the different countries, the creation of a European Higher Education Area presuppose reaching common standards in terms of participation rates. Therefore, a European benchmark for social dimension must be defined, in order to promote convergence of initiatives and concreteness of objectives.</u> (ESU)</i></p>	
<p><i>The key point is to improve access to higher education and the successful completion of first and second cycle study programmes. This involves improving the study environment and creating the appropriate economic conditions for students to be able to profit from the study opportunities. In order to widen participation, flexible learning paths are needed and so are measures actually allowing a diverse student population to participate in higher education.</i></p>	<p>The key point is to improve access to higher education and <u>to give opportunities to succeed to all those who are qualified and have the potential to benefit from higher education.</u> the successful completion of first and second cycle study programmes—This involves improving the study environment and creating the appropriate economic conditions for students to be able to profit from the study opportunities <u>at all levels.</u> In order to w <u>Widening participation will also require making further progress towards ensuring flexible learning paths, and introducing the necessary incentives are needed and so are measures actually</u> allowing a <u>more</u> diverse student population to participate in higher education. (EUA)</p> <p><i>...creating the appropriate economic conditions for students to be able to profit <u>benefit</u> from the study opportunities (CoE)</i></p>	
<p><i>The social dimension of higher education is not only related to the student body at bachelor and master level. The status of doctoral students is a concern and there is now a tendency to consider doctoral candidates as early stage researchers thus giving them employee status. Clear career paths ought to be set out. Providing good social and working conditions is a necessary requirement to attract more students into doctoral study programmes and thus</i></p>	<p>The social dimension of higher education is not only related to the student body <u>at bachelor and master level in first and second cycle programmes.</u> (Italy)</p> <p><i>"The status of doctoral students is a concern and there is now a <u>tendency</u> to consider doctoral candidates as early stage researchers thus giving them employee status." – do we just acknowledge a tendency or do we take a stand in favour of this new definition of doctoral students? (Italy)</i></p> <p>The status <u>and rights</u> of doctoral students is a concern and there is now a <u>consensus to say that</u> tendency to consider doctoral</p>	

Original text	Comments submitted by 9 October 2008	Revised text
<p><i>guarantee the sustainability of the European research endeavour.</i></p>	<p>candidates as early stage researchers, <u>be they formally considered as students or have thus giving them employee status must benefit from all commensurate social security benefits and pension entitlements.</u> Clear career paths ought <u>need</u> to be set out. (EUA)</p>	
<p><i>In order to understand the social dimension of higher education and to monitor this social agenda more reliable data are needed. Collecting data is a measure that will have to be widened in its scope so that a monitoring and a development of this policy will become possible.</i></p>	<p>...a monitoring and a <u>further</u> development of this policy will become possible. (UK/Scotland).</p> <p>... will become possible, <u>thus facilitating the elaboration of concrete means and initiatives for reducing social inequality within higher education and internationalisation.</u> (Denmark)</p>	
<p>1.2.2. Employability Employability has been defined as the empowerment of the individual student to seize opportunities on the labour market. It involves the teaching and learning of generic skills and competencies like analytical skills, communication skills as well as the capacity to reason at a level of abstraction. The balance between the teaching and learning of knowledge on the one hand and the acquisition of transferable skills on the other hand is a delicate one. Not only does it raise a question about the relationship between the depth of knowledge and the ensuing accurate mastery of skills and not only does it mean restructuring whole curricula, it also has a direct impact on the way the scholar or teacher perceives his/her role, which differs from the one in which the teacher merely acts as a lecturer. This new paradigm changes the life of the university department and thus requires further development.</p>	<p><i>We should take on board the discussions of the WG employability here.</i> (Germany)</p> <p>Employability has been defined as the empowerment of the individual student to seize opportunities on the labour market <u>on graduation and during the whole professional life.</u> (Poland)</p> <p>Employability has been defined as the empowerment of the individual student to seize opportunities on the labour market, <u>being employed or self-employed.</u> It involves the teaching and learning of generic skills and competencies like analytical skills, communication skills as well as the capacity to reason at a level of abstraction. The balance between the teaching and learning of knowledge on the one hand and the acquisition of transferable skills on the other hand is a delicate one. (remark: <i>the discrepancy between these two is not quite clear</i>) (Austria)</p> <p>It involves the teaching and learning <u>acquisition</u> of generic skills and competencies like analytical skills, communication skills as well as the capacity to reason at a level of abstraction. The balance between the teaching and learning of knowledge <u>content</u> on the one hand and the acquisition of transferable skills on the other hand is a delicate one. (Italy)</p> <p>The balance between the teaching and learning of <u>subject specific?</u> knowledge <u>and understanding</u> on the one hand and the acquisition of transferable skills on the other hand is a delicate one [<i>as it stands, this sentence raises some questions, since "knowledge" is contrasted with "transferable skills". The issue would seem to be either one of subject specificity vs. generic or of knowledge vs. skills. I would also prefer to include a reference to understanding somewhere</i>]. (CoE)</p> <p>...not only does it mean restructuring whole curricula, it also has a</p>	

Original text	Comments submitted by 9 October 2008	Revised text
	<p>direct impact on the way the scholars or teachers perceives his/her <u>their</u> role, which differs from... (Germany)</p> <p>This new paradigm changes <u>is changing</u> the life of the university department and <u>its impact needs to be further discussed and consequences drawn in institutions across Europe.</u> this requires further development. (EUA)</p>	
<p>Employability, however, is not a recent objective of higher education. Universities have always trained practitioners of law, medicine, theology and engineering; they have also been the training institutions for future civil servants and teachers. The introduction of the bachelor/master structure into these "regulated" professions proves challenging and the use of learning outcomes is daunting.</p>	<p>...civil servants and teachers. <u>However, experience with the Bologna reforms has shown that</u> the introduction of the bachelor/master structure into these "regulated" professions proves challenging <u>given the role of professional bodies and the development of relevant EU legislation.</u> and the use of learning outcomes is daunting. (EUA)</p> <p>bachelor/master two-cycle structure (Italy)</p> <p>The introduction of the bachelor/master structure into these "regulated" professions proves challenging and the use of learning outcomes is daunting (Austria).</p> <p><i>Paragraph 2 states that it is daunting and challenging to apply bachelor/master structures and learning outcomes to professional areas. You might want to add that it has largely been achieved in some (such as the UK).</i> (UK/Scotland)</p> <p>The introduction of the bachelor/master structure into these "regulated" professions proves challenging and <u>developing a greater reliance on</u> the use of learning outcomes is <u>no less</u> daunting. (CoE)</p>	
<p>Employability also refers to people staying in employment, not only to recent graduates. University training needs further investment in lifelong learning if it is to address this issue properly.</p>	<p>Employability also refers to people staying in employment, not only to recent graduates. <u>Relevance and quality of education is therefore fundamental to ensure sustainable employment.</u> But university training needs <u>also</u> further investment in lifelong learning if it is to address this issue properly. (ESU)</p> <p><u>Given the ever more rapid changes in the labour market and in skills required by the labour market</u> employability also refers to <u>the updating of the skills of those already</u> people staying in employment, <u>and therefore does not concern</u> only to recent graduates. Universities <u>therefore need to consider their role in continuing education and training and thus to invest further</u> needs further investment in lifelong learning <u>as indicated in section 1.2.3.</u> if it is to address this issue properly. (EUA)</p> <p><i>I would not agree with the statement about further investment in</i></p>	

Original text	Comments submitted by 9 October 2008	Revised text
	<p><i>lifelong learning, if this refers to funding. As we have stated before, we think funding should be a matter for individual countries, not the Bologna Process.</i> (UK/Scotland)</p>	
<p>Considered from the perspective of the labour market, employability also entails a rethinking on the employers' side, be they private or public ones. We need to realize that in many countries the full potential of bachelor degrees is not yet fully developed. The prevailing expectation still is that a specific diploma prepares for a specific job and that the longer the study programme the better the preparation for the job. This is short sighted. In a changing economic environment the degree holder must be capable of summoning knowledge and skills that make it possible for him to adapt to manifold situations. But businesspeople must be open to this perspective and especially smaller and medium sized enterprises still have a long way to go. A realization that a great many jobs are generated in the small business and voluntary sectors has led to the tailoring of appropriate degree programmes. It is essential that degrees testify to abilities and capacities that go beyond the immediate needs and that at the same time degrees do not lead to unemployment. Any employability measure will have failed if it does not lead to employment.</p>	<p>... be they private or public ones. <u>Experience hitherto suggests that we need to realize</u> that in many countries the full potential of bachelor degrees is not yet fully developed. ... (EUA)</p> <p><i>Reference should be made here to the comments made repeatedly for the public sector to set the standard by adjusting their career structures to the new Bologna degree structures that they have asked the universities to introduce.</i> (EUA)</p> <p>bachelor-first cycle degrees (Italy)</p> <p>...preparation for the job. This is short sighted. <u>Changing these perceptions will take time.</u> In a fast moving changing economic environment the degree holders <u>will increasingly have to</u> must be capable of <u>demonstrating</u> summoning knowledge and skills that make it possible for him to adapt to manifold situations. (EUA)</p> <p>In a changing economic environment the degree holders must be capable of summoning knowledge and skills that make it possible for him them [<i>to avoid gender specificity or the unwieldy him/her</i>] (CoE)</p> <p>... make it possible for him/<u>her</u> to adapt...(Austria)</p> <p><u>Also employers</u> But businesspeople must be open... (EUA)</p> <p>But businesspeople <u>employers in business and the public sector</u> must be open to this perspective... (Germany)</p> <p>...“and especially smaller and medium sized enterprises still have a long way to go”: <i>where is the evidence for this?</i> (EUA)</p> <p>...and especially smaller and medium sized enterprises still have a long way to go <u>have to be addressed in regard of this issue.</u> A realization that... (Businessseurope)</p> <p>“...has led to the tailoring of appropriate degree programmes”: <i>once again where is the evidence for this?</i> (EUA)</p> <p>... that go beyond the immediate needs <u>and allow adaptation to different circumstances and changing labour market needs.</u> <u>Of course that</u> at the same time degrees do should not lead to unemployment. Any and employability measures <u>that do not</u></p>	

Original text	Comments submitted by 9 October 2008	Revised text
	<p><u>enhance employment perspectives</u> will have failed if it does not lead to employment. (EUA)</p>	
<p><i>The key point is to design curricula and to foster teaching methods that promote the learning of competencies and skills that are needed in tomorrow's economy, including in the regulated professions. The employers' engagement in the design of curricula is a way of tuning programme provisions in such a way that they are relevant for the labour market. However, programme construction will still have to pay attention to the longer term needs of society for the provision of important centres of knowledge and research regardless of a more immediate context. This is a delicate balance to strike.</i></p>	<p>The key point is to design curricula and to foster teaching/learning methods that, <u>besides self-realisation and active citizenship</u>, also promote the learning of competencies and skills... (Italy)</p> <p>The key point is to design curricula and to foster teaching methods that promote the learning of competencies and <u>transversal</u> skills that are needed in tomorrow's economy. <u>Moreover, these considerations need to be introduced into ongoing discussions on- including in the regulated professions. The e</u> Employers' engagement in the design of <u>relevant</u> curricula is a way of tuning programme provisions in such a way that they are relevant for the labour market. However, programme <u>development must also</u> construction will still have to pay attention to the longer term needs of society <u>in relation to the creation and transmission for the provision of important centres of knowledge and research</u> regardless of a more immediate context. This is a delicate balance to strike. (EUA)</p> <p><i>Designing curricula in cooperation with employers and other stakeholders is a positive initiative and the dialogue needs to be strengthened. In addition it needs to be emphasized, that the higher education institutions hold an innovative function and are key contributors to the identification of competences and skills of relevance for the labour market of the future.</i> (Denmark)</p> <p>However, programme construction will still have to <u>must always</u> pay attention to the longer term needs... (Italy)</p> <p>This is a delicate balance to strike, <u>but nevertheless there is a need to encourage a more systematic dialogue between higher education institutions and employers.</u> (Austria)</p>	
<p><i>Moreover, the promotion of the new degree structure among employers, especially among small and medium sized enterprises, is an urgent short term task.</i></p>	<p>Moreover, The promotion of <u>the advantages of</u> the new degree structure... (EUA)</p> <p>... an urgent short term task. <u>Raising awareness of the value of the Bachelor degree is not only important for the employers but also for students, parents, academics/professors and higher educations institutions themselves.</u></p> <p><u>Giving Information advice and guidance for students at the end of their study period and for potential students about future careers and employment opportunities is fundamental. The responsibility for the provision of advice and guidance should be strengthened</u></p>	

Original text	Comments submitted by 9 October 2008	Revised text
	<p><u>within the higher education institutions. Governments/government agencies and employers should together with higher education institutions improve the accessibility and quality of their employment –related service to the students.</u> (Austria)</p> <p>Moreover, the <u>further</u> promotion of the new degree structure among employers, especially among small and medium sized enterprises, is an urgent short term task. <u>Especially the communication and collaboration between employers and higher education institutions has to be improved.</u> (Businesseurope)</p> <p>Moreover, the promotion of the new degree structure among employers, especially among small and medium sized enterprises, is an urgent short term task. <u>The development of national qualifications frameworks and the stakeholder engagement and debate it will require in order to be successfully carried out constitutes a first essential opportunity for communicating and clarifying the meaning of the new qualifications.</u> (ESU)</p>	
<p>Employability is not restricted to the first two cycles. In carrying out their central role in the training of researchers, universities increasingly have to face the challenges of a changing labour market for young researchers and need to prepare them for a wider variety of careers than in the past i.e. not only in the academic environment, but also in industry, non-profit organisations, private companies, or private and public independent research centres.</p>	<p><i>Question: which is the key concept – social dimension – lifelong learning – mobility – and how best to structure them?</i> (EUA)</p>	
<p>1.2.3. Lifelong Learning Goals like the social dimension and employability can only be reached if they are set within a perspective of lifelong learning. The concept of lifelong learning is a broad one where education that is flexible, diverse and available at different times and places is pursued throughout life. In its scope it is founded on the four “pillars” of education for the future as they were identified by the Delors report (1996): learning to know, learning to do, learning to live together (and with others) and learning to be.</p>	<p>The concept of lifelong learning is a broad one where education that is flexible, diverse and available at different times and places is pursued throughout life. <u>It encompasses at the same time the idea of flexible access and learning paths (with the aim of widening participation) and the concept of continuous education.</u> In its scope it is founded... (ESU)</p> <p>In its scope it is founded on the four “pillars” of education for the future as they were identified by the Delors report (1996): learning to know, learning to do, learning to live together (and with others) and learning to be. (Germany)</p>	
<p>In late modernity, change and uncertainty are often</p>	<p>...social cohesion. <u>First and foremost lifelong learning is the right of any citizen, but it could also be used to develop or improve</u></p>	

Original text	Comments submitted by 9 October 2008	Revised text
<p>seen as defining characteristics of the contemporary world. Lifelong learning is supposed to empower the individual, the citizen and the worker to address the different forms of change - economic, cultural, technological and demographic – in a positive manner. Lifelong learning puts emphasis on the need to become a “learning society” and lends support to the need for both economic competitiveness and social cohesion. Lifelong learning is both a cultural and economic commodity, located not only in the market place but the in the social system of class and status.</p>	<p>knowledge, skills and competences that are required by the labour market, and, together with the recognition of prior learning, may help individuals climb up the qualifications ladder both a cultural and economic commodity, located not only in the market place but the in the social system of class and status. (Italy)</p> <p>Lifelong learning is both a cultural and economic commodity, located not only in the market place but the in the social system of class and status. <i>I do not see what this sentence adds nor do I understand the link to “a social system of class and status” – this should not be part of the report</i> (EUA)</p> <p>Lifelong learning is both a cultural and economic commodity, located not only in the market place but the in the social system of class and status. <u>It is however easy to realise that, in the pursuit for sustainable employment, individuals with higher levels of education have greater awareness of the importance and the opportunities for continuous training and can potentially benefit more from the lifelong learning systems, increasing knowledge and capacity gaps with other social groups. Such a concern should always be taken into account when designing the lifelong learning systems.</u> (ESU)</p> <p>Lifelong learning is both a cultural and economic commodity, located not only in the market place but the in the social system of class and status <u>as well as in personal development and fulfilment.</u> (CoE)</p>	
<p>Lifelong learning is concerned with climbing higher up the qualifications ladder and improving knowledge, skills and competences, using recognition of prior learning. On the one hand, lifelong learning has thus become a policy goal for supporting economic growth.</p>	<p>Lifelong learning is concerned with climbing higher up the qualifications ladder and improving knowledge, skills and competences, using recognition of prior learning. (Italy)</p> <p><i>Paragraph 3 states that lifelong learning is concerned with climbing higher up the qualifications ladder. That's one aspect of it, but by no means the whole story - it also includes extending knowledge, gaining new skills (whatever the level) etc</i> (UK(Scotland))</p> <p>Lifelong learning is <u>about empowering citizens and concerned allowing all who can benefit the opportunity of accessing higher education, and indeed of moving in and out of higher education throughout their lives for a number of different purposes. It is a multifaceted concept and may involve with climbing higher up the qualifications ladder, and improving knowledge, skills and competences based, using upon the recognition of prior learning or simply pursuing learning to enrich one's personal growth.</u> On the one hand, lifelong learning has thus become a policy goal for</p>	

Original text	Comments submitted by 9 October 2008	Revised text
	<p><u>increasing participation in higher education and supporting economic growth, on the other for supporting the personal development of all citizens, also those who have not traditionally been previously involved in higher education.</u> (EUA)</p>	
<p>On the other hand, lifelong learning is seen as having a social function to encourage democracy and active citizenship. Three major domains stem from this social function:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a concern for social justice with an emphasis on educational fairness, equality and empowerment; • a concern for social inclusion; • a concern for reducing poverty (poverty being understood through the categories of income (relative and absolute), capability (deprivation of knowledge and skills for participation in public life) and indirect poverty caused by poor health, infrastructure, natural disaster, war). 	<p>Thus On the other hand, lifelong learning is <u>may be</u> seen... (EUA)</p> <p><i>This could be cut as I am not sure that it is necessary here to go into so much detail.</i> (EUA)</p> <p>...infrastructure, natural disaster, war). <u>In this sense, the importance of lifelong learning for both social development and economic growth is not separable from the rest of the education system, including higher education, since these have similar objectives. When defining the systems and modes of provision for lifelong learning, the same fundamental principles of public good and public responsibility used for higher education should also apply in this case.</u> (ESU)</p>	
<p><i>The key point is that if lifelong learning is to succeed it must be rooted in a social and economic climate in which learning is valued, used and rewarded. This amounts to a cultural change. The more fundamental structural issues to face are in terms of building the kind of seamless robe of provision required for a system of lifelong learning based on multiple sources of financing.</i></p>	<p>The key point is that if lifelong learning is to succeed it must be rooted in a <u>cultural</u>, social and economic climate in which learning is valued, used and rewarded. (CoE)</p> <p><i>Add a ref to moving to student centred learning to underline the link between this and the lifelong learning agenda.</i> (UK/Scotland)</p> <p>...building the kind of seamless robe of provision required for a system of lifelong learning <u>with alternations of learning and working periods and</u> based on multiple sources of financing. (Austria)</p> <p><u>In the context of lifelong learning it is necessary to distinguish between traditional "Bologna" degrees and further education degrees and to provide information on their value in a transparent way.</u> (Austria)</p> <p>"based on multiple sources of financing": <i>is this necessary?</i> (Italy)</p>	
<p>1.2.4. The attractiveness of European higher education The Bologna Process clearly impacts on how higher</p>	<p><u>General comment on section 1.2.4: There is no reference made to the fact that neither national strategies nor a European strategy can be successful unless they are implemented via higher education institutions, their staff and students, and thus can be</u></p>	

Original text	Comments submitted by 9 October 2008	Revised text
<p>education in Europe relates to higher education in other parts of the world. At the same time, it is clear that the global dimension of the Bologna process, seen from a European perspective, is a mix of what we have in common – the European Higher Education Area – and elements that are specific for each participating country, including strategies for marketing one's own national higher education.</p>	<p><i>integrated into individual institutional strategies; nor are questions asked as to how this can be achieved (incentives, etc.) – as a valid question for the future post 2010 (EUA)</i></p> <p>Bologna <u>P</u>rocess (CoE)</p> <p>...and elements that are specific for each participating country, including strategies for marketing one's own national higher education <u>or one's own institutions and programs.</u> (CoE)</p>	
<p>The attractiveness of the EHEA is based on its striving for excellence and its openness; it hinges on a number of conditions, among which the following ones feature prominently:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • make it an attractive place for study and research, • make it an attractive labour market for academics through the quality of the experience and clearly defined career paths, • preserve its rich and diverse cultural heritage in terms of institutional cultures, teaching and learning styles and curricular diversity. <p>Generally speaking, the reputation of European higher education rests upon its quality; reputation and quality are intertwined and they are main factors encouraging international students and academics to work/study in Europe.</p>	<p>...among which the following ones feature prominently: <u>The EHEA must</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • be make it an attractive place for study and research, • be make it an attractive labour market for academics through the quality of the experience and clearly defined career paths, (Germany) • make it an attractive labour market for academics <u>and professionals</u> through the quality of the experience and clearly defined career paths, (Denmark) 	
<p>The external dimension of the Bologna Process is also about positioning the EHEA in the global world of higher education. By 2020, the role competition plays in higher education will have grown substantially on account of the international "arms race" in investments and in innovation. The EHEA will have to position itself vis-à-vis its competitors, but it is unlikely that it will succeed in anything more than partly closing the gap between the US supremacy as a leading knowledge economy and the European one.</p>	<p><i>"global world" is a tautology. What is a "non-global world"?</i> (CoE)</p> <p>...partly closing the gap between the US supremacy as a leading knowledge economy and the European one. (Austria)</p> <p>By 2020, the role competition plays in higher education will have grown substantially on account of the international "arms race" in investments and in innovation. (Italy)</p> <p>By 2020, the role competition plays in higher education will have grown substantially on account of the international "arms race" <u>(desirable!) increase</u> in investments and in innovation <u>in many parts of the world</u> (Germany)</p>	

Original text	Comments submitted by 9 October 2008	Revised text
<p>However, the EHEA should aim at becoming the most creative and innovative sector in a global setting.</p>	<p>By 2020, the role competition plays in higher education will have grown substantially; <u>there is talk of an on account of the international academic "arms race" in terms of investments in research and innovation given their strategic importance for economic development and competitiveness.</u> (EUA)</p> <p>The EHEA will have to position itself vis-à-vis its competitors, but it is unlikely that it will succeed in anything more than partly closing the gap between the US supremacy as a leading knowledge economy and the European one. However, t The EHEA should aim at becoming the most creative and innovative sector <u>region</u> in a global setting. (Commission)</p>	
<p>As the Bologna Process developed, a growing interest in both the Process as such and the emerging European Higher Education Area could be noted worldwide and it becomes increasingly clear that the Bologna Process needs to react to this growing interest. While the EHEA should not appear as "fortress Europe", changing the criteria for membership or defining different categories for countries that expressed interest but are not eligible for membership do not seem to be feasible solutions.</p>	<p>While the EHEA should not appear as "fortress Europe", changing the criteria for membership or defining different categories for countries that expressed interest but are not eligible for membership does de not seem to be <u>a</u> feasible solutions, <u>the Bologna Process recognises and appreciates the importance of the significant number of countries that have chosen to align their HE systems with Bologna.</u> (Italy)</p> <p>While the EHEA should not appear as "fortress Europe", changing the criteria for membership or defining different categories for countries that expressed interest but are not eligible for membership do not seem to be feasible solutions, <u>the EHEA should not appear as "fortress Europe"</u>. (Commission)</p>	
<p><i>The key point thus is to provide information on the EHEA specifically targeted at non-EHEA countries through, among others, an appropriate EHEA-website and to facilitate coordinated information visits to and from non-EHEA countries. The values and achievements of the EHEA should be actively promoted.</i></p>		
<p><i>Optimal use should be made of existing EU policy fora for cooperation with other regions of the world.</i></p>		
<p><i>As agreed at the ministerial meeting in Berlin, the geographical scope and overall criteria for determining membership of the Bologna Process are the signing of the European Cultural Convention.</i></p>	<p>As agreed at the ministerial meeting in Berlin, the geographical scope and overall criteria for determining membership of the Bologna Process are the signing of dual: being a party to the <u>European Cultural Convention and committing to the goals of the EHEA.</u> (CoE)</p> <p>membership of the Bologna Process <u>European Higher Education</u></p>	

Original text	Comments submitted by 9 October 2008	Revised text
<p><i>Cooperation mechanisms should be devised to further cooperation with countries that have indicated an interest in the Process but are not eligible for membership. These mechanisms should be of mutual benefit and can include the following:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Policy dialogue on specific topics, such as quality assurance, recognition, student involvement, governance, etc;</i> • <i>Participation in Bologna-related conferences, seminars and other events;</i> • <i>Invitations to contribute to Bologna projects where appropriate;</i> • <i>Cooperation in the framework of relevant EU programmes with partners across the world;</i> • <i>A discussion forum with participants from non-EHEA countries en marge of ministerial meetings, making full use of existing EU and UNESCO initiatives.</i> 	<p><u>Area (ESU)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy dialogue on specific topics, such as quality assurance, recognition, student involvement, governance, etc; • Participation in Bologna-related conferences, seminars and other events; • Invitations to contribute to Bologna projects where appropriate; • Cooperation in the framework of relevant EU programmes with partners across the world; <p>A discussion forum with participants from non-EHEA countries en marge of ministerial meetings, making full use of existing EU and UNESCO initiatives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>A <i>Bologna policy forum</i> in the margins of Bologna ministerial meetings with participants from EHEA countries and countries that have expressed their interest in the Bologna Process but are not party to the European Cultural Convention</u> • <u><i>Policy dialogue on specific topics</i> (such as quality assurance, recognition, student involvement, governance etc.) at civil servant or stakeholder level, also making full use of existing EU and UNESCO initiatives.</u> • <u>Participation in Bologna-related conferences, seminars and other events.</u> • <u>Invitations to contribute to projects and initiatives as part of the BFUG work programme, where appropriate.</u> • <u>Cooperation in the framework of relevant EU programmes and projects with partners across the world.</u> • <u>Contribution by the BFUG to relevant projects and activities in other regions. (Austria)</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A discussion forum with participants <u>Bologna Policy Forum with ministers</u> from non-EHEA countries en marge of <u>the Bologna ministerial conferences (back-to-back meetings)</u>. <u>Countries participating in the Bologna Policy Forum would obtain the status of Bologna Partner Country (or any other term which reflects their strong interest, without suggesting that membership is within reach)</u>. • making full use of existing EU and UNESCO initiatives (Commission) • <u>Invitation for the participation of these countries in Bologna-related conferences, seminars and other events; (ESU)</u> 	

Original text	Comments submitted by 9 October 2008	Revised text
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cooperation in the framework of relevant EU programmes <u>and projects</u> with partners across the world. (France) 	
<p>1.2.5. Mobility</p>	<p>The mobility coordination group welcomes the idea to make mobility one of the priorities of the next phase of the Bologna Process and also supports the proposed measures. The proposal made on page 10 that <u>each</u> programme should provide “mobility windows” is considered to be of particular importance and should therefore also be taken up in the conclusions (2nd paragraph of chapter 4). Since it is not entirely clear what is meant with “mobility code”, this proposal needs to be further specified.</p> <p>In addition, the mobility coordination group suggests including the following proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data should be collected to get a better view of (a) mobility flows and (b) the funding available to support mobility. To substantially increase the number of mobile students and staff additional funding is needed, at both national and European level. Efforts should be continued to achieve mobility that is reciprocal and equitably balanced across the EHEA. <p>The group also advocates the introduction of clear <u>benchmarks</u> to be reached by 2020. Of the different proposals that were put forward, the following received the biggest support:</p> <p>By 2020,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 50% of all graduates in the EHEA should have been mobile at least once during their studies. 20% of all graduates should have spent at least one semester abroad. the number of international students in the EHEA coming from non-EHEA countries should have increased by 20%. the number of joint programmes in the EHEA should have been doubled. (Mobility CG) 	
<p>Mobility is one of the fundamentals of European cooperation and it has been a dominant issue in the rationales of the various communiqués of the Bologna Process. Indeed, apart from the economic value of creating a mobile labour force, student and staff mobility also has a cultural value enhancing mutual understanding between countries and regions as well as personal fulfilment. Mobility has much to do with the internationalisation of the system and the institutions and it finds its corollaries in multinational</p>	<p>... value of creating a mobile labour force, <u>and the academic and scientific benefits</u>, student, <u>young researcher</u> and staff mobility also has a cultural value enhancing mutual understanding between countries and regions as well as <u>contributing to</u> personal fulfilment. Mobility has much to do with the internationalisation of the system and the institutions and it finds its corollaries in <u>an international student body</u>, multinational faculty <u>and researchers</u> and in international curricula. (EUA)</p>	

Original text	Comments submitted by 9 October 2008	Revised text
<p>faculty and in international curricula. However, progress in this area does not seem to match the initial expectations.</p>		
<p>The original expectation was that the creation of a single space of education would give mobility a further boost. This does not necessarily seem to have happened. With regard to intra-European short-term programme mobility (Erasmus type mobility) the introduction of a two-tier degree system is sometimes pointed at as an obstacle to student mobility. It is argued that shorter degrees would make it more difficult to integrate a study period abroad and in some countries this latter argument has started massively to influence the debate about short-term mobility under the conditions of Bologna during the last years.</p>	<p>This does not necessarily seem to have happened <u>come about automatically, though</u>. (Austria)</p> <p>This does not necessarily seem to have happened <u>yet</u>. (Commission)</p> <p>This does not necessarily seem to have happened, <u>at least to the extent envisaged</u>. (CoE)</p> <p>...introduction of a two-tier <u>bachelor/master/Ph.D.</u> degree system (Austria)</p> <p>short-term mobility under the conditions of <u>in the context of the Bologna reforms during the last years</u>.</p> <p>...during the last years. <u>The long term, full programme mobility has shown, in some cases, the evidence of strengthening emigration and "brain drain". The further discussions and arrangements have to be undertaken to avoid this problem.</u> (Poland)</p> <p><u>More analysis is needed of the reasons for this development and consideration needs to be given of how to ensure sufficient flexibility within study programmes and degrees to allow for 'mobility windows'. At the same time it would also be important to enhance degree mobility, in other words to encourage more students to be mobile between the first and the second cycle, not least as an element of international competitiveness. The question of 'discipline mobility' also needs to be addressed.</u> (EUA)</p>	
<p>It is therefore suggested that stronger curricular efforts should be made in order to make teaching and learning during the study period abroad more meaningful.</p>	<p>It is therefore suggested that stronger curricular efforts should be made in order to make teaching and learning during the study period abroad more meaningful. (EUA)</p> <p>It is therefore suggested that stronger curricular efforts (<u>e.g. mobility windows</u>) should be made... (Austria)</p> <p>...more meaningful. <u>Furthermore, an analysis of the composition of the student body experiencing mobility periods abroad point out to a strong social selection and suggest the need for reinforcing the support schemes, articulating policies with the developments in the field of the social dimension.</u> (ESU)</p>	

Original text	Comments submitted by 9 October 2008	Revised text
	<i>It is not immediately clear what is intended here by the use of the word "meaningful": is this a reference to study abroad receiving credits? It would help if this were made clearer (UK)</i>	
<p>With regard to intra-European degree mobility, the positive expectations have remained in place. The existence of one and the same degree structure makes mobility from one country to another easier.</p>	<p><i>Where is the evidence for this? (EUA)</i></p> <p>With regard to intra-European degree mobility, the positive expectations have remained in place. <u>On one hand, the existence of one and the same degree structure makes mobility from one country to another easier. Progress towards coherence of recognition procedures is however required, as it has been identified above. On the other hand, the adoption of the same degree structures has not been sufficient to avoid imbalances in the mobility flows within the continent. A number of additional measures are required to promote more balanced flows between north and south, east and west.</u></p>	
<p>There is also growing emphasis on student mobility from other parts of the world. Growing proportions of mobile students from other parts of the world will impact on issues of quality, curricular change to accommodate their needs and expectations as well as the language in which the programme is delivered.</p>	<p>There is also growing emphasis on student mobility from other parts of the world. <u>Marketing and recruitment of international students is a growing priority for many HEIs.</u> Growing proportions of mobile students from other parts of the world... (EUA)</p>	
<p>However, mobility is also related to immigration issues and social security issues. These cannot be ignored as they define the relationships between the two groups of countries of the Bologna Process - those who are members of the European Union and those who are not – and their respective relationships to countries in other parts of the world.</p>		
<p>As far as academic mobility is concerned, issues of careers, social benefits, job security and pensions need to be taken into account when promoting increased mobility and international recruitment of academic staff.</p>		
<p><i>Besides the social dimension, mobility remains the key issue to be further developed under the Bologna beyond 2010 agenda. In terms of curriculum design, joint degrees and the ensuing necessary institutional</i></p>	<p>Besides the social dimension, mobility remains the key issue to be further developed under the Bologna beyond 2010 agenda. <u>The goal should be to reach a 20% of student intra-European mobility by 2020.</u> In terms of curriculum design... (ESU)</p>	

Original text	Comments submitted by 9 October 2008	Revised text
<p>partnerships are to be further developed. Each programme should provide "mobility windows" and provide for mutual recognition of study periods abroad.</p>	<p>Has this been decided, if so by whom? What about the widening participation/LLL question – cf EUA's comments about what is the overriding concept among these three (ie social dimension – LLL – mobility) (EUA)</p> <p>...of study periods abroad. <u>In line with the comments made on the previous page, mobility between the cycles should also be encouraged.</u> (EUA)</p>	
<p>In terms of the legal framework conditions, grants and loans are to be made portable and recognition improved; and entry requirements into a country should reflect the openness of the EHEA.</p>	<p>In terms of the legal framework conditions, grants and loans are <u>to</u> <u>should</u> be made portable and recognition improved; (Austria)</p>	
<p>Staff development is a necessary condition for the development of joint curricula.</p>	<p>This statement requires clarification and does not correspond to all the work that EUA and others have done on the question of joint curricula and joint degrees. This needs to be changed or deleted. (EUA)</p>	
<p>If the EHEA is to stay a centre of excellence in research and in teaching, staff mobility needs to be increased and the EHEA should become an EHEA labour market. The granting of visas and work permits specifically designed for and aimed at researchers is to be made easier. The transfer of pension rights will have to be made more widely possible. These measures interact with other areas of policy making and the follow up structure should respond to this adequately.</p>	<p>If the EHEA is to stay a centre of excellence in research and in teaching, <u>researcher and</u> staff mobility needs to be increased and the <u>EHEA should become an EHEA labour market.</u> This does not make sense – not sure what is meant – a more open labour market? (EUA)</p> <p>If the EHEA is to stay a centre of excellence in research and in teaching, staff mobility needs to be increased and the EHEA should become an EHEA <u>academic</u> labour market. (CoE)</p>	
<p>Generally speaking mobility is closely related to the social dimension and the development of a high quality learning and working environment with good social conditions. The political commitment to mobility will be laid down in a mobility code for the EHEA. Data collection will help monitor developments in this field and will enable the definition of benchmarks.</p>	<p>I am not sure what is envisaged by the "mobility code": what will its status be; who will it be aimed at etc. Some additional details would be welcome (UK)</p> <p>"Mobility code" - what does this mean? Further information needed. (Businessseurope)</p> <p>... "a mobility code for the EHEA": if this is to be a recommendation then further details are necessary. (EUA)</p>	
<p>1.3. The curriculum, an underlying issue The shift from structural reform to implementation, from institutionalization to practice will be successful</p>	<p>Delete entire section 1.3. As an underlying issue perhaps we need not include it here (Germany)</p> <p>The shift from structural reform to implementation, from</p>	

Original text	Comments submitted by 9 October 2008	Revised text
<p>if curricular development is an ongoing process. A degree structure based on learning outcomes, lifelong learning provision, study programmes with “mobility windows” - to cite but those - will only be properly implemented if it rests upon curricula that render the attainment of these objectives possible. Curricular change is thus the instrument par excellence and even though it is not a Bologna action line, it nevertheless features prominently on the Bologna agenda. Good practice in this area, which is ultimately the hallmark of quality education, must be one of the strengths of the European Higher Education Area.</p>	<p>institutionalization to practice will be successful <u>only</u> if curricular development is an ongoing process. (CoE)</p> <p>...will only be properly implemented if it rests upon <u>flexible learning paths and curricula</u> that render the attainment of these objectives possible. <u>The continuation of the huge efforts being made to adapt and reform curricula all across Europe thus needs to be continued to make sure that the Bologna reforms become a reality in institutions across Europe. Ongoing reflection on curricular change and adaptation to the needs of an ever more diverse student body</u> is thus the instrument par excellence <u>for ensuring the success of the Bologna reforms</u> and even though it is not a Bologna action line, it nevertheless features prominently on the Bologna agenda. (EUA)</p> <p>...it nevertheless features prominently on the Bologna agenda, <u>and entails a paradigm shift in teaching to a student-centred concept of higher education.</u> (Austria)</p> <p>...one of the strengths of the European Higher Education Area. <u>It also illustrates the key role of institutions, staff and students in the development of the EHEA.</u> (CoE)</p>	
<p><i>While learning outcomes have been generically defined for the degree structure in the context of the Dublin descriptors, the key point is to develop subject specific descriptors for knowledge, skills and competences.</i></p>	<p>While learning outcomes have been generically defined for the degree structure in the context of the Dublin descriptors, the key point is to develop subject specific descriptors for knowledge, skills and competences. <u>Such development should be taken up by establishing networks of cooperation between institutions and including students and should cater for the maintenance of diversity within the national systems and the EHEA.</u></p> <p>... skills and competences. <u>It is a prerequisite that the development of such descriptors takes place with due consideration of the diversity of programmes in Europe as well as of institutional, methodological, didactical and academic autonomy.</u> (Denmark)</p> <p><i>This is one point but not necessarily the key point unless there is evidence that points in this direction</i> (EUA)</p> <p><i>Is this really calling for the development of subject specific descriptors? It is not clear who would do this, and what purpose they would serve</i> (UK)</p>	
<p>Chapter 2. Bologna 2020</p>	<p><i>For this section specific drafting changes are not generally proposed but rather an overhaul of the structure of the section, of the issues raised, and the ways in which they are addressed.</i></p>	

Original text	Comments submitted by 9 October 2008	Revised text
<p>It is worth recalling one of the broad issues of the Bologna Declaration: <i>“Meanwhile, we are witnessing a growing awareness in large parts of the political and academic world and in public opinion of the need to establish a more complete and far-reaching Europe, in particular building upon and strengthening its intellectual, cultural, social, scientific and technological dimensions.”</i> This initial vision still holds true as an overarching principle for 2020. Yet, the world has changed since the last decade of the previous millennium and the goal as set forth in the Bologna Declaration needs to be related against a background of new challenges in order for relevant operational objectives to be defined.</p>	<p>(EUA)</p> <p>Heading “Bologna 2020”: <i>I think the main title of this paper is now “<u>Bologna beyond 2010</u>” and so the heading of chapter 2 should reflect this. (UK)</i></p>	
<p>2.1 Globalisation and competitiveness</p> <p><i>2.1.1. Global competitiveness in an emerging borderless higher education and research market</i></p> <p>One of the most visible manifestations of globalisation is the emerging “borderless” higher education market, which is the most evident trend in what is likely to be a continuing move toward a diversification of higher education provision. Traditional forms of provision, through organised programmes delivered by public and private higher education institutions belonging to a national education system and providing face to face interaction between learners and faculty are likely to remain the most important form of provision, but it is at the same time likely to meet competition and challenges from a range of other forms of provision, not all of which may even exist today. The huge increase in the world-wide demand in higher education, the budgetary and capacity problems of many countries to meet this demand, and on the other hand the opportunities created by new</p>	<p><i>On page 20 “demographic challenge” is named as the first major issue, secondly competitiveness. In terms of structural logic part 2.1 and 2.2 should be switched. (Businesseurope)</i></p> <p>General comments (EUA):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The question of borderless HE is not necessarily the key issue in relation to globalisation/competition – surely it must start with the reasons for this i.e. demographic change and the enormous growth in demand for HE throughout the world, the impact of technological change, etc 2) It is not clear what refers to Europe and what refers to elsewhere 3) Following on from this there is no analysis of what this means for Europe and what impact it has already had on European HE: i.e. the different demographics of Europe – increasing diversification of European HE in response to competitive pressures – the major debates in many countries on HE governance – autonomy – responsibility/social relevance – all a response to globalisation and its impacts 4) None of this is reflected in the first two paras below – the question of TNE I one specific phenomenon, however important it may be. 5) The first para should be focused on the impact of globalisation on European HE, the second and third paras should concentrate on the impact on the functioning of universities and how they react to these competitive 	

Original text	Comments submitted by 9 October 2008	Revised text
<p>communication technologies and the Internet, shape an environment in which new, mostly for-profit providers can successfully expand the supply of educational services. Universities from North America, Europe and Australia take initiatives to reach out their educational provision to this international higher education market, by active recruitment of international, fee-paying students to the home institution, by establishing branch campuses or franchising and twinning agreements with local institutions. The international demand for higher education has also invited new providers from outside the higher education sector to enter the scene.</p>	<p>pressures.</p> <p>6) I do not see the point of the remarks on faculty structure etc further on in the text unless they are related to a discussion on autonomy, especially as the last sentence refers to the importance of HEIs being 'responsive to society'.</p> <p>7) The arguments need to be reconsidered/made in a different way in order to underpin the key point i.e. it needs to be clear why Europe needs a broad base of research based HEIs to respond to global competition with arguments made for different kinds of research missions and more institutional profiling.</p> <p>8) Further reflection on the final point, i.e. the question of an 'international regulatory framework', is needed from EUA side as this is clearly the agenda for the future – nowhere discussed until now. Moreover, very few of the issues set out in the last para (e.g. IP, contract research etc.) are 'traditional' Bologna issues. (EUA)</p>	
<p>These market-like processes also entail that higher education institutions will tend to function more like an enterprise. Commercialising research results can be used as a means to increase income; the funding of research through research projects can endanger the autonomy of the researcher in the sense that tenure is no longer guaranteed since it is dependent on revenue from projects. Universities provide incubation support, advice on legal, technical or financial issues, expertise and knowledge transfer. Spin-offs tend to grow faster and have lower failure rates than conventional business start-ups. In other words by engaging in "academic capitalism" institutions of higher education become fully embedded in what is now called the knowledge triangle, but they risk losing the sense of their own identity which has rested upon their perceived, distinctive contribution: teaching for personal/cultural development, long-term research programmes, critical and reconstructive scholarship, an institutional space not owned by one powerful</p>	<p>"These market-like processes also entail that higher education institutions will tend to function more like an enterprise." <i>We don't follow the same conclusion. If it's a theoretical exercise, then it should be noted that it is an exercise. In such a case, we propose the following formulation: <u>"These market-like processes pressure universities to the creation of areas of activity that import enterprise-like mentality and organisation"</u>. (ESU)</i></p> <p>These market-like processes also entail that higher education institutions will tend to function more like an enterprise. <u>But they also encompass a number of dangers to features regarded as a fundamental part of the universities ethos.</u> Commercialising research results can be used as a means to increase income, <u>but pressure the institutions' research priorities;</u> the funding of research through research projects can endanger the autonomy of the researcher in the sense that tenure is no longer guaranteed since it is dependent on revenue from projects. <u>At the same time, universities are multiplying their services and activities to cope with increasing demands from society and governments to become more responsive and integrated with the business world. They provide incubation support advice on legal, technical or financial issues, expertise and knowledge transfer exchange.</u> (ESU)</p> <p><i>The term knowledge transfer assumes an idea of one-way flow, while it is more important the concept of knowledge exchange between institutions and between society, business world and institutions.</i> (ESU)</p>	

Original text	Comments submitted by 9 October 2008	Revised text
social agent but obliged to relate to all.	"academic capitalism": <i>We do not agree with this wording. Better: <u>Higher Education Institutions are becoming more and more entrepreneurial, fully embedded...</u></i> . (Businessseurope)	
The demand for more relevance might lead to a "commodification of knowledge production" on the one hand, and it might turn the relationship between teaching and learning into a provider-customer relationship on the other hand. This might constitute a threat to the other functions of the university pertaining to critical, thinking, curiosity driven research and theorising.	...curiosity driven research and theorising. <u>While market forces clearly play a role in determining the kind of higher education European countries develop and offer, there is reason to ask what is the proper role of market considerations in relation to other considerations. In autumn 2008, the world has had no shortage of reminders that market mechanisms are no more perfect than other mechanisms. Public authorities have a crucial role in ensuring that higher education also meet concerns – such as its responsibilities toward citizenship, cultural heritage and intercultural dialogue – that will not necessarily win out in pure market conditions.</u> (CoE)	
<p>Furthermore, the global problems are such that they cannot be solved by the methodology or the knowledge gained in one science alone. The most interesting debates take place at the edge of scientific fields or at the crossroads of sciences. "Disciplinarity" increasingly shows its limits, while interdisciplinarity is very much needed to be able</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - to address new investigations which are required by scientific developments in society, for example in bio-ethics, or by research opening up new fields at the cross-roads of subject areas, which is a must for our Knowledge society ; - to contribute to higher education and research as "global public goods". <p>Interdisciplinary approaches are needed to have creative people and to make the most of all the talents left unexploited in society; interdisciplinary approaches empower students:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - to address an issue from a wider range of perspectives, from different angles; - to communicate with each other, while over-specialization makes it increasingly difficult; 	<p><i>The first complete para on page 12 is another example of my general point about making statements about curriculum design. I do not think this is a matter for BFUG as a collective and we need to be clear how about how we present the need for curricula reform.</i> (UK/Scotland)</p>	

Original text	Comments submitted by 9 October 2008	Revised text
<p>- to understand, to read better an ever-complex reality with different clues for reading it, which makes it really crucial now to have multi or inter-disciplinary research teams in a knowledge society.</p>	<p>- to understand, to read better an ever <u>more</u> complex reality with different clues for reading it, which makes it really crucial now to have multi or inter-disciplinary research <u>as well as teaching teams and programs in a</u> knowledge society. (CoE)</p>	
<p>However, the universities and policy-makers have not yet overcome past experience. The department or faculty structure of most universities reflects the classification of science rooted in the 19th century; the traditional organisation is not innovative enough and not rational enough either in terms of the use of resources (cf. splitting the teaching of the same fundamental disciplines in the earliest stages of various health related study programmes). Organizational reform at institutional level must reflect this new organization of science. Curricula should build bridges between humanities and natural sciences. Content reform is needed if institutions are to be responsive to the needs of society.</p>	<p>However, the <u>most</u> universities, <u>academics</u> and policy-makers have not yet overcome past experience. (CoE)</p>	
<p>However, the need to compete in the global world of higher education does not exclude cooperative agreements. The resources needed for knowledge production are such that they can rarely be found within a single institution. Effective generation of new knowledge is increasingly based on complementary division of labour between various institutions, but also between industry and academia. Collaborative research and knowledge production can successfully take place provided that there is a positive willingness, a sense of maturity on both sides and that there is a willingness to adhere to a clearly drawn legal contract, including constraints on publishing due to patents, but also to be active in the pre-competitive collaborative research area, where there would be no patents and few publication constraints.</p>	<p>Effective generation of new knowledge is increasingly based on complementary division of labour between various institutions, but also between industry <u>the business world</u> and academia. (ESU)</p>	

Original text	Comments submitted by 9 October 2008	Revised text
<p><i>The key point is to reassert the unity between teaching and learning and to stress the fact that a distinguishing characteristic of European higher education is to base teaching and learning on the latest research findings. It should be noted that in a context in which the new models of open innovation and technology management are non linear and user-driven many types of research occur. By teaching a research methodology as part of the curriculum from early on, institutions of higher education will contribute to educating creative graduates able to function in the knowledge society and to rely on skills to deal with continuously changing technologies.</i></p>		
<p><i>Furthermore the key issue is to design new forms of provision compatible with the ICT age and in line with the demands of an interdisciplinary approach.</i></p>	<p>Furthermore the key issue is to design new forms of provision of <u>good quality which may be</u> compatible with the ICT age and in line with the demands of an interdisciplinary approach. (Italy)</p>	
<p><i>Finally an international regulatory framework might be needed to transcend the national policy contexts. The agenda of legal issues might be the following one: inventions and ownership; intellectual property; contract research; the rights of the researcher; the professional status and career of the researcher; ventures.</i></p>	<p><i>This issue needs further discussion, possibly on the basis of concrete examples (Germany)</i></p> <p><i>It is not clear what this means but, on face value, we would not be in favour of a legislative framework set at the European level (however defined or achieved). (UK)</i></p> <p>...the professional status and career of the researcher; ventures, <u>quality of cross-border provision of educational services.</u> (Italy)</p>	
	<p><u>Austria suggest that section 2.1.1 be replaced by:</u></p> <p>One of the most visible manifestations of globalisation is the emerging "borderless" higher education <i>market</i>, which is the most evident trend in what is likely to be a continuing move toward a diversification of higher education provision. Traditional forms of provision, through organised programmes delivered by public and private higher education institutions belonging to a national education system and providing face to face interaction between learners and faculty are likely to remain the most important form of provision. In the future, however, this traditional approach will face increasing competition and challenges from a range of other forms of provision. The huge increase in the world-wide demand in higher education, the budgetary and capacity problems of many countries to meet this demand, coupled with opportunities created</p>	

Original text	Comments submitted by 9 October 2008	Revised text
	<p>by new communication technologies and the Internet, shape an environment in which new providers can successfully expand the supply of educational services.</p> <p>Universities from North America, Europe and Australia take initiatives to widen their appeal and attractiveness and tap into this so-called international higher education market. They do so by actively recruiting international, fee-paying students, by establishing branch campuses or franchising and seeking twinning agreements with local institutions. The international demand for higher education has also invited new providers from outside the higher education sector to enter the scene.</p> <p>The pressure of these global market dynamics urges higher education institutions to gradually adopt an approach increasingly informed by a marked entrepreneurial spirit. Today's universities find themselves juggling new roles and expectations with traditional identities and conceptions. In a most delicate balancing act they have to seek to reconcile academic traditions and identities with new expectations and demands from society. Research results might, for example, be used as a means to increase income; on another level the funding of research through research projects could potentially endanger the autonomy of the researchers in the sense that tenure is no longer guaranteed since it is dependent on revenue from projects. Such quandaries call for open-minded, creative and innovative solutions. Repositioning of the universities and the pursuit of a gradually more enterprise-minded approach will accentuate the vital role of European universities in the knowledge triangle of research, education and innovation, which permeates a knowledge-intensive society.</p> <p><i>Europe's answer to the ever more competitive global educational sphere ought to unequivocally highlight the numerous benefits of a dynamic European Higher Education Area. Deeply entrenched in the traditional yet open-minded unity and symbiosis between teaching and learning the latest research findings shall inform and drive teaching at European universities. European higher education shall become a trademark quality label, which rests on the pillars championed by the Bologna Process. The EHEA shall boast a diversified catalogue of easily readable degrees and comparable degrees (monitored through the Diploma Supplement), a thorough implementation of the European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System, it shall champion the promotion of mobility, European cooperation in quality assurance and an overarching European dimension in higher education in general. The EHEA rests on these vital pillars, which allow universities to continuously strive for innovation on the basis of their traditions.</i></p> <p>Global problems are such that they cannot be solved by the</p>	

Original text	Comments submitted by 9 October 2008	Revised text
	<p>methodology or the knowledge gained in one science alone. The most interesting debates take place at the fringes of scientific fields or at the crossroads of sciences. The European Higher Education Area is rich in academic fields and boasts an unparalleled diversity of cultures and traditions. To fuse these disciplines in order to maximise students' benefits should be an overarching goal. Interdisciplinarity reflects Europe's diversity and it is crucially needed to address new investigations which are required by scientific developments in society, for example in bio-ethics, or by research opening up new fields at the cross-roads of subject areas. Interdisciplinary approaches empower students to address an issue from a wider range of perspectives, to ease communication across disciplines, to better grasp an ever-complex reality.</p> <p>The need to compete in the global world of higher education furthermore calls for new modes of cooperative agreements. The resources needed for knowledge production are scarce and can rarely be found within a single institution. Effective building and provision of new knowledge is increasingly based on complementary division of labour between various institutions, not least an intensified dialogue between industry and academia.</p> <p><i>The conceptualisation and design of new forms of provision based on and exploiting modern</i> <i>-day information and communication technology (ICT) represents yet another imminent challenge.</i></p> <p><i>Finally, an agreed-upon framework might be needed to transcend the national policy contexts. The following legal issues might be tackled: inventions and ownership; intellectual property; contract research; the rights of the researcher; the professional status and career of the researcher; ventures. Existing structures built on good practice should be used instead of creating new ones (e.g., The Researchers Mobility Portal, The European Charta for researchers and the code of conduct for the recruitment of researchers, The Lisbon Recognition Convention, etc.) (Austria)</i></p>	
<p>2.1.2. Global competitiveness and intercultural dialogue</p>	<p><i>This section needs to be reconsidered in the light of the above – if the above section concentrates on competition & its impact on HE this section should discuss more generally the purposes of cooperation in HE but in a broader context than just 'intercultural dialogue', e.g. also including reference to the pursuit of knowledge as a global enterprise (EUA)</i></p>	
<p>Globalisation does not only relate to an emerging borderless market. Higher education is also a means of cooperating with other parts of the world. It is about strengthening North-South cooperation and</p>	<p><i>This, indeed, is the key issue – globalisation has many elements, and there should be a more general reflection on its impacts on European HE, taking into account ongoing reforms & possible responses through the Bologna process. The introduction to this section requires reformulation. (EUA)</i></p>	

Original text	Comments submitted by 9 October 2008	Revised text
<p>working towards a globally engaged European higher education. The economic effect of globalisation leading to the creation of wealth is increasingly linked up with a capacity to handle differences and diversity.</p>		
<p>At the same time these trends are scarred by conflict, intolerance and fear. Our societies are faced with a number of challenges requiring that their members have the intellectual ability to analyze challenges, see connections between different areas, devise solutions and act on the basis of incomplete information, but also that they have attitudes of citizenship: a will to solve conflicts through negotiation and majority decisions (with due regard to minority views) rather than violence, a recognition of the importance of human dignity and of minority rights, and also an ability and willingness to engage in the public sphere and to weigh the benefits to the community in relation to individual benefits.</p>	<p><i>This para requires major editing (EUA)</i></p>	
<p>Higher education institutions can play a special role in this context. They are particular places for debating fundamental issues and they, therefore, should develop:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • intercultural competencies • understanding of different societies, their traditions, cultures and beliefs in Europe and beyond • an ability to reason ethically • responsible citizenship. 	<p>Higher education institutions can play a special role in this context. They are particular places for debating fundamental issues and they, therefore, should develop:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>responsible citizenship</u> • intercultural competencies • understanding of different societies, their traditions, cultures and beliefs in Europe and beyond • an ability to reason <u>and act</u> ethically • responsible citizenship. (CoE) 	
<p><i>The key point is to further the role of higher education in developing intercultural awareness. Curricula should help students to develop knowledge, skills and habits of mind to be able to reflect on their own beliefs and the choices they make; they should be aware and critical of their own assumptions and beliefs and engage open-mindedly with different</i></p>	<p>The key point is to further the role of higher education in developing intercultural awareness <u>and to imbed internationalization in the mission and strategy of the higher education institution</u>. Curricula should help students... (Austria)</p> <p><i>We are not persuaded that it is appropriate for Bologna to advocate furthering "the role of higher education in developing intercultural awareness". (UK)</i></p>	

Original text	Comments submitted by 9 October 2008	Revised text
<p><i>cultural forms and historical moments.</i></p>	<p>...and engage open-mindedly with different cultural forms and historical moments. <u>The support to cultural studies and social sciences play a fundamental role in this regard, building critical mass and anticipating and answering to challenges.</u> (ESU)</p> <p><i>There are challenges that are global and related to globalisation that doesn't fit in neither the frame of the emerging market nor the frame of intercultural dialogue, but fit well in the area of global consciousness and social responsibility. That is for example the case for engaging n solving problems such as energy, developing studies on migration, etc, etc. Such an engagement with the problems of the surrounding environment must not be limited to a global sphere, but rather encompass and understand that the problems of the local community steam from and relate with the global challenges.</i> (ESU)</p>	
<p>2.2. Demography European demographics are such that the average age of the European population is somewhere in the mid-forties. In ten years' time it will be in the fifties. Against this background, the central questions are how we secure enough professionals to operate Europe as well as how we develop a civic culture that will include and preserve a measure of solidarity between generations.</p>		
<p>European Higher Education has experienced "massification" during the last quarter of the previous century, without, however, giving fair access to children from culturally less privileged backgrounds. On the other hand, our capacity to address the societal issues of the 21st century, be they related to energy, climate change or social cohesion, will only be met if we manage to tap into intellectual resources that have hitherto been neglected.</p>	<p>European Higher Education has experienced "massification" during the last quarter of the previous century, without, however, giving fair access to children <u>learners</u> [so as not to stay with classical students only, cf LLL] from culturally less privileged backgrounds. (CoE)</p>	
<p>Lifelong learning is a way of addressing this issue. In an ageing population, advanced education for professionals is of paramount importance if they want to remain creative and innovative within their</p>		

Original text	Comments submitted by 9 October 2008	Revised text
field or move to another one.		
<p><i>The key issue, therefore, is to design the lifelong learning agenda in such a way that it can meet the challenges posed by an ageing population. Widening access and diversifying the body of learners are objectives that are met through the implementation of student centred learning and through flexible learning paths connected to qualifications frameworks and to recognition of prior learning.</i></p>	<p>...to recognition of prior learning. <u>Adequate resources should also be made available to meet the diversified demands of learners.</u> (Italy)</p>	
<p><i>This will entail a mainstreaming of lifelong learning in institutions of higher education and will call for changes in the legislative framework.</i></p>	<p>This will entail a mainstreaming of lifelong learning in institutions of higher education and will call for changes in the legislative framework. <u>In this context, the same principles applied to all other education sectors, such as recognising this as a public good and a public responsibility, apply also to lifelong learning provision.</u> (ESU)</p> <p><i>It is not clear which framework needs to be changed nor what changes are needed.</i> (UK)</p>	
<p><i>Furthermore, the implementation of lifelong learning to meet the demographic challenge has an impact on mobility. Mature students are less likely to engage in mobility schemes for personal or family reasons. The same situation applies to part-time students who will have to combine work and study. Mobility will have to be conceived of differently to meet the demands of an ageing population.</i></p>	<p>Mobility will have to be conceived of differently to meet the demands of an ageing population. <u>Accordingly, new impulse should be given to the development of activities for "internationalization at home".</u> (Italy)</p>	
<p><i>Regional differences in demographic changes will also have their impact on mobility flows of students and staff.</i></p>		
<p>2.3. Roles and responsibilities It is worth recalling that the modern university was put at the disposal of the nation-state by its German philosophical founders. One of the main functions of the university was to train future civil servants, which led to the nineteenth century nation building mission of the university. However, there is now a</p>	<p>"It is worth recalling that the modern university was put at the disposal of the nation-state by its German philosophical founders. One of the main functions of the university was to train future civil servants, which led to the nineteenth century nation building mission of the university." <i>These remarks should perhaps be rather more nuanced – some may not agree with this summary statement</i> (EUA)</p> <p>"However, there is now a growing disentanglement in the</p>	

Original text	Comments submitted by 9 October 2008	Revised text
<p>growing disentanglement in the relationship between institutions of higher education and the State. Moreover, the sole responsibility of the nation state has been nuanced by greater Community action within the European Union.</p>	<p>relationship between institutions of higher education and the State." <i>The overall context should be the role of the university in society as the university contributes to societal development rather than serving 'the state' as such. If this refers to more autonomy in relation to the state, it should be explained clearly from the outset in the context of the redefinition of the roles. Given the previous sections on globalisation the growing relationship with other stakeholders should be underlined and not only the role of the EU.</i> (EUA)</p> <p>Moreover, the sole responsibility of the nation state has been nuanced by greater Community action within the European Union <u>as well as a growing consciousness, not least in the academic community, of our moral responsibility as global citizens.</u> (CoE)</p>	
<p>The Bologna Process has led to structural reforms that were not part of the agenda at the outset. University autonomy is one of them. Usually it is defined as less regulation, keeping government intervention at arm's length. The reform process leading to greater institutional autonomy has taken place in an environment of structural changes in the economy and was for some time accompanied by a serious economic crisis. At the same time the instrumentality of system steering through evaluating institutional performance, efficiency and achievement has been developed.</p>	<p>Usually it is defined as less regulation, keeping government intervention at arm's length <u>and creating a new relationship between HEIs and the state.</u> The reform process leading to greater institutional autonomy <u>has been accompanied by a growth in the expectations of society towards the university and</u> has taken place in an environment... (EUA)</p>	
<p>At the European level, a growing "contractualisation" of relationships is expected and at the same time there will be an increasing penetration of international conventions and declarations into legal systems. Institutional autonomy is placed within this increasing number of interacting and overlapping layers of governance. So more market does not necessarily imply less State. Autonomy and regulation are not contrasting pairs.</p>		
<p>The Council of Europe Recommendation on public responsibility adopted by the Council's Committee of Ministers suggests that the responsibility of public</p>		

Original text	Comments submitted by 9 October 2008	Revised text
<p>authorities for higher education and research should be nuanced and defined relative to specific areas. The text broadly recommends that public authorities have:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • exclusive responsibility for the framework within which higher education and research is conducted; • leading responsibility for ensuring effective equal opportunities to higher education for all citizens, as well as ensuring that basic research remains a public good; • substantial responsibility for financing higher education and research, the provision of higher education and research, as well as for stimulating and facilitating financing and provision by other sources within the framework developed by public authorities. 		
<p>This recommendation points clearly at different roles public authorities can play as well as to the fact that public authorities may have an important role in some areas without claiming a monopoly. In other areas, the role of public authorities cannot be shared with other actors.</p>		
<p>The state is thus increasingly seen as a regulator, a catalyst rather than a direct provider; this raises the question of the regulatory framework.</p>	<p>The state is thus increasingly seen as a regulator, <u>and</u> a catalyst rather than a direct provider; this raises the question of the regulatory framework.</p>	
<p><i>The key issue is to redefine the roles and responsibilities of the various actors involved with regard to:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Quality development and assurance</i> • <i>Funding framework</i> • <i>Governance</i> • <i>Institutional autonomy and accountability</i> • <i>Diversity of missions and institutions</i> • <i>Social dimension.</i> 	<p><i>The key issue is to redefine the roles and responsibilities of the various actors involved with regard to:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i><u>Qualifications and learning outcomes</u></i> • <i><u>Quality development and assurance</u></i> • <i><u>Mobility</u></i> • <i>Funding framework</i> • <i>Governance</i> • <i>Institutional autonomy and accountability</i> • <i>Diversity of missions and institutions</i> • <i>Social dimension (CoE)</i> 	

Original text	Comments submitted by 9 October 2008	Revised text
<p>2.4. Institutional diversity</p>	<p><i>Cause and effect in relation to diversity need to be considered carefully, also making the link to the previous chapters and contextualising the remarks, i.e.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>more demands on the university to be relevant for society in different ways</i> • <i>more competition</i> • <i>the need for Europe to maintain its research competitiveness and hence the focus on research intensive universities with a certain critical mass, also related to the cost of research infrastructure etc. etc.</i> • <i>more autonomy allowing institutions to decide on their own mission, profile and priorities</i> • <i>growing discourse on ‘parity of esteem’ and the importance of being excellent in relation to a specific mission (EUA)</i> 	
<p>Global competition in higher education brings with it international league tables, rankings, benchmarks and other comparisons of the performance of higher education institutions. These trends invite the creation of new groupings whose reference points will be the need to maintain global reputations rather than to contribute to national or local needs. This will lead to a few rich research universities. However, for the majority of institutions this kind of “status” is beyond their reach and striving for it would anyway distract them from other important purposes. The latter certainly include economic ones, but also roles in relation to social equity, social mobility, social cohesion, citizenship, cultural engagement. All these form the various potential “public goods” of higher education.</p>	<p>Global competition in higher education brings with it <u>a demand for more international comparisons and measurement of performance. Recently, the development of</u> international league tables, rankings, benchmarks and other comparisons of the performance of higher education institutions <u>has impacted the academia and the policy debate.</u> These trends... (ESU)</p> <p>These trends invite the creation of new groupings whose reference points will be the need to maintain global reputations rather than <u>only</u> to contribute to national or local needs. This will lead to a few rich research <u>intensive</u> universities. (EUA)</p> <p>All these form the various potential “public goods” <u>benefits</u> of higher education. (Germany)</p>	
<p>The question arising out of these considerations is whether greater differentiation in the mission statements of higher education institutions will be necessary to protect them from market forces. Indeed, as a spontaneous corollary to the convergence brought about by the Bologna Process, institutions have further differentiated themselves. They show considerable variation in mission and</p>	<p>The question arising out of these considerations is <u>twofold: whether greater differentiation in the mission statements of higher education institutions will be necessary to protect them from market forces; the role and importance of differentiation in ensuring that societal expectations of universities are met; and how to ensure that HEIs across Europe benefit from sufficient autonomy to be able to consider their specific missions and profiles.</u> Indeed, as a spontaneous corollary to the convergence brought about by the Bologna Process, institutions have further differentiated themselves... <i>Not a spontaneous corollary – there</i></p>	

Original text	Comments submitted by 9 October 2008	Revised text
<p>ambition. Mission differentiation seems to be a promising avenue for development contributing to the overall performance of the system as a whole.</p>	<p><i>are reason for this ongoing process (EUA)</i></p>	
<p><i>The key issue is that institutional diversity should be made transparent. The next phase should therefore consist in the development of instruments to really address diversity and make it readable and understandable. The tools used for this differentiation of institutions would be the development of relevant transparency instruments like classification based on a sound methodology and the acknowledgement of diverse policy contexts, like multiple reputation mechanisms.</i></p>	<p>The key issue is that institutional diversity should be made transparent. The next phase should therefore consist in the development of instruments to really <u>reinforcement of the systems of quality assurance towards their maturity and the use of instruments and indicators that enhance the objectivity and comparability of the performance of the institutions, while allowing</u> addressing diversity and making it readable and understandable. The tools used for this differentiation of institutions would be the development of relevant sound methodology transparency instruments like classification based on a and the acknowledgement of diverse policy contexts, like multiple reputation mechanisms. (ESU)</p> <p><i>The conclusion should be to understand better and thus support further differentiation (cf comment above) – this is part of the discussion on public responsibility) (EUA)</i></p> <p><i>“The key issue is that institutional diversity should be made transparent.” This is not the most important issue – it should be much more to understand better and further support the differentiation process with the correct incentives and support so that excellence can be promoted in relation to a broad range of different missions. (EUA)</i></p> <p><i>“The tools used for this differentiation of institutions”: These are not tools for promoting differentiation which would be the important issue but just ways of trying to improve information on what an ongoing development process at different stages in different countries at present - which can be helpful but should not be the main goal of any process – this links to the previous section on public responsibility (EUA)</i></p> <p>The tools used for this differentiation of institutions would be the development of relevant transparency instruments like classification information <u>based on a sound methodology and the acknowledgement of diverse policy contexts, like multiple reputation mechanisms. This kind of classification should mean that diversification becomes clearer and more visible and should not entail ranking in the traditional sense of the term.</u> (Austria)</p> <p><i>“multiple reputation mechanisms”: This sounds like a European ranking exercise based on reputation. It will be better to provide</i></p>	

Original text	Comments submitted by 9 October 2008	Revised text
	<p><i>access to hard facts that illustrate quality aspects of HEI. (Austria)</i></p> <p><i>... like multiple reputation mechanisms. <u>The relevant transparency instruments should be developed in close dialogue with measures of quality assurance within the Bologna framework.</u> (Denmark)</i></p> <p><i>We do not favour the development of typology or rankings. (UK)</i></p>	
<p>2.5. Funding</p>	<p><i>I suggest to place this chapter immediately after 2.3 roles and responsibilities (Germany)</i></p> <p><i>EUA's GENERAL COMMENTS:</i></p> <p><i>1. The section of funding should be structured in a new way. It needs to be put in the context of the previous chapters (with the new amendments and suggested changes) and ideally follow the arguments developed before. - Funding necessary for the challenges outlined before.</i></p> <p><i>2. The first paragraph should outline the context that has an impact on funding (and could pick up on the suggestion in General comment 1 in section 2.1) and show the reason why funding is necessary:</i></p> <p><i>a. Demands and expectations on universities of both in teaching and research and other roles are growing rapidly (Could list roles addressed in the previous chapters)</i></p> <p><i>b. An increasing global market for education and research means more competition.</i></p> <p><i>c. Advances in the field of technology, a growing participation rate, tougher quality requirements, etc.</i></p> <p><i>All of the above increases costs of Higher Education</i></p> <p><i>3. The second paragraph should then address that public investment in Higher Education in the European Union member states remains below its competitors (various sources of evidence, GDP expenditure etc.). This should be followed by the argument for the need for additional funding to meet the rising costs.</i></p> <p><i>4. The 3rd paragraph could then show different developments and reactions from governments:</i></p> <p><i>a. move towards competitive funding</i></p> <p><i>b. move towards output oriented funding</i></p> <p><i>c. Some countries introduce student fees (it could pick up the controversial issues mentioned in the text, access, equity, etc.)</i></p> <p><i>d. autonomy as an instrument to increase "non public income"</i></p> <p><i>5. 4th paragraph can then address that despite the call for additional public funding universities will need to take action as well</i></p> <p><i>a. Closer look at their costs and strategic choice about their activities (link to institutional diversity in the previous chapter).</i></p> <p><i>b. need to seek additional funding from different sources</i></p>	

Original text	Comments submitted by 9 October 2008	Revised text
	<p><i>Both 5 a and b need a favourable/supportive environment, to be provided both at European and national level (maybe some examples)</i></p> <p><i>6. A possible conclusion: To achieve the goals set out before there is a need for additional public investment in HE, and support on European and national level for 5a + 5b to achieve financial sustainability.</i></p>	
<p>If we turn to American higher education, we realize that these institutions, both public and private, enjoy great autonomy, often combined with substantial public and private funding.</p> <p>We know that Europe does not have great fortunes ready to endow foundations and that the tax system is not conducive to this practice. Yet, the government must behave as if it dealt with institutions that are as autonomous as the American ones and face the question of how to finance them. Moreover funding in the US tends to take the form of allocation of resources to students and researchers rather than to institutions.</p>	<p>"If we turn to American higher education, we realize that these institutions, both public and private, enjoy great autonomy, often combined with substantial public and private funding." <i>This comparison is not true. It does not reflect the different status of Europe's universities in autonomy as well as the fact that a large number of American universities are not so autonomous when having a closer look at the different aspects of autonomy.</i> (EUA)</p> <p>If we turn to American higher education, we realize that these institutions, both public and private, enjoy great autonomy, often combined with substantial public and private funding. We know that Europe does not have great fortunes ready to endow foundations and that the tax system is not conducive to this practice. Yet, the government must behave as if it dealt with institutions that are as autonomous as the American ones and face the question of how to finance them. Moreover funding in the US tends to take the form of allocation of resources to students and researchers rather than to institutions. (EUA)</p> <p>"We know that Europe does not have great fortunes ready to endow foundations" [<i>the second part of the statement may be true but the first is not. What is lacking is not the great fortunes but the willingness to use them for HE. Certainly, a fortune that can buy a soccer club could equally well (read: better) have been used to fund HE...]. Rephrase: <u>The great fortunes of Europe do not seem prepared to endow foundations working in and for higher education, and the tax system is not conducive to this practice.</u></i></p> (CoE)	
<p>One of the most hotly debated topics in Europe about the efficiency of higher education funding has to do with the main sources of financial support for the institutions.</p>	<p><i>This is the wrong angle to address it. The efficiency debate is one way of arguing for student fees. The chapter of funding should be structured as commented in the general remarks – funding for challenges - public funding for HE is competing with other public priorities, therefore student fees are one way of shifting the burden. Then the pros and cons and equity and access can be addressed.</i> (EUA)</p> <p>One of the most hotly debated topics in Europe about the</p>	

Original text	Comments submitted by 9 October 2008	Revised text
	<p>efficiency of higher education funding has to do with the main sources of financial support for the institutions. (EUA)</p>	
<p>Generally speaking, the funding of higher education in many countries takes place by means of allocating grants to higher education providers. In the past the main criteria to determine the amount of funding allocated to each institution by the State have been based on input. There has been a change over the last years from input funding to output criteria, through the introduction of output criteria in the calculation of funding and through the use of instruments such as performance-based funding and contract funding.</p>	<p>Generally speaking, the funding of higher education in many countries takes place by means of allocating grants to higher education providers. In the past the main criteria to determine the amount of funding allocated to each institution by the State have been based on input. There has been a change over the last years from input funding to output criteria, through the introduction of output criteria in the calculation of funding and through the use of instruments such as performance-based funding and contract funding. (EUA)</p>	
<p>Furthermore, the sources of funding have been extended with the introduction of cost sharing in higher education, mostly associated with the introduction of tuition fees to cover part of the costs of instruction. Economists tend to consider that policies of low or no tuition fees are negative not only on efficiency grounds but on equity ones, since higher education is still to a large extent the preserve of students coming from wealthier social groups. In terms of redistribution policies, we face a re-distribution from low income groups to wealthier ones since all tax-paying citizens bear the cost. However, there is also concern about the possible negative effects for potential demand.</p> <p>Future debates about the funding of higher education will continue to engage both the allocation of costs and also the legitimacy of those costs. At the same time there will continue to be pressures to find new revenues since in most countries tax revenues are already stretched. Certainly changes in tax policy encouraging private philanthropy would be a step forward.</p>	<p><i>"Extended" is wrong – funding has been shifted from public to private (see example UK) (EUA)</i></p> <p>Furthermore, the sources of funding have been extended with the introduction of cost sharing in higher education, mostly associated with the introduction of tuition fees to cover part of the costs of instruction. Economists tend to consider that policies of low or no tuition fees are negative not only on efficiency grounds but on equity ones, since higher education is still to a large extent the preserve of students coming from wealthier social groups. In terms of redistribution policies, we face a re-distribution from low income groups to wealthier ones since all tax-paying citizens bear the cost. However, there is also concern about the possible negative effects for potential demand. (EUA)</p> <p>Furthermore, the sources of funding have been extended with the introduction of cost sharing in higher education, mostly associated with the introduction of tuition fees to cover part of the costs of instruction. Economists tend to consider that policies of low or no tuition fees are negative not only on efficiency grounds but on equity ones, since <u>Such measures are usually highly controversial, especially considering that in many countries</u> higher education is still to a large extent the preserve of students coming from wealthier social groups. In terms of redistribution policies, it can mean that we face a re-distribution from low income groups to wealthier ones since all tax-paying citizens bear the cost.</p> <p>Economists tend to consider that policies of low or no tuition fees are negative not only on efficiency grounds but on equity ones,</p>	

Original text	Comments submitted by 9 October 2008	Revised text
	<p>since higher education is still to a large extent the preserve of students coming from wealthier social groups. In terms of redistribution policies, we face a re-distribution from low income groups to wealthier ones since all tax-paying citizens bear the cost. However, there is also concern about the possible negative effects for potential demand. (Denmark)</p> <p>Certainly changes in tax policy encouraging private philanthropy would be a step forward. (Denmark)</p> <p><i>DK does not find the above paragraph, leading into the recommendation/conclusion below, optimal nor appropriate and DK proposes a comprehensive rewriting. DK can not support the concrete formulations or the analytical offset, which leads to the citing of conclusions that tuition fees leads to inefficiency as well as inequity. In many countries (indeed in Denmark) free access to higher education is seen as a democratic attainment. Higher education funding is in these cases completely provided by the state and no tuition fees are charged to students. This political concept should not be questioned in a Bologna context.</i></p> <p><i>Furthermore the mentioning of tuition fees as the only example of a cost sharing model entails an undesirable focus on this type of financing. The discussions and the proposed issues are farther-reaching and treats the funding and financing challenges of European Higher Education per se. (Denmark)</i></p> <p><i>"Economists tend to consider that policies of low or no tuition fees are negative not only on efficiency grounds but on equity ones, since higher education is still to a large extent the preserve of students coming from wealthier social groups. In terms of redistribution policies, we face a re-distribution from low income groups to wealthier ones since all tax-paying citizens bear the cost." This issue has been addressed in the OECD report on tertiary education. Should we refer to this rather than to "economists"? (Germany)</i></p> <p><u>However, there is also concern about the possible negative effects for on the overall potential demand and in the cases of high tuition fees associated with loans the fear of risk taking has moved away the lower social groups from enrolments. The cost-sharing debate is furthermore very complex and all costs related to education must be taken into account when analysing the systems. In many countries where tuition fees have not been introduced, the level of the cost taken by the students is still remarkably significant. All measures adopted in this regard must therefore include a concern for coherence with the objectives of the social dimension of the</u></p>	

Original text	Comments submitted by 9 October 2008	Revised text
	<p><u>Bologna Process.</u> (ESU)</p> <p>...Certainly changes in tax policy encouraging private philanthropy would be a step forward. <u>Ultimately, the availability of public funding for higher education is a test of the values of our society but it would seem imprudent to assume there will be substantial new public funding for higher education in the short run. In the longer run, one of the key tasks of higher education has to be to increase public awareness and understanding of the key role of higher education to the future of modern societies.</u> (CoE)</p>	
<p><i>The key issue is to encourage further discussion and sharing of good practice in relation to accessing diverse sources of funding, recognising that in practice very few countries are going to be able to provide sufficient public funds to fund all the higher education provision they would like. A diversification of funding mechanisms does not mean, though, that higher education ceases to be a public good. The responsibility of public authorities is not limited to providing direct funding. It includes laying down the rules under which alternative funding may be sought and provided.</i></p>		
<p><i>The European higher education agenda needs sustainable funding. The question is whether a target like 2% of GDP for higher education should be adopted. Public funding should not be declined because of the entrepreneurial behaviour of institutions, reasonable tuition fee policies and other financial means invested from private sources.</i></p>	<p>...from private sources. <u>Greater attention should be paid to the need for measures enhancing the attractiveness of higher education institutions and their capacity to obtain private funding from industry and business linked to the provision of training and research. Such efforts must in all cases consider the tensions to academic freedom and the autonomy of the institutions.</u> (ESU)</p> <p>“Public funding should not be declined” I suggest either “should not be reduced” or “should not decline”. To me, “decline” as an intransitive verb means “reduce/be reduced”, but as a transitive verb it means “refuse”. I would read the sentence as it now stands as meaning that funding is offered by public authorities but refused by institutions...because of the entrepreneurial behaviour... (CoE)</p> <p>reasonable tuition fee policies (Denmark)</p> <p><i>We are not in favour of a simplistic 2% of GDP target. Surely the focus be on the outcomes of higher education rather than the inputs (i.e. funding).</i> (UK)</p>	

Original text	Comments submitted by 9 October 2008	Revised text
	<p><i>Can be addressed in the new structure as suggested above – recent policy docs (Lambert, Dewatripont, Aghion) all point to the need for additional funding, suggesting increasing GDP expenditure over 10 years by 1% per year (both public & private expenditure) (EUA)</i></p>	
<p>It emerges that a number of policy objectives and instruments that have been defined and developed over the last decade still appear to provide adequate responses to the challenges facing the European societies in the following decade. The pursuit of the objective of the social dimension of higher education with its agenda of participative equity and of social fairness coupled with lifelong learning are ways of addressing the demographic challenge.</p> <p>The curricular reforms underway help educate creative and innovative people able to function in a knowledge society, while the policy “Bologna in its global dimension” makes European higher education fit to both compete and cooperate on a global scale. However, this should not detract us from ensuring that these action lines and policy areas will be taken to the next stage of their development if they are to remain effective and relevant.</p>	<p><i>These two final paras appear to be a conclusion: if so it should refer to/prioritise the many different challenges set out in Section 2. The main message needs to be clearer, i.e. that curricular reform is still underway and that policies (and implementation) in relation to the social dimension/equity and access issues and finally the global dimension still have to taken forward. (EUA)</i></p>	
	<p><i>The European Commission suggests adding a section 2.6 Addressing the new challenges – Focus on three key areas</i></p> <p>In addressing the new challenges described in this chapter, the Bologna process post 2010 should focus on a few key areas which build on the work carried out in the first Bologna decade. The key areas chosen must be relevant, concrete and operational (see foreword) and appealing to a broad set of stakeholders. The three key areas could be:</p> <p>Qualifications for the future Now that the structures are in place and to a large extent implemented, efforts should concentrate on delivering qualifications which are relevant for our citizens in terms of personal fulfilment, citizenship and access to the labour market.</p>	

Original text	Comments submitted by 9 October 2008	Revised text
	<p>Attractiveness of European higher education European universities should become very attractive places to study, do research and innovate for European talent and for students and scholars from other continents.</p> <p>Mobility for all Mobility should become an encouraged option in every programme of study. As a target institutions and countries should aim at achieving mobility '(study or work placement) for 50% of the graduate population by 2020. (Commission)</p>	
<p>Chapter 3. Follow-up structure</p> <p>The first two chapters of this report have outlined the possible content of future Bologna Process cooperation. This third chapter will deal with the follow-up structure needed to support this cooperation, as requested by Ministers at their meeting in London:</p> <p><i>We ask BFUG as a whole to consider further how the EHEA might develop after 2010 and to report back to the next ministerial meeting in 2009. This should include proposals for appropriate support structures, bearing in mind that the current informal collaborative arrangements are working well and have brought about unprecedented change.</i></p> <p>(London Communiqué, paragraph 4.3)</p>		
<p>3.1. Present support structures</p> <p>Since 1999, Ministers have met every two years to assess progress made and to decide on new steps to be taken. The follow-up structure supporting the process in-between those ministerial meetings has emerged gradually; the arrangement as it exists now, was agreed upon by Ministers at their meeting in 2003 in Berlin.</p>		

Original text	Comments submitted by 9 October 2008	Revised text
<p><i>"Ministers entrust the implementation of all the issues covered in the Communiqué, the overall steering of the Bologna Process and the preparation of the next ministerial meeting to a Follow-up Group, which shall be composed of the representatives of all members of the Bologna Process and the European Commission, with the Council of Europe, the EUA, EURASHE, ESIB and UNESCO/CEPES as consultative members. This group, which should be convened at least twice a year, shall be chaired by the EU Presidency, with the host country of the next Ministerial Conference as vice-chair.</i></p> <p><i>A Board also chaired by the EU Presidency shall oversee the work between the meetings of the Follow-up Group. The Board will be composed of the chair, the next host country as vice-chair, the preceding and the following EU Presidencies, three participating countries elected by the Follow-up Group for one year, the European Commission and, as consultative members, the Council of Europe, the EUA, EURASHE and ESIB. The Follow-up Group as well as the Board may convene ad hoc working groups as they deem necessary.</i></p> <p><i>The overall follow-up work will be supported by a Secretariat which the country hosting the next Ministerial Conference will provide.</i></p> <p><i>In its first meeting after the Berlin Conference, the Follow-up Group is asked to further define the responsibilities of the Board and the tasks of the Secretariat." (Berlin Communiqué)</i></p> <p>The BFUG in Rome on 14 November 2003 reacted to this request by Ministers and further defined the responsibilities of Board and Secretariat.</p>		

Original text	Comments submitted by 9 October 2008	Revised text
<p>In 2005, Education International Pan-European structure (EI), ENQA and UNICE (now BUSINESSEUROPE) were accepted as additional consultative members of the Bologna Follow-up Group.</p>		
<p>The main advantage of the Bologna Process and the present support structures is that they enable the key stakeholders to work together as partners. The present arrangement creates a sense of collective ownership among ministers (and ministries) as well as higher education institutions, students and staff based on informal cooperation and partnership.</p>	<p><i>The main advantage of the Bologna Process and the present support structures is that they enable the key stakeholders to work together as partners</i> (CoE).</p>	
<p>EUA, EURASHE, ESU, Education International, ENQA and BUSINESSEUROPE, together with the European Commission, the Council of Europe and UNESCO-CEPES, have greatly contributed to the process of policy formulation and also play an important role in facilitating the implementation of the Bologna Process reforms.</p> <p>Another element of the present support structures that is often mentioned as strength (not least in the London Communiqué) is their relatively informal character, which further increases the sense of engagement and ownership among all participants.</p>		
<p>In terms of membership, the Bologna Process currently has two categories: members (the 46 countries and the European Commission) and consultative members. To become a member of the Bologna Process, countries have to be party of the European Cultural Convention and to declare their willingness to pursue and implement the objectives of the Bologna Process in their own systems of higher education. BFUG introduced the additional category of "BFUG partner" for organisations that</p>	<p>BFUG introduced the additional category of "BFUG partner" for</p>	

Original text	Comments submitted by 9 October 2008	Revised text
<p>wished to be involved more closely with the Bologna Process but were not interested in or not eligible for consultative membership.</p> <p>Ministers responsible for higher education in the countries participating in the Bologna Process meet on a regular basis (currently every two years) to assess progress made, to decide on new steps to be taken and to set priorities for the period leading to the following ministerial conference. These meetings play an important role in overseeing the implementation and maintaining the momentum of the process but also allow Ministers to react to new challenges.</p> <p>The Bologna Process is currently chaired by the country holding the EU Presidency, which rotates every six months. This means the EU Presidency country chairs and usually also hosts the meetings of Bologna Follow-up Group and Board, oversees the work in-between those meetings and represents the Bologna Follow-up Group at international events.</p> <p>The Bologna Follow-up Group (BFUG) oversees the Bologna Process between the ministerial meetings and meets at least once every six months, usually for one-and-a-half days. The BFUG has the possibility to set up working groups to deal with specific topics in more detail and also receives input from Bologna Seminars.</p> <p>The Board, as defined by the Berlin Communiqué normally meets once before each BFUG meeting to assist Chair and Secretariat with preparing the BFUG agenda and other meeting documents.</p> <p>The central task of the Bologna Secretariat is to</p>	<p>organisations that wished to be involved more closely with obtain more information on the Bologna Process but were not interested in or not eligible for consultative membership. (ESU)</p>	

Original text	Comments submitted by 9 October 2008	Revised text
<p>support the work of the Bologna Follow-up Group at four levels: BFUG, Board, working group, seminar. The Secretariat prepares draft agendas, drafts reports, notes and minutes and carries out the practical preparation for meetings as requested by the Chair. It is also at the disposal of the Chair to assist it in its tasks of finding compromise solutions, coordinating work and summing up situations. While the Chair of the Bologna Process rotates every six months, the Secretariat provides continuity in proceedings.</p> <p>Another task of the Secretariat that has become increasingly important is to provide up-to-date and reliable information about the Bologna Process (for both a European and a non-European audience) and to maintain an electronic archive. To fulfil those functions, the Secretariat makes use of the Bologna website as central tool.</p> <p>Finally, the Bologna Secretariat is asked to prepare the following ministerial conference. Up to now, the Bologna Secretariat has been provided by the country/countries hosting the following ministerial meeting, which led to a full rotation every two years. Seconding national experts has been a possibility that so far has not been used.</p>		
<p>3.2. Support structures beyond 2010 The support structures are deemed to have been working efficiently and effectively over the years. One of the main advantages is that the threat of over-bureaucratization has been successfully avoided, the structures in place being light ones and the Secretariat changing on a regular basis. Besides, its “unbureaucratic” touch, the Bologna Process has managed to create a sense of ownership among its members through the incitement to contribute to</p>	<p>The support structures are deemed to have been working efficiently and effectively over the years. One of the main advantages is that the threat of over-bureaucratization has been successfully avoided. The structures in place being are light ones and the Secretariat changes <u>changes</u> on a regular basis. Besides, its “unbureaucratic” touch, the Bologna Process has managed to create a sense of ownership among its members through the incitement to contribute to specific policy areas, for the good of the EHEA. It is, therefore, suggested that they be <u>modified</u> only slightly modified. (CoE)</p>	

Original text	Comments submitted by 9 October 2008	Revised text
<p>specific policy areas, for the good of the EHEA. It is, therefore, suggested that they be only slightly modified.</p> <p>The chair of the Bologna Follow-up Group should also in future be linked to the rotating EU Presidency while a twinning arrangement with a non-EU country should be sought. The question of how to define the non-EU country co-chairing BFUG should be further explored.</p> <p>The Board should be maintained, but its terms of reference should be updated to turn it into an advisory committee for the Chair and the Secretariat to prepare BFUG meetings. The rules for its composition should remain unchanged, although a good balance between EU and non-EU countries should be sought.</p> <p>The Secretariat should be a rotating Secretariat linked to the next host country(ies). It should preferentially be internationally composed. The issue of continuity from one Secretariat to the next needs exploring.</p>		
<p>A permanent website should be established with a country-neutral name and should be managed by the Secretariat.</p>	<p>A permanent website should be established with a country-neutral name and should be managed by the Secretariat. <u>The provision of information should be enhanced and aimed at all targets between ministerial conferences. Such development render unnecessary to keep the status of partnership of the organisations within the Bologna Process.</u> (ESU)</p>	
<p>In order to interact with other policy areas, BFUG should set up a number of working groups gathering experts and policy makers from other fields, like immigration, social security and employment.</p>	<p><i>Cooperation with experts and policy makers is important; however we suggest to continue with a "lighter" approach than working groups (Germany)</i></p>	
<p>The next ministerial conference will be organized in 2010 jointly by Austria and Hungary. The Benelux countries will provide the Bologna Secretariat until 1</p>		

Original text	Comments submitted by 9 October 2008	Revised text
July 2010, with national experts from Austria and Hungary being seconded into the Secretariat in Brussels.	... with national experts from Austria and Hungary being seconded to the Secretariat in Brussels. (CoE)	
The following ministerial conferences should be held in 2012, 2015, 2018 and 2020.	<p>The following ministerial conferences should be held <u>every two years, starting in 2012</u>. 2015, 2018 and 2020. (Germany)</p> <p><i>Businessseurope pleads for a regular 2-years-frequency.</i></p> <p>The following ministerial conferences should be held in 2012, 2015, 2018 2017 and 2020. <i>In order to avoid a slow down of the political process of convergence and build-up of the EHEA, it is important to keep the visibility of the process. That can only be achieved through the ministerial conferences. We suggest that the conferences happen every two years and half, rotating from the summer semester to the autumn semester.</i> (ESU)</p>	
<p>Chapter 4.</p> <p>Conclusions and master plan</p>	<p><i>It seems to me that the conclusions mentioned here do not really flow from the discussion in the previous chapters: e.g. on employability, quality and recognition. If these are meant to be covered by the initial sentence of chapter 4 it would be helpful if this could be made clearer.</i> (UK)</p> <p><i>To get the balance right between finishing what we started and identifying news action lines, I would suggest giving the "finish what we have stated" section more primacy in the text in Chapter 4. We all seemed to be agreed about this. So I think this should get its own section in bold too.</i> (Scotland)</p>	
The first priority for the agenda beyond 2010 is to finalise the action lines started previously and to move from structure to practice. This will be done in a spirit of mutual assistance maintaining and even increasing the energy that has so far gone into the establishment of the EHEA. In a short term perspective, this entails implementing the new degree structure, also endorsing it in the so called regulated professions, as well as developing and implementing qualifications frameworks, which are based on learning outcomes, have been devised with stakeholder involvement and are linked to quality.	<p><i>Any reference to moving from structures to 'content' should underline the primordial role of HEIs as this is their responsibility - once the structures have been agreed -in the context of discussions on public responsibility, autonomy & accountability.</i> (EUA)</p> <p><i>"even increasing the energy that has so far gone into the establishment of the EHEA": How?</i> (EUA)</p> <p>In a short term perspective, this entails <u>continuing with the curricular reform processes that are necessary to implement</u>ing <u>and give sense to</u> the new degree structure <u>in order to meet the goals of encouraging more student centred learning in our HEIs</u>, also endorsing it in the so called regulated professions. <u>This also means redoubling efforts</u>, as well as to developing and implementing qualifications frameworks, which are based on learning outcomes, have been devised with stakeholder involvement and are linked to quality. (EUA)</p>	

Original text	Comments submitted by 9 October 2008	Revised text
<p>Mobility of students and staff will continue to feature prominently on the agenda. As far as mobility of students is concerned, a significant number of curricula will be designed in such a way that they create “mobility windows” and/or lead to the awarding of joint degrees. The framework conditions will be such that the granting of visas and work permits as well as the portability of grants and social benefits will be made easier. For this purpose ad hoc working groups set up by BFUG and comprising experts and policy makers from the policy fields concerned will prepare and propose the appropriate measures.</p>	<p>Mobility of students, <u>young researchers and staff</u> will continue to feature prominently on the agenda. As far as <u>short term</u> mobility of students is concerned, a significant number of curricula will be designed in such a way that they create “mobility windows” and/or lead to the awarding of joint degrees. <u>This will require ensuring that the implementation of the structural reforms outlined above allows the necessary flexibility for mobility to take place.</u> The framework conditions will be such that... (EUA)</p> <p><i>Mobility should also include degree mobility, internal mobility within national systems and promotion of and recognition mobility between universities and other stakeholders (EUA)</i></p> <p>As far as mobility of students is concerned, a significant number of <u>all</u> curricula will be designed in such a way that they create “mobility windows” and/or <u>. A significant number of them should</u> lead to the awarding of joint degrees. (Commission)</p> <p>...the portability of grants and social benefits <u>loans</u> will be made easier. (Austria)</p> <p><i>Again: Cooperation with experts and policy makers is important; however we suggest to continue with a “lighter” approach than working groups (Germany)</i></p>	
<p>Mobility policies must thus bring together political initiatives of this kind with a range of practical measures running from recognition through financing to receiving students at host institutions, and they must devise different formulas for mobility to seek to include students who have family and work obligations.</p>		
<p>As far as mobility of staff is concerned, framework conditions will be established to ease immigration into the EHEA as well as within and to guarantee social security and adequate pension rights to the mobile staff. BFUG will seek the advice and support of experts and policy makers from the respective fields.</p>	<p>As far as mobility of <u>young researchers and staff</u> is concerned, (EUA)</p> <p>As far as mobility of staff is concerned, framework conditions will be established to ease immigration into the EHEA as well as within <u>it</u> and to guarantee social security and adequate pension rights to the mobile staff. (CoE)</p>	
<p>A policy document establishing a mobility code will be drafted and put forward for adoption. Data</p>	<p><i>I am not sure what is envisaged by the “mobility code” mentioned here (and earlier in the report): what will its status be; who will it be aimed at etc. Some additional details would be welcome. (UK)</i></p>	

Original text	Comments submitted by 9 October 2008	Revised text
collection will help monitor the internationalization of higher education and will serve as a basis for benchmarking.	"mobility code": <i>What about the link to the charter and code of conduct for young researchers?</i> (EUA)	
Two major issues are identified as facing higher education in the years to come. The two challenges of demography on the one hand and of global competitiveness on the other hand call for a coordinated European response. Emulation and competition will vie with cooperation in a global world while the unique European response will lie in the implementation of the social dimension of higher education.		
The first major issue facing Europe in the decade to come is the demographic challenge of an ageing and increasingly diverse population in a knowledge society. This challenge is to be met by reinforcing the social dimension of higher education, by fully engaging in lifelong learning practices and by rethinking international mobility.	The first major issue facing Europe in the decade to come is the demographic challenge of an ageing and increasingly diverse population... (Germany)	
Equitable access into, successful progress and completion of higher education for the whole spectrum of the population in their various walks of life and age groups call for a learning environment of great quality geared to the needs of a diverse student body. While a coherent strategy for lifelong learning will be devised, improved and enhanced data collection will help monitor the developments in this field.	While a coherent strategy ies for lifelong learning will be devised... (UK/Scotland)	
The teaching and learning in the institutions of higher education will aim at educating creative graduates able to function in the knowledge society and to profit fully from lifelong learning opportunities through the provision of adequate learning paths. Student centred learning will be developed as a new paradigm with learning outcomes focusing on specific	The teaching and learning in the institutions of higher education will aim at educating creative graduates able to function in the a knowledge society <u>characterized by the need for intercultural dialogue and understanding as well as the ability to think and act ethically</u> and to profit fully from lifelong learning opportunities through the provision of adequate learning paths. (CoE) ...through the provision of adequate <u>flexible</u> learning paths. (UK/Scotland)	

Original text	Comments submitted by 9 October 2008	Revised text
subject areas. Business engagement will be fostered to foster the employability of graduates at all levels of higher education.	<i>I would also suggest dropping the ref to learning outcomes focusing "on specific subject areas". I think we should avoid any implication that we are looking for any form of harmonising across the EHEA in terms of learning outcomes. (UK/Scotland)</i>	
	<u>Demography is also an issue for universities themselves given the age structure of academic staff in many countries which means that large numbers of staff will be retiring in the next 10 years and will need to be replaced at a time when there is also a consensus that the number or researchers in our HEIs needs to be increased. (EUA)</u>	
A second major issue facing Europe is the competitiveness of European higher education in a global context . The policy will engage European higher education globally by striking a balance between cooperation and competition. The role of educated people who clearly see how economies and values operate together and how they are accelerated by critical thinking and discovery is central to the achievements of humankind. The teaching and learning experience will have to reflect this dimension of education.	A second major issue facing Europe is the competitiveness role of European higher education in a global context . (CoE)	
The nexus between teaching and research will remain a principle firmly entrenched in the EHEA. It is recognized that there are various types of research and that there is great differentiation in the missions of higher education institutions.		
Transparency is an important way of making European higher education attractive; new instruments will be designed to show the strengths of institutions with diverse mission statements.	<p>Transparency is an important way of making European higher education attractive <u>and use of the existing</u>; new instruments <u>should be made, wherever possible</u> will be designed to show the strengths of institutions with diverse mission statements. (Austria)</p> <p>Transparency is an important way of making European higher education attractive; new instruments will be designed to <u>further development of the quality assurance systems and its European dimension should be continued with the aim of clearly showing</u> the strengths of institutions with diverse mission statements. (ESU)</p>	

Original text	Comments submitted by 9 October 2008	Revised text
	<p><i>Transparency itself does not make European HE attractive – but rather that universities make their various profiles clear and can demonstrate their excellence in pursuing these different missions within an overall coherent framework (EUA)</i></p> <p><i>Our comments on typology and rankings above apply to this paragraph (UK)</i></p>	
<p>A third issue is the redefinition of the roles and responsibilities of the various actors in a system defining higher education as a public good. A policy statement by ministers will determine the various roles in relation to quality development and assurance, funding frameworks, governance, institutional autonomy and accountability and the diversity of missions and institutions.</p>	<p>A third issue is the redefinition of the roles and responsibilities of the various actors in a system defining higher education as a public good <u>and a public responsibility</u>. A policy statement by ministers will determine the various roles in relation to quality development and assurance; <u>qualifications, curricula and programs</u>; funding frameworks; governance; institutional autonomy and accountability and the diversity of missions and institutions. (CoE)</p>	
<p>The present organisational structure of the Bologna Process is endorsed as being fit for purpose, while it is recognised that a link with other policy areas will have to be established. This concerns immigration and social security to advance the mobility and social dimension agenda.</p>		