Progress in higher education reform across Europe:

The Bologna Process

Mid-term progress report
from
CHEPS, INCHER-Kassel and ECOTEC

Agreement 2008 -3112 / 001 -001 ERA ERPROG

Project Leaders
Professor Jürgen Enders, Director
Jon File, Executive Director (Contact person)

Center for Higher Education Policy Studies (CHEPS)
University of Twente
P.O. Box 217
7500 AE Enschede
The Netherlands
T   053 – 4893263
F   053 – 4340392
W   www.utwente.nl/cheps
E   j.m.file@utwente.nl

Introduction

At the project kick-off meeting it was agreed that the project team would submit an interim progress report in June 2009 as required in the project contract and terms of reference but that this would be a "technical report" with the first substantive report on the findings of the research project being in mid-September when the project team will submit an interim report.

Our interim and final reports will focus on:

- One partial indicator of progress towards a strategic goal, i.e. the increase of intra-European student mobility since the signing of the Bologna Declaration.
- Three major operational elements: curriculum reform, cooperation in quality assurance as a condition for improved recognition of degrees and study periods,
- Major elements of the social dimension
- The management of the Bologna Process
- External views on the Bologna Process.

These areas will form the basis of the structure of the final report; the different methods (research phases II, III and IV) will contribute to each of these parts.

Progress in relation to the broad project plan

The research team has been very busy in the first half of this project. Meetings of the core research team took place in Haarlem to finalise the study design (17 and 18 February), in The Hague to plan all of the empirical phases (9 and 10 February) and in Haarlem to consider the data collected to date and to plan for the interim report in September (29 and 30 June). Email and telephone contact between the researchers and particularly with national experts has been intensive.

In terms of progress, in our project proposal the following broad project plan was included as Table 2.

Table 2 Broad project plan

Phase \ Project months / Calendar months	1-2 '08-09/10	3-4 '08-11/12	5-6 '09-01/02	7-8 '09-03/04	9-13 '09-05/09	14-17 '09-10/'10-01
Key meetings	EC & AB	CM		CM & AB		CM, IP & AB
Key reports	PP		3/4		IR, DFR	FR
1. Study design	■					
2. Desk research		■	■			
3. In-depth case studies			■	■	■	
4. Stakeholder interviews			■	■	■	
5.. Analysis & reporting					■	
6. Seminar with BFUG						■

The actual situation regarding the Bologna independent assessment at the time of this mid-term report is as follows (for ease of counting, Table 3).

Table 3 Mid-term broad project realisation/plan

Phase \ Project months / Calendar months	1-2 '08-10/11	3-4 '08-12/09-01	5-6 '09-02/03	7-8 '09-04/05	9-12 '09-06/09	13-16 '09-10/'10-01
Key meetings	EC & AB		CM, AB		CM, AB	CM, IP&AB
Key reports	PP				IR, DFR	FR
1. Study design	■					
2. Desk research		■			■	
3. In-depth case studies			'09-03-27	■	■	
4. Stakeholder interviews				■	■	
5. Analysis & reporting					'09-09-29	■
6. Testing seminar						'09-12-01

The table shows that research phase 2, the desk research, has proved critical and has somewhat delayed the commencement of the other two empirical phases (phase 3, in-depth case studies and phase 4, stakeholder interviews); moreover, we will need to come back to the desk research in project months 9-12. The issue is that collection of comparable data for the fifteen composite indicators across the 46 countries in our study has proved more complicated than originally expected. First, our research team needed more time to develop the operational definitions (and the range of flexibility around the definitions needed for allowing national data to be used as near-equivalents). Second, many national contact persons needed more time to find applicable data or to make reasoned judgements where data were missing. For that reason, we also decided to go through a verification cycle, asking national experts to verify if data collected by us seemed correct and up-to-date. For that reason, too, we are now returning to this research phase, with national data sheets being returned in July '09.

In order not to delay progress in the study as a whole, we started in-depth case studies and stakeholder interviews before finishing the collection and construction of indicators, once these 12 case studies were agreed with the Advisory Board after the meeting in Prague on March 27.

This means that currently our research teams in INCHER-Kassel, ECOTEC and CHEPS are working in parallel on the in-depth case studies and on interviews with stakeholders (phases 3 and 4), while CHEPS is finalising the data collection for the indicators (phase 2). Partial reports on individual case studies and on series of interviews are being drafted in this process.

As planned from the beginning, over the summer break, the results of the three empirical phases will be brought together through internet and phone communication between the researchers, leading to the 'bullet point report' to be presented to the Advisory Board on September 29 in Stockholm. Tasks for the writing-up of the different facets of the final report will be distributed among the research team members at the Research Group Meeting on 29-30 June.

In addition to the activities of our research team our international panel has started work on producing essays for the project on the Bologna process from the perspective of their countries/regions.

The European Commission (DGEAC) has started logistical and programme planning for the Testing Seminar to be held on December 1, 2009, in Brussels. The Austrian hosts of the 2010 ministerial meeting have contacted us about the printing of the final report, which is now planned to consist of ca. 150 pages (not counting appendices, case descriptions, etc.).

Examples of key deliverables produced to date

To give an indication of the progress made to date we have attached a number of (examples of) key deliverables produced within the project to date:

- Final list of national experts contracted to work with us on the Bologna project (Appendix 1)

- The questionnaire that is being completed for each country to verify and collect the information required for the development of indicators – the Dutch questionnaire is included as an example (Appendix 2)

- The methodology for the selection of case studies including the final selection made by the Advisory Board (Appendix 3)

- The Schematic outline for the 12 case studies currently in progress (Appendix 4)

- The framework for the essays currently being written by the international expert panel (Appendix 5)

Conclusion

Although the complexities of this multi-dimensional, multi-country research project have led to some internal rearrangement of deadlines and work plans, the Research Team will meet all of the external deadlines agreed for the project and in particular the "bullet-point" interim report in mid-September, the draft final report on 1 November and the final report at the end of January 2010.

On behalf of the research team

Jon File
Executive Director
Center for Higher Education Policy Studies (CHEPS)
University of Twente

25 June 2009

Appendix 1

Bologna project 2009: National expert information for 13 countries only in this project

Country	National expert	Institution	email
Albania	Dhimiter Doka	Universiteti i Tiranes	dhdoka@yahoo.com
Andorra	Jordi Llombart i Pubill	Government of Andorra	Jordi_Llombart@govern.ad
Armenia	Arayik Navoyan	French University in Armenia, Department of External Relations	vice_recteur_rel_ext@ufar.am, navoyana@yahoo.fr
Azerbaijan	Elmina Kazimzade	Baku State University	ekazimzade@yahoo.com, ekazimzade@cie.az
Bosnia-Herzegovina	Srebren Dizdar	Faculty of Philosophy in Sarajevo	decanus@ff.unsa.ba
Georgia	Rusiko Tkemaladze	Individual expert	rusiko.tkemaladze@ ge.britishcouncil.org
Holy See	Emanuela Reale	Cnr CERIS	e.reale@ceris.cnr.it
Moldova	Anatol Gremalschi	Institute for public policy	Anatol_Gremalschi@ipp.md, Anatol_Gremalschi@yahoo.com
Montenegro	Djordje Jovanovic	University of Montenegro	jdjordje@cg.yu
Russia	Irina Arzhanova	State corporation "Olympstroy"	iarzhanova@gmail.com
Serbia	Martina Vukasovic	Centre for Education Policy	mvukasovic@cep.edu.rs
Macedonia	Marija Stambolijeva	Youth for Understanding	marija.stambolieva@yahoo.de
Ukraine	Sergiy V. Kurbatov	Institute of Higher Education,	kurbatov71@yahoo.com
		Academy of Pedagogical Sciences of Ukraine	

HE Reform projects 2009: National expert information for the 33 countries in all three projects

Austria	Hans Pechar	University of Klagenfurt	Hans.Pechar@uni-klu.ac.at
Belgium	Kurt de Wit	Katholieke Universiteit Leuven	Kurt.DeWit@dowb.kuleuven.be
Bulgaria	Pepka Boyadjieva	Institute of Sociology, Bulgarian Academy of Sciences	pepka7@gmail.com
Cyprus	Petros Pashiardis	Open University of Cyprus	p.pashiardis@ouc.ac.cy
Czech Republic	Ales Vlk	Independent consultant	ales.vlk@seznam.cz

Denmark	Hanne Foss-Hansen	University of Copenhagen	hfh@ifs.ku.dk
Estonia	Hanna Kanep	Estonian Rectors' Conference	Hanna.kanep@ern.ee
Finland	Timo Aarrevaara	University of Tampere	Timo.Aarrevaara@uta.fi
France	Christine Musselin	Centre de Sociologie des Organisations (Sciences Po and CNRS)	c.musselin@cso.cnrs.fr
Germany	Barbara Kehm	INCHER–Kassel	kehm@incher.uni-kassel.de
Greece	Rania Filippakou	Institute of Education, University of London	ofilippakou@ioe.ac.uk
Hungary	Jozsef Temesi	Corvinus University of Budapest	jozsef.temesi@uni-corvinus.hu
Ireland	Lewis Purser	Irish Universities Association	lewis.purser@iua.ie
Italy	Emanuela Reale	Cnr CERIS	e.reale@ceris.cnr.it
Latvia	Indrikis Muiznieks	University of Latvia	indrikis@lanet.lv
Lithuania	Rimantas Zelvys	Vilnius Pedagogical University	Rimantas.Zelvys@vpu.lt
Luxembourg	Fritz Ohler	Technopolis	fritz.ohler@technopolis-group.com
Malta	Carmel Borg	University of Malta	carmel.borg@um.edu.mt
Netherlands	Ben Jongbloed	CHEPS, University of Twente	b.w.a.jongbloed@utwente.nl
Poland	Wojciech Duczmal	The Academy of Management and Administration in Opole	w.duczmal@poczta.wszia.opole.pl
Portugal	Pedro Texeira	University of Porto	pedrotx@fep.up.pt
Romania	Luminita Nicolescu	Academy of Economic Studies	luminicolescu@yahoo.com
Slovakia	Gustav Murin	Comenius University	'murinsk@yahoo.com'
Slovenia	Aleksandra Kovac	CHEPS, University of Twente	a.kovac@utwente.nl
Spain	Pepe Mora	Institute of Education, University of London	j.mora@ioe.ac.uk
Sweden	Anki Dällnes	SISTER	anki.dellnas@gmail.com
United Kingdom	Paul Temple	Institute of Education, University of London	p.temple@ioe.ac.uk
Croatia	Danijela Dolenec	Institute for Social Research	danijela@idi.hr
Turkey	Fatma Mizikaci	Eastern Mediterranean University	fatmamizikaci@yahoo.com
Iceland	Jón Torfi Jonasson	University of Iceland	jtj@hi.is
Liechtenstein	Benedetto Lepori	University of Lugano	benedetto.lepori@unisi.ch
Norway	Bjorn Stensaker	NIFU STEP	bjorn.stensaker@nifustep.no
Switzerland	Benedetto Lepori	University of Lugano	benedetto.lepori@unisi.ch

Appendix 2

Questionnaire for the National Bologna Process Expert – **The Netherlands**

Dear Expert,

In the framework of the Independent Assessment of the Bologna Process that the 46 higher education ministers asked for, in preparation of their 2010 meeting in Budapest and Vienna, we make an overview of key indicators regarding activity and the state of the art on some of the crucial dimensions of the Bologna Process. We focus on mobility, curriculum reform, international recognition, quality assurance, and the social dimension of higher education. Your help is needed to make our information as extensive and accurate as possible, comparable and up to date.

The following table gives our main indicators and the information that we have found up to now from several sources. Our questions to you are:
1. Could you please **verify** if our data are correct and up to date? (third column)
If our information is not up to date not correct, or completely missing:
2. Could you please **give better information**? (fourth, last column)
We much prefer to get precise and internationally comparable data; wherever we can, we gave short definitions of the data, which should help you to find additional data. However, if the exact type of data is not available,

- Please give **other quantitative information** that comes as close as possible to what we asked for,

or if that is not available,

- Please give **other qualitative information** that helps us to get an impression of the situation in your country.

We want to work as transparently as possible. Therefore, **please *always* state your source(s) of information (publication and year)**, even if that is 'my impression, 2009'. Because in the last resort, we rather have your impressions based on your everyday experience, than be left without information at all. We shall be careful in reporting non-comparable, qualitative and impressionistic data—even not publish information if needed, but we urge you to give some answer to each of the indicators, under the motto 'better something than nothing'.

For further questions, please contact the study's coordinator:
Dr. Don F. Westerheijden
CHEPS, University of Twente, the Netherlands
Tel. +31 53 489 3263 / Skype: d.f.westerheijden
e-mail: d.f.westerheijden@utwente.nl, please c.c. to: a.kovac@utwente.nl

I. Degree structure

Indicator	Information/data that we have, source and year	Verification: is our information correct and up to date?.	(Better) information
Indicator 1: Percentage of all students in the country below doctoral level enrolled in the 2 cycle system in 2008/2009. Students in short cycle programmes (less than bachelor/undergraduate) are not	**Information we have: 96,8%** (National report for Bologna Process 2007-2009)	❑ Yes, this is correct and up to date ❑ No, this is not correct and/or it is outdated	… **Source of information**: …

Indicator	Information/data that we have, source and year	Verification: is our information correct and up to date?.	(Better) information
included. All students in all higher education sectors (private/public, university/non-university) should be taken into account. If you can, provide us the percentages of students.			
Indicator 2.1: Credit system. Study programmes and individual courses at the higher education institutions in your country are described in terms of credits: a) No, any kind of credits is not used b) Yes, ECTS credits are used. c) ECTS compatible national credits are used. d) ECTS non-compatible credits are used.	**Your country is placed under category: b:** ECTS credits are used.	❏ Yes, this is correct and up to date ❏ No, this is not correct and/or it is outdated	… **Source of information**: …
Indicator 2.2: Percentage of all higher education programmes (except doctoral) in which all programme components are linked with ECTS or compatible credit system	100% (National report for Bologna Process 2007-2009)	❏ Yes, this is correct and up to date ❏ No, this is not correct and/or it is outdated	… **Source of information**: …
Indicator 3.1 How many percent of the higher education institutions are providing Diploma Supplement? (1) none at the moment, yet there are initiations; (2) introduced partially in some of the HEIs; (3) used in the 25-89% of HEIs; (4) used more than 90% of all HEIs for the 1st and the 2nd cycles; (5) used in more than 90% of all HEIs for all	**Your country is placed under category 4: used in more than 90% of all HEIs for the 1st and the 2nd cycles**; National report for Bologna Process 2007-2009	❏ Yes, this is correct and up to date ❏ No, this is not correct and/or it is outdated	… **Source of information**: …

Indicator	Information/data that we have, source and year	Verification: is our information correct and up to date?.	(Better) information
cycles			
Indicator 3.2 Is Diploma Supplement provided in your country? (1) no (2) on request/paid; (3)on request/free of charge; (4) automatically and free of charge	**Your country is placed under category 4:** automatically and free of charge Source: National report for Bologna Process 2007-2009	❑ Yes, this is correct and up to date ❑ No, this is not correct and/or it is outdated	… **Source of information**: …
Indicator 4.1 What is the percentage of elective courses in a typical study programme? (1) Most of the study programmes offer only obligatory courses (2) Less than 25 percent of the courses are elective (3) 25- 50 percent of the courses are elective (4) More than 50 percent of the courses are elective	**Your country is placed under category 4:** More than 50 percent of the courses are elective Source: CHEPS 2006 Research report on "the Extent and Impact of Curricular Report in Europe"	❑ Yes, this is correct and up to date ❑ No, this is not correct and/or it is outdated	… **Source of information**: …
Indicator 4.2 Are modular structures available in your country. If so, how many percent of the study programmes have modular structure? (1) None (2)There has been an initiation, but no general structure or clear implementation (3)More than 25% of the study programmes are modularised (4) More than 90% of the study programmes are modularised	**Your country is placed under category**: **4:** More than 90% of the study programmes are modularised (National report for Bologna Process 2007-2009)	❑ Yes, this is correct and up to date ❑ No, this is not correct and/or it is outdated	… **Source of information**: …

Additional questions on degree structure:

Indicator	Information/data that we have, source and year	Verification: is our information correct and up to date?.	(Better) information

Indicator	Information/data that we have, source and year	Verification: is our information correct and up to date?.	(Better) information
1. Did the 2 cycle study structure exist in your country before the start of Bologna Process (1999)?	No	❏ Yes, this is correct and up to date ❏ No, this is not correct and/or it is outdated	… **Source of information**: …
2. Are there certain study programmes excluded from the 2 cycle system structure?	No, although some programmes in medicine have not yet been converted.	❏ Yes, this is correct and up to date ❏ No, this is not correct and/or it is outdated	… **Source of information**: …
2.1.If yes, please, (1) indicate these study fields and (2) the percentage of all students in your country enrolled in these study programmes?	(1) none (2) negligible %	❏ Yes, this is correct and up to date ❏ No, this is not correct and/or it is outdated	… **Source of information**: …
3. Is there a short cycle studies within the higher education in your country?	Yes, since 2007.	❏ Yes, this is correct and up to date ❏ No, this is not correct and/or it is outdated	… **Source of information**: …
3.1. If yes, what is the percentage of all students enrolled in the short cycle studies?	Less than 5%	❏ Yes, this is correct and up to date ❏ No, this is not correct and/or it is outdated	… **Source of information**: …

4. The credits used to describe study programmes and their components in your country are dominantly allocated to courses based on:
  a. estimation of average student workload and defined and written learning outcomes
  b. estimated average student
	Your country is placed under category: c : defined and written learning outcomes, but without estimation of average student workload	❏ Yes, this is correct and up to date
		❏ No, this is not correct and/or it is outdated
			…
			
			Source of information:
			…

Indicator	Information/data that we have, source and year	Verification: is our information correct and up to date?.	(Better) information
workload, but without using learning outcomes c. defined and written learning outcomes, but without estimation of average student workload d. teaching / contact hours e. formally allocated to individual courses without any specific rationale f. Something else. Please specify:			

II. Mobility

Indicator, information/data we have, source and year	Verification: If the information we have is correct please write **YES**, if it is not correct or you have more recent data please write **NO** and add correct and/updated information. In this case please indicate the source and relevant year. In case that we have no data for your country with regard to some indicator please ignore this column and go to the **information column**.	Information: In the case that we have no data about an indicator for your country, please provide us if possible with this data/information. Please indicate the source and year. In the case that there is no such data available please write – **Not Available**. In this case please give us if possible your expert estimate or guess.
Indicator 5 Increase in % of foreign non-EHEA students		

(1999 - 2006) (Data Eurostat Data base)		
5.1 Number of foreign students from Asia, Africa, Oceania, North and South America enrolled at higher education institutions in 1999. **Information we have: 6932**		
5.2 Total number of students in your country in 1999 **Information we have: 469885**		
5.3 Number of foreign students from Asia, Africa, Oceania, North and South America enrolled at higher education institutions in your country in 2006. **Information we have: 12852**		Please provide us also if possible information for some of the years after 2006
5.2 Total number of students in your country in 2006. **Information we have: 579622**		Please provide us also if possible information for some of the years after 2006
Indicator 6 Increase in % of Incoming foreign students (1999-2006) from EU, EEA and candidate countries in the total student population (Eurostat Data) **Information we have: 2,3%**		
Indicator 7:Increase in % of outgoing students to other		

Bologna Process counrties(1999-2006) (Eurostat Database)		
7.1. Number of outgoing students from your country to other Bologna Process country in 1999 **Information we have:** **10400 (outgoing students to other EU, EEA or EU candidate country)**		
7.2. Number of outgoing students from your country to other Bologna Process countries in 2006 **Information we have:** **11500 (outgoing students to other EU, EEA or EU candidate country)**		Please provide us also if possible information for some of the years after 2006
Indicator 8: Stage of implementation of the Lisbon Recognition Convention of Council of Europe My country has: 1. not ratified the Convention 2. ratified the Convention, but the supplementary documents and Convention principles are not fully implemented in the relevant legislation and practice		If you cannot place your country in none of the listed categories, please specify the situation and provide the description of the category where your county would fit.

3. ratified the Convention and implemented supplementary documents and Convention principles into relevant legislation and practice **Your country is placed under category 3** (Based on National reports 2009)		

III Quality assurance

Indicator, information/data we have, source and year	Verification: If the information we have is correct please write **YES**, if it is not correct or you have more recent data please write **NO** and add correct and/updated information. In this case please indicate the source and relevant year. In case that we have no data for your country with regard to some indicator please ignore this column and go to the **information column**.	Information: In the case that we have no data about an indicator for your country, please provide us if possible with this data/information. Please indicate the source and year. In the case that there is no such data available please write – **Not Available**. In this case please give us if possible your expert estimate or guess.
Indicator 9 Development of the national QA system	CHEPS	
Indicator 10 National Qualification Framework	CHEPS	

Indicator 11 International cooperation in QA	CHEPS	

IV Social Dimension

Indicator, information/data we have, source and year	Verification: If the information we have is correct please write **YES**, if it is not correct or you have more recent data please write **NO** and add correct and/updated information. In this case please indicate the source and relevant year. In case that we have no data for your country with regard to some indicator please ignore this column and go to the **information column**.	Information: In the case that we have no data about an indicator for your country, please provide us if possible with this data/information. Please indicate the source and year. In the case that there is no such data available please write – **Not Available**. In this case please give us if possible your expert estimate or guess.
Indicator 12 Participation		
12.1 Enrolment rates in tertiary education by age (students aged 20-29 as a percentage of population aged 20-29) **Information we have:** **26.9** Source: OECD Statistics 2006		
12.2 Ratio of female students in tertiary education (ratio between female students aged 18-34 and females		

aged 18-34 in the whole population) **Information we have:** **1.03** Source: OECD Statistics 2006		
12.3.1 What is the ratio of students' mothers with up to lower secondary education? (Ratio between the students' mothers who have education up to lower secondary education (ISCED 0-2) and women of corresponding age of 40-60 years olds with up to lower secondary education (ISCED 0-2) in the whole population) **Information we have:** **1.01** Source: EURO Student III The information we have is based on a survey result of ISCED 5A level students		
12.3.2 What is the ratio of students' fathers with up to lower secondary education (Ratio between the students' fathers who have education up to lower secondary education (ISCED 0-2)and men of corresponding age of 40-60 years olds with up to lower secondary education (ISCED 0-		

2) in the whole population) **Information we have:** **1.04** Source:EURO Student III The information we have is based on a survey result of ISCED 5A level students		
12.4.1 Occupational status of mothers (Ratio between students' mothers with blue collar status among all students' mothers and women with blue collar status in the corresponding age of 40- 60 years old women) **Information we have:** **1.22** Source: EURO Student III The information we have is based on a survey result of ISCED 5A level students. ISCO-88 categories 6-9 are included as blue collar status		
12.4.2 Occupational status of fathers (Ratio between students' fathers with blue collar status among all students' fathers and men with blue collar status among all men in the corresponding age of 40-60years old) **Information we have:** **0.79** Source: EURO Student III The information we have is		

based on a survey result of ISCED 5A level students. ISCO-88 categories 6-9 are included as blue collar status.		
Indicator 13 RPL	ECOTEC	
Indicator 14 Student services		
14.1.1 Are there educational guidance and counselling targeting at the higher education students? (1)no service targeting HE students, (2)inadequate/ limited service, (3)there is widely applicable service **Your country is placed under category:3** Source: Katzensteiner, M, Ferrer-Sama, P & Rott, G 2008 Guidance and Counselling		

14.1.2 Are there services for disability and social needs targeting at the higher education students? (1)no service targeting HE students, (2)inadequate/ limited service, (3)there is widely applicable service **Your country is placed under category: 3** Source: Katzensteiner, M, Ferrer-Sama, P & Rott, G 2008 Guidance and Counselling		
14.1.3 Are there psychological student counselling targeting at the higher education students? (1)no service targeting HE students, (2)inadequate/ limited service, (3)there is widely applicable service **Your country is placed under category: 3** Source: Katzensteiner, M, Ferrer-Sama, P & Rott, G 2008 Guidance and Counselling		
14.1.4 Are there counselling services for career		

guidance and employment targeting at the higher education students? (1)no service targeting HE students, (2)inadequate/ limited service, (3)there is widely applicable service **Your country is placed under category: 2** Source: Katzensteiner, M, Ferrer-Sama, P & Rott, G 2008 Guidance and Counselling		
Financial support to students		
14.2.1 How many percent of the higher education students receive direct state (any public source) assistance? **Information we have:** **86.70 %** Source: EURO Student III This information is based on a survey that covers only ISCED 5A level students		
14.2.2 What is the median amount of state assistance for higher education students? (€) **Information we have:** **327.0€** Source: EURO Student III This information is based on a survey that covers only ISCED 5A level students.		

14.2.3 What is the percentage of financial aid for students in the total public expenditure on tertiary education? **Information we have:** **27.7** Source: EURO Stat 2005		
14.2.4 How many percent of the monthly average student income is spent as a payment to the higher education institution? **Information we have:** **9.20** Source: EURO Student III This information is based on a survey that covers only ISCED 5A level students		
14.2.5 What is the percentage of public expenditure on tertiary education as a share of GDP? **Information we have:** **1.0** Source: OECD 2005		
14.2.6 Are there portable student grants in your country? (1)no, (2) partially portable, (3)		

fully portable **Your country is placed under category: 3** Source: National report for Bologna Process 2007-2009		
14.2.7 Are there portable student loans in your country? (1)no, (2) partially portable, (3) fully portable **Your country is placed under category: 3** Source: National report for Bologna Process 2007-2009		
<mark>**Indicator 15 Flexible learning paths**</mark>	<mark>**ECOTEC**</mark>	

Appendix 3

Selected Case Studies

Independent Assessment Study – Bologna Process

Second Draft, for final Comments from Advisory Board

Don F. Westerheijden on behalf of core research teams, 2009-03-31

Place in the Independent Assessment Study

The Independent Assessment Study consists of three main empirical parts, mentioned in the Proposal for the study:

Phase 2: overview of national situations, based on indicators and available studies
Phase 3: twelve case studies
Phase 4: stakeholder interviews

At the kick-off meeting in Brussels, 2008-09-30, it was agreed that the research team would propose 20 cases, out of which 12 would be selected. The current memorandum contains our 20 proposals.

Methodology

The pre-selection of the potential cases is based on the preliminary results of Phase 2 and on our background knowledge as researchers of the issues involved. The data collected for Phase 2 are organised as indicators, based on the National Reports for the 2009 ministerial Follow-Up conference (28-29 April, Leuven/Louvain-la-Neuve), on statistics of Eurydice, Eurostat, OECD, etc., and on several dedicated empirical studies. A detailed justification of that will be included in the report on Phase 2.

For the moment, it appears that only the National Reports give information about all countries in the Bologna Process and our additional data collection through national contact persons is still ongoing, so that data coverage for non-EU and non-OECD countries is only partial until now. This applies especially to detailed figures on student mobility. However, we are convinced that the general picture would not change dramatically with better and more (statistical) data; this makes us reasonably confident about the case study proposals in this memorandum.

The general aim of the proposed case studies is to provide readers of the final report with in-depth knowledge about good or interesting practices on a number of crucial issues. The character of the case studies therefore should be 'didactical', i.e. they should point readers to positive and negative lessons learnt that may help them shape their own policies and strategies for further implementation of the Bologna Process action lines.

Starting from the 'simplified scheme' showing the main expected connections in the study's conceptual framework, the main division among the indicators collected was between indicators of goal achievement (strategic, intermediate and operational goals) and indicators of application of means.

The other major division was into the four broad areas of activities distinguished in this study: degree structure/curriculum, mobility, quality assurance and the social dimension.

With our case studies, we aim to cover all of the eight cells in the matrix resulting from goals/means and the four activity dimensions; most of them through thematic case studies and the totality through across-the-board country studies (the right-hand column of Table 1). It should be noted that the 'white cells' of means regarding curriculum reform and of goals regarding quality assurance will be taken up in across-the-board country studies. It would have needed more resources for our study to develop case studies for these tow cells as well. Besides, these two cells seemed to have least priority. For one thing, the formal means of degree reform have already been applied in most Bologna Process countries so that our study comes too late to guide other countries in their choice of policy in this respect. The argument concerning the other 'white cell' is that quality assurance is intended to be a means to achieving the operational goals of the Bologna Process, more than the other dimensions distinguished, so that exclusive attention to it as a policy activity rather than as a goal in itself seems warranted.

Table 1 Matrix for case studies

	Curriculum and Degrees	Recognition and Mobility	Quality Assurance	Social Dimension	*All dimensions*
Means applied		Policies for recognition and mobility	Adaptation of Q.A. to Bologna Process	Flexible access and curriculum	4 country cases
Goal achievement	Easily readable and comparable degrees	Levels of Mobility		Equity of participation	2 country cases

In addition, we aim to achieve a distribution across different types of countries involved in the Bologna Process (especially focusing on 'old-time' members and new-comer countries from East and West, small and large ones) and to ensure that not too many studies focus on the same countries.

Perspectives: From Means to Goals and from Goals to Means

Some of the case studies below are starting from means (policies) chosen and are directed towards two types of questions. First, what are impacts of choosing these means? Different means (policy mixes, i.e. combinations of regulation, funds, communication etc.) may lead to different levels of goal achievement but also may differ in the secondary impacts they have (side effects), be they beneficial or undesirable. Second, choice of means may not be a completely free choice: policies tend to be contextually-bound and path-dependent. Major factors affecting choice of means (policy mixes) will be explored in

these studies, too, aiming to give others a more grounded choice of options for their future policies.

Other case studies start from the question of goals achieved. Cases are chosen that seem to be successful. In these cases the view will be mostly backwards: which means and conditions made this success possible?

As a result, the differences between the two lines of case studies will not be that large in terms of issues covered, but the perspective will be different.

A)   Across the Board Country Case Studies

The first set of proposals is about countries studied 'completely', i.e. across all areas distinguished, and relating means to goal achievement. These will constitute 6 of the 12 cases.

Cases 1-2: Across the Board High Performance on Goals

Eventually, a high level of performance on the goals (strategic, intermediate and operational goals) is desired. The main research question for the cases in this category is: what did they do by way of policies, how did they involve higher education institutions and stakeholders, and what were the relevant conditional factors that contributed to their level of 'success'? Two cases are selected.

Countries: Ireland, the Netherlands.

Admittedly, Ireland had a two-cycle structure already before the Bologna Declaration, and it also was in the *avant-garde* with regard to qualification structures. Their example may show to countries starting later what further developments or outcomes are possible after a longer period of time.

Cases 2-6: Across the Board Good Level of Application of Means

Some countries showed a generally high level of application of means for the Bologna Process. The main research question for these cases is how the different means are correlated in policy and empirically, and how these help to achieve the operational, intermediate and finally strategic goals of the Bologna Process, or what prevents their achievement (given that these are not always high-performance countries when goals are considered)? In the context, we will look for factors enabling or hindering policy development towards operational goals of the Bologna Process.

We chose one 'old-time' and three 'late-coming' countries, bringing the total of the six country-wide studies of section A in balance (three long-time signatories of the Bologna Declaration and three more recent joiners in the Process).

Countries: Estonia, Georgia, Serbia, Turkey.

B)   Thematic Comparative Case Studies on Degrees and Curriculum Reform

For the other half of the case studies, we are focusing on comparative case studies across in principle three countries, a main country (indicated below in bold) and two secondary ones. The sets of three countries are chosen to be interesting examples on a narrow set of

issues. As a rule, the three countries provide contrasting experiences, usually of alternative but all somehow successful ways towards the same goal, sometimes of successful (primary) cases in contrast to 'struggling' (secondary) cases.

Case 7: Easily Readable and Comparable Degrees

In a formal sense, it may be easy to regulate a new degree structure, but it may take much more than regulation to make a real transformation of study programmes into meaningful programmes under such a new structure. Do they apply the ECTS in-depth, i.e. focusing on actual students' workload and on expected learning outcomes? Is this connected to modularisation of curricula and does modularisation entail flexibility? Is all of this communicated clearly to students and employers to stimulate employability of new-degree graduates in practice, e.g. through the Diploma Supplement? The influence of contextual factors will be investigated as well: the countries chosen display different higher education traditions, resource levels, policy styles, relations with stakeholders, etc.

   In this study, some countries that are struggling with converting to real transformation will be focused upon, and their achievement will be contrasted with literature on some of the better-known examples (not formally part of this case study) in order to highlight success factors.

Countries: **Italy**, Poland, Romania.

C)   Thematic Comparative Case Studies on International Recognition and Mobility

Case 8: Policies for Recognition and Mobility

This study is to investigate the complex of policies needed to set the conditions for successfully increasing mobility of students (and staff): ECTS, Diploma Supplement, Lisbon Recognition Convention (additionally: National Qualifications Framework and Recognition of Prior Learning). How are these different elements combined successfully? Are there necessary linkages and/or are compensatory policies possible? How do contextual factors influence the options and their implementation?

Countries: **Norway**, Denmark, Estonia.

Case 9: Achievement of Increased Mobility

Three aspects of mobility are considered under this heading: increase of inward mobility of students from outside the EHEA, increase of inward intra-EHEA mobility and increase of outward intra-EHEA mobility. The UK has a high volume of incoming student mobility both from outside and inside the EHEA; it is a special case regarding mobility due to its language advantage: what lesson can we draw from it for other countries? Yet, it is a big player for international students and it is actively engaged in 'nation branding' for mobility. Especially in this latter respect it can be fruitfully contrasted with France's approach to international mobility. Some of the Central and Eastern European countries showed large increases in outward mobility, while for others this remained mainly stable: is such an increase a 'success' and which factors influence its occurrence?

Countries: **UK**, France, the Czech Republic.

D) Thematic Comparative Case Studies on Cooperation in Quality Assurance

Case 10: Adaptation of Quality Assurance Schemes to the EHEA

Given the importance that quality assurance has in the Bologna Process, it is interesting to contrast countries making their quality assessment system 'heavier' to comply with the perceived needs of the EHEA with countries opting for a light-touch external quality assurance model: does the choice of either path make a difference for international recognition of degrees and for mobility of staff and students in the higher education institutions? Spain is an example of a country where quality assurance seems to be strongly developing in reaction to the Bologna Process; Sweden seems to be a good contrasting case maintaining an organic, only incrementally-changing relation with its long tradition in quality assurance. Are these two alternative routes to achieving the EHEA, or is one evidently more successful than the other? Under which circumstances is the previous answer valid? In the latter respect, the contrast with Hungary can be illustrative, with its previous tradition of major change in the transition period in the 1990s against the backdrop of strong but very different traditions e.g. with regard to involvement of students and stakeholders.

Countries: **Spain**, Sweden, Hungary.

E) Thematic Comparative Case Studies on the Social Dimension of Higher Education

Case 11: Policies to Widen Participation in Higher Education

In this comparative case study we aim to compare and contrast policy strands intended to widen access into higher education for groups of society who had limited access to higher education through traditional ways. Alternative entry into higher education is the first object in a number of countries and several different ways are tried. Recognition of prior learning (RPL) is one of the means to widen access to higher education. The practices and policies of RPL measures are different among the countries, including the levels of the recognition of RPL. RPL is not only intended to give access to traditional, full-time degree-awarding study programmes, but plays a role in making higher education more flexible and accessible in the framework of lifelong learning. Although not a major focus, some 'points of contact' between RPL and lifelong learning will come to the fore in this study; the choice of countries should enable getting a broad overview of options chosen.

Countries: **France**, Portugal, Slovenia.

Case 12: Increased Equity of Participation in Higher Education

There are only few countries that show high levels of achievement regarding increased social equity of participation. A study of some of them may assist other countries in the Bologna Process of defining benchmarks and learning from their experiences. The Finnish case is worth of choosing especially for its good progress in participative equity within and beyond Bologna context implementations. Some other countries showing indicators of fair social participation are included in this study, too. As with all studies starting from

goal achievements, the research questions will centre on which policies and circumstances made these successes possible; student services are one of the factors to be given attention here.

Countries: **Finland**, Germany, UK-Scotland.

Appendix 4: Scheme for country case studies

General structure

1. Introduction (*indicative length:* 2 pages)
   a. How large is the higher education system in the countries examined for the theme?
   b. How is higher education governed, as a rule? (centralisation/decentralisation, major characteristics of funding and governance) Introduction (1 page)
   c. Comparative overview of the situation of the countries in this case:
      i. When the countries joined the Bologna Process?
      ii. Did it have a two-/three-cycle structure before?
      iii. Were they part of Erasmus before?
      iv. What kind of major quality assessment scheme did it have before?
   d. What were its major policies for equity and equality of participation in higher education across social strata before joining the Bologna Process?
   e. State the aim of this case study / explain from why these countries were chosen for the case and which the prime country is. In this study, some countries that are struggling with converting to real transformation will be focused upon, and their achievement will be contrasted with literature on some of the better-known examples (not formally part of this case study) in order to highlight success factors

2. Main research question (here: *On readable and comparable degrees*): *indicative length:* 10 pages
   a. Describe the goal achievement in some detail: to what extent did the countries in question succeed?
   b. What did they do by way of policies to achieve these results? For example (2 pages):
      i. Do they apply the ECTS in-depth?
      ii. Is this connected to modularisation of curricula and does modularisation entail flexibility?
      iii. Is all of this communicated clearly to students and employers to stimulate employability of new-degree graduates in practice, e.g. through the Diploma Supplement?
      iv. Etc.
   c. What were the critical success factors as well as the setbacks in implementing the policies to reach their goals?
   d. Compare and contrast the different policies adopted
      i. How did they involve higher education institutions and stakeholders in the implementation process?
      ii. Did they take different routes

      iii. Did these different routes have an impact on the way the countries are now looking as far as Readable and comparable degrees are concerned?

      iv. Which contextual factors (e.g. different higher education traditions, resource levels, policy styles, relations with stakeholders) contributed to possible differences in their level of success?

3. Summary of main findings *indicative length:* 1 pages
    a. Focus on lessons learned that may be relevant to other actors in the Bologna Process, or in similar processes around the world. (1-2 pages)

Our first request to the International Panel

We kindly request the members of the international panel to present their views on the Bologna Process from the perspective of their own country or region. We would like to have these views in the form of "an essay" of approximately 2500 words that addresses the following questions. You are welcome to include parts of relevant publications that you have already written on these issues.

External perceptions on the goals and instruments of Bologna

1. How is the Bologna process perceived in your country, by government, the higher education community and the media? We are particularly interested in which goals, action lines and instruments feature most prominently in these discussions.

   a. Which ***goals*** are emphasised in the discussions concerning Bologna?

   > • *Improving the attractiveness of European higher education for other parts of the world*
   > • *Increasing international mobility within Europe*
   > • *Reforming European higher education*
   > • *Compatibility & comparability of HE systems in Europe*

   b. Which of the ***action lines*** are most prominent in the discussions?

   > • *Adoption of a system of easily readable and comparable degrees*
   > • *Adoption of a system essentially based on two cycles*
   > • *Establishment of a system of credits*
   > • *Promotion of mobility*
   > • *Promotion of European co-operation in quality assurance*
   > • *Promotion of the European dimension in higher education*
   > • *Focus on lifelong learning*
   > • *Inclusion of higher education institutions and students*
   > • *Promotion of the attractiveness of the European Higher Education Area*
   > • *Doctoral studies and the synergy between the European Higher Education Area and the European Research Area*

   c. Do the following ***instruments*** play a role in the discussions?

   > • *European Credit Transfer System and the Diploma Supplement*
   > • *Dublin Descriptors, the European Qualifications Framework & National Qualification Frameworks*
   > • *Erasmus and Erasmus Mundus*
   > • *Accreditation and Quality assurance (European Standards and Guidelines for QA; the European Quality Assurance Register)*
   > • *The introduction of short cycle degrees,*
   > • *Recognition of Prior Learning lifelong learning and the Copenhagen process*
   > • *Doctoral studies and the European research Area*

The effects of Bologna outside Europe

2. Does your country or region take (specific elements of) Bologna as an example for future reforms? Would this be a transfer of the goals of Bologna or the transfer of specific measures or instruments? Or has the Bologna process impacted policies in your country in another way?

3. Do you think Bologna has provoked further harmonisation of higher education structures in your 'part of the world'? Is creating a common higher education area an issue in your region?

External perceptions on the effects of Bologna

4. This part focuses on the ultimate effects of Bologna and the way success (or failure) is perceived in your region or country. Do you think that Bologna has improved the reputation of higher education in Europe and enhanced Europe's position as a knowledge intensive region? What is the general perception in your country on the success (or failure) of Bologna? In particular, have you observed any changes in the HE interaction between Europe and your region over the last decade (student & staff mobility; research co-operation etc.)?