

<p>BOLOGNA beyond 2010 (version of 21/11/08)</p>	<p>Comments (from: Austria, CoE, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Education International, ENQA, ESU, EUA, European Commission, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Norway, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, UK, UK-Scotland)</p>
<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 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 and the ensuing BFUG meeting in Paris, 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</p>	<p><u>Finland:</u> General remarks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What is the expected audience? - We would like to join those who have already mentioned that the document is "longish" and we are afraid that it will loose its focus. - What is the purpose of the Foreword text? Do we think that the description of the process is of value to the possible readers? - It could be difficult for the Ministers to agree on every single word that has been written in the Foreword, Introduction and the chapters 1 - 4 (24 pages). We think that Introduction and chapters 1-3 could work as a background material, if needed. Instead, the Ministers should focus on the future priorities written in compact form (based on the chapter 4). - We think that it could be useful if we now could concentrate on redrafting the chapter 4 as it would be also difficult for the BFUG to handle the whole document plus the draft communiqué <p><u>Sweden:</u> The paper is well structured but too long for serving as a basis for a communiqué. Maybe the background part could be shortened and more stress put upon chapter 4.</p> <p><u>E. I.:</u> Taking into consideration that we have a number of amendments to the text we would like to outline what we find is the most important issues to change in the text.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Education International believes that it is crucial in the text to maintain that the state needs to have the prime responsibility and be the prime source to fund higher education. We think that this text, if it is to be forward looking and visionary cannot state that Europe does not have more public money to invest in higher education and therefore must point out clearer the public responsibility for funding. Furthermore the text in its original version is ambiguous over the issue of tuition fees. EI cannot accept a text that is open for, or even promoting tuition fees. This issue is highly debated and we see diverse trends in Europe, with countries refraining from introducing fees and even examples of fees being abolished (Hesse in Germany for example). We find it inappropriate to include this issue in the Bologna Process at this stage, when we have not had proper and serious discussion about it. 2. The text must be clearer on that higher education belongs in the public domain. Higher education cannot be left to the whims of some sort of “education market”. The fact that our higher education, and research at universities, also in the future should have a public character must be clearly stated in the text. 3. EI want to point out that it is crucial for a well-functioning higher education system that we protect the academic freedom of researchers, teachers and other academic staff and students. Only if the academic freedom is protected can critical thinking, intellectual development and following this innovation and new knowledge be advanced. Europe needs to stand up for academic freedom and make sure that commercial or political actors are not exerting undue influence over teaching and research. 4. Following the need for academic freedom is also the issue of collegial governance. Higher education staff and students must also in the future have influence over and be part of the higher education institutions.

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.

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.

Part 3 discusses the follow up structure required to support this cooperation.

Part 4 summarises the conclusions and proposes priorities for future objectives and actions.

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.

Collegial governance is a well-functioning model for higher education institutions. It is also a bearing principle in the Bologna Process and should be part also of a future European Higher Education Area.

5. Finally, EI does not want the chapter on "Institutional diversity" to conclude that we need a new instrument for making our higher education systems more transparent. This formulation is opening the way for a European Ranking system, something that EI is strongly opposing. Furthermore it is inappropriate to include a new issue into the process and conclude that this is something that the Bologna Process needs to work on – without it having been thoroughly discussed with all members and consultative members.

Sweden: The paper is well structured but too long for serving as a basis for a communiqué. Maybe the background part could be shortened and more stress put upon chapter 4.

Enqa: ENQA supports the views expressed by so far by several other colleagues on the need to identify the readership and the purpose of the document and to clarify "what has to be done, by when and by whom" aspect.

It might also be useful to shorten and simplify some parts of the document, keeping in mind the purpose and readership.

ENQA is content with the QA chapter and with the consensus other colleagues have expressed as regards.

Germany: As a general comment and taking up some of the remarks made by others, I would like to state that we have to reach consensus on the nature, and addressees of the Bologna beyond 2010 - paper.

To our understanding the paper (chapters 1-3) is a discussion paper of BFUG which should reflect the consensus we have on many points, but which may also show the issues on which further discussion is still necessary. We should reach agreement as far as possible until the next BFUG meeting in February, but then come to a close with this paper and concentrate on what is to become the communiqué, i.e. chapter 4.

The present draft of chapter 4 is a good starting point for further discussions and will certainly be fleshed out in the light of the discussions on the other chapters.

Italy: Three general comments to the text, some of them already mentioned by others:

- the internal coherence of the three sections of the document (Chapter 1, 2 and 4) could be improved and the arguments leading to the conclusions made more explicitly built;
- the language of the document could be simplified;
- the text tends to be too much EU-centred and Lisbon oriented.

Norway: Norway welcomes the revised draft of the report "Bologna beyond 2010". The overall structure of the report and chapter two in particular is in our opinion much improved from the previous draft, and there is greater coherence between the various sections.

We do, however, have several comments to the revised draft.

First of all we are still concerned about the length of the document. We should in our opinion look to reduce the length of the text further as the document is still too long if the intention is to make this a public document. We believe that we need to keep in mind the potential audience of the document when redrafting the report further.

We should also strive at ensuring greater coherence between chapter 4 and the rest of the report. Even though the coherence is greatly improved from the previous draft, chapter 4 still does not seem to fulfill the intended goal of a conclusion and a summary of the report. There is still a bit of a mismatch between chapter 4 and the other chapters of the report.

Greece: We acknowledge the hard work undertaken in compiling this report. However, we share the view that the report is very extensive and thus not user-friendly.

In particular the first part describing the work done so far is very extensive, an excellent job for academics, historians and researchers, but, extremely detailed for politicians and readers.

We think that the part focusing on Bologna beyond 2010 must be most highlighted in the text. It should clearly state Europe's orientation, that is, the European HE model for the next decade, visible to those outside Europe.

We also express our reservations about the part of the text concerning the funding of Higher Education, sharing and fully supporting the views of EI and ESU about tuition fees.

We should instead declare once again that higher education in Europe is a public good, equally accessible by all, under public responsibility.

European Commission: Overall, we believe the note provides a good basis for the upcoming discussions on the Ministerial Communiqué, which obviously will need to provide more focus in order to serve as an agenda for Bologna type reforms in the coming decade

Ireland: Some general points - we would add our support to the calls from other countries for a shorter, more succinct text. While the report manages to pull together all the relevant issues, there is an element of repetition and it appears some of the key points are getting lost. We consider that the document should be more focused and easier to read. Also to repeat others, there needs to be more of a focus on exactly what will be done to address the issues identified. As the key chapter for drafting the Communiqué appears to be Chapter 4, we have not marked editing/textual changes in the overall document. However, we have highlighted areas where we think further consideration is required and marked a number of possible deletions.

Slovenia: Purpose and target group of the report:

I have the impression that we've once again reached the point when "we can't see the wood for the trees". I

think that happened every single time in past years when the redrafting of certain document was well advanced. Thus the questions what's the purpose of the document and the readership. While I expect that the Secretariat will clarify these questions, for me there is no doubt that the report is intended for the reflection of ministers at the next ministerial conference (London Communiqué: 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.). I expected, however, that the text will also serve as a background document for discussions in working groups in Leuven. As such, like any other material for the conference, would obviously be public as it would be at the disposal of all conference participants. Nevertheless, it should primarily serve the ministers. The text could still be shortened, especially in chapter 1. The text will, of course, also serve as the basis for drafting the Communiqué.

Although the concept was agreed already in Brdo meeting I now suggest that the Follow-up structure becomes chapter 4 and Conclusions and priorities for beyond 2010 become chapter 3 and thus follow the challenges for Bologna 2020.

UK-Scotland: As we take this further, I think we should look to reduce it further if we can, bearing mind that Ministers are amongst the target audience.

I also think we should look to ensure greater coherence between section 4 and the earlier parts of the document. There is still a bit of a mismatch between the two.

Also, I agree with Peter that we should try and start to identify who will do what by when. It's all very well to be ambitious, but we do need to be realistic about what we can achieve.

Last general point, I plan to discuss the references to lifelong learning learning when the co-coordinating group meets on 9 January. I might therefore offer on behalf of the group some further comments on those sections of the document early in the New Year.

UK:

i. I am not sure who the intended readership for this document is, or to what purpose the document will be put. If it is to be a report for Bologna ministers then it is too long for them and a little repetitive in places. It would need some more rigorous editing to make it more "user friendly" for them. If this is to be a statement to the wider world outside Europe about the modern forward thinking Europe it should be written in a more accessible way, one which minimises "jargon"; and

ii. I take it the sections of text which appear in *italics* are intended to be recommendations or pointers for future action. It would be helpful if they could be made a little more specific in terms **who** should do **what** by **when**.

for the coming years.

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 voluntary co-operation between

Verwijderd: decade to

Verwijderd: e

Opmerking [p1]: Need to be clear that difference stakeholders have different roles. In particular, most actions should be left to individual higher education institutions with strategic input from Governments.

Verwijderd: a

	<p>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 <u>agreeing</u> the role each stakeholder should play.</p> <p>ESU: We thank for the work done so far, but we would like to understand what will be the process for incorporating the comments, as we have sent a number of amendments last time and saw them not being included. Also, the last BFUG meeting cleared out a large consensus on removing some topics from the agenda that yet were put back in the document.</p> <p>Denmark: We support the points already made by many others regarding the length and the status of the revised version of the document. Dependent on the use of the document it needs to be shortened considerably. We note that it is the intention of the Bologna secretariat to draft the communiqué on the basis of the ongoing process and thus this current Bologna Beyond 2010 document is to be considered as a discussion document for the BFUG. The document will not benefit from being further elaborated or detailed.</p> <p>However, if the document is to be made public a more focused version must be drawn up and some of the more controversial points removed from the document.</p>
<p align="center">BOLOGNA beyond 2010</p> <p align="center">The contribution of European higher education to the global public good</p> <p align="center">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 European Higher Education Area “EHEA” was formalized a year later in Bologna by 30 countries (The Bologna Declaration, 1999). It is</p>	<p>CoE: The decision to engage in a voluntary process to create the European Higher Education Area (EHEA) (comment: this is more than a trivial change: the EHEA is by now well enough established not to appear in</p>

Verwijderd: specifying

<p>now apparent that this was a unique undertaking as the process today includes 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 and interest, but also some uneasiness in other parts of the world.</p>	<p>quotation marks...) was formalized a year later in Bologna</p> <p>that <u>have ratified</u> the European Cultural Convention</p> <p><u>ESU</u>: ... but also some uneasiness in other parts of the world.</p> <p><u>Ireland</u>: Moreover, the process has aroused growing curiosity and interest, but also some uneasiness in other parts of the world.</p>
<p>The process has 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 as well as international organizations like the European Commission, the Council of Europe and UNESCO-CEPES and the European network of quality assurance agencies. The process also encouraged many countries to ratify the Council of Europe-UNESCO Lisbon Recognition Convention (1997).</p>	<p><u>CoE</u>: The Council of Europe-UNESCO Lisbon Recognition Convention (1997) is the only legally binding text of the EHEA, and ratification of the Convention is among the obligations undertaken by Ministers.</p>

Opmerking [BC2]: Does this add anything to the paper? How will this sound from an extra-European perspective?

<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>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 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>UK: to strengthen European integration</p> <p>Czech Republic: The undergraduate/postgraduate degree structure has been modified into a three-cycle system, which now should be articulated through qualifications frameworks with an emphasis on learning outcomes – what people know, understand and can do – as well as progression in the system and how different qualifications “communicate together”.</p> <p>E.C.: and the academic recognition of qualifications...</p>
<p>The Bologna Process has developed 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. At the same time, though, some overall goals can</p>	<p>Austria: The Bologna Process has used and developed a number of instruments (e.g. DS and ECTS were developed before Bologna!) 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. At the same time, though, some overall goals can also be looked at in terms of instruments, such as mobility. At the same time, though, some overall goals can also be looked at in terms of instruments. Mobility, for instance, is both a means and an end. It strongly contributes to the European dimension of higher education,</p>

Opmerking [c3]: Never understood that to be the case. An overstatement?

Verwijderd: includes the concept of

Verwijderd: progression in the system and

Verwijderd: articulate

<p>also be looked at in terms of instruments. Mobility, for instance, 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>but it is also a goal worth pursuing in itself Explanation for deleting the old text: to depict mobility as a “goal worth pursuing in itself” plays into the hands of those critics who refuse recognition in the spirit of the Lisbon Recognition Convention. Content and Quality must play an important role, too, for that matter. In other words, we know that there is a lot of added value to be gained from the intercultural and linguistic experience and the strengthening of a persons’s personality alone. But many university administrators refuse recognition if the content of the study abroad portions of a student’s programme does not reflect 100% the domestic curriculum, which runs counter to the idea of fuzziness and tolerance embedded in the LRC.</p> <p><u>Italy</u>: The Bologna Process has developed a number of instruments, <u>such as the Qualifications Framework for the EHEA and the European Standards and Guidelines</u>, 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 (<u>examples?</u>). At the same time, some overall goals...</p>
<p>The European dimension is very much the raison d’être of the Bologna Process, it is its defining characteristic. The European dimension finds its expression in the fact that European higher education systems are based on diversity and cooperation, on the participation of all stakeholders and on academic freedom. Multilingualism is another distinguishing feature. European higher education is seen as a public good in which the social dimension is firmly embedded and it is this unique combination of values and principles that shape the European dimension of European higher education.</p>	<p><u>UK</u>: shape the European dimension of European higher education.</p>
<p>As far as implementation is concerned, progress over the years has been uneven, as can be seen from the various stocktaking exercises. Differences exist between countries, between institutions as well as between disciplines. Not all participating countries will have implemented all policies and reached all stated goals by 2010. 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.</p>	<p><u>ESU</u>: ... the various stocktaking exercises. The complexity of the process, involving many different stakeholders in the conception and multiple levels in the implementation creates difficulties and, in many cases, progress remained at the surface level, or was limited to the introduction of legal frameworks. Differences exist...</p> <p><u>Hungary</u>: However, it has to be acknowledged that the Bologna Process has resulted in changes that go beyond previous estimations as for their depth and their speed, affecting the higher education of a great number of countries and a huge area in and outside Europe. Along with their positive and negative consequences, the changes already realized are a vast achievement resulting from joint efforts.</p>

Verwijderd: ¶

Verwijderd: though,

Opmerking [c4]: Much of this is not unique to Europe..

<p>Moreover, prior to the publication of the independent 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><u>UK:</u> to give <u>policy</u> orientations</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><u>Sweden:</u> It important to stress that proper understanding and implementation of the 3 action lines is important in all of the EHEA-countries.</p> <p><u>Slovenia:</u> When talking about the finalisation agenda, the text should single out those areas where most progress is still needed and were identified in Sarajevo. For others it should only refer to the last stocktaking exercise and stress that the whole picture will only be known in 2010 after the results of independent assessment.</p> <p><u>Hungary:</u> Objectives and action lines has been modified, has become richer and more precise during the Process, as actors (governments, stakeholders in higher education and other areas) got engaged in an ever intensifying dialogue that permitted for all of them to learn about each other's points of view and to understand each other better and better. Modifications, adjustments of action lines and an enrichment of goals underway are to be forseen for the future of the Bologna Process as well. Thus the continuation of the Bologna Process is necessary not simply because not all - previously set- goals have been achieved by all participating countries so far, but also because goals and action lines adjusted and enriched underway continue to hold their relevance. (For example, see the development of the conceptions of learning outcomes and the qualifications framework.)</p>
<p>1.1. Action lines This category comprises the degree structure, qualifications frameworks, quality assurance and recognition.</p> <p>1.1.1. The degree structure and qualifications frameworks 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 based on student workload. The first</p>	<p><u>Sweden:</u> <i>The degree structure and qualifications framework</i>, the interval for second cycle should be 60 – 120 ECTS. Even if most countries have implemented a three cycle structure and the national qualifications framework related to the overarching qualifications are under way there still remains a lot of work. Self certification reports must be available and learning outcomes understood. And still remains work on <i>Joint degrees!</i></p> <p><u>Germany:</u> The first cycle typically contains between 180 and 240 ECTS, while the second cycle typically carries 60-120 ECTS.</p> <p><u>Austria:</u> at least 60 of which should be at second cycle level.</p>

Verwijderd: political

<p>cycle typically contains between 180 and 240 ECTS, while the second cycle typically carries 90-120 ECTS, at least 60 of which should be at second cycle level.</p>	<p>UK-Sc: based on student workload <u>and learning outcomes</u></p> <p>UK: The European Higher Education Area is structured <u>(this does not make sense surely it is qualifications in the EHEA are structured</u> around three cycles, bachelor, master and doctorate, with a possibility of intermediate qualifications, and with progression from one cycle to the next; each cycle is defined in terms of generic descriptors based on learning outcomes. <u>In addition to descriptors the first two cycles are also</u> defined by ECTS credit ranges based on student workload <u>and learning outcomes</u>. The first cycle typically contains between 180 and 240 ECTS, while the second cycle carries <u>60-120 ECTS, with a range of 90-120 being typical of most awards.</u></p> <p>Italy: is structured around three cycles, with a possibility of...</p>
<p>Moreover, 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>Ireland: Moreover, <u>national</u> qualifications frameworks <u>which must be</u> certified against the overarching Qualifications Framework for the EHEA and designed to encourage mobility as well as employability are currently being <u>developed and</u> implemented. In most countries ...</p> <p>CoE: Moreover, qualifications frameworks self certified against the overarching Qualifications Framework for the EHEA and designed to encourage mobility and employability as well as an emphasis on learning outcomes and on designing a variety of learning paths toward a given qualification 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. The Coordination Group on Qualifications Frameworks has submitted a revised deadline for the completion of national frameworks that will recognize that many countries will need some additional time but at the same time underscore the urgency of the matter.</p> <p>UK: Moreover, <u>national</u> qualifications frameworks <u>to be self-</u>certified against the overarching Qualifications Framework for the EHEA and designed to encourage mobility as well as employability are currently being <u>developed and</u> implemented. In most countries self certification procedures will be completed after 2010 and the self certification reports will only then be made accessible to <u>all</u>.</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. Both are meant to increase transparency and confidence and thus also to encourage academic mobility. Yet, the structural reform amounts to more than a re-labelling of</p>	<p>Ireland: <u>The implementation of NQF is critical to</u> 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. Both are meant to increasing, transparency</p> <p>ESU: of credit points <u>has led to</u> a focus</p>

Verwijderd: within the first cycle

Verwijderd: proper

Verwijderd: T

Verwijderd: are

Verwijderd: typically

Verwijderd: 90

Verwijderd: at least 60 of which should be at second cycle level.

Verwijderd: bachelor, master and doctorate,

Verwijderd: partners

Verwijderd: e

Opmerking [BC5]: Is expected to allow for

<p>previously awarded diplomas and is accompanied by more fundamental changes. 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 and to content as well as to properly implement this change of paradigm. 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>UK: While much of the structural reform is already in place, the key challenge is to move from structure to practice and content as well as to</p> <p>CoE: Further work at institutional, national, regional and European level and associated resources will be required...</p> <p>Austria: While much of the structural reform is already in place, the key challenge is to move from structure to practice and to content as well as to properly implement this change of paradigm from teacher-centred learning to putting the students at the centre of interest.</p> <p>Austria: As a result, the way teaching and assessment is conducted will change, which in turn will have organisational implications.</p> <p>Italy: It is undeniable that the adoption of a common degree structure in all participating countries 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. Both are meant to increase comparability of degrees and mutual confidence, and thus also to encourage academic mobility. Generally speaking, the implementation of structural reforms amounts to more than a re-labelling of previously awarded diplomas and is accompanied by more substantial changes; degree programmes are increasingly described in terms of learning outcomes and the introduction of workload-based credits has led to a focus on student centred learning. Yet, while much of the structural reform is already in place, the key challenge is to move from principles and structures to a proper implementation in institutions of this new paradigm by academics. Further work and associated resources will be required to improve understanding of learning outcomes and their use for designing and delivering curricula in the various subject areas. As a result, the way teaching and learning take place will change, which in turn will have organisational implications.</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>The European Standards and Guidelines for quality assurance in higher education (ESG), developed by the European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA) and its E4 partners, are now being implemented in higher education institutions and quality</p>	<p>Sweden: Good to stress the role of quality assurance compared to accreditation.</p> <p>Austria: The European Standards and Guidelines for quality assurance in higher education (ESG), developed by the European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA) and its E4 partners (European Student Union, European University Association, and European Association of Higher Education Insitutions), are now being implemented in higher education institutions and quality assurance agencies.</p> <p>UK: for the inclusion of quality assurance agencies and review of compliance with them is the main criterion</p>

Verwijderd: to

Verwijderd: implementation of the

Verwijderd: transparency

Verwijderd: Yet

Verwijderd: in institutions

Verwijderd: fundamental

Verwijderd: .

Verwijderd: D

Verwijderd: s

Verwijderd: fined

Verwijderd: points

Verwijderd: W

Verwijderd: structure to practice and to content as well as to properly implement this change of

Verwijderd: .

Verwijderd: 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

Verwijderd:

Verwijderd: is conducted

<p>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 the European Standards and Guidelines still constitute a challenge for many countries and institutions.</p>	<p><u>for full membership of ENQA.</u></p> <p>EUA: 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. But the European Standards and Guidelines still constitute a challenge for many countries and institutions.</p> <p>ESU: ... (ENQA) in association with ESU, EUA and EURASHE, ...</p> <p>But the implementation of the European Standards and Guidelines...</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>UK: The fundamental responsibility for quality rests within the world of academia <u>(what exactly is meant by this – we would say HEIs.)</u></p> <p>CoE: Internal quality assurance and development is a duty of the institution...</p> <p>Italy: ... is a duty of the institutions <u>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. and the development of a "quality culture" is clearly linked with their degree of autonomy</u></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>	<p>UK: External quality assurance fulfils <u>different needs</u>: at its best it combines both accountability for the reassurance of the public <u>by providing information about quality and standards</u> and an objective and developmental commentary for institutions.</p> <p>Italy: ... <u>objective and developmental commentary for institutions.</u></p>
<p>Because of their pervasiveness and importance, the effects of changes made due to the quality agenda 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. Also the functions, objectives and priorities of agencies are diverse and changing. In this respect the principle of recognition of diversity in the approaches to quality assurance as the main principle of the European Standard and Guidelines has to be borne in mind.</p>	<p>ESU: ... Process need to be examined. Student participation is becoming an increasingly dominant feature of quality assurance in all levels, including in the governance of internal quality assurance, external review panels and governance of agencies. Quality Assurance...</p> <p>UK: <u>The current movement, however,</u> appears to be towards quality audits...</p> <p>Italy: ... <u>the changes due to the quality agenda within the Bologna Process need to be further elaborated.</u> 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 <u>- though the current movement appears to be towards quality audits and institutional level accreditations.</u> Also... <u>Although, the recognition of diverse approaches to quality assurance is the main principle of the European Standard and Guidelines.</u></p>

Opmerking [r6]: Unless there is evidence of this, the statement should be removed.

Verwijderd: a

Verwijderd: - though the current movement

Verwijderd: effects of

Verwijderd: made

Verwijderd: examined.

Met opmaak: Lettertype: Arial, Engels (Groot-Brittannië), Doorhalen

Verwijderd: In this respect

Verwijderd: principle of

Verwijderd: ity in the

Verwijderd: as

Verwijderd: has to be borne in mind.

Verwijderd:

<p>There are new and developing areas affecting quality assurance in the EHEA. These include how to balance accountability and improvement within HEIs, on the one hand, and the shared responsibilities of HEIs, quality assurance agencies and policy-makers, on the other; how to make real the roles of different stakeholder groups (students, the business world, etc) and how to provide these groups with an adequate level of information; 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>Italy: <u>The accumulation of 'accreditation labels', often as a means of branding, and of rankings without proper controls, carries the risk of confusing and misleading the public as well as of increased and unnecessary bureaucratisation. 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. The agencies act as a support for institutions in their continuing development while, at the same time, have a key role as protectors of the public interest.</u></p> <p><u>New issues require thorough consideration in quality assurance. These include...</u></p> <p>... how to <u>enable different stakeholder groups (students, the business world, etc) to play their roles effectively</u> and how to provide these groups with an adequate level of information; how to handle the increasing diversity across higher education (diversity, of institutions, of students, of expectations, of missions, of pedagogies); how to react to the internationalisation...</p>
<p>The accumulation of 'accreditation labels', often as a means of branding, and of rankings, without proper controls, carries the risk of confusing the public as well as of increased and unnecessary bureaucratisation. 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. The agencies act as a support for institutions in their continuing development and, equally, have a key role as protectors of the public interest.</p>	<p>EC: The accumulation of 'accreditation labels', often as a means of branding, and of rankings, without proper controls, carries the risk of confusing the public as well as of increased and unnecessary bureaucratisation. Comment: This statement is too negative. Subject-based accreditations may have a role to play as stated above. Like all agencies they should be encouraged to apply for the Register. Ranking is addressed in section 2.3.2</p> <p>CoE: The criteria and procedures for quality assurance need to take account of the variety of missions of higher education institution, most prominently teaching and learning; research; and community service, all of which may be accomplished well or less well.</p> <p>UK: The accumulation of 'accreditation labels', often as a means of branding, and of rankings, without proper controls, carries the risk of confusing the public as well as of increased and unnecessary bureaucratisation.</p> <p>Italy: The accumulation of 'accreditation labels', often as a means of branding, and of rankings, without proper controls, carries the risk of confusing the public as well as of increased and unnecessary bureaucratisation. 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. The agencies act as a support for institutions in their continuing development and, equally, have a key role as protectors of the public interest.</p>

- Verwijderd: There are new and developing areas affecting
- Verwijderd: in the EHEA
- Verwijderd: make real the roles of
- Verwijderd: of pedagogies,

Opmerking [PD7]: Bologna Process stakeholders such as the European Commission would therefore do well to avoid producing more of these labels and rankings.

<p>The continuing construction of the European dimension of quality assurance still requires enhanced dialogue between higher education institutions, quality assurance agencies and governments, stakeholders and other users of the results of quality assurance, on their various expectations of that dimension. To progress, it must also be recognised that different national requirements and objectives need different quality assurance tools and approaches. In order to give coordinated answers to collective European demands, quality assurance agencies should develop a capacity to understand the core of each others missions and to jointly elaborate answers to the quality assurance challenges in the European Higher Education Area.</p>	<p>Italy: The ongoing construction of the European dimension of quality assurance requires an open dialogue between higher education institutions, quality assurance agencies, governments, stakeholders and other beneficiaries of quality assurance results to clarify their different expectations of that dimension. It must also be recognised that different national requirements and objectives need different quality assurance tools and approaches. In order to give coordinated answers to collective European demands, quality assurance agencies should develop a capacity to understand the core of their respective missions and to jointly elaborate...</p> <p>Cyprus: ... in the European Higher Education Area, while respecting national legislations.</p> <p>Ireland: Need to state more clearly what measures need to be taken to improve QA mechanisms.</p> <p>UK: in the European Higher Education Area.</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 at European level. It increasingly ensures that all learners are given fair recognition of their qualifications.</p>	<p>EC: 1.1.3. <u>Academic recognition / acceptance of qualifications in the labour market</u></p> <p>Academic 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 at European level. It increasingly ensures that all learners are given fair academic recognition of their qualifications.</p> <p>EUA: However 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. While clear progress</p> <p>Italy: It ensures that...</p>
<p>However, while clear progress has been made, there is a general perception that recognition practices are not yet coherent across the EHEA and that variations in programmes are too easily defined as substantial differences and thus as impediments to recognition. Recognition in the sense of the Lisbon Recognition Convention concerns academic recognition. But recognition</p>	<p>CoE: Recognition in the sense of the Lisbon Recognition Convention mostly concerns academic recognition. But recognition is a wider topic. It is also used in relation to access to professions or in general for</p>

- Verwijderd: continuing
- Verwijderd: still
- Verwijderd: enhanced
- Verwijderd: and
- Verwijderd: users
- Verwijderd: the
- Verwijderd: of quality assurance,
- Verwijderd: on
- Verwijderd: various
- Verwijderd:
- Verwijderd: To progress, i
- Verwijderd: each others
- Opmerking [c8]: Surely this has been done by the ESG and the work of ENQA, ECA etc?
- Verwijderd: R
- Verwijderd: R
- Verwijderd: increasingly

<p>is a wider topic. It is also used in relation to access to professions or in general for appreciation by the labour market. However, there is inconsistency between recognition for academic purposes and recognition of professional qualifications for entering the labour market.</p>	<p>employment purposes.</p> <p>Sweden: Which inconsistency is referred to between recognition for academic purpose and prof. qualifications for entering the labour market. Which is the responsibility for HE?</p> <p>E.C.: ... recognition is a wider topic. It is also used in general for appreciation by the labour market. However, there is inconsistency between recognition for academic purposes and <u>acceptance by employers of professional qualifications for entering the labour market when a profession is not regulated because in such case employers have no certainty that the qualification from another Member State is equivalent to the national qualification.</u></p>
<p>The key point, therefore, is to ensure that there is more transparency about how the Lisbon Recognition Convention is implemented, the processes involved and the criteria for decisions. 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 and of possible “substantial differences”.</p>	<p>Italy: ... the criteria <u>adopted</u> for decisions.</p> <p>CoE: Not least, there are still different “recognition cultures” throughout Europe. One of the biggest challenges we face is to develop a common understanding of the concept of qualifications and of possible “substantial differences”, i.e. how different qualifications may be without there being valid reasons for non-recognition. One “recognition culture” takes the view that qualifications need to be very similar to warrant recognition, whereas another “recognition culture” accepts considerable differences between qualifications as long as these do not make the foreign qualification unfit for the purpose(s) for which recognition is sought. Recognition practices need to be more firmly anchored in a common understanding of the concept of qualifications and qualifications frameworks. The existence of quality assurance mechanisms should also contribute to greater trust in issues of recognition. <i>[Comment: the rewording is suggested because the original formulation could be interpreted as saying the opposite of what was intended]</i></p> <p>UK: understanding of the <u>concept</u> of qualifications</p> <p>E.C.: and of possible “<u>significant</u> differences”.</p> <p>Ireland: “substantial differences”. <u>Does this need to be more specific?</u></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</p>	<p>E.C.: It is expected that there will be more agreements on automatic <u>academic recognition and better acceptance of qualifications in the labour market</u> once the degrees and diplomas are related to the qualifications framework. In this sense the establishment of qualifications frameworks and <u>academic recognition as well as acceptance of qualifications in the labour market are</u> closely linked; the existence of quality assurance mechanisms should also contribute to greater trust in issues of recognition.</p>

Verwijderd: in relation to access to professions or

Verwijderd: recognition

Verwijderd:

Opmerking [c9]: What does this mean?

Verwijderd: substantial

Verwijderd: are

<p>mechanisms should also contribute to greater trust in issues of recognition.</p>	<p>CoE: 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>EUA: It is expected</p>
<p><i>Generally speaking the degree structure and the qualifications framework, quality assurance and recognition are action lines 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 implications on the governance of the various systems of higher education and the way participating countries organize their systems. At this stage there is no felt need for new measures or new rules at European level, but what is called for is a proper understanding and implementation of these action lines, especially at institutional level.</i></p>	<p>Italy: Generally speaking the <u>common</u> degree structure...</p> <p>E.C.: ... assurance and <u>academic</u> recognition...</p> <p>UK: ... is a <u>legal</u> structure.</p> <p>Italy: The <u>common</u> degree structure and the qualifications framework have direct implications on the various systems of higher education and the way participating countries organize them.</p>
<p>1.2 Policy areas The social dimension, employability, lifelong learning 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>Italy: The social dimension, employability, lifelong learning, the Bologna Process in its global dimension <u>and mobility</u> are defined as</p> <p>Austria, Germany, UK-Sc: ... that have not yet been translated into a regulatory framework.</p> <p>UK: that have <u>not</u> been translated</p>
<p>1.2.1. Social dimension 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>	

Opmerking [r10]: Once more, where is the evidence? Moreover, the lack of progress on the QFs front – which has been discussed and for which there is evidence - also needs to be taken into account.

Opmerking [p11]: This implies legal force which it does not have. Possibly describe it differently.

Verwijderd: governance of the

Verwijderd: ir systems

Verwijderd: and

Opmerking [PD12]: We do not necessarily need a regulatory framework to ensure progress in these areas.

Verwijderd: yet

	<p>CoE: The social dimension is about justice to the individual as well as about making the best possible use of our societies' resources by allowing and encouraging everyone to make the best possible use of their talents and capabilities.</p>
<p>The Bologna Process has increasingly heightened its policy attention on the social dimension. The key policy messages are:</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 for social cohesion and active citizenship. <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 these higher education institutions have met their obligations of social cohesion in terms of groups defined by social background or relative disadvantage.</p>	<p>Italy: In a knowledge-society higher education is important to the development of successful economies and in providing opportunities</p> <p>Italy: the welfare state model of social cohesion.</p> <p>Austria: Education and more specifically higher education institutions contribute to the re-distribution of wealth through investing in social mobility and above all through public investment in the younger generation.</p> <p>Ireland: 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 these higher education institutions have met their obligations of social cohesion in terms of groups defined by social background or relative disadvantage.</p> <p>UK: 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 promote the re-distribution of wealth through investing in...</p> <p>ESU: ... or relative disadvantage. 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</p>

Opmerking [c13]: Is this some sort of suggestion that there is a common understanding of what welfare state means and that does in fact exist in all EHEA countries.....

Opmerking [PD14]: Saying that HEIs 'act as public instruments' undermines the autonomy that HEIs have.

Verwijderd: act as public instruments for the

Verwijderd:

	<p>presupposes 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.</p>
<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. Higher education is part of a system where choices have to be made earlier on in a pupil's career. Considerations of equity in higher education cannot be separated from considerations of equity in other parts of the education system. Institutions of higher education thus cannot overturn a student's former social and cultural experience. However, 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>Italy: ... considerations of equity in other <u>sectors</u> of the education system.</p> <p>Germany: However, barriers to equitable access within the higher education sector can include the cost of participation, entry qualification requirements, a lack of flexible learning opportunities, limited availability of support services and an "institutional culture": Not all these are barriers as such!</p> <p>Sweden: The social dimension is not only related to students in first and second cycle but also to doctoral candidates and early stage researchers. Sweden underlines that more reliable data are needed.</p> <p>ESU: Institutions of higher education can overturn a student's former social and cultural experience 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. In some countries there were attempts to overcome the social gaps through a mere expansion of the system. But it is increasingly recognised that additional measures are required to adequately face these challenges. The barriers to...</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Italy: an "institutional culture" <u>(what does institutional culture mean in this context? Is it possible to clarify?)</u>.</p> <p>Hungary: Admitting the shared responsibility of all sectors of education systems in ensuring equity and reducing disadvantages, a specific task of higher education could be to play an active (initiator) role in the</p>

Verwijderd: parts

	<p>cooperation with other sectors of education, notably secondary level education, in order to be more effective in equity issues.</p>
<p>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 benefit from the study opportunities at all levels. Widening participation will also require making further progress towards ensuring flexible learning paths to allow a diverse student population to participate in higher education.</p>	<p>UK: This involves improving the <u>learning</u> environment</p> <p>EUA: The key point is to improve access to higher education and to give opportunities to succeed to all those who are qualified and have the potential to benefit from higher education. This involves improving the study environment and creating the appropriate economic conditions for students to be able to benefit from the study opportunities at all levels. Widening participation will also require making further progress towards ensuring flexible learning paths and introducing the necessary incentives to allow a more diverse student population to participate in higher education</p>
<p>The social dimension of higher education is not only related to the student body in the first and the second cycle. The status of doctoral students is a concern and there is now a consensus to consider doctoral candidates as early stage researchers thus giving them employee status so that they benefit from all commensurate social security benefits and pension entitlements, acknowledging their professional experience as researcher.</p>	<p>Germany: The status of doctoral students is a concern and there is now a consensus to consider doctoral candidates as early stage researchers so that they benefit from all commensurate social security benefits and pension entitlements or equivalents, acknowledging their professional experience as researcher.</p> <p>Ireland: The social dimension of higher education is not only related to the student body in the first and the second cycle. The status of doctoral students is a concern and there is now a consensus to consider doctoral candidates as early stage researchers thus giving them employee status so that they benefit from all commensurate social security benefits and pension entitlements, acknowledging their professional experience as researcher.</p> <p>UK-Sc: <i>(as Peter B has suggested, we are not prepared to support this. Early stage researchers would actually lose out financially if they were to be treated as employees.)</i></p> <p>UK: The status of doctoral students is a concern and there is now a consensus to consider doctoral candidates as early stage researchers so that they benefit</p> <p>EUA: The social dimension of higher education is not only related to the student body in the first and the second cycle. The status and rights of doctoral students is a concern and there is now a consensus to</p>

Verwijderd: s

Verwijderd: tudy

Opmerking [I15]: We would not agree with this. This would be a significant step and needs to be given more consideration.

Opmerking [PD16]: There is no consensus that doctoral students across Europe should be given employee status. Doctoral students in the UK have student status – this position is supported by the National Postgraduate Committee.

Verwijderd: thus giving them employee status

	<p>consider doctoral candidates as early stage researchers, be they formally considered as students or have employee status</p> <p>Italy: ... status so that they <u>can enjoy</u> all commensurate social security benefits and pension entitlements, <u>acknowledging</u> their professional experience as researchers.</p>
<p>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 further development of this policy will become possible.</p>	<p>Italy: ... that will have to <u>widen</u> its scope...</p>
<p>1.2.2. Employability Employability has been defined as the empowerment of the individual student to seize opportunities on the labour market, i.e. to gain initial meaningful employment, or to become self-employed, to maintain employment, and to be able to move around within the labour market. It involves the acquisition 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 knowledge on the one hand and 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 scholars or teachers perceive their role, which differs from the one in which the teacher merely acts as a lecturer. It is thus not only a question of content but also of teaching methods. This new paradigm is changing the life of the university department and its impact needs to be further discussed and consequences drawn in institutions across</p>	<p>Sweden: Make clear that employability is only one dimension of the HEI's role.</p> <p>Czech Republic: It involves the acquisition of generic skills and competencies like analytical skills, communication skills as well as the capacity to reason at a level of abstraction, <u>last but not least skills to learn further. Still good professional knowledge and understanding is "conditio sine qua non" considered by the employers</u>.</p> <p>Footnote: ¹ See e.g. the Chapter 8 „Conclusions and policy implications“ of the European study carried out under the Reflex project, October 2007</p> <p>CoE: It involves the acquisition of generic skills and competencies like analytical skills, communication skills, ethical awareness and the ability to calculate benefits and risks in a longer time perspective as well as...</p> <p>Sweden: Is the last part of the first para under the headline Employability necessary? How the HEIs solve the problem of differences types of knowledge is interesting but must be discussed at local level (not at the European level).</p> <p>Italy: ... within the labour market. <u>Besides knowledge, it involves the acquisition of subject-specific and generic skills and competencies, like the capacity of analysis and synthesis, the capacity to apply theory to practice or to work in a team.</u> The balance between knowledge on the one hand and <u>subject-specific or transferable skills...</u></p>

Verwijderd: benefit from

Verwijderd: be

Verwijderd: ed in

Verwijderd: I

Verwijderd:

Verwijderd: analytical skills, communication skills as well as the capacity to reason at a level of abstraction.

¹ See e.g. the Chapter 8 „Conclusions and policy implications“ of the European study carried out under the Reflex project, October 2007

Europe.	... also of teaching, learning and assessment methods.
<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. However, experience with the Bologna reforms has shown that the introduction of the two cycles into these “regulated” professions proves challenging given the role of the professional bodies and the EU internal market legislation; moreover the use of learning outcomes is daunting in most systems across Europe, though it has largely been achieved in some.</p>	<p>Sweden: Since there exist <u>regulated</u> professions following the directive pls delete the quotation marks.</p> <p>E.C.: ...“regulated” professions proves challenging given the role of the professional bodies.</p> <p>EUA: moreover the use of learning outcomes is daunting in most systems across Europe, though it has largely been achieved in some</p> <p>Italy: Here the shift from employability to the regulated professions (only those mentioned above?) is not clear. Maybe mention should be made of the European directives and their link with the Bologna cycles proves challenging...</p>
<p>A new challenge for those systems with traditionally long first cycles is the design and implementation of bachelor programmes that prepare for the labour market. Experience hitherto suggests that in many countries the full potential of the first cycle degree is not yet fully developed and more awareness raising is needed.</p>	<p>EUA: A new challenge for those systems with traditionally long first cycles is the design and implementation of bachelor programmes that prepare for the labour market. Experience hitherto suggests that in many countries the full potential of the first cycle degree is not yet fully developed and more awareness raising is needed.</p> <p>Hungary: Generally, Bachelor programmes are currently overcrowded and their function is not properly clarified. The examination of the possibility of explicitly marking the characteristics of first degree programmes would be needed (for example: academic, professional programmes).</p>
<p>Given the ever more rapid changes in the labour market and in skills required, employability also refers to the updating of skills of those already in employment and therefore does not only concern recent graduates. Higher education institutions need to play an important role in continuing education and training and thus to further invest in lifelong learning.</p>	<p>Italy: ... the design and implementation of <u>first cycle</u> programmes...</p> <p>ESU: ... only concern recent graduates. Relevance and quality of education is therefore the first step to ensure sustainable employment. But higher education...</p>

Verwijderd:

Verwijderd: and the EU internal market legislation

Opmerking [r17]: This is scarcely a new challenge and the issue is widely referenced. If included, the complexity of the issues involved, eg re the structure & traditions of specific labour markets should be highlighted rather than just mention made of the need for awareness raising.

Verwijderd: bachelor

<p>Considered from the perspective of the labour market, employability also entails a rethinking on the employers' side, be they private or public ones. 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 degree holders must be capable of summoning knowledge and skills that make it possible for them to adapt to manifold situations. Employers in both the public and the private sector must be open to this perspective.</p>	<p>CoE: This is short sighted and confuses the length of study and the level of a qualification with its quality. Qualifications at any level may be of good or less good quality. For some kinds of employment, a second or third cycle qualification may be required whereas for other a first cycle qualification will be well suited. In a changing economic environment degree holders must be capable of summoning knowledge and skills that make it possible for them to adapt to manifold situations. Employers in both the public and the private sector must be open to this perspective. Not least, public authorities – which have been a driving force in the important restructuring of European higher education qualifications – must be clear about the role of first cycle qualifications for employment in the public sector.</p> <p>EUA: ... the preparation for the job. Changing these perceptions will take time. In a fast moving economic environment degree holders will increasingly have to be capable of demonstrating knowledge and skills...</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. Moreover, institutions of higher education contribute to the identification of competences and skills of relevance for the labour market. This is a delicate balance to strike, but nevertheless there is a need to encourage a more systematic dialogue between higher education institutions and employers.</i></p>	<p>Sweden: The conclusion on p 8 on the dialogue between employers and HEI:s must be completed with the students and teachers as well. Since there exist <u>regulated</u> professions following the directive pls delete the quotation marks.</p> <p>Austria: including in the regulated professions. Delete as the regulated professions only apply in the EU member states</p> <p>E.C.: ... including in professions <u>countries regulate</u>.</p> <p>Ireland: ..., including in the regulated professions <u>and that promote lifelong learning</u>.</p> <p>Cyprus: ADD: in a way higher education maintains also the academic role which has to fulfil.</p> <p>UK: The key point is to design curricula and to foster teaching methods that promote the <u>acquisition of competencies and skills that are needed in tomorrow's economy, including in the regulated professions</u></p> <p>EUA: The key point is to design curricula and to foster teaching methods that promote the learning of competencies and transversal skills that are needed in tomorrow's economy. Moreover, these considerations need to be introduced into ongoing discussions on 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</p>

Verwijderd: the regulated

Verwijderd: learning

Opmerking [c18]: Suggest delete the reference to regulated professions. There is no common understanding of this across the EHEA.

	<p>labour market. However, programme development must also still pay attention to the longer term needs of society in relation to the creation and transmission regardless of a more immediate context</p> <p>Italy: The key point is to design curricula and to foster teaching methods that promote the <u>acquisition of knowledge, competencies and skills that are needed in tomorrow's economy, including in the regulated professions</u>. The employers' <u>involvement</u> 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 <u>the present context</u>. <u>Institutions of higher education should be most aware of these needs while they contribute to the identification of competences and skills of relevance for the labour market.</u> This is...</p>
<p>Moreover, the further promotion of the new degree structure among employers, especially among small and medium sized enterprises, is an urgent short term task. The public sectors, too, need to set the standards by adjusting their career structures to the new Bologna degree structure. 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.</p>	<p>Sweden: The conclusion p 6 on the need of the public sector to set the standards by setting their career structure should be completed with <u>if applicable!</u></p> <p>EUA: Moreover, the further promotion of the advantages of the new degree...</p> <p>ESU: ... higher educations institutions themselves. 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.</p> <p>Italy: <u>The further promotion...</u> ... the value of the <u>first degree...</u></p>
<p>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 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.</p>	<p>Sweden: Next conclusion on advice guidance should change employment-related service to <u>study information, advice and guidance</u>. Important to stress the question of employability for young researchers.</p> <p>Italy: Giving information, advice and guidance <u>to students at the end of their study periods and to potential students</u></p>

- Verwijderd: learning
- Verwijderd: of
- Verwijderd: engagement
- Verwijderd: a more immediate
- Verwijderd: Moreover, i
- Verwijderd:

- Verwijderd: Moreover, t
- Verwijderd: Bachelor

- Verwijderd: for
- Verwijderd: for
- Verwijderd:

<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, private and public independent research centres.</p>	<p>UK: of a changing labour market for <u>new or early stage</u> researchers</p> <p>EUA: QUESTION: which is the key concept – social dimension – lifelong learning – mobility –? This is important for some of the later statements made on priorities for the future.</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.</p>	<p>Sweden: Explain that life long learning is not life long education - stress that leaning in working life and in different circumstances could imply a new role for HE.</p> <p>Czech Republic: <u>General remark: For us it is a little bit difficult to have lifelong learning as one of the policy areas. We think lifelong learning is a framing, overarching concept and as stated later in the text “a multifaceted concept, which may involve climbing higher up the qualifications ladder, extending knowledge, gaining new skills and competences, upon the recognition of prior learning or simply pursuing learning to enrich one’s personal growth”</u></p> <p>Austria: A reference to the EUA charter for LLL should definitely be made here</p>
<p>In late modernity, change and uncertainty are often seen as defining characteristics of the contemporary world. Lifelong learning is about empowering citizens to address the different forms of change - economic, cultural, technological and demographic – in a positive manner by allowing them to move in and out of higher education throughout their lives for different purposes. 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.</p>	<p>Italy: <u>Change and uncertainty...</u></p> <p>ESU: In the pursuit for sustainable employment, individuals with higher levels of education 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.</p>
<p>Lifelong learning is a multifaceted concept, which may involve climbing higher up the qualifications</p>	

Verwijderd: In late modernity, c

<p>ladder, extending knowledge, gaining new skills and competences, upon the recognition of prior learning or simply pursuing learning to enrich one's personal growth. Lifelong learning has become a policy goal for supporting economic growth, social cohesion and personal development. In this sense it is a policy to increase participation in higher education, also for those who have not traditionally been previously involved in higher education.</p>	<p><i>Italy:</i> ... <u>through</u> the recognition...</p> <p>ESU: Lifelong learning is part of the education system and a fundamental tool for both social development and economic growth. When defining 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.</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 with alternations of learning and working periods and with study programmes based on student centred learning. Lifelong learning therefore needs to be integrated into individual institutional strategies and to be mainstreamed</i></p>	<p>CoE: ... which learning is valued, used and rewarded and in which it is accepted that a given qualification may be obtained through different learning paths.</p> <p><i>Italy:</i> ... and with <u>flexible</u> study programmes...</p>
<p><i>In the context of lifelong learning it is necessary to relate further education qualifications to the three cycle Bologna degree structure and to provide information on their value in a transparent way.</i></p>	
<p>1.2.4. The attractiveness of European higher education The Bologna Process clearly impacts on how higher 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</p>	<p>EUA: <u>General comment on this section:</u> 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 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.</p>

Verwijderd: upon

<p>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>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. The EHEA must be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • an attractive place for study and research, • an attractive labour market for academics and professionals through the quality of the experience and clearly defined career paths, • an attractive area preserving its rich and diverse cultural heritage in terms of institutional cultures, teaching and learning styles and curricular diversity. 	<p><u>Sweden:</u> Another dot sentence to add to the other three ones after EHEA must be: by all its actors aware of the European dimension. Also the research based HE with the connections and links between education and research should be mentioned as one of the characteristics.</p>
<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><u>Spain:</u> rests upon its quality and diversity;</p>
<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 increase in investments and in innovation in many parts of the world. There is talk of an international “arms race” in terms of investments in research and in innovation given their strategic importance for economic development and competitiveness.</p>	<p><u>Germany:</u> There is talk of an international “arms race” in terms of investments in research and in innovation given their strategic importance for economic development and competitiveness.</p> <p><u>Norway:</u> In the last part of the fourth paragraph the sentence “the EHEA should aim at becoming the most</p>

<p>The EHEA will have to position itself vis-à-vis its competitors, and the EHEA should aim at becoming the most creative and innovative region in a global setting</p>	<p>creative an innovative region in a global setting” has been inserted. This is in our opinion highly ambitious, and it is a bit unclear how this aim should be defined and how one intends to fulfill this aim.</p> <p>Italy: There is talk of an international <u>race</u> in terms of...</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 changing the criteria for membership or defining different categories for countries that expressed interest but are not eligible for membership do not seem feasible solutions, the EHEA should not appear as “fortress Europe”. The Bologna Process recognizes and appreciates the importance of the significant number of countries that have chosen to align their higher education systems with Bologna.</p>	<p>Italy: ... and it <u>has</u> become increasingly clear...</p> <p>CoE: the EHEA is not and should not appear to be “fortress Europe”. The Bologna Process recognizes and appreciates the importance of the significant number of countries that have chosen to reform their own higher education systems on the basis of the values, objectives and policies of the European Higher Education Area. The Bologna Process will engage in policy discussions and projects with other countries and regions on the basis of its considerable <i>acquis</i> of basic values and good practice. Cooperation with other countries and regions will focus on content and be carried out in a spirit of respect and equal dignity; the Bologna Process is not in a position to pass judgement on higher education in other parts of the worlds by issuing “labels” or other kinds of official value judgements.</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>UK: <i>The key point thus is to provide information on the EHEA specifically targeted at <u>countries outside the EHEA</u> through, among others, an appropriate website and to facilitate coordinated information visits to and from <u>countries outside the EHEA</u>. 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>Sweden: Optimal use should be made of existing EU policy as well of other relevant policy international organisations e.g Council of Europe and UNESCO.</p> <p>Czech Republic: existing EU and UNESCO policy for a...</p> <p>UK: <i>Why?</i></p>

Verwijderd: “arms race”

Verwijderd: s

Verwijderd: non-

Verwijderd: countries

Verwijderd: EHEA-

Verwijderd: non-EHEA

	<p><i>Italy: Optimal use should be made of existing EU policy fora for cooperation with other regions of the world. Often in these fora non EU countries have a different status from EU- countries</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 being party to the European Cultural Convention and a commitment to pursuing and implementing the objectives of the Bologna Process in the national systems.</p>	<p>ESU: for determining membership of the Bologna Process</p>
<p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ A Bologna policy forum 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 ➤ Countries participating in the Bologna Policy Forum would obtain the status of Bologna Forum Countries. ➤ Policy dialogue on specific topics (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. ➤ Participation in Bologna-related conferences, seminars and other events. ➤ Invitations to contribute to projects and initiatives as part of the BFUG work programme, where appropriate. ➤ Cooperation in the framework of relevant EU programmes and projects with partners across the world. 	<p>Cyprus: ...cooperation with countries in order to avoid political discussions, members of the UN,</p> <p>Italy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ to the European Cultural Convention <u>It is still not clear how these countries will be identified and invited to the forum and who will do this</u> <p>Sweden: A Bologna policy forum connected to the ministerial meeting for these countries which are not party to the European Culture Convention must be developed further concerning membership criteria, funding etc.</p> <p>UK-Sc: not party to the European Cultural Convention: <u>(clarity about membership etc would be helpful)</u></p> <p>Germany: Countries participating in the Bologna Policy Forum would obtain the status of Bologna Forum Countries. If we refer to them as Forum countries, that is fine, but we do not need a separate status</p> <p>Norway: In page 10 several new bullet points have been inserted, amongst others that <i>Countries participating in the Bologna Policy Forum would obtain the status of Bologna Forum Countries.</i> The issue of the introduction of a certain type of status or label given to countries who have aligned their systems to the "Bologna-standard" but are not eligible for membership in the Bologna Process, has been discussed by the BFUG at several occasions, including the last BFUG meeting in Paris. The conclusion has always been a negative one. Introducing the status of Bologna Forum Countries opens this debate once more. Selecting countries eligible for such a status based on who has participated in the Policy Forum adjacent to the ministerial meeting is in our opinion not well suited as a criterion, since it is highly likely that not all interested countries from outside the EHEA interested in the Bologna process will be invited to and have the possibility to participate in this Forum. Consequently we suggest that we delete this point as well as have a closer look at point three and five against this background.</p>

Opmerking [BC19]: As the EHEA will be declared open in 2010, shouldn't we substitute the expression Bologna Process by "membership of the EHEA"?

Contribution by the BFUG to relevant projects and activities in other regions.

~~Austria:~~ ~~Countries participating in the Bologna Policy Forum would obtain the status of Bologna Forum Countries.~~ This deleted statement does not reflect the discussions at the Paris meeting, as not a single country championed any status for non EHEA countries, except the European Commission!!

Cyprus: Countries participating in the Bologna Policy Forum would obtain the status of Bologna Forum Countries: Need to be discussed further!

Czech Republic: ...existing EU and UNESCO initiatives. Question: Is there any reason in having UNESCO and EU here but not above?

E.C.: Third Countries participating in the Bologna Policy Forum would obtain the status of Bologna Forum Countries

Ireland: status of Bologna Forum Countries. Is this necessary?

CoE

- : A *Bologna policy forum* in the margins of Bologna ministerial meetings with participants from EHEA countries and countries and regions that have expressed their interest in the Bologna Process but are not party to the European Cultural Convention
- Invitations to participate in Bologna Policy Fora will, in addition to acknowledging the explicit interest in the Bologna Process expressed by some countries, seek to encourage balanced representation of all regions. Participation in the Policy Fora are not to be construed as passing judgment of the degree to which a given country or region have carried out "Bologna style reforms", and this is clearly not for the BFUG or other bodies of the EHEA to judge. [Comment: the wording as proposed appears to be simply a relabeling of the Commission proposal concerning "Bologna labels". Since this proposal has so far not been supported by any other member or consultative member, it is clearly inappropriate to (re)introduce it in the "Beyond 2020" document. Institutional criteria, such as leadership position within UNESCO Regions, EU policy dialogue with other regions, within regional cooperation structures or similar structures must be used to ensure balanced representation at Policy Fora].

France: - Status of Bologna Forum Countries : on the basis of the arguments against any kind of "status" for non-Bologna countries, which were made clear during the discussion in the Paris BFUG and in the EHEA WG as well, we do not support at all the idea of such a new status, while the EHEA will develop its openness through the cooperation mechanisms suggested for the future.

UK:

- Policy dialogue on specific topics (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.
- Contribution by the members of the BFUG to relevant projects and activities in other regions.

Opmerking [PD20]: This adds another layer of bureaucracy to the Process. There should be no new 'status'.

Verwijderd: Countries participating in the Bologna Policy Forum would obtain the status of Bologna Forum Countries.

Opmerking [c21]: There are many other fora where such things go – for example all EHEA countries are members of UNESCO

	<p><u>EUA:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ A Bologna policy forum 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 ➤ Countries participating in the Bologna Policy Forum would obtain the status of Bologna Forum Countries. <p>These two proposals have never been agreed in the BFUG, let alone any of the issues of how decisions on such a status should be taken relation. Hence the points should be removed.</p> <p><u>ESU:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ A Bologna policy forum in the margins of Bologna ministerial meetings with members of the BFUG and countries that have expressed their interest in the Bologna Process but are not party to the European Cultural Convention ➤ Countries participating in the Bologna Policy Forum would obtain the status of Bologna Forum Countries. ➤ Policy dialogue on specific topics (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. ➤ Invitation to participate in Bologna-related conferences, seminars and other events.
<p>1.2.5. Mobility</p> <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 also has academic and scientific benefits for both the institutions and the individual researchers. Mobility has much to do with the internationalisation of the system and the institutions and it finds its corollaries in multinational faculty and in international curricula. However, progress in this area does not seem to match the initial expectations.</p>	<p><u>Sweden:</u> Still a key issue.</p> <p><u>Czech Republic:</u> <u>General remark: It seems that the only type of mobility, i.e. one-two semesters mobility is emphasised. If mobility should become a “norm”, we should be realistic and think also about “short term” mobility effectively incorporated into mobility windows (e.g. summer schools). Otherwise we can forget about lifelong learning and “non-traditional learners” or adult students in higher numbers. Last but not least somebody has to pay for mobility and somebody has to create conditions for incoming students as well as organise out and incoming.</u></p> <p><u>The staff mobility might be more elaborated as well. And last but not least with IT development and lifelong learning concept the virtual mobility should also be taken into account.</u></p> <p><u>France:</u> Mobility should not be presented as an end in itself and the only refce to mobility as a means should be kept.</p> <p><u>EUA:</u> 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 and the academic and scientific benefits, student, young researcher and staff mobility also has a cultural value enhancing mutual understanding between countries and regions as well as contributing to personal fulfilment.</p>
<p>The original expectation was that the creation of</p>	

Opmerking [BC22]: We disagree and we have discussed this over and over! Is this a permanent status? Would it change every ministerial meeting, depending on who would join the forum? What are the conditions to join?

Opmerking [BC23]: This chapter is about what the BFUG will do and not what the other countries will/should do. Therefore, the expression “invitation to participate” is more adequate.

<p>a single space of education would give mobility a further boost. This does not necessarily seem to have happened yet. 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 make it more difficult to integrate a study period abroad and in some countries this argument has started massively to influence the debate about short-term mobility under the conditions of Bologna during the last years.</p>	<p>CoE: This does not necessarily seem</p> <p>UK-Sc: <u>(we need to be mindful of the need to consider all forms of mobility – not just the Erasmus type of programme.)</u></p> <p>Italy: With regard to intra-European short-term <u>horizontal</u> mobility...</p> <p>EUA: ... the debate about short-term mobility in the context of Bologna reforms.</p> <p>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'.</p> <p>Italy: and in some countries this argument has started massively to influence the debate about short-term mobility under the conditions of Bologna during the last years.</p>
<p>It is therefore suggested that stronger curricular efforts should be made in order to ensure sufficient flexibility within study programmes and to create "mobility windows".</p>	<p>Austria: "mobility windows".(mobility windows may be any type of study-related stay at a HEI other than the home institution)</p> <p>EUA: It is therefore suggested that stronger curricular efforts should be made in order to ensure sufficient flexibility within study programmes and to create "mobility windows".</p>
<p>With regard to intra-European degree mobility, the positive expectations have remained in place. It is important to further 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 existence of one and the same degree structure should make mobility from one country to another easier.</p>	<p>Italy: With regard to intra-European <u>vertical</u> mobility, the positive expectations have remained in place. It is important to further enhance <u>vertical</u> mobility, ...</p> <p>ESU: not least as an element of developing the European dimension. The existence of one and the same degree structure should make mobility from one country to another easier. Progress towards coherence of recognition procedures is however required, as it has been identified above.</p> <p>At the same time, an analysis of the composition of the student body experiencing mobility periods abroad points out to a strong social selection and suggests the need for reinforcing the support schemes, articulating policies with the developments in the field of the social dimension.</p> <p>Finally, 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.</p>

Verwijderd: programme

Verwijderd: degree

Verwijderd: degree

<p>The question of discipline mobility also needs to be addressed.</p>	<p>ESU: The question of discipline mobility also needs to be addressed.</p> <p>Italy: The question of discipline mobility also needs to be addressed</p>
<p>There is a growing emphasis on student mobility from other parts of the world. Marketing and recruitment of international students is a growing priority for many HEIs. 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>Italy: There is a growing emphasis on student mobility from other parts of the world. Promotional activities and recruitment of international students are a growing priority for many HEIs. Growing proportions of mobile students from other parts of the world will impact on issues of quality, curricular change and language of instruction in order to accommodate their needs and expectations.</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>CoE: Put bluntly, the mobility goals of the Bologna process and its goal of making European higher education more attractive cannot be fully met unless governments facilitate visas and, where appropriate, work permits for foreign students and staff</p>
<p>The long term, full programme mobility can strengthen emigration and brain drain from some countries. Further discussions and new arrangements are needed to address this issue.</p>	<p>Norway: We are very pleased that a reference to potential brain drain from countries outside the EHEA as a result of the focus on strengthening mobility into the EHEA has been taken in.</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>	

Opmerking [BC24]: What does this mean?

Verwijderd: Marketing

Verwijderd: is

Verwijderd: to accommodate their needs and expectations

Verwijderd: as well as the

Verwijderd: in which the programme is delivered

<p>Finally, the effects of lifelong learning on the make up of the student body will have to lead to a rethinking of mobility programmes.</p>	
<p><i>Mobility remains one of the key issues to be further developed under the Bologna beyond 2010 agenda. In terms of curriculum design, joint degrees and the ensuing necessary institutional partnerships are to be further developed. Each programme should provide “mobility windows” and provide for mutual recognition of study periods abroad.</i></p>	<p>EUA: 2010 agenda</p> <p>Austria: HEIs should be encouraged to make periods of mobility a part of their degree courses, either in the first or the second cycle and provide for mutual recognition of these periods.</p> <p>UK: study periods abroad.</p> <p>Italy: Mobility remains one of the key issues to be further developed under the Bologna beyond 2010 agenda. In terms of curriculum design, each degree programme should provide “mobility windows” and ensure mutual recognition of study periods abroad. Moreover, joint programmes, possibly leading to joint degrees, are to be further developed through strengthened institutional partnerships. The involvement of academics is a necessary condition for the enhancement of student mobility and the development of joint programmes based on integrated curricula.</p>
<p>Staff development is a necessary condition for the development of joint curricula</p>	<p>EUA: joint curricula</p>
<p><i>In terms of the legal framework conditions, grants and loans should be made portable and recognition improved and entry requirements into a country should reflect the openness of the EHEA.</i></p>	<p>UK: recognition improved and entry <i>(does this mean visa?)</i> requirements</p> <p>Italy: In terms of the legal framework conditions, grants and loans should be made portable, recognition guaranteed and entry requirements into a country should reflect the openness of the EHEA.</p>
<p><i>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 for academics. 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</i></p>	<p>EUA: ... and in teaching, researcher and staff mobility</p> <p>ESU: ... staff mobility needs to be increased and an EHEA labour market for academics should be developed.</p> <p>Ireland: Application processes for visas and work permits...</p>

Opmerking [r25]: Mobility is certainly one important question for the future, but so are the overarching issues of widening participation and promoting LLL – this relate to previous comments about what is the overriding concept among these three (ie social dimension – LLL – mobility). It does not make sense or correspond to discussions in the BFUG until now to single out mobility without referring to the context in which mobility should take place in the future.

Opmerking [p26]: This is undeliverable and may not be appropriate in every case.

Verwijderd: and the ensuing necessary institutional partnerships

Verwijderd: Each programme should provide “mobility windows” and provide for mutual recognition of study periods abroad. Staff development is a

Opmerking [r27]: This statement require 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.

Verwijderd: and

Verwijderd: improved

Verwijderd: The granting of

<p>interact with other areas of policy making and the follow-up structure should respond to this adequately</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.</p>	<p>Germany: "The political commitment to mobility will be laid down in a mobility code for the EHEA": We do not know the code or another form of agreement yet – it <i>might</i> be laid down.</p> <p>Ireland: for the EHEA: Need more information on this</p> <p>UK-Sc: The commitment to mobility <i>might be</i>, be laid down in a mobility code for the EHEA. (<i>we don't yet know what this mobility charter might be – so we cannot say it will be adopted</i>)</p> <p>France: Mobility code: a further explanation on that concept would seem necessary; in any case, if such a notion is hinted at for the future, it should be referred to as a possible future action which "might be developed".</p> <p>UK: ... in a mobility code for the EHEA.</p> <p>EUA: a mobility code for the EHEA.</p>
<p>Spontaneous mobility is generated by excellence. In case of structured mobility reciprocity and equitably balance have to be taken into account in the EHEA.</p>	<p>Austria: Spontaneous mobility is generated by excellence.</p> <p>Ireland: Spontaneous mobility is generated by excellence. In case of structured mobility reciprocity and equitably balance have to be taken into account in the EHEA.</p> <p>UK: Spontaneous (?) mobility</p> <p>Italy: Spontaneous mobility is generated by excellence. In case of structured mobility reciprocity and equitably balance have to be taken into account in the EHEA.</p>
<p>Data collection will help monitor developments in this field and should provide a better view of (a) mobility flows and (b) the funding available to support mobility.</p>	
<p>The benchmarks are defined as follows: By 2020, ➤ 25 % of all graduates should have spent</p>	<p>Sweden: benchmarks proposed: 25% of all graduates with 1 semester abroad is OK. Not only joint programmes should be doubled but also joint degrees should increase to XX.</p>

Verwijderd: political

Verwijderd: will

Opmerking [c28]: What exactly does this mean? There is existing EU legislation about mobility and Erasmus Charter etc. Who will prepare this "code" and what status will it have?

Opmerking [r29]: Is this a recommendation – where does it come from and what does it mean??

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.

Germany: By 2020,

- 25 % of all new graduates in the EHEA 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.

We do not even know where we start from.

Austria: ~~The benchmarks are defined as follows: By 2020~~(no benchmarks because there are no internationally comparable data available!):

- as many graduates as possible should have spent at least one study-related stay abroad.
- the number of international students in the EHEA coming from non-EHEA countries should be substantially increased
- the number of joint programmes in the EHEA should also be considerably increased (explanation: as every country has a different status-quo situation, no absolute criteria can be given!).

Cyprus: the number of joint programmes in the EHEA should have been doubled: very ambitious!

Czech Republic: *It seems that these indicators will not be realistic. We would suggest collecting data first and making indicators that are motivating, otherwise it will not work for progress. It seems nowadays we have 4% of mobile students.*

E.C.: the number of joint programmes in the EHEA should at least have been doubled

Ireland: These benchmarks appear ambitious and need further consideration.

UK-Sc: The benchmarks are defined as follows: *(we have not yet discussed these benchmarks and given the lack of data, it is difficult to tell if they're realistic or not. Should we not improve data collection first?)*

UK: The benchmarks are defined...

... one semester abroad.

... by 20%.

... EHEA should have been doubled

EUA: The benchmarks

Opmerking [p30]: This section would benefit from a clearer description of where we are starting from and how these “benchmarks” are to be achieved. Perhaps they should not be described as “benchmarks” but as aspirations against which countries can say that if they achieve them they will have done well.

Opmerking [c31]: This is completely impossible without a huge increase in funding which given current economic conditions is highly unlikely. Erasmus has never even reached 10%.

Opmerking [c32]: What is the rationale for this figure? And if we do not know the numbers of international students now how will we ever know?

Opmerking [c33]: Same as above. No-one knows how many joint programmes there are.....

Opmerking [r34]: The possibility of benchmarks was first discussed in the Paris BFUG and there was agreement on their introduction in the future? However, the definition of specific targets requires further discussion, also of the framework conditions to make these commitments reality.

	<p>ESU:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ 20 % of all graduates in each country should have had a mobility experience <u>abroad</u>. ➤ <u>Inward mobility from EHEA countries should have increased in each country to meet the levels of outward mobility by 2020;</u> ➤ <u>the number of joint programmes in the EHEA should have been doubled.</u> <p>Denmark: We are not opposed to setting mobility benchmarks, but because of the lack of current data about the various starting points we agree with the many who have pointed out that the mobility benchmarks should be taken out of the document. Furthermore, mobility benchmarks should reflect the need for quality and recognition of mobility</p>
<p>1.3 The curriculum, an underlying issue The shift from structural reform to implementation will be successful 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 they rest 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 and it entails a paradigm shift from teaching towards a student centred concept of higher education.</p>	<p>Sweden: The curriculum, an underlying issue and depending on a.o. the academic autonomy aspect.</p> <p>Norway: We believe that this whole section is a bit unclear, and we remain uncertain as to what the aim of this section of the report actually is.</p> <p>Spain: The curriculum, an underlying issue" is especially motivating since curriculum development is one of the final steps when implementing structural reforms like those linked to the Bologna process. The mention to interdisciplinarity, to the need of a common language but taking into account the autonomy of HE institutions, and to the regulated professions merits some specific measures and/or actions to be inserted in Chapter 4 when talking about the priorities for "beyond 2010"(probably in section 4.3 devoted to Lifelong Learning or at the end of section 4.2 when mentioning qualifications frameworks).</p> <p>EUA: if they rest upon flexible learning paths and curricula that render the attainment of these objectives possible. 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 is thus the instrument par excellence for ensuring the success of the Bologna reforms. and even though it is not a Bologna action line, it nevertheless features prominently on the Bologna agenda and it entails a paradigm shift from teaching towards a student centred concept of higher education</p>
<p>This is also an area where the different levels of the Bologna Process meet: institutional implementation is set within a framework of common reference points as agreed upon by the stakeholders both at European and at national</p>	<p>Italy: The <u>implementation of structural reforms based on Bologna principles</u>, will be successful <u>only if curricular innovation becomes an ongoing process. A degree structure based on learning outcomes and, study programmes with “mobility windows”, for example, will only be properly implemented if the process of curriculum design and delivery is organised in such a way as to make these objectives explicit and their attainment possible.</u> Curricular change is thus the instrument par excellence <u>for the implementation of</u></p>

Opmerking [BC35]: This is the conclusion of the Let's Go campaign and it is an achievable goal.

Opmerking [BC36]: Mobility hasn't been a really successful feature in the build up of the EHEA so far. It doesn't make any sense to introduce this priority at this point. We should concentrate efforts in promoting mobility within the EHEA.

- Verwijderd: shift from
- Verwijderd: to implementation
- Verwijderd: development
- Verwijderd: is
- Verwijderd: lifelong learning provision,
- Verwijderd: to cite but those
- Verwijderd: they rest upon
- Verwijderd: a
- Verwijderd: that render
- Verwijderd: of these objectives

<p>level. Moreover, institutional implementation rests upon the involvement of the academic community and is linked up with institutional autonomy and academic freedom.</p>	<p>Bologna reforms and even though it is not a Bologna action line, but rather an effect of the Process for institutions and their programmes, it nevertheless features prominently on the Bologna agenda as it is through curricular change that the paradigm shift towards a student centred education will actually be realised.</p> <p>Moreover, curriculum development is an activity of the Bologna process where institutions from participating countries can cooperate within specific subject areas in order to identify common reference points. A lot of work of this kind has already been done on about twenty subject areas by the European HEIs engaged in the Tuning Project and in thematic networks. This different levels of the Bologna Process meet: institutional implementation is set within a framework of common reference points as agreed upon by the stakeholders both at European and at national level. Moreover, institutional implementation rests upon the involvement of the academic community and is linked up with institutional autonomy and academic freedom. However, while curricular reform is the responsibility of the institution, there is also a call for new common reference points to be developed. These may in the long run lead to the definition of subject descriptors and the establishment of sectoral qualifications frameworks. There is thus some tension between the principle of programme diversity and the move towards greater convergence of programmes through the identification of common reference points in and the possible development of broad sectoral frameworks. This approach should not hinder the development of interdisciplinary or multidisciplinary programmes, which may be considered as a possible academic response to the challenges of the 21st century.</p>
<p>However, while curricular reform is the responsibility of the institution, there is also a call for new common reference points to be developed. These may lead to the definition of sector or subject descriptors and the establishment of the corresponding qualifications frameworks. There is thus a tension between the principle of programme diversity and the greater convergence of programmes through the likely introduction of subject descriptors. Moreover, access to the regulated professions of the EU internal market is ultimately granted on condition that the diplomas awarded testify to similar contents. Curricula are thus streamlined to meet the requirements of the notification procedure as laid down by the EU directive 2005/36, which is based on content issues and not on quality assurance. This increasingly complex system of coexisting frameworks, which to some extent are founded upon different principles, can lead to</p>	<p>Denmark: We agree with the point made by Norway that the aim of this section is unclear. Furthermore, the added text regarding the likely introduction of subject specific descriptors, establishment of corresponding qualifications frameworks and the existing system regarding the regulated professions adds to the ambiguity. There is not sufficient consensus on this issue for it to be included in the document in the current form and we suggest that it is deleted. A strong focus on fully implementing the three cycle structure and the qualifications frameworks at programme level should be maintained instead.</p> <p>Czech Rep. Remark: <i>We have the tuning methodology: some sectors have developed and have been developing their descriptors anyway. We are not sure we need more at European level. At national level it would be for benefit to take all these developments into account. We feel that the access to regulated professions is important. Should we not be more explicit and address directly the EC to start thinking about their directives to be compatible with the EQF which the EC promotes itself and not to contribute to creation "autonomous sectoral systems" and leading thus some disciplines out of the overall development?</i></p> <p>Germany: "less transparency": Any kind of streamlining must happen in a voluntary process. The main streamlining instrument should be the wish of students. By their interest and participation in programmes, they decide about further developments. We need of course transparency. In the fields of EU-directive n2005/36 (only a few but important subjects) we should on the long run find ways</p>

- Verwijderd: nd
- Verwijderd: entails a
- Verwijderd: from teaching
- Verwijderd: concept of higher
- Verwijderd: This
- Verwijderd: also an area

- Verwijderd:
- Verwijderd: sector or
- Verwijderd: the corresponding
- Verwijderd: a
- Verwijderd: likely introduction of subject descriptors
- Verwijderd: it
- Verwijderd: as will be seen later

<p>less transparency</p>	<p>to include the EU quality assurance systems into ours.</p> <p><u>E.C.</u> ▾</p> <p><u>Italy.</u> Moreover, access to the regulated professions of the EU internal market is ultimately granted on condition that the diplomas awarded testify to similar contents. Curricula are thus streamlined to meet the requirements of the notification procedure as laid down by the EU directive 2005/36, which is based on content issues and not on quality assurance. This increasingly complex system of coexisting frameworks, which to some extent are founded upon different principles, can lead to less transparency.</p>
<p>Moreover, the establishment of too detailed subject specific descriptors could hinder the development of interdisciplinarity, which as will be seen later may be considered as a possible academic response to the challenges of the 21st century.</p>	<p><u>Italy.</u> Moreover, the establishment of too detailed subject specific descriptors could hinder the development of interdisciplinary <u>or multidisciplinary programmes</u>, which may be considered as a possible academic response to the challenges of the 21st century.</p> <p><u>ESU.</u> Therefore, any development in this regard is a responsibility of the institutions that should engage in a curricular reform within the references given by the existing national and European frameworks. Such a process should be developed in cooperation with the relevant stakeholders, including the students, and within the context of networks of institutions, where appropriate.</p>
<p>The development of new frameworks must be done in such a way that they relate to the national and existing European frameworks.</p>	<p><u>ESU.</u> The development of new frameworks must be done in such a way that they relate to the national and existing European frameworks.</p> <p><u>Czech Repub.:</u> <i>. And the national frameworks should be implemented with understanding and under the same interpretation of the overarching European framework. One common methodology based on learning outcomes at all levels (i.e. knowledge, skills and competencies descriptors) is needed, as well as common approach to their self-certification against (referencing to) the European level. This methodology has to be understood at the level of institutions and be used when describing the degree programmes and their modules. The process of creation of the national qualification frameworks will be important for establishing better cooperation of institutions and the application sphere (employers), thus creating the degree programmes and /or modules being a compromise between the immediate needs of employers and sustainable needs of society. Not less important is the role of other stakeholders (e.g. partners in recognition, quality assurance etc.). Qualification frameworks should be connected to quality assurance systems. In qualification frameworks, in Bachelor's and Master's degree programmes ECTS credits should be used with their full potential related to learning outcomes. On the bases of defined learning outcomes systems of recognition of prior learning could be established and thus we could really create „flexible learning paths“. The qualification based on learning outcomes should thus be less dependent on the way it was achieved and its quality not questionable any longer. – Probably the QFs should have a separate paragraph.</i></p> <p><u>Italy.</u> ▾</p>

Verwijderd: Moreover, access to the regulated professions of the EU internal market is ultimately granted on condition that the diplomas awarded testify to similar contents. Curricula are thus streamlined to meet the requirements of the notification procedure as laid down by the EU directive 2005/36, which is based on content issues and not on quality assurance. This increasingly complex system of coexisting frameworks, which to some extent are founded upon different principles, can lead to less transparency.

Verwijderd: it

Verwijderd: as will be seen later

Opmerking [BC37]: This sentence is non critical and assumes that there is a need for new frameworks.

Verwijderd: The development of new frameworks must be done in such a way that they relate to the national and existing European frameworks. ¶

<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 knowledge, skills and competences. The development of such descriptors should take place with due consideration of the diversity of programmes in Europe as well as of institutional, methodological, didactical and academic autonomy.</p>	<p>Czech Republ. : see above in yellow.</p> <p>UK-Sc: <i>(Not sure I agree we need subject descriptors, but we certainly need to take full regard of the national qualifications frameworks – part of the current complexity derives from the fact that there are still very much in development in many countries and not yet well understood. There is a risk that suggesting we need more descriptions might lead to further delays in producing national qualifications frameworks.)</i></p> <p>UK: ... to develop subject specific knowledge...</p> <p>Italy: <i>While the Dublin descriptors describe in general terms the learning outcomes to be developed in each of the three cycles, work has been done by European institutions at the subject area level first to identify common reference points in their programmes and then to develop new ones, in terms of subject specific knowledge, skills and competences. Such reference points do not impinge on have been generically defined for the degree structure in the context of, the key point is to develop subject specific knowledge, skills and competences. The development of such descriptors should take place with due consideration of the diversity of programmes in Europe, nor, on institutional, methodological, didactical and academic autonomy.</i></p>
<p>Chapter 2. Bologna 2020</p> <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>UK: Bologna Beyond 2010</p> <p>Norway: The restructuring of this chapter and the stronger emphasis put on the connection between globalisation and co-operation as well as the connection to demography has highly improved this chapter.</p> <p>Slovenia: Chapter 2: Bologna 2020 I believe that new title would be more appropriate for the content of this chapter. Something like “Challenges for development of EHEA beyond 2010” would better reflect the content. I propose to delete sub sub-chapters and keep only three sub-chapters:</p> <p>2.1 globalisation 2.2 demography 2.3 issues arising out of globalisation and demography</p> <p>Alternatively, we could rename them. For example, roles and responsibilities should be changed to the changing roles and responsibilities or similar. Even then, I’m not sure that institutional diversity is the result of globalisation or demography. We should also move some content between these three sub-chapters. For instance, the modernisation agenda should be moved from 2.1 to 2.3 as it is not an aspect of globalisation but deals with issues that should be addressed when responding to the challenges of globalisation.</p> <p>Italy: to be set against</p>

Opmerking [p38]: Unclear what is meant by “subject specific” descriptors: are you suggesting a Tuning approach? There is a danger of more bureaucracy and the risk that knowledge and curricula will only ever advance either at the pace of the slowest or the lowest common denominator.

Verwijderd: ~~the Dublin descriptors~~

Verwijderd: ~~as well as~~

Verwijderd: ~~of~~

Verwijderd: ~~2020~~

Verwijderd: ~~related~~

<p>The European Higher Education Area is facing the twin challenges of globalisation and demographics. The Bologna Process cannot be viewed in isolation from global processes – it is the response of European higher education to global integration and to the expansion in the provision of Higher Education; it needs to address the accompanying financial resource challenge.</p>	
<p>2.1 Globalisation: competitiveness and cooperation</p> <p>2.1.1. Global competitiveness</p> <p>The demographic changes with an ageing population in Europe and with an increasing population in other regions of the world, the ensuing huge increase in the world-wide demand for higher education, the budgetary and capacity problems of many countries to meet this demand, coupled with opportunities created by new communication technologies and the Internet, shape an environment in which the traditional HEIs have had to seek new responses to these challenges and in which new providers can successfully expand the supply of educational services.</p>	<p><u>Sweden</u>: EHEA challenges: <i>Globalisation</i>, competitiveness and international cooperation</p> <p><u>Norway</u>: We appreciate stronger references to and focus on the <i>global aspect</i> in this section</p> <p><u>Italy</u>: and in which new <u>institutions</u> can successfully expand...</p>
<p>The European Union's higher education modernisation agenda has already identified the key issues which need to be addressed if higher education in Europe is to adapt effectively to the needs of globalisation. Increasing autonomy for institutions, more effective working with business and employers, qualifications matched to employment needs, adopting alternative funding mechanisms and developing university leadership are the key areas. Moreover a closer link between education and research is needed if European higher education is to retain its broad research basis.</p>	<p><u>UK</u>: has already identified <u>some of</u> the key issues</p> <p><u>Austria</u>: ... is to adapt effectively to the needs of globalisation. This is not only valid for EU countries but for the entire EHEA! Increasing autonomy for institutions, ...</p> <p><u>Italy</u>: The European Union's higher education modernisation agenda has already identified the key issues which need to be addressed if higher education in Europe is to adapt effectively to the needs of globalisation. Increasing autonomy for institutions, more effective working with business and employers, qualifications matched to employment needs, adopting alternative funding mechanisms and developing university leadership are the key areas. Moreover a closer link between education and research is needed if European higher education is to retain its broad research basis. <u>Has this agenda been formally adopted by the Bfug?</u></p>

Verwijderd: providers

<p>As a response to the changing environment, there has been a continuing move towards a diversification of higher education provision. This diversification is not only observed in the missions and profiles of HEIs, but also in the forms of delivery. 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 in the future, this traditional approach will face increasing competition and challenges from a range of other forms. Therefore, the conceptualisation and design of new forms of provision based on and exploiting modern-day information and communication technology (ICT) represents yet another imminent challenge.</p>	
<p>Moreover, one of the most visible manifestations of globalisation is the emerging “borderless” higher education <i>market</i>. 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>Italy: One of the most visible manifestations...</p> <p>UK: fee-paying students</p> <p>Italy: ... has also invited new providers <u>can this be clarified?</u> from...</p>
<p>The pressure of these global market dynamics urges European higher education institutions to gradually adopt an approach increasingly informed by a marked entrepreneurial spirit. Today’s HEIs 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</p>	<p>Germany: “The pressure of these global market dynamics urges European higher education institutions to gradually adopt an approach increasingly informed by a marked entrepreneurial spirit. Today’s HEIs 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.” We have to take up the challenges posed by global competition both by improving the financial conditions of our HEIs and by ensuring that the quality of offers from outside the EHEA corresponds to our quality criteria.</p>

Verwijderd: Moreover,
Verwijderd: o

Opmerking [c39]: Not all charge fees.

<p>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>CoE: ... demands from society, the most vocally expressed of which are those coming from economic actors. Research results might, for example, be used as a means to increase income as well as to further societal equity and cohesion; on another level...</p> <p>Italy: The pressure of these global dynamics... ... to increase income; <u>however</u>, the funding of research...</p>
<p>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 (characterized 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.</p>	<p>CoE: ... drive teaching and learning at European universities.</p> <p>Ireland: European <u>universities</u>, 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 (characterized 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.</p> <p>UK: the latest research findings shall inform and drive <u>learning and teaching</u> at European universities. <u>The quality of</u> European higher education shall become <u>a characteristic of</u>, the Bologna Process. The EHEA shall boast a diversified catalogue of easily readable and comparable degrees (characterized through the Diploma Supplement), <u>use</u> of the European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System, ...</p> <p>Italy: Deeply entrenched in the traditional yet open-minded unity and symbiosis between teaching and learning the latest Research findings shall inform and drive teaching <u>and learning</u> 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 and comparable degrees, <u>described by</u> the Diploma Supplement <u>and constructed through</u> a thorough implementation of the</p>

Verwijderd: market

Verwijderd: on another level

Opmerking [I40]: Mention of the ERA here

Opmerking [I41]: repetitive

Verwijderd: a trademark quality label, which rests on the

Verwijderd: pillars championed by

Verwijderd: degrees

Opmerking [PD42]: The Bologna Process calls for ECTS to be 'used' as a meta-framework, not 'implemented' as the one and only system.

Verwijderd: a thorough

Verwijderd: implementation

Verwijderd: r

Verwijderd: degrees

Verwijderd: (

Verwijderd: characterized

Verwijderd: through

Verwijderd:),

	<p>European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System. It shall promote 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.</p>
<p><i>The key point is to reassert the unity between teaching and research 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 research methodologies 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>Sweden: The connection between education and research must be stressed even harder than in this chapter on global competitiveness. It should also be stressed as one of the characteristics of EHEA.</p> <p>UK: teaching and research and to stress the fact that a distinguishing characteristic of European higher education is to base teaching and learning on the latest research findings.</p>
<p><i>Furthermore the key issue is to design new forms of provision of good quality compatible with the ICT age and in line with the demands of an interdisciplinary approach.</i></p>	<p>Italy: ... provision of good quality education compatible with...</p>
<p>2.1.2. International cooperation At a European and at an international level, the necessity to be competitive is not the only mover. Competition and cooperation are not mutually exclusive, they are corollaries. The pursuit of knowledge is a global enterprise and it is founded upon cooperation among academics. The resources needed for knowledge production are such that they can rarely be found within a single institution. Effective generation of</p>	<p>Sweden: The para on International cooperation stresses intercultural competence for HE in a positive way.</p>

- Verwijderd: ,
- Verwijderd: i
- Verwijderd: champion the
- Verwijderd: io
- Verwijderd: n of

Opmerking [p43]: But this does not mean that each university has to be research intensive.

Opmerking [c44]: Other countries claim to do this – so it is hardly unique to EHEA. But, how does this fit with the wide diversity of institutions and their missions?

<p>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><u>Sweden:</u> ... provided... Deletion of the further text of this paragraph and comments by UK are fully supported by <u>Austria</u></p> <p><u>UK:</u> in both a legal and non-legal framework, with partners themselves agreeing on legal constraints involving patents and publishing rights if required.</p>
<p>Cooperation is needed for the advancement of science. 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 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><u>CoE:</u> The most interesting debates often take place...</p> <p><u>Italy:</u> Linking these disciplines in order to...</p>
<p>Moreover, higher education is a means of cooperating with other parts of the world. It is about strengthening North-South cooperation and working towards a globally engaged European higher education. The economic effect of globalisation leading to the creation of wealth</p>	<p><u>UK:</u> It is about strengthening North-South and East-West cooperation and working towards a globally engaged European higher education sector.</p>

Verwijderd: 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.

Verwijderd: To fuse

<p>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>Ireland: 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>CoE: ...individual benefits as well as short term gain and long term benefits.</p> <p>EUA: ... to individual benefits</p> <p>Italy: ... 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 problems, see connections...</p> <p>Hungary: These methods may be used in the Bologna Process, too. The traditional European values of tolerance and solidarity should be present in the cooperation of participating countries of the Bologna Process - beyond the level of institutional and individual cooperation - in the form of measures supporting countries facing difficulties or developing at a slower pace. The presence of solidarity and tolerance would constitute an added value and a specific feature of the EHEA, compared to other higher education areas of the world.</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><i>The key point is to boost the emergence of new scientific fields at the crossroads of traditional disciplines so that the global problems can be properly addressed. This will require the</i></p>	<p>Ireland: The key point is to <u>encourage international collaboration between institutions and to boost the emergence...</u></p> <p>Germany: "This will require the introduction of new rewards systems in the researchers' careers" What does</p>

Opmerking [r45]: This paragraph still needs major editing – the underlining ideas could be expressed much more clearly and succinctly could

Verwijderd: O

Verwijderd: challenges

<p>introduction of new rewards systems in the researchers' careers as well as intensified global cooperation among scientists.</p>	<p>this mean?</p> <p>EUA: These supposed conclusions also require substantial editing and need to be short, clear and succinct.</p> <p>Italy: This will require the introduction of new rewards systems in the researchers' careers as well as intensified global cooperation among scientists.</p>
<p>Moreover, 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 cultural forms and historical moments.</p>	<p>UK: ... should help students to <u>attain</u> knowledge <u>and develop</u> skills...</p> <p>Italy: skills and <u>attitudes</u> to be able to...</p> <p>Ireland: ... and historical moments: It's not entirely clear what is being addressed in this overall section</p> <p>EUA: These supposed conclusions also require substantial editing and need to be short, clear and succinct</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. In the years until 2020, there will be a reduction of 10% among the European youth generation between 15 and 29 years of age. In the same period technological changes will be even more pervasive and global competition will increase, not least the competition for talented people. 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>Sweden: The ageing population requires a life long agenda and last but not least a reflection of how to meet the active student generation's need of new knowledge related to the issues of the 21st century.</p> <p>UK: 10% among the <u>overall</u> European youth generation</p> <p>Ireland: 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>UK: enough professionals to operate? Europe...</p>
<p>European Higher Education has experienced "massification" during the last quarter of the previous century, without, however, giving fair access to learners from culturally less privileged backgrounds. On the other hand, our capacity to address the societal issues of the 21st century, be</p>	

- Verwijderd: develop
- Verwijderd: ,
- Verwijderd: habits of mind

<p>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>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 field or move to another one.</p>	
<p>Lifelong learning and the implementation of the social dimension of the Bologna Process are ways of offsetting the implications of an ageing population on the capacity to remain creative and innovative in a knowledge society</p>	
<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>Italy: student centred learning, through flexible learning paths connected to qualifications frameworks and the recognition of prior learning</p>
<p><i>This will entail a mainstreaming of lifelong learning in institutions of higher education and might call for changes in the governance of national systems.</i></p>	<p>UK: the governance of national systems.</p> <p>ESU: ... changes in the governance of national systems, while ensuring the application of the principles of public good and public responsibility to this specific provision of education.</p> <p>Italy: This will entail a mainstreaming of lifelong learning in institutions of higher education and might call for changes in the governance of national systems???</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</i></p>	

Verwijderd: and

Verwijderd: to

Opmerking [c46]: What exactly does this mean?

Met opmaak: Lettertype: Arial, Engels (Groot-Brittannië), Doorhalen

Met opmaak: Lettertype: Arial, Engels (Groot-Brittannië)

<p>and study. Mobility will have to be conceived of differently to meet the demands of an ageing population. It cannot be excluded from mobility schemes.</p>	<p>Italy: Mobility will have to be conceived, differently to meet the demands of an ageing population, which cannot be excluded</p> <p>UK: excluded from mobility schemes</p>
<p>2.3. Highlighting three issues arising out of globalisation and demography</p> <p>As has been hinted at in the preceding paragraphs the combined challenges of globalisation and demographics tend to redefine the relationships that exist between HEIs and the State both at micro and at macro level. The HEIs have been given the necessary autonomy so that they can respond to these challenges adequately. However, this changing environment has given rise to market forces intervening within the world of higher education and has thus led to a rethinking of the role of the State. Moreover, the response of higher education to these societal trends has been one of diversification. Finally, with expanding higher education and with more demands being placed on HEIs to be relevant for society the financing of higher education needs to be seen in a new light.</p> <p>The following paragraphs will deal with these points separately.</p>	<p>EUA: The HEIs have been given the necessary autonomy so that they can respond to these challenges adequately.</p> <p>Italy: ... changing environment has given rise to market forces intervening within the world of higher education and has thus led to a rethinking...</p>
<p>2.3.1. Roles and responsibilities</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. However, there is now a 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. Roles and</p>	<p>Sweden: Roles and responsibility</p> <p>1.st para What is the consequence of the sentence 6th line by ...the sole responsibility of the nation state has been nuanced by greater community action within the European union for HE policy? And how does it relate to the treaty?</p> <p>Ireland: The point of this section isn't clear.</p> <p>UK: German philosophical founders? <u>What are we all Humboldt?</u> 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 growing disentanglement in the relationship between institutions of higher education and the State. Moreover, the sole responsibility of the nation state (for education? I think not.)</p> <p>EUA: It is worth recalling that the modern university was put at the disposal of the nation-state by its German</p>

Verwijderd: of

Verwijderd: . It

Opmerking [c47]: So, need to match this up with the 'target' for student mobility – see above. And what about “virtual” mobility?

Opmerking [r48]: This is once more an example of a statement made that while it may well be true in some cases is certainly substantiated across the EHEA.

<p>responsibilities are thus undergoing change.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>... and the State.</p> <p>Italy: It is worth recalling that the modern university was put at the disposal of the nation state by its German philosophical founders.</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 and creating a new relationship between HEIs and the state. The reform process leading to greater institutional autonomy has been accompanied by a growth in the expectations of society towards HEIs and 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>CoE: Usually it is defined primarily in legal terms, as less regulation, ...</p> <p>Italy: ... 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...</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 or into the governance of higher education. 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>CoE: ... layers of governance. Political goals and strategies as well as economic considerations as well as an evolving body of good practice will increasingly supplement legal provisions in setting the framework within which institutional autonomy is exercised. So,...</p> <p>UK-Sc: are not <u>necessarily</u> contrasting pairs</p> <p>Italy: So, more market does not necessarily imply less State.</p>

Opmerking [r49]: This should be a little bit more nuanced. Some may not agree with this statement

Opmerking [r50]: If this refers to more autonomy it should be explained clearly from the outset in the context of the redefinition of the roles between universities and the state and set more generally in the context of the changing role of the university in society. The relationship between nation states & the EU is only one example of these changes.

<p>The Council of Europe Recommendation on public responsibility adopted by the Council's Committee of Ministers suggests that the responsibility of public authorities for higher education and research should be nuanced and defined relative to specific areas. The text broadly recommends that public authorities have:</p>	<p>.</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>Sweden: The explanation of Public responsibility following the CoE Recommendation CoE is good but could maybe shortened in this context</p>
<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 less seen as a regulator, but rather as a catalyst, next to the main funder, though there is much variation across Europe. While market forces clearly play a role in determining the kind of higher education that is globally developed and offered, public authorities thus have a crucial role in ensuring that higher</p>	<p>CoE: The state is thus less seen as a regulator, but rather as a catalyst as well as the main – but not exclusive - funder, though there is much variation across Europe. While market forces clearly play a role in determining the kind of higher education that is globally developed and offered, public authorities have a crucial role in ensuring that higher education can meet its manifold objectives.</p> <p>UK: where an agreed-upon framework might be needed to transcend the national policy contexts. The</p>

Opmerking [c51]: By whom?

<p>education can also meet its manifold objectives. This also holds true for the international level, where 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 Charter for researchers and the code of conduct for the recruitment of researchers, The Lisbon Recognition Convention, etc.)</p>	<p>following legal issues might be tackled:</p> <p>Austria: This also holds true for the international level, where 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 Charter for researchers and the code of conduct for the recruitment of researchers, The Lisbon Recognition Convention, etc.)</p> <p>Ireland: The Lisbon Recognition Convention, etc. These all relate to research and haven't been elaborated elsewhere in the text. Would need more detail in any regard.</p> <p>UK-Sc: <u>(We would need to be clear that any European initiatives in these areas add value, rather than increase complexity.)</u></p> <p>EUA: The state is thus less seen as a regulator, but rather as a catalyst, next to the main funder, though there is much variation across Europe.</p> <p>Italy: While market forces the new needs of society clearly play a role...</p>
<p>2.3.2. Institutional diversity The more autonomous HEIs have become over recent years, the more demands have been placed on them to be relevant for society in different ways. This in turn has led the institutions to define specific profiles and priorities and to decide on their own missions. Being relevant to society has thus led to profiles and mission statements focusing on local and regional needs. At the same time the need for Europe to maintain its research competitiveness has contributed to the profiling of research intensive universities with a certain critical mass whose aim also is to maintain global reputations. This trend 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</p>	<p>Czech Rep. <u>The autonomy definitely contributes positively to diversification, however, we think this trend is driven rather by many factors: changing needs of society, dynamic development, necessity to learn and change qualification several times, more demands on citizenships etc.. Universities in Europe are in majority autonomous and the autonomy has been growing. Should the institutions be successful in different types of activities, diversity must be supported with indirect steering mechanisms. There are mainly quality assurance and funding mechanisms.</u></p> <p>UK: Being relevant to society has thus led to profiles and mission statements focusing on local, national, regional and international needs...</p> <p>Austria: This trend will lead to a few rich research universities. This trend may lead to a few highly competitive research universities.</p> <p>Czech Rep. <u>The higher education institutions should gain some time to analyse their potential, identify their</u></p>

Opmerking [p52]: By whom and how?

Opmerking [r53]: This is the opposite from what was said in the previous version but this statement is not clear either – there is an enormous literature on this point which should be reference is such issues are going to be addressed.

Verwijderd: and

<p>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. This diversity, though not well understood, is necessary to ensure that societal expectations of HEIs are met.</p>	<p><u>strength, if possible minimise their weaknesses and benefit from their diversity. Each university should be given an opportunity to use its autonomy for defining its own development and profile. The range of profiles probably will be broader multi-dimensional and go beyond research, teaching and non- university types (or sometimes only university and non-university type of higher education).</u></p> <p>EUA: to a few rich research intensive 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.</p> <p>Italy: has contributed to the profiling of research intensive universities with a certain critical mass whose aim also is to maintain global reputations. This trend 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. This diversity, though not well understood, is necessary to ensure that <u>all</u> societal expectations of HEIs are met.</p>
<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 international league tables focus on the research capacity of the institution and thus 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.</p>	<p>ESU: ... and other comparisons of the performance of higher education institutions with doubtful accuracy.</p> <p>UK-Sc: global reputations <u>as well as</u> contribute to</p> <p>EUA: ... rather than only to contribute to national...</p> <p>Italy: These international league tables focus on the research capacity of the institution and thus 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.</p> <p>However, as we have seen, the demands placed upon HEIs in a context of greater autonomy, have led those same institutions to further differentiate themselves and to show considerable variation in mission and ambition. Moreover, amidst this variety of ...</p>
<p>However, as we have seen, the demands placed upon HEIs in a context of greater autonomy, have led those same institutions to further</p>	

Opmerking [r54]: This formulation implies that HEIs are all aiming at the same things which is not the case. It needs major reformulation to reflect the different objectives of different HEIs and the different purposes they serve. It should also emphasize the role of each national authority is providing the necessary incentives and supportive environment necessary to promote true diversity ie the famous ‘catalyst’ function referred to above.

Verwijderd: rather than to

<p>differentiate themselves and to show considerable variation in mission and ambition. Moreover, amidst this variety of specific missions and profiles, there is a growing discourse on “parity of esteem” no matter what the profile or the priorities of the HEIs are. A European response should be developed to make this diversity transparent.</p>	<p><u>Czech Rep.</u>: A European response should be <u>to support this diversity and make it transparent. Not on contrary to diversification, as result of the contemporary rankings, push the universities which want to succeed only towards research performance in spite only few are able to. Mechanisms to support strengths in different areas of university activities not less important - teaching, innovation, lifelong learning and continuing education, internationalisation etc. should be found and applied. The institutions should share responsibilities towards society, their profile should become diversified and this process should be underlined by enabling diversity in governance structures of institutions, funding mechanisms as well as quality assurance mechanisms.</u></p> <p><u>CoE</u>: Our policies with regard to quality assurance and institutional funding must make it possible and legitimate for institutions to seek to develop profiles of excellence in a variety of higher education missions. It is important for Europe to have top quality research institutions but it is also important to have top quality teaching institutions, institutions providing high quality service to their local and regional communities or excelling in other areas of activity.</p> <p><u>EUA</u>: A European response should be developed to make this diversity transparent.</p> <p><u>ESU</u>: A European response should be developed to make this diversity transparent.</p>
<p><i>The key issue is that institutional diversity should be made transparent and that tools be developed to reflect the European vision of higher education. 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 multidimensional transparency instruments conveying information based on a sound methodology and the acknowledgement of diverse policy contexts. Diversification should become clearer and more visible and should not entail ranking in the traditional sense of the term. Moreover, these instruments should help to further support the</i></p>	<p><u>Sweden</u>: Stress and develop further how the diversity should be readable and understandable.</p> <p><u>EUA</u>: The <u>tools</u> used for this differentiation</p> <p><u>Czech Rep.</u>: ... diverse policy contexts. <u>Next to those, appropriate indicators have to be promoted including those for diversified funding mechanisms which would support the diversity of “excellence” (not only the research one) and look for successful models, analyse them and identify principles and mechanisms which could help to bring them into practice. Similarly criteria and indicators which are used for quality assurance should enable to promote different strengths of institutions. Some higher education institutions might have to think about their internal diversification – different parts can serve to different missions. The legislation should be open to the above mentioned instruments as well as enable different governance structures, i.e. most appropriate forms for different types of institutions. Diversification should become clearer...</u></p>

Opmerking [r55]: 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 issues

Opmerking [r56]: 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

<p>differentiation process so that excellence can be promoted in relation to a broad range of different missions.</p>	<p>UK-Sc: The key issue is that institutional diversity should be made transparent <i>through maximising the use of existing transparency tools</i>, to reflect the European vision of higher education. The next phase should consist in the <i>application of a range of instruments</i> to really address diversity and make it readable and understandable. The tools used for this differentiation of institutions <i>could be the development of relevant multidimensional transparency instruments conveying information based on a sound methodology and the acknowledgement of diverse policy contexts</i>. Diversification should become clearer and more visible and should not entail ranking in the traditional sense of the term. Moreover, <i>all transparency instruments...</i></p> <p>UK: This has been mentioned several times in BFUG but has never been fully discussed by the Group. We should be clear what this is for and how it fits with other work in the same area – eg the OECD work. At this time BFUG should not endorse the creation of new projects such as the CEIHE project, or the proposed French Presidency ranking. There is a lot of scepticism about these tools, within BFUG and from HEIs and students. Encouraging participating countries to implement the Diploma Supplement, use the ESGs and the Register of QA agencies is a better way to promote transparency.</p> <p>ESU: The next phase should therefore consist in the 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, allowing the QA processes to address diversity...</p> <p><i>Diversification should become clearer and more visible and should not entail rankings. Moreover, these instruments should help to further support the differentiation process so that excellence can be promoted in relation to a broad range of different missions. This development should be undertaken by the E4 Group.</i></p> <p>Italy: make it readable and understandable. <i>They should be relevant multidimensional transparency...</i></p>
<p>2.3.3. Funding The demands put on higher education in both their teaching and research missions are growing rapidly. The lifelong learning agenda, widening participation rates, an increasingly costly research infrastructure due to advances in the field of technology and tougher quality requirements raise the question of how to fund the HEIs if they are to meet these challenges.</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</p>	<p>Italy: grants to higher education <i>institutions</i> s.</p>

- Verwijderd: and that tools be developed
- Verwijderd: therefore
- Verwijderd: development of
- Verwijderd: w
- Verwijderd: these
- Verwijderd: i

Verwijderd: The tools used for this differentiation of institutions would be the development of

Verwijderd: provider

<p>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>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.</p>	<p>EUA: ... the sources of funding have been shifted with the introduction ...</p> <p>ESU: Furthermore, the sources of funding have been extended through a more active role of the higher education institutions in partnerships with industry. In some cases, tuition fees were introduced to cover part of the costs of instruction. The cost-sharing debate is very complex, as all costs related to education must be taken into account. In countries where tuition fees have not been introduced, the level of the cost supported 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 Bologna Process.</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 but also the efficiency of higher education funding. 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>Hungary: Higher education should remain a public good, too.</p>
<p>Moreover, from 2001 to 2005, annual public expenditure on tertiary education increased at the same pace as GDP in most Bologna countries. However, a look at the annual expenditure per full time student across the Bologna countries shows that a "typical" Bologna country spent 7 080€ (Purchasing Power Standards) per full time equivalent student in 2005, of which nearly 20% was devoted to R&D and ancillary services. Bologna countries are increasingly investing in R&D at the expense of core educational goods and services. A comparison with the US shows that in the US spending on core educational goods and services per student is twice as high as in most</p>	<p>EUA: Moreover, from 2001 to 2005,</p> <p>Italy: From 2001 to 2005 ...</p> <p>Norway: We highly appreciate the redrafting of this part. We cannot, however, see the need for the inclusion of the reference to the estimated annual expenditure per full time student across the Bologna countries. The definition of a "typical" Bologna country is unclear, and how one has reached the amount of €7080 is not defined in the text. We are also uncertain as to the value of the contribution of this part to the text, and thus we suggest that the entire paragraph is deleted.</p> <p>Germany: "Bologna countries": source for this paragraph?</p> <p>Ireland: ... goods and services: 20% in 2005, what was it previously, need reference data?</p>

Opmerking [r57]: Where do these figures come from? Including the source would be helpful

Verwijderd: Moreover, f

<p>Bologna countries.</p>	<p><u>Spain:</u> The statement "Bologna countries are increasingly investing in R&D at the expense of core educational goods and services." needs stronger evidence or needs to be completely reformulated.</p> <p><u>Denmark:</u> We highly appreciate this new version of the paragraph on funding mechanisms. However, we agree with the point made by others that there is no need for the inclusion of the reference to the estimated annual expenditure per full time student across the Bologna countries. The definition of a "typical" Bologna country is unclear, and how one has reached the amount of €7080 is not defined in the text. We are also uncertain as to the value of the contribution of this part to the text, and thus we suggest that the entire paragraph is deleted.</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 responsibility. 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 thus acknowledging that European higher education needs sustainable funding.</i></p>	<p><u>Sweden:</u> A diversification of funding may not mean that higher education ceases to be a public responsibility.</p> <p><u>ESU:</u> <i>provision they would like. 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</i></p> <p><u>Czech Republic:</u> . <i>The Bologna process can learn from and follow actively the initiatives and projects carried out by other organisations, in particular the OECD.</i></p> <p><u>Italy:</u> <i>all the higher education provision they would like to offer.</i></p>
<p>Furthermore, core educational goods and services require further financing.</p>	<p><u>EUA:</u> ... require further financing.</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</i></p>	<p><u>Slovenia:</u> Chapter 3: becomes chapter 4</p>

Opmerking [lw58]: What does this mean?

<p>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.”</p> <p>(London Communiqué, paragraph 4.3)</p>	
<p>3.1. Present support structures 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>	
<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</i></p>	

<p><i>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.”</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>	
<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>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</p>	

<p>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><u>CoE</u>: as a strength...</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.</p>	
<p>BFUG introduced the additional category of “BFUG partner” for organisations that 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><u>Czech Rep.: The communiqués and reports accepted by the ministers thus have become partly the political outline of the future two-year development, partly standard setting texts.</u></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</p>	

<p>Board, oversees the work in-between those meetings and represents the Bologna Follow-up Group at international events.</p>	<p><u>Czech Rep. To keep the continuity between the ministerial conferences the vice-chair to the BFUG is from the hosting country.</u></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 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. Finally, the Bologna Secretariat is asked to prepare the following ministerial conference. Up</p>	

<p>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 are light ones and the secretariat changes on a regular basis. Besides, with 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 modified only slightly.</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>Sweden: The proposed chairmanship following The EU presidency with a twinning arrangement with a non EU Country is good but should perhaps be elaborated before recommended. The secretariat connected to next host country is a good solution as well as a permanent website.</p> <p>UK-Sc: (we might need to offer a view on how the twinning arrangement would operate)</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</p>	<p>UK: preferentially be internationally composed.</p>

Opmerking [p59]: Explain further what this would look like.

next needs exploring.	
A permanent website will be established with a country-neutral name and will be managed by the Secretariat from July 2010 onwards.	
In order to interact with other policy areas, BFUG will set up a number of working groups gathering experts and policy makers from other fields, like immigration, social security and employment.	<p>Germany: "BFUG will set up a number of working groups": cooperation yes, but with a lighter touch?</p> <p>Austria: In order to interact with other policy areas, BFUG will set up a number of working groups gathering experts and policy makers from other fields, like immigration, social security and employment. Delete, because these activities will only be successful and can only be carried out at the national level.</p> <p>UK: and employment.</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 July 2010, with national experts from Austria and Hungary being seconded to the secretariat in Brussels.	
The following ministerial conferences will be held in 2012, 2015, 2018 and 2020.	UK: 2020.
<p>Chapter 4. Conclusions and priorities for "beyond 2010"</p> <p>Since it was originally agreed upon in 1999, the Bologna Process has led to the modernization of European higher education by building upon and strengthening Europe's intellectual, scientific and cultural dimension. The Bologna Process has brought about a considerable degree of change within European higher education by achieving greater compatibility and comparability of the systems of higher education. Major reforms in the structure of higher education have been made with the adoption of a three cycle-structure including the possibility of a short cycle within or linked to the first cycle; quality assurance</p>	<p>Sweden: Prepare the reader with some reminders of the future challenges we are going to meet by new actions.</p> <p>Finland: The challenges of the working environment (demography, globalisation) could be described in the beginning of the text. Now they are in pieces under the priorities and sometimes even duplicated.</p> <p>Bologna declaration emphasised the creation of the European area of higher education as a key way to promote citizens' mobility and employability and the Continent's overall development. This could still be the main objective of the Process.</p> <p>Finishing the initial agenda is still the main objective but we do not have to list all the actions that were agreed on the Bologna declaration (and following communiqués) but preferably concentrate on priorities. In our opinion all the priorities are not actually priorities but rather mean (Follow-up structure, resourcing, transparency and accountability). Therefore, we suggest the following priorities:</p> <p>4.1. The pursuit of excellence at all levels of higher education - modernisation of higher education</p>

Opmerking [p60]: These areas are largely outside the ability of BFUG to influence and may not be an effective use of BFUG resources.

Opmerking [p61]: So, it is another 10 years of Bologna then?

guidelines have been developed, a European register for quality assurance agencies has been created, and an agreement has been reached at European level on appropriate qualifications frameworks based on learning outcomes to facilitate recognition.

- resourcing (diverse source of funding)
- quality assurance (EQAR)
- accountability
- increased autonomy of HEIs
- linking education and research

4.2. Internationalisation of higher education

- mobility
- transparency through qualification frameworks, learning outcomes, DS
- collaboration

4.3 Enhancing lifelong learning

- equitable participation (access, successful progress and completion of higher education)
- employability
- recognition of prior learning (incl. non-formal and informal learning)

Norway: Even though it is much improved from the previous version of the document, we believe this chapter still needs quite a lot revision in order to become a proper conclusion and summary of the report. Cf. our general comment at p 1

E.C.: ... a European register for quality assurance agencies has been created, an agreement has been reached at European level on appropriate qualifications frameworks based on learning outcomes to facilitate academic recognition and acceptance of qualifications in the labour market.

Verwijderd: and

Verwijderd: .

Slovenia: Chapter 4: Conclusions and priorities for “beyond 2010”

Considering the title of this chapter, I propose to structure its content as follows:

- As shows the last stocktaking exercise, the original goals of the Bologna Declaration have been achieved to a great extent but the agenda will still need to be finalised. The description of the state-of-the-art of the European Higher Education Area in 2010 will be possible after the results of the independent assessment.
- Ever new challenges or changing of existing ones not only make the creation of EHEA a dynamic process but also calls for redefinition of EHEA for 2020.
- We are reaffirming our commitment to some main objectives of Bologna declaration that are still as valid as in 1999, like (see the passages from original declaration below!):
 - o a Europe of Knowledge
 - o the importance of education and educational co-operation
 - o the European area of higher education as a key way to promote citizens' mobility and employability and the Continent's overall development
 - o to ensure that the European higher education system acquires a world-wide degree of attraction equal to our extraordinary cultural and scientific traditions.
- Taking into account the developments in last decade, we see the vision of EHEA in 2020 as an area

of higher education that is:

- a public responsibility;
- based on diversity of HEIs, their missions and purposes but
- convergent degree structures and commonly agreed standards and instruments that guarantee the quality and transparency of provision and qualifications;
- responsive to the needs of wider society;
- educating creative graduates for the knowledge society, active citizens ...;
- in pursuit of excellence in broad range of issues;
- open and globally attractive ...

(We should be able to state some distinctive features of EHEA 2020!)

- In order to reach this vision we set the following priorities for the next decade:
 - promotion of creativity and support for excellence
 - ongoing curricular development
 - equitable participation and LLL
 - cooperation with other world regions and promotion of EHEA

(I don't see other issues like mobility or transparency as not important but I don't consider them priority issues. Being late in my response, I have the advantage of being able to read some comments of other BFUG members. Thus, I don't need to repeat very good comments and recommendations what concerns the content made by others.)

Bologna Declaration:

... the need to establish a more complete and far-reaching Europe, in particular building upon and strengthening its intellectual, cultural, social and scientific and technological dimensions.

A Europe of Knowledge is now widely recognised as an irreplaceable factor for social and human growth and as an indispensable component to consolidate and enrich the European citizenship, capable of giving its citizens the necessary competences to face the challenges of the new millennium, together with an awareness of shared values and belonging to a common social and cultural space.

The importance of education and educational co-operation in the development and strengthening of stable, peaceful and democratic societies is universally acknowledged as paramount, the more so in view of the situation in South East Europe.

The Sorbonne declaration of 25th of May 1998, which was underpinned by these considerations, stressed the Universities' central role in developing European cultural dimensions. It emphasised the creation of the European area of higher education as a key way to promote citizens' mobility and employability and the Continent's overall development.

We must in particular look at the objective of increasing the international competitiveness of the European

	<p>system of higher education. The vitality and efficiency of any civilisation can be measured by the appeal that its culture has for other countries. We need to ensure that the European higher education system acquires a world-wide degree of attraction equal to our extraordinary cultural and scientific traditions.</p> <p><u>France:</u> - We agree with the 7 priorities put forward, but <u>the 7 priorities should not be put on the same level</u>, as excellence and LLL (linked to equitable participation and employability) and mobility are core ones, while transparency, resources and follow-up structures are mere means.</p> <p>For the sake of clarity, the current sections are nevertheless referred to as they are proposed with this new Draft.</p> <p>- <u>Intro</u> to chapter 4 : Referring to an "emerging EHEA" - which has been sought after since La Sorbonne and Bologna - + "underpinned on core European values such as academic freedom, institutional autonomy and public responsibility for HE" should be introduced after "major reforms have been made", and before the listing of these reforms (3-cycle structure, QA with ESG and EQAR, + explicit refce to the EHEA-QF (rather than "an agreement has been reached")</p> <p>- <u>Why 2020?</u> It should be made clear why we'd rather suggest a focus on 2020 rather than 2030 and single out this point (which appears there in the very first words of section 4.1): of course, a first hint results from chapter 2 's title, but without explaining there why we shifted from Bologna post-2010.</p> <p>The following reasons might be suggested: mainly in order to avoid "looking at the crystal-box" ; because the 10-year Bologna time span proved relevant enough for significant reforms ; because changes are so fastly evolving, 2030 would prevent ministers from creating the momentum ; because a few reports have already focused on 2020, and the next Lisbon strategy is likely to do so.</p> <p><u>Denmark:</u> As for chapter 4 this is a good starting point for a final document for the ministers. If indeed this is the use it is intended for it should be kept very short and clear. We support a restructuring along the lines of the Finnish suggestion. However, the aspects of transparency and accountability as is described in section 4.5 should remain linked.</p> <p><u>Italy:</u> Since it was originally agreed upon in 1999, the Bologna Process has led to the modernization of European higher education by building upon and strengthening Europe's intellectual, scientific and cultural dimension. The Bologna Process has brought about...</p>
<p>The Bologna Process has managed to instil European higher education with a permanent sense of cooperation by encouraging and increasing dialogue between different stakeholders, both governments and institutions.</p>	

<p>There has been strong adherence to the principles of promoting compatibility and comparability as well as respecting diversity. Through the Bologna Process European higher education has acquired a world-wide degree of attraction. At the same time, the process has generally avoided creating additional bureaucracy.</p> <p>Full implementation of these principles and objectives, which are adhered to, will still require continual momentum after 2010. Co-operation within the Bologna Process will continue to support and monitor the achievement of the initial objectives of the Bologna Declaration with a view to creating a European Higher Education Area of high quality.</p>	<p><u>Italy</u>: ... after 2010. <u>Special efforts should be made to promote effective curricular reform and the new learner-centred paradigm in institutions.</u> Co-operation within the Bologna Process...</p> <p><u>Czech Rep.</u>: <u>In order to understand the policy areas stated below and to monitor the results more reliable data are needed. Collecting data is a measure that will have to be widened in its scope and will serve as a basis for decisions as well criteria and benchmarking if we feel we need them.</u></p>
<p>4.1. The pursuit of excellence at all levels of higher education</p> <p>In the years up to 2020, the major challenges identified are those of globalisation and demography. European higher education will respond adequately through its contribution to building the European knowledge society and to making it a cohesive society.</p>	<p><u>France</u>: - 4.1 / Excellence</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> > the reference to HEI as "providers" - with its connotation to a market conception based on supply and demand - should be avoided ; > the fact that excellence is multiple, plural and is not limited to an "elite" education should be better enhanced ; and hence, excellence must be for "all" the HEIs, taking into account their own different missions and profiles. <p>> because high quality education must be accessible to the widest student population, a connection should be made with 4.4 focused on equitable participation and employability ;</p> <p>> because excellence is plural, its corollary is transparency ; so point 4.1 and 4.5 should be in connection as 4.5 is a means to make excellence more visible.</p> <p>> the will to make the EHEA "highly creative and innovative" should lead to point out the issue of a better connection between EHEA and ERA, and possibly a EHE and Research Area, all the more so as European universities link up education and research, and thanks to doctoral education, train future researchers.</p> <p><u>Sweden</u>: Some more stress on research is needed e.g. Institutions of higher education, <u>based on research</u> are vital sources...</p> <p>via</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -modernisation and autonomy of higher education -quality assurance -funding -accountability

	<p>-links between education and research</p> <p>ESU: 4.1. The pursuit of excellence at all levels of higher education</p> <p>Italy: The pursuit of high quality at all levels of higher education</p>
<p>Institutions of higher education are vital sources of new knowledge and essential contributors to innovation. They act as providers of personnel educated and trained in both general and specific skills necessary to the well-being of society. In their engagement with the community, institutions of higher education attract international talent and business to a region, but they also contribute to the social and cultural vitality of that particular region. Excellence must thus be pursued at all levels of the institutions of higher education, in teaching and research as well as in innovation and community engagement.</p>	<p>Italy: Institutions of higher education are vital sources of new knowledge and essential contributors to innovation. The <u>students they educate develop the general and specific competences necessary to the well-being of society. In their engagement with the community, institutions of higher education contribute to the social and cultural vitality of a region but they also attract international talent and business to that particular region.</u> <u>High quality must thus be pursued at all levels of ...</u></p> <p>Czech Rep.: <u>The principle objective should be to support all higher education institutions so that they may pursue top quality in activities where the future lies for them and where they are capable of achieving excellence. This relates to another objective, which is the maximum possible use of all capacities and resources, and no institution should be excluded but excel in the areas where they show major strengths.</u></p>
<p>The overarching aim of the Bologna Process beyond 2010, therefore, is to equip institutions of higher education in such a way that the European Higher Education Area will become a highly creative and innovative region as well as an attractive global partner in the advent of a global knowledge society.</p>	<p>Ireland: ... knowledge society: The pursuit of excellence will be dependent on other areas eg embedding QA practices, curricular reform, financing..</p> <p>Czech Rep.: Degree programmes for future <u>The shift from structural reform to implementation will be successful 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 they rest upon curricula that render the attainment of these objectives possible. This is also an area where the different levels of the Bologna Process meet: institutional implementation is set within a framework of common reference points as agreed upon by the stakeholders both at European and at national level. Moreover, institutional implementation rests upon the involvement of the academic community and is linked up with institutional autonomy and academic freedom. 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 knowledge, skills, and competences. The</u></p>

Opmerking [BC62]: We are missing as priorities the elements contained in the first chapter. The priorities should be: by this order:
 -Finishing the agenda
 -Social Dimension: expansion of the systems while diversifying the student body
 -Student centred learning
 -Lifelong learning
 -Mobility of students and staff
 -The following...

- Verwijderd: excellence
- Verwijderd: y act as providers of personnel educated
- Verwijderd: and trained in both
- Verwijderd: skills
- Verwijderd: a
- Verwijderd: but they also contribute to the social and cultural vitality of that particular region
- Verwijderd: Excellence

Verwijderd: , skills

	<p><u>development of such descriptors should take place with due consideration of the diversity of programmes in Europe as well as of institutional, methodological, didactical and academic autonomy. It is necessary to use fully the potential of and opportunity offered by the concept of qualification frameworks at European as well as national levels. The process of creation of the national qualification frameworks will involve institutions, the application sphere (employers) and other stakeholders, thus creating the degree programmes and /or modules having a balance between (compromising) the immediate needs of employers and sustainable needs of society.</u></p> <p><u>Italy:</u> in a global knowledge society.</p>
<p>4.2. Internationalisation of higher education European higher education will be further embedded in an institutional culture of internationalisation. The Bologna Process is part of the global world of higher education. The attractiveness and openness of European higher education will be highlighted. At the same time, competition on a global scale will be complemented by policy dialogue and cooperation based on partnership with other regions of the world.</p>	<p><u>Czech Rep.:</u> <u>4.3. Internationalisation of higher education</u></p> <p><u>Sweden:</u> Internationalisation of HE reassuring the attractiveness of European -The European dimension -Mobility - 25% which is the level today? -recognition of prior learning -collaboration; joint curricula and joint degrees</p> <p><u>UK-Sc:</u> <u>(we need to be clearer about who, what, how this will be undertaken.)</u></p> <p><u>France:</u> - 4.2/ Internationalisation > these benchmarks are of course ambitious, but should enable us to go further on the basis that our data collections with reliable and comparable information will have improved by then - that's already a must required since Bergen. As lots of colleagues were doubtful or against such "suggested" benchmarks, "should" instead of "will" might be used for the whole 4th par. of p 23 (including also the mentioning of ad hoc WGs - see 4.7 as well from this point of view) as well as in the other part of the report (under 1.2.5 section).</p> <p>> recognition and national QFs : it should be underlined here again that these national QFs should be "connected to the EHEA-framework together with other European QFs to be compatible with the EHEA-framework"</p> <p><u>Italy:</u> European higher education will <u>develop</u> an institutional culture of internationalisation. <u>As the Bologna Process is part of the global world of higher education, the attractiveness and openness of European higher education will be highlighted. Competition on a global scale will be complemented...</u></p>
<p>Collaboration by individuals and universities, firms and governments has the potential of raising the general well being of our populations to new heights. Wide-spread collaboration in a</p>	<p><u>Italy:</u> Collaboration <u>among</u> individuals and universities...</p>

- Verwijderd: the advent of
- Verwijderd: ¶
- Verwijderd: be further embedded in
- Verwijderd: T
- Verwijderd: .
- Verwijderd: T
- Verwijderd: At the same time, c
- Met opmaak: Lettertype: (Standaard) Arial, Niet Vet, Engels (Groot-Brittannië)
- Verwijderd: by

<p>virtually borderless world can stoke the engines of growth of new knowledge and understanding. The teaching and research carried out within institutions of higher education are the instigators and incubators of societies' progress. Institutions of higher education will have to perfect new mechanisms and adjust their structures to become effective participants and pivotal key players.</p>	
<p>Mobility of students and staff is the key instrument higher education will further develop to respond to these challenges and trends. Mobility is important for personal development, boosting people's skills and employability and it breaks down barriers between people and groups, thus contributing to responsible citizenship. In an increasingly multicultural society, mobility fosters respect for diversity and is a key ingredient for a more stable and peaceful world. Mobility also underpins the multilingual tradition of the European higher education area. It increases cooperation between institutions since it deepens the flow of knowledge across the spectrum of higher education.</p>	<p>Austria: Mobility of students and staff is the key instrument which higher education will further develop to respond to these challenges and trends</p> <p>ESU: Mobility of students and staff is the key instrument...</p> <p>Italy: Mobility is important for personal development, <u>as it enhances people's skills and employability and breaks down barriers between people and groups, thus contributing to responsible citizenship.</u> In an increasingly multicultural society, mobility fosters respect for diversity and is a key ingredient for a more stable and peaceful world. Mobility also underpins the multilingual tradition of the European higher education area. It increases cooperation between institutions since it <u>facilitates the flow of knowledge across the spectrum of higher education.</u></p>
<p>Therefore, mobility of students and staff within Europe and exchanges with the wider world will feature prominently on the agenda of the Bologna Process beyond 2010.</p>	<p>EUA: See previous comment on mobility: should this be the main aim of the Bologna process?</p>
<p>As far as mobility of students is concerned, 25% of those graduating in 2020 will have been physically mobile. All curricula will be designed in such a way that they create "mobility windows"; and the number of joint programmes will have been doubled. The framework conditions will be such that the granting of visas and work permits as well as the portability of grants will be made easier. For this purpose ad hoc working groups comprising experts and policy makers from the</p>	<p>Germany: "mobility": what kind of mobility – at least one semester? Short stays as well? <u>"As far as mobility of students is concerned, 25% of those graduating in 2020 will have been physically mobile. All curricula will be designed in such a way that they create "mobility windows"; and the number of joint programmes will have been doubled".</u> While being in favour of concrete objectives, I think we still have to discuss – on the basis of data - whether these figures are feasible and ambitions enough "All curricula": other than joint programmes</p> <p>Austria: As far as mobility of students is concerned, as many of the students graduating in 2020 as possible will have been physically mobile. Curricula will be designed in such a way that they create "mobility windows"; and the number of joint programmes will have been considerably increased. The framework conditions will be</p>

- Opmerking [BC63]: Mobility should be a priority of its own and not a mere tool in the context of the internationalisation of HE.
- Verwijderd: boosting
- Verwijderd: it
- Verwijderd: deepens

<p>policy fields concerned will prepare and propose the appropriate measures.</p>	<p>such that the granting of visas and work permits as well as the portability of grants will be made easier. For this purpose ad hoc working groups comprising experts and policy makers from the policy fields concerned will prepare and propose the appropriate measures. (national level commitment!!)</p> <p>Ireland: 25% of those graduating in 2020 will have been physically mobile. All curricula will be designed in such a way that they create “mobility windows”; and the number of joint programmes will have been doubled.</p> <p>E.C.: and the number of joint programmes will <u>at least</u> have been doubled.</p> <p>UK-Sc: (I do not these are realistic goals at a European level. We need to amend the emphasis to say that we will work towards these aims in our respective national contexts.)</p> <p>Spain: the number of joint programmes will have at least been doubled. The framework conditions will be such that the granting of visas and work permits as well as the portability of grants and loans will be made easier.</p> <p>UK: 25% of those graduating in 2020 will have been physically mobile.</p> <p>EUA: See previous comment on mobility: should this be the main aim of the Bologna process?</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>UK: together initiatives</p> <p>Italy: 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. The Bologna Process will liaise with those relevant policy areas that are outside higher education and will seek the advice and support of experts and policy makers from the fields of social security and immigration.</p>	<p>EUA: As far as mobility of young researchers and staff...</p> <p>Ireland: to ease immigration into the EHEA</p> <p>UK-Sc: to ensure appropriate access to social security and portable pension rights for mobile staff.</p> <p>UK: into the EHEA</p> <p>Italy: into the EHEA as well as within and to guarantee...</p> <p>Hungary: Along with student mobility, staff mobility also deserves particular attention and treatment as a crucial element of the internationalization of higher education that still needs developing (removing legal and financial barriers, enhancing attitudes towards mobility and supporting cooperations, on national, institutional</p>

Opmerking [I64]: Too ambitious, further consideration needed

Opmerking [c65]: But, see comments about demographics, the changing nature of the student population etc. This is probably unrealistic.

Verwijderd: political

Opmerking [I66]: Is this possible? Simplification of application processes might be more appropriate

Verwijderd: guarantee

Verwijderd: adequate

Verwijderd: to the

Opmerking [c67]: This needs to be re-worded. It sounds like the promise of open doors and in any case migration is very influenced by economic conditions. There is Schengen and non-Schengen and so is probably unrealistic.

	and academic field levels). An indicator (like in the case of students) would be very helpful.
Data collection will help monitor the internationalisation of higher education and will serve as a basis for benchmarking.	
Progress on agreements for automatic recognition supported by the development of national qualifications frameworks remains of utmost importance.	<p>Czech Rep.: Recognition of qualifications has been a cornerstone of the Bologna Process since its very beginning and the Lisbon Recognition Convention is the only legal instrument that the Bologna Process relies on at European level. The key point, therefore, is to ensure that there is more transparency about how the Lisbon Recognition Convention is implemented, the processes involved and the criteria for decisions. One of the biggest challenges we face is to develop a common understanding of the concept of qualifications and of possible "substantial differences". Progress on agreements...</p> <p>E.C.: for automatic academic recognition</p> <p>CoE: Progress on agreements for automatic recognition supported by the development of national qualifications frameworks remains of utmost importance National qualifications frameworks compatible with the overarching framework of qualifications of the EHEA as well as with the Europe Qualifications Framework for lifelong learning will emphasize learning outcomes, make it easier for learners to obtain qualifications through a variety of learning paths and make recognition of qualifications easier across the borders of education systems.</p> <p>UK-Sc: agreements for automatic recognition</p> <p>UK: recognition supported by the development</p>
<p>4.3. Lifelong Learning The demographic challenge of an ageing population in a knowledge society can only be met by reinforcing the social dimension of higher education and by fully engaging in lifelong learning practices. 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 our societies. This can only happen if higher education taps into resources that have hitherto been neglected.</p>	<p>Sweden: 4.3 Lifelong learning and employability -equitable participation – access, progress and completion -employment -validation of prior learning</p> <p>Czech Rep.: 4.4. Lifelong Learning ... and by fully engaging in lifelong learning practices. Lifelong learning is a multifaceted concept, which may involve climbing higher up the qualifications ladder, extending knowledge, gaining new skills and competences, upon the recognition of prior learning or simply pursuing learning to enrich one's personal growth. The role of educated people...</p> <p>Austria: EUA Charter should definitely be included here!</p>

Opmerking [c68]: Automatic for what and by whom? This could potentially interfere with institutional autonomy and public health and safety. Surely we should strive for recognition processes should be fair and transparent and that decision making powers for recognition should be granted to institutions for admission. .

Verwijderd: 3

	<p>France: > We miss the reference to the EUA Charter on U and LLL here, together with a sound implementation of genuine recognition of prior learning, all the more so as the effective implementation of the Charter's action lines within HEIs will be quite a challenge for the upcoming years ; > point 4.4 related to equitable participation and employability - our definition of Social Dimension (which should be made explicit to avoid the impression that this overarching Bologna principle is renamed here and is forgotten) - should be connected to LLL.</p> <p>Italy: ... values operate together and how they are accelerated by <u>through</u> critical thinking</p>
<p>Social and human growth are indispensable components for European citizenship; the advent of a Europe of knowledge that is highly creative and innovative rests upon the ability of its citizens to summon the competences that are necessary to address the new challenges. 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 subject areas.</p>	<p>UK: Social and human growth (?)</p> <p>Italy: 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 subject areas.</p> <p>Czech Rep.: <u>Lifelong learning therefore needs to be integrated into national as well as individual institutional strategies and to be mainstreamed. In the context of lifelong learning it is necessary to relate further education qualifications to the three cycle Bologna degree structure and to provide information on their value in a transparent way.</u></p>
<p>4.4. Equitable participation and employability 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 progress in the social dimension. The student body within higher education should reflect the diversity of Europe's populations and significant progress should be made within each</p>	<p>Norway: Chapter 2 includes reference to the problem of lack of relevance of the bachelor's degree for the labour market. No reference is made to this problem in chapter 4. This is unfortunate as chapter 4 also intends to include priorities for beyond 2010. We are of the opinion that this is an important challenge for "beyond 2010", and consequently should be mentioned in this part.</p> <p>Cyprus: Equitable participation and employability: This section must be split into two policies which will continue in the next decade: the social dimension and the employability. Social dimension and equitable access</p> <p>Czech Rep.: <u>4.5. Equitable participation and employability</u></p> <p>Ireland: decade.</p>

Verwijderd: 4

Opmerking [169]: Include details of existing actions eg enhancing flexible learning methods

<p>participating country over the next decade.</p>	<p>UK: While a coherent strategy for lifelong learning will be devised,</p> <p>Italy: Equitable access into, successful progress and completion of higher education for the whole spectrum of the population in the various age groups call for a learning environment geared to the needs of a diverse student body.</p>	<p>Opmerking [c70]: By whom?</p> <p>Verwijderd: ir</p> <p>Verwijderd: walks of life and</p> <p>Verwijderd: of great quality</p>
<p>The social dimension of higher education cannot be dissociated from the objective of employability. Higher education should equip students with the knowledge, skills, competences and attributes that individuals need in the workplace, whether in employee or self-employed status, whether to gain employment, or to become self-employed, to maintain employment or to renew those skills and attributes throughout their working lives. Higher education institutions and employers are to engage in a meaningful dialogue allowing, on the one hand, institutions to be more responsive to employers' needs and, on the other hand, employers to explain their needs better to institutions. Business engagement will thus be encouraged to foster the employability of graduates at all levels of higher education.</p>	<p>Cyprus: Employability</p> <p>ESU: The social dimension of higher education cannot be dissociated from the objective of employability.</p> <p>Italy: The social dimension also involves the responsibility of higher education for economic development, therefore it cannot be dissociated</p> <p>Hungary: "Equity" and "employability", in order to be realized, both necessitate a diverse and well-prepared teaching staff (including highly qualified researchers, experts in pedagogy and in development) and the introduction of a diversified teaching methodology - which is yet in itself a goal to be achieved and to focus on.</p> <p>Czech Rep.: On the other hand 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. Moreover, institutions of higher education contribute to the identification of competences and skills of relevance for the future labour market.</p>	<p>Opmerking [BC71]: A number of things cannot be dissociated from employability. But we don't see link explained and the social dimension is a priority on its own according to the 2 last BFUG meetings.</p> <p>Verwijderd: of higher education</p>
<p>4.5. Transparency and accountability The Bologna Process has achieved transparency through its convergent degree structure, its qualifications frameworks and its compatible quality assurance mechanisms. Although the nexus between teaching and research will remain a principle firmly entrenched in the EHEA, it is</p>	<p>Czech Rep.: 4.6. Diversified and transparent</p> <p>CoE: Transparency, autonomy and accountability</p> <p>UK-Sc: In the light of this greater diversification of higher education, the Bologna Process will consider the need for the creation any new instruments designed to show and measure the strengths of institutions with diverse mission statements. Any such instruments should help institutions of higher education to develop</p>	<p>Verwijderd: 5</p> <p>Verwijderd: Transparency and accountability</p> <p>Verwijderd: tribute to</p> <p>Verwijderd: and to the monitoring of</p> <p>Verwijderd: These</p> <p>Verwijderd: be such that they</p>

<p>recognized that there are various types of research and that there is great differentiation in the missions of higher education institutions. In the light of this greater diversification of higher education, the Bologna Process will contribute to the creation and to the monitoring of new instruments designed to show and measure the strengths of institutions with diverse mission statements. These instruments should be such that they help institutions of higher education to develop diversity and that they are relevant information tools for students and academic staff in higher education. For institutions of higher education such tools are necessary to allow them to establish cooperative partnerships and to compare and identify their competitive position.</p>	<p>diversity and <u>be</u> relevant information tools for students and academic staff in higher education. ▾</p> <p>CoE: with diverse mission statements as well as to ensure that academic freedom and institutional autonomy remain key values of European higher education.</p> <p>Spain: the expression "and to compare and identify their competitive position" should not be on the text since there is not a clear relation between rankings and transparency and accountability.</p> <p>Spain: and to compare and identify their competitive position.</p> <p>France: instead of "instruments designed to show and to measure", the idea of a "mapping" should be better enhanced with the mention of "to map out" instead of "to measure". Also an explicit reference should be made to which kind of instruments we are aiming at : mappings, multi-dimensional rankings based on objective and reliable information and typology of HEIs for better informed student and teacher/researcher choices.</p> <p>UK: 4.5. Transparency ▾ The Bologna Process has achieved transparency through its <u>degree structure, its qualifications frameworks and its quality assurance standards and guidelines</u>. Although 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. <u>Proper implementation and use of Bologna Process tools such as the Diploma Supplement and the European Quality Assurance Register will enhance the transparency of the EHEA.</u> ▾</p> <p>EUA: will contribute to the creation and to the monitoring of new instruments designed to show and measure the strengths of institutions with diverse mission statements.</p> <p>ESU: ... the Bologna Process will contribute to the increase of objectivity in the QA processes to show and measure...</p> <p>Italy: Although the <u>link</u> between teaching and research... ... to allow them to establish cooperative partnerships and <u>identify and compare</u> their competitive position</p>
<p>These instruments need closely relating to quality assurance and recognition and should be based on sound data collection and development of indicators.</p>	<p>Czech Rep.: <u>The institutions should share responsibilities towards society, their profile should become diversified. This process should be underlined by diversity in governance structures of institutions, and closely relating to instruments to support strengths in different areas of university activities, in particular diversified funding as well as quality assurance mechanisms. All</u> should be based on sound data collection, thorough <u>analysis</u> and development of indicators.</p> <p>UK-Sc: <u>All such</u> instruments need <u>to relate</u> closely <u>to</u> quality assurance and recognition <u>practices</u> and should be based on sound data <u>collection.</u> ▾</p>

- Verwijderd: that they are
- Verwijderd: For institutions of higher education such tools are necessary to allow them to establish cooperative partnerships and to compare and identify their competitive position.
- Verwijderd: and accountability
- Verwijderd: convergent
- Opmerking [c72]: NO. The mechanisms are different.
- Verwijderd: compatible
- Verwijderd: mechanisms
- Verwijderd: In the light of this greater diversification of higher education, the Bologna Process will contribute to the creation and to the monitoring of new instruments designed to show and measure the strengths of institutions with diverse mission statements. These instruments should be such that they help institutions of higher education to develop diversity and that they are relevant information tools for students and academic staff in higher education. For institutions of higher educ... [1]
- Opmerking [r73]: See comments above on the sam... [2]
- Verwijderd: nexus
- Verwijderd: to compare and
- Verwijderd: These instruments need closely... [3]
- Verwijderd: These
- Verwijderd: c
- Verwijderd: relating
- Verwijderd: collection
- Verwijderd: and development of indicators.

	<p>UK:</p> <p>ESU: These developments need closely relating to the existing quality assurance and recognition, should be based on sound data collection and development of indicators and will rely on the cooperation of the consultative members.</p> <p>Italy: These instruments need to be closely related to quality assurance and recognition and should be based on sound data collection and suitable indicators.</p> <p>Hungary: Indicators related to accountability are of special interest. Addressing the issue of transparency only through quality assurance is insufficient, accountability has to be widely implemented also by the means of the transparency of structures, mechanisms and data in higher education (at all levels) and of that of the results of quality assurance procedures. Accountability also requires that responsibilities be clearly defined and allocated.</p>
<p>4.6. Resourcing Moreover, in a global world the relationship between the State and the higher education institutions has changed. Higher education has gained greater autonomy along with expectations to be responsive to societal needs and to be accountable. Multiple funding is seen as an opportunity to guarantee institutional autonomy and as a way of addressing the challenges that the Bologna Process faces beyond 2010.</p>	<p>Czech Rep.: 4.7. Resourcing</p> <p>Ireland: Resourcing: could include under 4.1</p> <p>... and to be accountable: <u>The demands put on higher education in both their teaching and research missions are growing rapidly. The lifelong learning agenda, widening participation rates, an increasingly costly research infrastructure due to advances in the field of technology and tougher quality requirements raise the question of how to fund the HEIs if they are to meet these challenges.</u> Multiple funding is seen as an opportunity to guarantee <u>further sustainable development of institutions and their autonomy. 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 responsibility. 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 thus acknowledging that European higher education needs sustainable funding.</u> Addressing these challenges the Bologna Process faces beyond 2010.</p> <p>CoE Multiple funding within an overall framework established by public authorities is seen as...</p> <p>UK-Sc: Multiple <u>sources of funding are seen...</u></p> <p>Spain: Higher education <u>as a public service</u> has gained</p> <p>France: The refce to HE understood as a public good and and the public responsibility for it is also necessary here, as multiple sources of funding will not put this core Bologna value into question.</p>

Verwijderd: These instruments need closely relating to quality assurance and recognition and should be based on sound data collection and development of indicators.

Verwijderd: ing

Verwijderd: development of

Verwijderd: 6

Verwijderd: further sustainable development of institutions and

Verwijderd: institutional

Verwijderd: and as a way of a

Verwijderd: that

Verwijderd: is

	<p>Hungary: However, an attitude that considers higher education not as an expense but as a long term investment needs further - general - dissemination among higher education's stakeholders and decision-makers.</p>
<p>4.7. Follow-up structure The present organisational structure of the Bologna Process is endorsed as being fit for purpose</p>	<p>Finland: FOLLOW-UP STRUCTURE (not a priority, taken into account in headlining)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - we support continuing with the present structure - setting up working groups under BFUG with experts and policy makers from other fields might be too challenging to handle. We think that co-operation could bear fruit. Instead of new structures, it could be more practical to have national consultations and maybe seminars on precisely defined subject areas at the European level - if the policy forums with countries outside Bologna Process are needed, this document should introduce such structures - during the period 2007-2009 BFUG has organised tens of seminars. This has been, of course, important tool for grass-rooting the Process. To enhance Bologna Process implementing in all countries it could also be useful to organise Peer Learning Activities for a more targeted audiences (not all countries or players of the Bologna Process) based on for example regional needs or field-specific questions. <p>Germany: being fit for purpose: I miss here or in another place the reference to a regular monitoring of the progress by stocktaking in addition to data collection</p> <p>Czech Rep.: 4.8. Follow-up structure</p>
<p>In order to interact with other policy areas, BFUG will set up a number of working groups gathering experts and policy makers from other fields, like immigration, social security and employment.</p>	<p>Germany: ... BFUG will set up a number of working groups gathering experts and policy makers from other fields, like immigration, social security and employment. too ambitious – we certainly have to increase cooperation with these fields but perhaps in a different format</p> <p>Austria: In order to interact with other policy areas, BFUG will set up a number of working groups gathering experts and policy makers from other fields, like immigration, social security and employment. (deleted because national commitment is asked for)</p>
<p>The next ministerial conference will be organized in 2010 jointly by Austria and Hungary. The following ministerial conferences will be held in 2012, 2015, 2018 and 2020.</p>	<p>Austria: The Bologna Anniversary conference will be organized in 2010 jointly by Austria and Hungary.</p>
	<p>Norway: We would like to thank “the drafters” for the good work done in revising the document, and once again, we would like to express that Norway welcomes the revised draft</p>

Verwijderd: 7

Czech Rep.: General Comment

The underlying principles of the documents should be that our main priorities for future are as follows:

- 1) finalising the agenda of the Bologna Process – i.e. fostering the already implemented goals and finishing those which still wait for implementation
- 2) European Higher Education Area as part of the lifelong learning - i.e. lifelong learning is a framing, overarching concept, as stated in the text "a multifaceted concept, which may involve climbing higher up the qualifications ladder, extending knowledge, gaining new skills and competences, upon the recognition of prior learning or simply pursuing learning to enrich one's personal growth" – which is connected with other levels of the whole educational system
- 3) EHEA is responsive to the needs of labour market as well wider societal needs, including equity and cohesion. Public authorities should be clear about the role of different cycle qualifications in the public sector. Qualification frameworks prepared in cooperation with all the stakeholders could be supportive and similar approach might be expected in the private sector.
- 4) Cooperation with other countries and regions of the world is of utmost importance. EHEA should be responsive to the interest of the other countries and regions of the world. EHEA should establish links and be understandable to these regions and countries. The cooperation should be open as the Bologna Process can hardly find any criteria how to assess the outside-European systems to label them in an official way. The cooperation should be based on concrete topics of common interest.

The areas as governance and funding are also important and it should not be pretended that they do not exist. However, with the diversity of almost 50 different countries solutions at European levels should not be looked for and full flexibility should be given. What the role of Bologna should be is to provide a platform for spreading examples of good practices, help countries to identify why and where they work, provide information and make the countries learning from the results and activities of other organisations.

France: In the last line referring to the rhythm of ministerial cces over the next 2010-2020 period, we should tell why this is so... at least not to get rid of the momentum while having a necessary "life-span" to further implement actions at the grass-root level.

Formally :

> in order to make this report to Ministers for Louvain more "user-friendly" to them, a kind of Executive summary with main recommendations suggested for the future should be added.

> Last but not least, whenever a consensus is not reached, with important points are being raised on sensitive issues by several delegations, arguments "for" and "against" might be put forward.

Met opmaak:
opsommingstekens en
nummering

Pagina 74: [1] Verwijderd

Paul Dowling

9-12-2008 15:11:00

In the light of this greater diversification of higher education, the Bologna Process will contribute to the creation and to the monitoring of new instruments designed to show and measure the strengths of institutions with diverse mission statements. These instruments should be such that they help institutions of higher education to develop diversity and that they are relevant information tools for students and academic staff in higher education. For institutions of higher education such tools are necessary to allow them to establish cooperative partnerships and to compare and identify their competitive position.

Pagina 74: [2] Opmerking [r73]

ruth

18-12-2008 13:09:00

See comments above on the same issue: this is not the central issue for our higher education systems: 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 issues. The ability of HEIs to develop diverse missions successfully depends upon the appropriateness of the different incentive measures put in place by HE authorities.

Pagina 74: [3] Verwijderd

Univerzita Karlova v Praze

10-12-2008 13:50:00

These instruments need closely relating to quality assurance and recognition and