

Summary

The mission of this Fifth Meeting of Heads of Schools of Architecture was to further anchor architectural education within the European Higher Education Area. The fact that, for the first time, this meeting was organised with financial support of EU provided a more official and institutional status. This support is channelled through ENHSA or 'European Network of Heads of Schools of Architecture', a division of EAAE (European Association of Architectural Education). Its activities also include the creation of a website as platform for communication; the formation of thematic sub-networks and research into matters related to architectural training. The annual meeting of heads of schools of architecture is its first and most important action.

This meeting was a logical follow-up of last year's edition on 'Bologna', which was concluded with a joined "Hania Statement 2001 - Regarding Architectural Education in the European Higher Education Area". The announcement that this Statement was adopted among the 'opinion papers' for the EU Berlin summit 2003 was an encouraging opening, and underlined the credibility of our work

The unanimous conclusion of last year was not repeated, but, as it turned out, the character of this meeting was more pivotal and oriented towards the future role of EAAE and its Annual Heads' Meeting. This Meeting's rather 'introvert' character is a sign that the so-called European Higher Education Area is starting to become reality for architectural education. Indeed, the reflective mood was caused by the recognition and identification of the many obstacles ahead. The most pressing ones - as identified by the organisers - were the subjects of the four sessions structuring the meeting : (1) Curricula of Architectural Education; (2) Exchange and Collaboration between Schools; (3) The relationship between Education and the Professional Context; and (4) Quality Assurance & Academic Assessment.

It soon became apparent that the many nuances and openings to related problems, which were addressed by the introductory panel, consequent plenary session and occasional workshops, were too vast to be dealt with in one Head's Meeting. As a consequence the proposed methodology was to create working groups tackling the most important subjects. Appointed by EAAE Council, these groups will work during the academic year and their reports will constitute the backbone for the next Head's Meeting. The following five subjects were short-listed: (1) Profession & Education; (2) Assessment; (3) Curriculum BA-MA-PhD; (4) Exchange & Mobility & (5) Doctorates.

By concluding it is necessary to mention two subjects that floated as red lines through the various sessions of the meeting, as well as the more informal discussions during coffee breaks and dinners. Firstly the repeated plead for discussing the matter of PhD's in architecture, and, related, the pressing issue of research and in particular 'Research by Design': how can we articulate the scientific status of architecture? Secondly there was the cry for clear information about one another on matters of curriculum, profile, strategy and assessment (ENHSA's questionnaires and website will possibly provide solutions).

Koenraad Van Cleempoel, (Antwerp, Belgium)

November 2002

Report on the Fifth Meeting of Heads of School of Architecture in Europe

Koenraad VAN CLEEMPOEL
Antwerp, Belgium, Secretary of the Meeting

Welcome & Opening

The opening of the conference is heralded with welcoming words of the following persons: The host, or director of the Center for Mediterranean Architecture who is proud of his newly restored premises and invites EAAE for future collaboration; Constantin Spiridonidis, organizer of the Hania meeting refers to this city as becoming a European Center for Architectural Education. He also states that because of EU involvement, these meetings start to gain an institutional status.

The mayor of the city is honored by this fifth EAAE conference in his city, and hopes that we found a permanent basis. He also thanks EU for sponsoring the event. The Prefect of the County of Hania announces the foundation of an architectural school specializing in conservation and restoration. The president of EAAE, Herman Neuckermans, feels like a host, but guest at the same time, because all preparatory work has been done in Greece.

Keynote lecture by Professor Dimitris Fatouros

Constantin Spiridonidis introduces the keynote lecturer, Emeritus Professor Dimitris Fatouros, former rector of the University of Thessaloniki, and former Minister of Education. The title of his lecture, "Who cares?" refers to the apparent indifference with respect to architectural education as encountered both on the level of official dealing with education, as well as colleague architects.

Prof. Fatouros supports the "Hania Statement 2001", where heads of European Schools of Architecture unanimously stated that an education leading to entry to architectural profession should take at least 5 years of full-time study. It is a clear reaction against the "compact intentions of bureaucraties", a trend which worries the speaker. In order to achieve the goals of "Hania Statement 2001", and to train the best possible architects we have to set out "axioms", so that we do not loose ourselves in details.

Essential in this debate is the challenge to identify and to describe the scientific character of the studio; the place where design is taught. Design is the most important component of architectural education, and yet the most difficult one to translate into a scientific vocabulary. Research into the domain of design, and a scientific approach in the studio work is conditional for securing the discipline

Prof. Fatouros admits, however, that he attempted to do this for the last 20 year without success. He tried to concentrate on conceptual thinking and link it to science; e.g. why a line is drawn like this and not a little bit different. Being not isolated, the speaker refers to the existing trends during 1960-70, mostly by Italians, that focused on "scientific design".

This critical thinking about processes that generate concepts seems absent in the present arena of architectural theory, the speaker fears.

So what can be identified as scientific about studio work? Fatouros draws a comparison with surgeons, who also operate in studio-like environments. For him studio's are bodies of knowledge that operate through their interactive character.

Also scientific, but equally difficult to grasp, is the process of 'problem solving thinking'. About this, he is also pessimistic, as it tends to disappear in many practices, which are lacking a certain methodology.

Concluding Prof. Fatouros invites us to counter this trend by poring our decisions and ideas into official documents, in order to persuade decision makers who seem no to care. We also have to take care of our own community as many architects are only concerned about jobs, rather than concentrating on education.

Introduction to the Conference

The Conference Organizer, Constantin Spiridonidis, welcomes a record number of 115 participants. This year, for the first time, the Hania Meeting is framed in the ENHSA-project, or "European Network of Heads of Schools of Architecture'.

Starting with some history, Spiridonidis explains how Hania started five years ago as a platform to create dialogue between the heads on common issues. Financing was partly done through sponsorship by architecture-related industries. As a consequence, one sessions of the three day programme was always occupied by the sponsors. So, in order to operate more freely, and gain space in the programme, we looked for alternative finance. EU presented such an opportunity, but to become eligible it was necessary to frame it in a larger network, which was to become ENHSA. Its mission is the gathering, analysis and distribution of information for the Heads of Schools of Architecture in order to help their decision-making.

The proposal included 4 concrete projects:

1. The Hania Meeting for the coming three years
2. Creation of a website as a channel of communication.
3. Thematic sub-networks around the disciplines of :
Construction / History & Theory / Urban Design / Architectural Design
4. Research in the field of Architecture.
This year information was collected on three subjects:
Radiography of the curriculum / Evaluation processes / Relation between
Education & Profession

The European Union accepted the ENHSA proposal, and, consequently, this Hania Meeting is the first to be funded independently from private sponsors.

The programme coordinator of this conference, Richard Foqué, equally welcomes the audience, and starts of by informing us about the afterlife of "Hania Statement 2002". He brings back to mind the main points:

1. Architecture takes five years of study or 300 ECTS

2. Bachelor cannot give access to profession
3. EAAE supports ECTS system as key to mobility, exchange, modularity & flexibility
4. EAAE will participate in the process of quality assessment and accreditation

Foqué then refers to the political dimensions of this "Statement", as it is listed as a 'Bologna Position Paper' among the 'Main Documents' on the official website of the forthcoming Berlin 2003 summit of the European Ministers of Education. It is thus becoming obvious to EAAE that such "Statements" are an instrument to influence on decision-makers. For Foqué this is a good enough incentive to conclude this Hania meeting with a follow-up Statement.

The Mission of this Meeting, Foqué continues, is to work and think together about the following four subjects:

1. A European Curriculum for Architectural Education
2. Exchange, Mobility and Collaboration between Schools in Europe
3. Relationship between Education and Profession
4. Quality Assurance and Academic Assessment

In order to obtain maximum results, he proposes an open meeting to stimulate discussion and confrontation of opinions in order to generate ideas and propositions. As a result, hopefully, there might be agreement on the formulation of common standpoints on these issues. It is to be understood that these items form the cornerstones for the creation of a Common Higher Education Space in Architecture

In terms of organization and structure of the conference, each a chairman and/or panel introduce the session, followed by plenary discussion and occasionally workshops. Albeit similar in concept to former meetings, new to this meeting is the task of the workshops. Each workshop should present a report with the agenda of the working group. The idea is that these working groups are formed during this conference and continue to work after the meeting in order to prepare the following Heads Meeting. There should be a working group for each session, addressing the following matters:

- State the context regarding the subject
- Define the problem area to be covered
- Formulate questions to be answered
- Propose methodology
- Establish Mission Statement
- Suggest candidates for collaboration

Foqué concludes by wishing all participants a fruitful and enjoyable conference.

Session 1

Curricula for Architectural Education in the Common European Higher Space

Presentation

This first session is paneled by Kees Doevendans (Eindhoven, The Netherlands), Alan Bridges (Glasgow, UK) and Johan Verbeecke (Brussels, Belgium).

Doevendans introduces their joined paper "A European Curriculum in Architecture?", which repeats the essentials of the Bologna concept, as well as the existing differentiation in European curricula. The question thus arises whether or not there should be 'core' elements in all curricula. As a source for comparing the different curricula he consulted the Worthington report and the results of the ENHSA questionnaire on curricula.

It becomes immediately apparent that differentiation in curricula depends on the typology of the school: either focusing on design (architectural schools) or technical matters (engineers). The structure of the curriculum also depends on an orientation towards generalization or specialization. An important advantage of Bologna is the ambition of more flexible curricula, modularized (or deconstructed?) through ECTS and making a distinction between the 'Offer-driven' Bachelor and the 'Demand-driven' Master. But the speaker warns that deconstruction of the curriculum may lead to a potential loss of identity. On the other hand, however, joined courses on master's level as well as a much more regulated student mobility help to 'save' or articulate one identity.

Not highlighted enough, according to Doevendans, is the PhD strategy. Architectural research is underdeveloped, and PhDs are not integrated in European curricula. There is an obvious opportunity for ENHSA and EAAE to stimulate the creation of a European PhD-network and research programmes. Inevitably, the speaker enters the same domains as Prof. Fatouros did during the open lecture: What are the criteria for design related research? What are the different types of Architectural Research? Surely, here are possibilities and opportunities for EAAE and ENHSA.

Along the same lines is the problem of architectural research: we must describe the scientific criteria of our discipline, which may possibly lead to 're-thinking' the studio work. There are different types of research in architecture, but the already mentioned concept of 'research by design' seems the one that concerns us most.

Doevendans also suggests to EAAE to be pro-active in relation to Quality Control and Accreditation. An internationally consistent system of quality control seems necessary and the 'peer review' method the most appropriate.

As conclusion, emphasis is put on: (1) the core qualifications of Bachelor & Master; (2) possible common subjects in the architectural curriculum; (3) curricula & profile of the school; (4) the scientific aspect of the discipline & the position of the PhD

Bridges and Verbeeck present the educational system at their respective schools, but Bridges broadens the discussion by addressing the subject of balancing education and profession: if one realizes that only 5% of the graduates becomes professional designers, it is necessary to define what can be taught in order not to disappoint the other 95%. For his school, this situation created new opportunities which are also featured on the enclosed print-out of the slides.

Plenary Discussion

During the plenary sessions, the subject of the discussion swings between issues dealing with the problem of the period & structure of the curriculum, and its contents.

Period/Structure

We all agree on the BA/MA structure, and the fact that architectural training should take at least 5 years. The profile of the five-year training is equally clear: the formation of

architects. But various participants raise the problem of profile and identity of the Bachelors: 'what shall we learn these people, what can a 3-year person do after leaving the system?'. No questions are provided, apart from Dutch participants who stress the independent status of education with respect to the profession; students will find their own way and we should give them as much conceptual baggage as possible, because that is something the profession will not learn them.

Also on the subject of the three-year programme is the concern about funding. There exists a trend to believe that national governments will take advantage of the short diplomas recognized by the profession (Bachelors), in order to cease funding on long-term diplomas (Masters). This sinister aspect of Bologna should not create fear and confusion, as long as there are clear guaranties.

A consistent and coherent implementation of the ECTS system is repeatedly mentioned to be very important, not in the least because mobility (see also the following session) may encourage academic competition. Along these lines, participants from Delft mention that their Master course is taught in English from this year onwards. The concept of academic networks and joined Masters -instead of a unified curriculum- is brought up again by Kees Doevendans.

Contents

Distilling from the discussion, there are three issues: the question of a 'common curriculum'; the relationship with the profession and the subject of research.

The president of EAEE refers to the Hania Statement 2001, which guarantees the diversity of existing programs. But, he argues, there might still be room for 'core' elements. There is opposition, as this may equally undermine the precious diversity and variety.

On the relationship between education and profession; the two opposite views are voiced by the UK and the Netherlands. In the first the professional organization RIBA influences considerably the contents of the curriculum, whereas Dutch participants stress the independent status of education, especially with relation to the profession.

Finally research; like in the opening lecture, there is again the notion of frustration when it comes to the scientific status of design. Are we able to integrate design into the scientific bibliography? Guido Morbelli states that if we want to compete with other scientific disciplines, we have to explain the specific character of design processes. And then, off course, how can we consolidate this 'scientific' knowledge into the curriculum?

Many participants express the wish, and need, to have clear information from one another. It seems absolutely necessary to have a comprehensive survey of the different curricula of the different schools of architecture in Europe. Questionnaire n° 2, which was circulated before the event, would provide that sort of information. It is clear that a discussion on a 'European Curriculum?' would benefit a great deal from such a chart of European curricula.

Keynote lecture by Architects Suzanne and Dimitris Antonakakis

Entitled "Thoughts on Architecture: the Defined and the Interminable", the speakers presented their theoretical ideas underlying their architectural work of their studio 'Atelier 66'. The point of departure is the tension between the interminable and the defined void. In order to ease the abstract discussion about these spatial relationships and the creative

process, they seek for parallels in literature, in particular the six American lectures of Italo Calvino written in 1985. Calvino distils six points that define directions for the process creating literature: (1) Lightness; (2) Quickness; (3) Exactitude; (4) Visibility; (5) Multiplicity & (6) Consistency.

The speakers mirror this to architecture and interpret the notions as follows: (1) Lightness; (2) Speed; (3) Precision; (4) Envision-Visibility; (5) Complexity & (6) Coherence.

There is a particular emphasis on the final notion; lightness. The buildings of 'Atelier 66' are characterized by a search for the diffusion and the impregnation of the built form with tiny pieces of infinite sky as well as adjacent or distant landscape. These aims are difficult to realize because of several obstacles, such as construction defaults or the attitude of the commissioner, they humbly admit. But some of their blocks of flats (e.g. Benaki Street & Doxapatri Street) show that, despite limiting conditions, it is still possible to realize certain intentions.

Another theoretical reflection is on the notion of 'exactitude' or 'precision', where Calvino refers to his obsession to limit the spectrum of his themes into smaller spectra, and consequently, his passion for details. The speakers recognize this search and link it to their time as apprentice of James Speyer (who, in his turn, studied with Mies Van der Rohe) who stressed the importance of moderation and measure that determines with precision the proportions. In this education they also discovered the 'applied discourse' measures, spaces and volumes.

The various allusions to literature and poetry are clearly reflected in the very elegant and pure architectural vocabulary of 'Atelier 66' as shown through several projects, including the university of Hania, museums, hotels and private residences. They show the integer and honest quest for an intellectual and integrated architecture.

Session 2

Exchange and Collaboration between Schools of Architecture in the European Higher Education Space

Presentation

Chaired by James Horan, the introduction panel further consisted of Michèle Michel (Bordeaux, France), Koenraad Van Cleempoel (Antwerp, Belgium), Alan Bridges (Glasgow, UK) and Christian Huetz (Regensburg, Germany).

In a joined presentation Michel and Van Cleempoel witness from their experiences as international programme coordinators. They first explain on terminology: institutional mobility vs. free mobility and long-term mobility vs. short-term mobility. In a section called 'main issues' they state that (1) mobility is necessary both for students and members of staff for developing a wider system of intellectual reference; (2) that the confrontation with different cultures, social and educational contexts enriches personal and cultural development; and (3) that we move from a national to a European space.

Their evaluation continues in seeing that most disadvantages of the exchange system seem to be voiced by the staff, and that most advantages are experienced by the students. As advantages they shortlist: (1) the mutual benefit of living in a different cultural and academic environment; (2) a fresh input of contents and methods, both on the level

of students and staff; (3) a better understanding of the position of ones own school within the international context; (4) the creation of networks; (5) a generation of more mature & international orientated students; (6) the improvement of linguistic skills; (7) the confrontation with new approaches towards architectural education; (8) the development of a more critical sense & a wider system of personal references. As disadvantages they immediately put (1) the different interpretations of the ECTS-system by the different schools; (2) the difficulty in understanding each others programmes and academic system; (3) language barriers; (4) the incompatibility of the academic calendar; (5) different systems of assessment & marking; (6) the difficulties with the 'Learning Agreement' and the transmission of transcripts of confirmed results; (7) a lack of confidence in the programme of the host school, and the existence of a situation of second assessments and juries; (8) it creates a gateway and escape route for weaker students; (9) problems in positioning incoming students at the right level; and (10) possible financial difficulties of some students.

Alan Bridges further elaborates on the problem of ECTS, as well as on the fact that some of his students haven't even traveled to the nearest big city in their own country, and are then confronted with a totally different situation. Christian picks up the point on finance: is Erasmus really democratic? He still sees that students with limited economic means are discouraged to participate as living abroad always turns out to be more expensive.

There are also some final observations: (1) that there is an increased demands from students, especially from EU countries; (2) the notion of national & trans-national 'Diploma shopping'; (3) the mobility is sometimes encouraged by the existing differences between the entry requirement of the different schools; (4) that Erasmus students sometimes become 'academic emigrants' when they decide to stay on in their host university; (5) the possibility that schools can offer modules on the international education market; and finally (6) that mobility may stimulate the competition between school.

As conclusion, the panel presents several suggestions: (1) to come to a general implementation of the ECTS value and structure; (2) to come to a unified ranking system; (3) to come to more comparable & transparent curricula; (4) and to have more confidence in the partnership. The chairman expresses his strong opinion that mobility and exchange are exceptionally important, and that its advantages are much more important than the disadvantages.

(there is no plenary discussion)

Keynote lecture by Architect Dan Hanganu

With certain irony Mr. Hanganu opens his presentation how he experienced his childhood and architectural training during the communist regime in Rumania, his home town. His stay in Paris during 1968, and his departure soon afterwards to Canada and the USA was definitive. Nevertheless, this evening he would like to show us that his buildings still carry a certain 'Memory' of that personal past. By that he means that architectural is always 'conditioned' by nationalistic elements settled in ones genes. Also, according to Mr. Hanganu, there is discrepancy between what you see and what you intend.

What follows is an overview of the last fifteen years of his work with particular emphasis on the most recent projects. His Montreal-based practice, founded in 1978, realized the Laurier Design Centre, the Abbey Church of St. Benoit du Lac, the Theatre du Nouveau

Monde in Montreal, and more recently the Pavilion de Design at University of Quebec at Montreal and the Law Library at McGill University. In 1992, Mr. Hanganu received the Governor General's Award for the Pointe-a-Calliere Museum of Archeology and the prestigious Prix Paul-Emile Borduas. His final project for the evening is the headquarters of the Cirque du Soleil.

During the overview of his buildings Mr. Hanganu elaborates on various subjects: the tension between masonry and metal, the notion of transparency in larger buildings (e.g. the monastery of St Benoit), and his observation that Architecture in the USA becomes increasingly meaningless, and solely focuses on financial implication. Also, he finds, as building materials become increasingly elegant and sophisticated, the design of buildings' exterior seem to move in an opposite direction.

Session 3

The European Higher Education Space in Architecture and the Professional and Institutional Context

This session is completely taken in by the presentation of the results of a research carried out by Lawrence Johnston (Belfast, UK) and Koenraad Van Cleempoel (Antwerp, Belgium) on the subject of 'The Relationships between Architectural Education, Internship and Competence to Practice'. ARB, or Architectural Registration Board (London) commissioned the research. The main focus was to chart the existing variety within EU for the entry condition to the bodies regulating the practice of architecture. An excel database with basic, but systematic and consistent information on all architectural schools of the EU was also composed. During the presentation, Johnston focused on the different routes to Academic Qualifications in architecture, but mostly on the entry conditions that permit architectural candidates to practice as an architect. Different entry conditions, such as internship or additional examinations are surveyed and the difference between official regulating bodies (such as national orders) and private institutions (such as RIBA) is also explained.

The content of this study is still property of ARB, but publication is envisaged.

Session 4

Quality Assurance and Academic Assessment of Educational Programmes in Architecture in the European Higher Education Space

Presentation

This session is introduced by Katia Baltzaki (Greece), who presented a preliminary evaluation of the results of the questionnaire 'Concerning the Implementation of Self-Assessment Procedures in European Schools of Architecture'. The speaker brings back to memory the Hania Statement 2001, where it says that to EAAE is willing to participate in quality assurance and assessment systems, as well as the need to respect the existing diversity in European schools of architecture.

The questionnaire was composed in order to survey considerations, decisions or

implementations of self-assessment procedures. Because the collection and analysis of completed questionnaires is still in process, a conclusive presentation of results is not yet possible. From the answers given so far, however, it already seems as if a majority of schools have already implemented, or intend to implement self-assessment procedures. Those with implementation apply self-assessment procedures to all their activities. The motivation to start self-assessment is sometimes related to funding decisions or faculty's policies, but usually it is imposed from the national educational systems. The conception that self-assessment forms the key to a more elevated status is universal. Methods of self-assessment vary considerably and it also seems as if a common context is absent.

The speaker concludes by stating there are still lots of empty questionnaires on the web. As this is the only medium to chart the existing situation, a collaboration of all participants is necessary.

Plenary Discussion

The discussion is introduced by Herman Neuckermans (Louvain, Belgium). He wonders why so few participants responded to the questionnaire in self-assessment that was circulated two months before the conference. Speaking from personal experience as a member of an assessment board, Neuckermans, immediately focuses on the problem of assessing the design studio, which is, nevertheless a core discipline of our curriculum. A colleague from Germany replies that in his country a recently established bureau assists schools of architecture in preparing a self-assessment report. This information will soon be put on the ENSHA website. Alan Bridges (Glasgow, UK) explains that the UK has a well-developed scheme for such purposes; 'Architect Benchmark Scheme', which is equally available on the web.

Constantin Spiridonidis wonders how we can collect data on different methods in different schools and countries, and suggest that we use the already mentioned questionnaire.

From Germany we hear that assessment is organized by the state, but there are differences between the Länder. Andreas Wagner (Karlsruhe, Germany) explains how it evolved, in a system where three universities assess one another, among colleagues, under the supervision of ETH in Zurich. Richard Foqué (Antwerp, Belgium) stresses the importance of national accreditation, which will become the result of assessment. Soon, Foqué believes, this will become a matter of common interest and concern and EAAE should take position in this international debate.

Juhani Katainen (Tampere, Finland) also has experience as an evaluator in Gratz, and he urges for prudence on the side of the evaluators as they are always bound to their culture, and will consequently project this their exercise. He also refers to the UIA charter on the matter of assessment.

Marvin Malecha (Raleigh, USA) explains how USA seems obsessed with self-assessment, and has, over the years, distilled 5 different types of assessment:

1. Accreditation
2. What the faculty senate does in relation to the curriculum
3. The competition among universities (referring to the Lombardi report - titled 'The Top American Research Universities')
4. Peer review
5. Public surveys on ranking (can be done by journalists)

Malecha has the impression, after hearing this discussion on different methods and suggestions, that people in Europe do not make these distinctions.

Session 5

Plenary Session: Conclusions and Proposals for Future Actions and Initiatives

The Meeting's programme coordinator, Richard Foqué, explains how interwoven the four sessions are. He invites the audience to think together on to proceed from here, as we should try to come to concrete results.

The conference organizer, Constantin Spiridonidis, is of the opinion that the exchange of ideas of the past days has been fruitful, but the time is ripe to start working in a different fashion. This has been the fifth conference of its kind and so far the methodology never changed. We should, therefore, now define the mission of these meetings. He strongly believes that it should remain a platform where people meet who care about architectural education, and who wish to participate in order to receive information and raise points of discussion. The first motivation to apply for EU funding was just that: to establish architectural education within the European Higher Education Area. In order to create the necessary transparency for achieving this, it is our task set out a consistent methodology. The concept of working groups as explained at the outset of this conference seems therefore the appropriate method

The question is put to the participants. Dimitris Kotsakis (Thessaloniki, Greece) stresses the importance of framing the workshops in the right context, which would be:

1. ENHSA is part of EAAE
2. members of ENHSA are school representatives
3. Mission of ENHSA is (1) Dialogue and (2) Coordination

He suggests the creation of three working groups around (1) Assessment, (2) Curriculum & (3) System. There are two types of Assessment: by others (state accreditation / professional accreditation / market itself or ranking); or through self-assessment (internal accreditation / peer review / civic and public responsibility). The group on Curriculum should map both the professional and the university requirements). The working group on System looks into mobility & ECTS.

Herman Neuckermans (Louvain, Belgium) agrees with the concept of working groups, but suggests focusing down on two issues: Course description and ECTS.

Karel Weeber (Delft, The Netherlands) suggests that the working groups are not only constructed around existing subjects, but that they should also reflect on the topics for next year's conference. Constantin Spiridonidis repeats the proposed methodology whereby these groups distill issues from the aforementioned sessions, in order to feed next year's programme, which will, consequently, differ in subject from this version.

Matteo Robiglio (Torino, Italy) also believes in the working groups, but gives the advice to maintain transparency between the groups. Allegorically, he states that EAAE should not only chart information, but that we should also navigate with these maps. Therefore, he asks about the status and power of EAAE. Its president, H. Neuckermans, replies that EAAE can only voice and distribute opinions, but has no legal power. Just like ACE, its

professional counterpart, it can participate in debates and acts as a lobby group.

James Horan (Dublin, Ireland) focuses again on the methodology of the working groups. In order to proceed from here, he suggests that all participants write down their name and personal interest. From this list working groups are composed. This list is transcribed as an appendix. It results in five groups: (1) profession & education; (2) assessment; (3) Curriculum; (4) Exchange & Mobility; (5) Doctorates. Horan suggests not to go into an 'ad-hoc' grouping right now, but the council will set up the methodology and composition of the groups. He thus asks for the authority, and trust in the council.

Constantin Spiridonidis wonders if it would be worthwhile to create a coordinating committee for this purpose, as the council may not be the appropriate body for such matters. In a reaction, James Horan, believes that too many committees may lead to fragmentation. Furthermore, at the end of the day the council is responsible anyway. Neuckermans (ibid.) and Juhani Katainen (Tampere, Finland) agree by stating that the Council should take up its responsibility on these matters. Horan gives a nuance by saying that the council has no intention to impose anything, but that there is need to advance a coherent methodology and a consistent framework.

Richard Foqué sees the apparent opposite opinions of Spiridonidis and Horan, but suggests that the Council, eventually, delegates the preparation of Hania to an executive committee. He also believes that EAAE should behave professionally vis-à-vis its members.

The president of EAAE, Herman Neuckermans, concludes this meeting by thanking Maria Voyatzaki and Constantin Spiridonidis again for organizing this meeting. Loud applause echoes the president's gratitude and recognition.