

## **Chapter 6**

### **The Preparation for the next Meeting**

## **Plenary Session:**

# **Conclusions and Proposals for Future Actions and Initiatives**

**Richard Foqué**, Antwerp, Belgium

We are coming now to finalize our meeting. It is good that we have maybe half an hour's time now for the first reactions to those two days of intensive work. I, myself, have seen a lot of points raised and if I compare it with previous Heads' Meetings, I would say that the same points were raised also two years ago but I have the impression that this year people came up with more precise remarks, more precise propositions, more precise comments to the four main items of the conference.

We had a first session on the curricula, on European curricula, a second session on all the systems of exchange mobility, ECTS system, a lot of interesting things were raised then we spoke about the relation between education and profession and this morning about quality assurance, assessment, self-assessment, internal assessment, external assessment and also the question coming up of accreditation. So, a lot of things to think about and we cannot deny that these four main issues are interrelated. The curriculum of course, is directly related to quality. It is important for maybe entrance to the profession and of course is also a key to exchange mobility. So we can go on and can make several layers, making interconnections and interrelations between the four issues.

Nevertheless, we should now move on. The yearly Heads' Meeting can play a very important role as I said at the beginning of this process to continue and take the initiative. If we don't do that all the students will do that for us and speaking for Belgium, it's the same maybe in other countries, the legislature as the ministries are already working on new legislation regarding the Bologna Implementation. We should be very careful in some ways in not only the way we would like to go. We should take initiatives. That's the main need which should come out of this meeting and then of course, how do we do that and how do we proceed or do we go further with concrete results because this is important. We cannot go on to refresh our minds and then go home and say well, we had very interesting discussion but I think we should be very concrete as well. I pass the word to Constantin Spiridonidis because he wants to make a suggestion on how we could proceed and it may be a start for discussion among us of the way we could work in the next year and prepare our 2003 meeting.

**Constantin Spiridonidis**, Thessaloniki, Greece

I will start from the beginning. I have the feeling that five years is enough to speak about experiences on such a kind of meeting. My feeling is that we should not continue to organize this meeting the way we did till now and we must change a little bit the way that we are working here. We work here and we leave this place for the next year. I think that we have to use the experience of all those previous years and introduce a new

scheme, which must be clear, transparent, efficient and responsible, and to open the participation to all participants in the preparation of the next meeting. I would like to confess to you that it was very difficult for us all those years to deal with the agenda because it appears as a kind of personal interpretation of the tendencies that someone could sense from the discussions, the feelings that someone could detect through the discussions and always, we felt that the structure of the agenda, which is the big responsibility of this meeting, must be something which is the result of a more collective and participatory process.

The fact that a new condition of funding appeared this year gave to this meeting a new possibility, which is to support in financial terms this preparation process and I think that we must use this advantage in order to make this meeting, I would say, more democratic probably but more open to people who participate in the event. I think we have to redefine what exactly this meeting is. All of us know, of course, and probably there is an evident answer but it must become clear that it's not a meeting where any power game is played. It's not a meeting, which represents the voice of schools of architecture in Europe, at least not yet. It is a meeting where people who care about the issues of architecture education and people who have an administrative role in the academic issues of the schools, participate in order to exchange information, to discuss and to circulate between them viewpoints and aspects, to raise questions which will be useful for the decision making or to undertake in the best case particular academic or political initiatives. The application we made in the framework of the extension of the previous meetings in the EAAE was that we asked for funding of a meeting, which will support the schools of architecture in the process of their introduction to the common European Higher Education Area.

In order to achieve a better quality of this discussion and the better quality of the organization of the event we must decide now the way that we will continue the discussion next year, if we will continue because maybe the decision will be no. So, it must be a very clear process, it must be very transparent and here we have to define the rules of our existence in order to avoid any misunderstandings or to create any kind of fears here or there. As I already told you in the beginning of the meeting the idea is to create a number of working groups, which will elaborate issues or themes, which appeared as the most significant in our debates in all the previous years. These working groups will prepare the themes for the next meeting and they will have this responsibility to prepare and introduce to the next meeting the results of their preparatory work. The program will have the possibility to support them financially. I cannot think at this moment of figures and budgets, but there will be a possibility to have support in order to work, to collect information, to elaborate or to ask people to elaborate this information and after to prepare for the next meeting the sessions in the framework of which this information will be diffused and probably, if necessary, some decisions or some statements probably could be made. This is the idea.

If this idea is considered as useful for our Meeting or there are probably others, we have to discuss it and decide. We have to decide it here and probably after that we have to define a kind of coordination of those groups in order to have a more coherent presence in that meeting. This year we had four sessions and of course, as Richard Foqué already mentioned, those sessions have very serious overlapping. Of course, the main subject and the most crucial one is the curriculum but we can see in the curriculum probably two different orientations: the one orientation is that which concerns the content of studies and that which concerns the system of studies speaking about the structure of the

program (three or four plus two, or five year continuous) and of course, the ECTS question, an issue that our discussions proved as extremely important. The evaluation is an issue which, remains one of the top issues in our discussion so, probably a working group will be concern with this subject and will deal with the way that we can discuss it. A fourth issue will probably be what we discussed yesterday and it concerns the relation with the profession. All kinds of interference between those two bodies, or two worlds maybe. So the idea is the structure of the program of the next meeting to have those four sessions and we will expect from the working groups to develop the main issues and prepare for the next year something more coherent. This is a very first approach and we can open the discussion for more inputs.

**Richard Foqué**, Antwerp, Belgium

So, if you take the suggestion of Constantin that it's a good idea to have these working groups preparing the conference for next year I think maybe it will be useful to have your opinion and your ideas about which working groups. We have the four sessions. The first idea is to have one working group according to issues but I can imagine that you have further ideas. You can say why not match two working groups to one because they are so much interrelated or not so, this maybe a point of discussion now that you form your opinion about, first of all the idea of working groups, secondly which ones.

**Dimitris Kotsakis**, Thessaloniki, Greece

First I would like to say a few words about the context in which you are going to do this, which is the Meeting of the Heads of Schools. I think we are really at the end of the after-the-Hania-Statement, at the end of what has been done here and some fears that were expressed in this room I think are justified. Not because there are bad intentions but, as I said in the first day, because if we are not careful we can slide. So, maybe it is something like an egg and maybe ends like the bird, which has been hatched by the egg then you know. It isn't. So, these four groups if we don't define the context in which they are we cannot define the mission statement, because the context gives the meaning to that and no matter what we say about the mission statement, if the context is not right then the mission statement would change.

So the context is, the framework are four points: this ENHSA is part of EAAE, in two senses: the first sense is membership, which means that it is not European Union, it is Europe, that is very important for what this Meeting is. Because if we are dealing with a space for education we have to be by definition and in action broader than the European Unions and even broader than the counties selected by the European Union as future members. So this very important and this is the context, Europe and not the European Union. These who are full members now, who pays for it, what are the papers that we must fill, these are technical matters I don't even get into.

The second point is who are the members of this ENHSA. The third point is what is the mission of this ENHSA. The members are not just individuals that belong to the Schools that form the EAAE. Members are representatives of the Schools. Maybe you have to change the H to an R. Representatives of two kinds; the one is the administration of the Schools, the other is the programmes of the schools. So, they do not need all the time people getting around, it depends on what is the discussion about, they represent their

Schools, they are sent by the Schools.

The third point is what is the mission of this, because if they represent Schools, the Union of the representatives of schools controls, deals with or has to be responsible for power, so we must be very careful about the definition of the mission and there are only two things that people can do. One is dialogue between Schools, people persons and the other is coordination, nothing more than that. And if there is a statement or a declaration then it will be very well prepared so that the schools know very well what their representatives are going to sign on. This is how I see the context.

Now, I'll come to the content, which is going to have meaning only in this context. Make three working groups quite clear, in fact they are not three they are two. The one is divided into two. The one is the programme and it is divided into curriculum first and then the system. The second is assessment. I shall start with the second first, because we had this discussion this morning. I think that Marvin Malecha was very kind as an honorary member of this Association when we talked about fusion. My feeling is that we are totally confused on the issue of assessment. You cannot give the mission statement to the group who is working on assessment unless we clarify the issues.

There are two kinds of assessment and taking in the levels and everything, there are six types of assessment. The first kind is the assessment by others, assessment by authorities, by economic powers. So, I am taking Marvin's point. First state accreditation, political authorities, they do assessment because they must accredit the courses. Second level is the professional accreditation. They do assessment because they have to do this. Third level is not about authorities but about market powers. They do a sort of ranking by several authorities which is a market assessment, the top ten everything. So these three levels of assessment are important to be mapped so that we know what is going on. But according to our Hania Statement, we are not interested in this. We are interested only because we are acting within this. So we must know what is going on so that we can react to it. It is a question of existence, the first kind of accreditation, it is our own not according to our statement but it is the context in which we exist or not exist, State, professional and market. Now, the second kind is what we have already declared, which is self-assessment and this has three different types; the first is the University accreditation which is internal accreditation of courses. Second is the peer assessment which is a kind of guarantee of transparency and effectiveness control. Third, which is the culmination point of the two previous points, the one I mentioned before is the civic and public responsibility taken by the Universities. This group has to make a map and a charter of the first kind but concentrate on self-assessment because this is where we are going to decide according to our Declaration. So this is one group of working.

The other two groups; the one which is the curriculum relates to two things not only the profession which is very very important, but also to the University context because this is University education of architects so the curriculum group should also map the professional requirements but there are other bodies as well doing that, UIA, ACE. And the other one the system, is all what we have been discussing, is readability, transparency, this is the ECTS system mobility, the degrees, Bachelor and so on, so they are quite a lot. I think that these three groups have to be the permission between the three, but the fourth group about the profession is not really our own group. We must be informed about because otherwise we cannot form the first group of the curriculum. This could be done in relation to the others.

**Herman Neuckermans**, Leuven, Belgium

I think that a number of groups also have to do with a number of people you can mobilize. I would like to make a small comment but not to get enter into the discussion. There is still a huge difference between assessment and accreditation.

**Richard Foqué**, Antwerp, Belgium

I suggest not to go to the discussion now. I don't think it is the right moment.

**Herman Neuckermans**, Leuven, Belgium

But I think that the first one even if it is a combined group as well discussing curriculum as well as the system it's a lot of work. It's huge but I know if you split it, there is a danger. But on the other hand if you keep it together it's a lot of work, it's more work. So, who is willing to... I'm a little bit confident about how difficult it is to get answers to a simple inquiry so, maybe it's challenging to mobilize you.

**Constantin Spiridonidis**, Thessaloniki, Greece

So, are there any comments, reactions about not necessary one, three, four or fifteen groups but on the structure of the preparation and the way that we have to precede?

**Joaquim Braizinha**, Lisbon, Portugal

Well, Constantin I can come back to the first meeting for instance, when a group of persons clearly asked you that was very important to continue doing these meetings in Hania or anywhere to discuss and to know what was happening with architecture teaching, what was happening with schools of architecture. You say that maybe it cannot continue and I suppose this is not what you are thinking really. We must continue but maybe in another way. This is a forum where we have to discuss this very important moment of changing of schools and changing of the paradigm that is going through the future of our schools so, it cannot change. We cannot stop, we must change but with evolution. About the items I think the items have already been seen. We have problems with the curriculum for the reasons we know. We have problems with our relation with the profession and the mobility and I suppose that we keep on discussing these if other problems that we have to discuss don't come from the authorities. I think that the only problem is, and I agree with you, to see who is going to prepare the new meeting because we know where the problems lie.

**Constantin Spiridonidis**, Thessaloniki, Greece

This is one interpretation of the silence of course, probably there are some other interpretations. That's why I'm asking.

**Herman Neuckermans**, Leuven, Belgium

Yes, that means that all of us are on your list that...I would like to say that in my perception

I agree with the structure Dimitris proposed to us. However, being a realist I would say that we may come to limit ourselves to produce a document, which is circulated or not but which is prepared before the next meeting on: first, relating to the curriculum only the thing of the course subjects, is that something that we can think of and the second is what I remember from our discussion and the second one is about the ECTS because those two things are very important for all of us, I think. That is a suggestion; to focus down on two documents in fact we promised it when we wrote our Hania Statement that we would work on the ECTS, that we would collaborate so, that's an issue that is not just one of 1000 in the list. It's something that we could focus on. Thank you.

**Richard Foqué**, Antwerp, Belgium

But I think this suggestion goes along the same lines as proposed by Constantin but if you want to prepare such a document, I'm quite in favor of that. You need a working group to do that and personally I think it would be best that this working group consists of a limited number of people who come from different countries and from different regions of Europe. That makes it much more efficient. So, in fact, I think you are supporting what we are suggesting.

**Herman Neuckermans**, Leuven, Belgium

I have a suggestion. I would like to participate in the self-assessment group and first of all I would like to invite those people who have experience in collecting information because we speak different languages, to put something together but this is not limited if more people are willing to collaborate from now, ok but I think that all those who went to the process and have written these things, they should gather together and produce something which is readable for all of us because of the difference of languages and we can now invite more people if they are willing to contribute. That's my suggestion. So, I'm more or less designating volunteers. It's very democratic.

**Joaquim Braizinha**, Lisbon, Portugal

Yes, by the assessment I would like to contribute with the experience we are now having in Portugal...I say that for instance I'm desperate to be in a working a group, for instance, on the assessment because we are in the middle of this process in Portugal so we will have a lot of experience to exchange.

**Carlos Weeber**, Delft, The Netherlands

A practical question. You started with a remark to think about next year. So, I want to propose not only working groups for that we have done now but also working groups to what we will do next year because otherwise if we go to repeat what we get this year it doesn't seem very...so, I want to know from you how you are going to prepare next year a connection with working groups because we need working groups to become better than this year. I'm sorry.

**Constantin Spiridonidis**, Thessaloniki, Greece

No, we never had working groups preparing the curriculum of the previous years. This is why we had bad preparation if you want to accept it more or less, ok. It was something, which was empirical, very introverted, not at all representative but it was the only way to have an agenda.

**Carlos Weeber**, Delft, The Netherlands

No, I don't criticize the situation, I want to know how you are going to prepare next year a connection with the working groups you are proposing.

**Richard Foqué**, Antwerp, Belgium

The question is if we agree about establishing working groups. How will be then the relation of the working groups of this year with the next conference that's I think a question that Carlos put forward and is a right question. I think the idea is straightforward that the agenda of the next meeting will be the results or conclusions of those working groups presented in the general assembly of the Heads and maybe and hopefully it, will prepare the Hania statement 2003.

**Carlos Weeber**, Delft, The Netherlands

I think we can spend part of the time this afternoon to search for new items for next year and connect this with another working group because it should be very stupid to repeat the discussions we had this year next year or I say we have to start another sort of content next year.

**Constantin Spiridonidis**, Thessaloniki, Greece

The idea was that the working group, and it's not the working group that we have here defined in the program, I was thinking about something like five or six or seven persons, who will undertake the responsibility to organize the session on a subject, for example the curriculum or the system of evaluation and from this subject they will raise a number of issues which will be organized by their own responsibility for the session even if this session will be a paper presentation, a presentation of cases, a presentation of different viewpoints or that session could be, if the working group decides it to be this way, an open discussion about that. So, there is not any kind of predefined way of the way that this working group will do this preparation and presentation. I think that it must be in the responsibility of the working group to organize the session in the way that this working group will decide. That was the theme. Of course, I understand that the reason is not to repeat the same themes but I don't have the feeling that the discussion groups in this session got to something which was very exhausted or very defined. On the contrary, I think that it was just a discussion which was without coherence and without orientation as it was all the previous years and this is why I say that's enough. Probably, this model will not work but at least we have to try something different. We must self-evaluate ourselves and this is myself that I say this thing first because I feel responsible up to a point for this condition.

**Richard Foqué**, Antwerp, Belgium

At least I think this conference as a conclusion you could say has defined the problem areas in a much closer way than before. Conclusion is these working groups which are proving that we have defined let's say, the important problem areas. I think it's important to work on those areas and to go further into deepening it and furthering it and may hopefully come to some results, which can be helpful in creating this European Higher Education Area in architecture. That's the aim, the overall aim, the main goal.

**Constantin Spiridonidis**, Thessaloniki, Greece

If there are issues that escaped from our discussion, and someone considers that he or she would be interested in creating a working group on those issues or even to introduce them in a discussion framework, I think that now is time to say it. The idea is that we ask groups of five, six or seven, we will see how many, persons, to develop an issue or a group of issues and undertake the responsibility to prepare a session for the next meeting.

**Herman Neuckermans**, Leuven, Belgium

Yes, I agree with what has been said that we don't have to repeat over and over again the same thing. You know, it's my position, that we need to accumulate our knowledge and the first thing anyhow is that we have to create these working groups, a small number of people willing to do something. The first thing we have to do is to report or to synthesize what has been said here and at least input that as something that is given for the next meeting, plus, that they have to further some subjects and as I propose, I propose to limit yourselves to a few subjects, which stand more chance to succeed. That's all. Core subjects, ECTS and the evaluation; put the different things together and then use this meeting to inform each other about what all these experiences can bring to the others. That's my position.

**Claudie Viatte**, Ministry of Culture, France

Je pense qu'il serait très intéressant de changer nos informations sur les trois, cinq, huit parce que même si des pays n'adoptent pas ce système je pense qu'en lieu d'information réciproque ici ce serait très intéressant de faire vraiment un point un peu exhaustif sur où en sont les écoles, qu'est-ce qu'elles produisent comme diplômés ou non diplômés à ce niveau-là qu'on sache vraiment entre nous ce qui se passe et je pense que les trois niveaux sont essentiels le Bachelor, le Master et ne pas oublier le Doctorat sur lequel je pense qu'il y a beaucoup d'échanges d'information nécessaire pour bien comprendre ce qui se passe en matière de recherches dans les différentes écoles.

**Richard Foqué**, Antwerp, Belgium

Ok, I'll try to make a short translation for those who don't speak French. Our colleague is saying that it's important to put into account that the way the education will be structured in the three cycles in fact the three years Bachelor, two plus two Masters plus also and she says that the importance of also the Doctorate, the three years or four years Doctorate. I think that's the main issue you are raising and I think this is also an input, it may be an

input to the working group. I don't think as I said to the others, we are not going to discuss again about the content but I think it's worthwhile to make a contribution to the input for the working group that is working on that. Thank you very much.

**Pierre Culand**, Bordeaux, France

Within the working group of curriculum, I would like to work on one, two subjects. One is what could be the shared diploma and second subject, what could be the requirement to enter the Masters.

**Constantin Spiridonidis**, Thessaloniki, Greece

Thank you very much. That's already something raised. Our colleague from Torino and after James Horan.

**Matteo Robiglio**, Torino, Italy

I would be very interested in working on the theme of assessment and quality assessment but I have two questions. I agree with the working group structure. I suggest that working groups should be more at a narrow so that they can be effective because it's very difficult to arrange learner's agendas in the academic world but in any world and they can report to assure transparency to the Website Constantin has presented. So, we can put papers and working materials by thematic areas on the site. Maybe somebody already says it's quite banal but that could use transparency and help people react while working groups are working so that we can come to the next Hania or at a meeting somewhere else with some statements but then I have a question that is really a newcomer's question to the President. Can EAAE state something? I mean that if we make a working group and we produce something that in my opinion will more or less look like a standard or something that a faculty should adhere to, when you are saying we are a company, in fact each faculty is a company and our problem is similar to the problem they care constructors had at the beginning of the century when everybody was making his own screws and it couldn't fit the screws with the others. But if we make a statement on that, this is a real question, which way EAAE decides that this output of the working groups becomes the reference? Because otherwise I fear that we produce just maps. Ok, maps are very interesting knowledge, exchanging knowledge, getting into new doctorate problems, everything I love it. But I need maps like the militaries do for action because we want to move from year to year and so, we need a map of the ground to move. If we stay to maps, then let's say that these working groups are just meant to map situations and give a good geography and then everybody is free to do whatever he wants but I can think the EAAE, that is my opinion, it's no longer the question, could make maybe a step forward something that becomes a reference to what of course, you are not compelled to adhere but you are encouraged to adhere. That's the normal way that we do a quality assessment and the only possibility of having quality assessment not just being a self-portrait in which everybody says that he is number one in Europe like cities do and they do urban market.

**Herman Neuckermans**, Leuven, Belgium

I think your question partially is inspired by the fact that you are a newcomer. I repeat now here that EAAE has no legal power. EAAE is a non-profit making association and the only thing it can do is to act as the voice of and to act as de facto voice of. This is maybe not enough but do you know that the European Architects' Directive has also no legal value but it's a very powerful directive. Last year we have taken position regarding the European Higher Education Area discussion and that has been circulated as a voice of the whole community of teachers, of Schools of Architecture to those people who ultimately made the decision. But that's for the moment all that we can do. The other track we are following without having the legal power is that we try to become part of the debate as a partner in the revision of the European directives concerning architecture and that's the reason why I mentioned very fast yesterday in the General Assembly that I attended the meeting with ACE because also I said a discipline exists in tension between the partners. ACE has the ambition to play a role in this revision of the Directive and our opinion is that EAAE is the counterpart in this dialogue and that's what we, EAAE are lobbying in fact but you cannot. We are a legal body but we have no legal power. It's a matter of convincing people. We respect that we are completely different from ACSA, the Americans, our sister association, who has this legal position in the accreditation of the schools. It's a completely different situation. Maybe we can achieve that in the course of time but we are not yet there and the only way we can do it is by lobbying and also by proofing our quality because lobbying by innocence is dangerous, I think.

**Richard Foqué**, Antwerp, Belgium

Thank you Herman for the clarification. I think it's sufficient for now. We have to close the session and the last intervention is from James Horan.

**James Horan**, Dublin, Ireland

One of the difficulties that I experience at meetings like this and conferences of this nature is that we have first of all, a very large number of people, all of whom individually have a huge amount of different experiences but it's always difficult to try and get some clear coordinated thinking coming from a group of this size. The discussions about the possibility of working groups I think, is extremely interesting and very important and I would put a proposal as to a methodology about how we might go about this process. First, there are many subject areas that we need to address as an organization and that goes from all sorts of things about accreditation, about methods of teaching, about the appropriateness of qualification. There is an endless list and it's very easy to wonder around like in a supermarket, not knowing exactly what to buy and what to pick up. What I suggest we might do as a starting point is to ask the individuals in this meeting after this session to sign their name to a paper outside here in the hallway and sign up their name and put down the topic in which they have a passionate interest. From that list we would form a series of working groups by people, who have already stated their commitment in this area. And if there are subjects that are not on the list we'll deal with them later. We will only deal with the stuff that we know. People will put in time and really put valuable work into it and if in the end of one year we have three, four or five topics carefully analyzed, discussed at length and presented to this meeting we would then be

able to publish something, which is the voice of the EAAE and becomes the credibility against which we are measured. That's how we get the power. We don't need the legal power if we are seeing to be effective. We will automatically get the power. Thank you.

**Richard Foqué**, Antwerp, Belgium

Thank you very much, James. I think it's an excellent suggestion and the applause is proving that we all agree. I think what we would suggest everyone could do that we put on that paper after lunch or before lunch.

**Stéphane Hanrot**, Marseille, France

Just to say that in this list of groups possible groups you will find one, which is dedicated to doctorates. The content of this working group was defined in Newsheet 62. I will put on a copy what was in the Newsheet. So, if you are interested, join us and work on that, put your name references and you will be informed of what is happening on this topic.

**Harun Batirbaygil**, Istanbul, Turkey

I feel a little bit trickled of the atmosphere I found here on behalf of our country. Therefore I don't feel empowered to contribute to those speeches and to groups by groups but I strongly feel that I want to work with the working groups. So, first of all, I think my colleague Kotsakis stated that we should clarify some points of working together. So, please clarify those and we'll have the courage to raise our hands for working groups. Thank you very much.

**Constantin Spiridonidis**, Thessaloniki, Greece

Of course, we have to clarify once again these points. You are very right to raise the issue and I'm really very glad that you raised it because I said that we must be transparent. I will speak as an individual. I really feel very uncomfortable because of this condition. I think that the possibility to overcome this condition exists. EAAE is an association which has no limitations of such kind that the European Union policies have. So, this is our ground and we are here as an association with no exclusions. Now, the fact that a process of funding creates such a kind of problems I believe that it is feasible to overcome it. I said it many times that this unfair for some EAAE members condition of discrimination has only financial implications which we can very easily overcome. It is only a decision of the EAAE to say that we cover the participation of our members who, because of that reason of European policies, are not equal to participate, making this way equal participants. I think that this is an obligation of the EAAE. So, this is a simple technical way to overcome that and to forget this distinction in this room and in our future meetings and to consider as necessary to have in these working groups persons regardless of their origin or country.

**Harun Batirbaygil**, Istanbul, Turkey

Ok, thank you. To further this, so, I would propose further to enrich this atmosphere and to invite all the people for the next meeting to Istanbul; if they found it appropriate, the next meeting could take place in Istanbul.

**Proposed WORKING GROUPS to elaborate on the issues raised at the debates of the Fifth Meeting of Heads, and will present the results and proposals of their work at the next Meeting of Heads which will be held in Hania, 3-6 September 2003.**

**1. Profession & Education**

1. Radford, Denis (Leicester, UK)
2. Johnston, Lawrence (Belfast, UK)
3. Krumlinde, Heiner (Bochum, Germany)
4. De Bleeckere, Sylvain (Diepenbeek, Belgium, states 'European Identity')
5. Tilmont, Michele (Lyon, Paris)
6. Roosebeeck, Marina (Amsterdam, The Netherlands)
7. Balogh Balazs (Budapest, Hungary)

**2. Assessment**

1. Kara Pilehvarian, Nuran (Istanbul, Turkey)
2. Foqué, Richard (Antwerp, Belgium)
3. Hilti, Hansjoerg (Liechtenstein, Switzerland)
4. Bridges, Alan (Glasgow, UK)
5. Braizinha, Joaquim Jose (Lisbon, Portugal)
6. Schaefer, Wim (Eindhoven, The Netherlands)
7. Robiglio, Matteo (Torino, Italy)
8. Neuckermans, Herman (Louvain, Belgium)
9. Onür, Selahattin (Ankara, Turkey)

**3. Curriculum (BA-MA-PhD)**

1. Batirbaygil, Harun (Istanbul, Turkey)
2. Wagner, Andreas (Karlsruhe, Germany)
3. Culand, Pierre (Bordeaux, France)
4. Henry, Didier (Paris, France)
5. Gatermann, Harald (Bochum, Germany)
6. Musso, Stefano (Genoa, Italy)
7. Vovaulin Kealm ?
8. Gökan, Koray (Istanbul, Turkey)
9. Hersek, Can (Ankara, Turkey)
10. Kotsakis, Dimitris (Thessaloniki, Greece)

**4. Exchange & Mobility**

1. Baranowski, Andrzen (Gdansk, Poland)
2. Van Cleempoel, Koenraad (Antwerp, Belgium)
3. Caglar, Nur (Ankara, Turkey)
4. Pilate, Guy (Brussels, Belgium)
5. Ruan, Jeanne Frence (Paris, France)
6. Michel, Michèle (Bordeaux, France)

**5. Doctorates**

1. Doevendans, Kees (Eindhoven, The Netherlands)
2. Hanrot, Stéphane (Marseille, France)
3. Tran, François (Lyon, France)
4. Verbeeke, Johan (Brussels, Belgium)
5. Liberloo, Roger (Diepenbeek, Belgium)
6. Culand, Pierre (Bordeaux, France)