

## **Appendix**

### **Documents about Architectural Education and the Common European Higher Education Area**



# The Role of the Universities in the Europe of Knowledge

Commission of the European Communities

Brussels, 05.02.2003

## Summary

This Communication seeks to start a debate on the role of Universities<sup>1</sup> within the knowledge society and economy in Europe and on the conditions under which they will be able to effectively play that role. The knowledge society depends for its growth on the production of new knowledge, its transmission through education and training, its dissemination through information and communication technologies, and on its use through new industrial processes or services. Universities are unique, in that they take part in all these processes, at their core, due to the key role they play in the three fields of research and exploitation of its results, thanks to industrial cooperation and spin-off; education and training, in particular training of researchers; and regional and local development, to which they can contribute significantly.

The European Union therefore needs a healthy and flourishing university world. Europe needs excellence in its universities, to optimise the processes which underpin the knowledge society and meet the target, set out by the European Council in Lisbon, of becoming the most competitive and dynamic knowledge-based economy in the world, capable of sustainable economic growth with more and better jobs and greater social cohesion. The European Council in Barcelona recognised this need for excellence, in its call for European systems of education to become a "world reference" by 2010<sup>2</sup>.

However, the European university world is not trouble-free, and the European universities are not at present globally competitive with those of our major partners, even though they produce high quality scientific publications. The Communication notes a number of areas within which reflection, and often also action, is needed, and raises a series of questions such as:

- how to achieve adequate and sustainable incomes for universities, and to ensure that funds are spent most efficiently;
- how to ensure autonomy and professionalism in academic as well as managerial affairs;
- how to concentrate enough resources on excellence, and create the conditions within which universities can attain and develop excellence;
- how to make universities contribute better to local and regional needs and strategies;
- How to establish closer co-operation between universities and enterprises to ensure better dissemination and exploitation of new knowledge in the economy and society at large

---

<sup>1</sup> In this Communication, the term "universities" is taken to mean all higher education establishments, including, for example, the "Fachhochschulen", the "polytechnics" and the "Grandes Ecoles".

<sup>2</sup> Barcelona European Council - Presidency Conclusions.

- how to foster, through all of these areas, the coherent, compatible and competitive European higher education area called for by the Bologna Declaration, as well as the European research area set out as an objective for the Union by the Lisbon European Council, in March 2000.

This Communication, which has been prepared in the context of the 2003 Spring European Council, invites responses to these questions from all those concerned with higher education, research and innovation. The Commission will review the state of the debate in the summer of 2003 and identify suitable initiatives, possibly in a further Communication for examination by the Education Ministers in the Education Council and the Research Ministers in the Competitiveness Council, as well as by the European Summit of Higher Education Ministers scheduled for 18-19 September 2003 in Berlin.

## 1. Introduction

The creation of a Europe of knowledge has been a prime objective for the European Union since the Lisbon European Council of March 2000. Subsequent European Councils, particularly Stockholm in March 2001 and Barcelona in March 2002, have taken the Lisbon objective further forward.

The Lisbon agenda calls for efforts from a wide range of players. These include the universities, which have a particularly important role to play. This is because of their twofold traditional vocation of research and teaching, their increasing role in the complex process of innovation, along with their other contributions to economic competitiveness and social cohesion, e.g. their role in the life of the community and in regional development.

Given their central role, the creation of a Europe of knowledge is for the universities a source of opportunity, but also of major challenges. Indeed universities go about their business in an increasingly globalised environment which is constantly changing and is characterised by increasing competition to attract and retain outstanding talent, and by the emergence of new requirements for which they have to cater. Yet European universities generally have less to offer and lower financial resources than their equivalents in the other developed countries, particularly the USA. Are they in a position to compete with the best universities in the world and provide a sustainable level of excellence? This question is particularly topical as enlargement draws nearer, considering the frequently difficult circumstances of universities in the accession countries as regards human and financial resources.

To implement the Lisbon agenda, the European Union has embarked upon a series of actions and initiatives in the areas of research and education. One example is the European area of research and innovation, to achieve which fresh perspectives have just been opened up<sup>3</sup> and, in this context, the objective to increase the European research and development drive to 3% of the Union's GDP by 2010<sup>4</sup>.

In the area of education and training, we can mention the achievement of a European

---

<sup>3</sup> European Commission, Communications "Towards a European research area", COM (2000) 6 of 18.1.2000 and "The European research area: providing new momentum", COM (2002) 565 of 16.10.2002.

<sup>4</sup> European Commission, Communication "More research for Europe/towards 3% of GDP", COM (2002) 499 of 11.9.2002.

area of lifelong learning<sup>5</sup>, the implementation of the detailed work programme on the objectives of education and training systems<sup>6</sup>, work to strengthen the convergence of higher education systems, in line with the Bologna process, and vocational training systems, in line with the Copenhagen declaration.

European universities as such have not recently<sup>7</sup> been the focus of reflection and debate at European Union level. The Commission seeks to contribute to such a debate, and this Communication accordingly examines the place and role of European universities in society and in the knowledge economy (Section 3), offers some ideas on universities in a European perspective (Section 4) and sets out the main challenges facing the European universities, along with some issues for consideration (Section 5).

The Commission calls upon all players concerned (universities themselves, the rectors' conferences, national and regional public authorities, the research community, students, business and the people of Europe) to make known their comments, suggestions and points of view on the various aspects addressed by this Communication<sup>8</sup>. In the light of the contributions the Commission receives from this consultation, it will determine future action and whether to submit a follow-up communication for the Education Ministers (in the Education Council) and the Research Ministers (in the Competitiveness Council), as well as to the European Summit of Higher Education Ministers scheduled for 18-19 September 2003 in Berlin as part of the Bologna process.

## 2. The European University Today

### 2.1 *The universities at the heart of the Europe of knowledge*

The knowledge economy and society stem from the combination of four interdependent elements: the production of knowledge, mainly through scientific research; its transmission through education and training; its dissemination through the information and communication technologies; its use in technological innovation. At the same time, new configurations of production, transmission and application of knowledge are emerging, and their effect is to involve a greater number of players, typically in an increasingly internationalised network-driven context.

Given that they are situated at the crossroads of research, education and innovation, universities in many respects hold the key to the knowledge economy and society. Indeed, universities employ 34% of the total number of researchers in Europe, although national figures vary in the ratio of one to three between Member States (26% in Germany, 55% in Spain and over 70% in Greece). They are also responsible for 80% of the fundamental research pursued in Europe.

In addition, universities train an ever increasing number of students with increasingly higher qualifications, and thus contribute to strengthening the competitiveness of the

<sup>5</sup> European Commission, Communication "Making a European area of lifelong learning a reality", COM (2001) 678 of 21.10.2001.

<sup>6</sup> Detailed work programme on the follow-up of the objectives of education and training systems in Europe, OJ C 142 of 14.06.2002, p. 1.

<sup>7</sup> European Commission, Memorandum on higher education in the European Community, COM (1991) 349 of 5.11.1991.

<sup>8</sup> See Section 7 "How to make a contribution".

European economy: one third of Europeans today work in highly knowledge-intensive sectors (over 40% in countries like Denmark and Sweden), which have on their own accounted for half the new jobs created between 1999 and 2000).

Universities also contribute to the other objectives of the Lisbon strategy, particularly employment and social cohesion, and to the improvement of the general level of education in Europe. Many more young Europeans have a higher education qualification today than in previous generations. While some 20% of Europeans aged between 35 and 39 hold such qualifications, this figure is a mere 12.5% for the 55-59 age group. If we look at the total population aged 25-64, the rate of employment of persons holding higher education qualifications (ISCED 5 and 6) stood at 84% in 2001, i.e. almost 15 points above the average taking all education levels together, and nearly 30 points more than people having completed only lower secondary level (ISCED 0 to 2). Finally, the rate of unemployment amongst those holding higher education qualifications stood at 3.9% in 2001, one third of that of persons with a low level of qualifications.

### **3. The European university landscape**

There are some 3 300 higher education establishments in the European Union, approximately 4 000 in Europe as a whole, including the other countries of Western Europe and the candidate countries<sup>9</sup>. They take in an increasing number of students, over 12.5 million in 2000, compared with fewer than 9 million ten years previously.

The European university landscape is primarily organised at national and regional levels and is characterised by a high degree of heterogeneity which is reflected in organisation, governance and operating conditions, including the status and conditions of employment and recruitment of teaching staff and researchers. This heterogeneity can be seen between countries, because of cultural and legislative differences, but also within each country, as not all universities have the same vocation and do not react in the same way and at the same pace to the changes which affect them. The structural reforms inspired by the Bologna process constitute an effort to organise that diversity within a more coherent and compatible European framework, which is a condition for the readability, and hence the competitiveness, of European universities both within Europe itself and in the whole world.

European universities have for long modelled themselves along the lines of some major models, particularly the ideal model of university envisaged nearly two centuries ago by Wilhelm von Humboldt in his reform of the German university, which sets research at the heart of university activity and indeed makes it the basis of teaching. Today the trend is away from these models, and towards greater differentiation. This results in the emergence of more specialised institutions concentrating on a core of specific competences when it comes to research and teaching and/or on certain dimensions of their activities, e.g. their integration within a strategy of regional development through adult education/training.

---

<sup>9</sup> By way of comparison, there are over 4 000 higher education establishments in the USA, 550 of them issuing doctorates, and 125 identified as "research universities". Of these, some 50 account for the lion's share of American academic research capacity, public funding in support of university research and the country's Nobel prizes for science.

### 3.1 *The new challenges facing European universities*

All over the world, but particularly in Europe, universities face an imperative need to adapt and adjust to a whole series of profound changes. These changes fall into five major categories.

#### *Increased demand for higher education*

This will continue in the years ahead<sup>10</sup>, spurred on simultaneously by the objective of certain countries of increasing the number of students in higher education<sup>11</sup> and by new needs stemming from lifelong learning. This increase, which Europe's low birth rates are not expected to slow down in any great measure, will further intensify capacity saturation in the universities.

How can this increasing demand be met, considering the limited human resources (which can be expected to become a deficit, both as regards teaching staff and as regards researchers, in the years ahead) and the limited financial capacity (which does not keep in step with requirements)? How can sustainable funding of universities, constantly beleaguered as they are by fresh challenges, be ensured? It is crucially important to maintain and strengthen the excellence of teaching and research, without compromising the level of quality offered, while still ensuring broad, fair and democratic access.

#### *The internationalisation of education and research*

The momentum of internationalisation is considerably speeded up by the new information and communication technologies. The result is increased competition. Competition between universities and between countries, but also between universities and other institutions, particularly public research laboratories (where research staff are not expected to meet simultaneous teaching commitments), or private teaching institutions, often specialised and sometimes run on a profit-making basis. An increasing share of the funds allocated to the universities is distributed on a competitive basis and this means ever keener competition to attract and keep the best talent.

Be that as it may, European universities are attracting fewer students and in particular fewer researchers from other countries than their American counterparts. The former in 2000 attracted some 450 000 students from other countries, while the latter attracted over 540 000<sup>12</sup>, mostly from Asia<sup>13</sup>. More significantly, the USA in proportion attracts many more students from other countries at advanced levels in engineering, mathematics and informatics, and are successful in keeping more persons with doctorate qualifications: some 50% of Europeans who obtained their qualifications in the USA stay there for several years, and many of them remain permanently.

<sup>10</sup> European Commission, Joint Research Centre, Report on "The future of education between now and 2010", June 1999.

<sup>11</sup> Countries such as the United Kingdom and Denmark have set a target of training 50% of a given age group at university level between now and 2010.

<sup>12</sup> European Commission, DG RTD, Key Figures 2002 (based on OECD and Eurostat data)

<sup>13</sup> Students from four Asian countries (China, India, Japan and South Korea) on their own accounted for nearly 40% of the total of foreign students in the USA (Open Doors 2001, IIE, New York).

European universities in fact offer researchers and students a less attractive environment. This is partly due to the fact that they often do not have the necessary critical mass, which prompts them to opt for collaborative approaches, e.g. creation of networks, joint courses or diplomas. But other factors, outside the university, play also an important role, e.g. the rigidities of the labour market or lower entrepreneurship entailing fewer employment opportunities in innovative sectors. This is reflected in lower performances in e.g. research funding, links to industry, patenting rates and spin-off creating rates than in the USA and Japan<sup>14</sup>.

*To develop effective and close co-operation between universities and industry*

Co-operation between universities and industry needs to be intensified at national and regional level, as well as geared more effectively towards innovation, the start-up of new companies and, more generally, the transfer and dissemination of knowledge. From a competitiveness perspective it is vital that knowledge flows from universities into business and society. The two main mechanisms through which the knowledge and expertise possessed and developed by universities can flow directly to industry are the licensing of university intellectual property, and spin-off and start-up companies .

Although little data is currently available in Member States on the extent to which universities are commercialising their research, so that it is difficult to say how well universities across the European Union are exploiting research results with the enterprise sector, some data are available through the "Community Innovation Survey" (CIS). The CIS asks enterprises, inter alia, about the most important sources of information for innovation. The results<sup>15</sup> show that education-related and public research sources are ranked very low. Less than 5% of innovative companies considered information from government or private non-profit research institutes, and from universities or other higher education establishments, as being a very important source of information.

It would facilitate the dissemination of knowledge into the EU industrial fabric, including SMEs in traditional sectors, if universities were actively to pursue the promotion of effective university-industry relationships, and better to exploit the results of their knowledge in relationships with industry. Evaluation criteria for the performance of universities' could take account of this challenge.

The European Commission will continue to analyse the existing barriers and factors conducive to this co-operation and will disseminate the results widely to interested circles.

*The proliferation of places where knowledge is produced*

This development and the increasing tendency of the business sector to subcontract their research activities to the best universities mean that universities have to operate in an increasingly competitive environment. The result that is on top of the traditional links between the universities of a given region and the businesses in the surrounding area

---

<sup>14</sup> European Commission, Communications "Towards a European research area", COM (2000) 6 of 18.1.2000 and "The European research area: providing new momentum", COM (2002) 565 of 16.10.2002.

<sup>15</sup> "Statistics on Innovation in Europe" Data 1996-97, EUROSTAT

new relations have appeared in the picture. Geographical proximity is no longer the main basis for selecting a partner. High-tech businesses, for their part, tend to set up near the best-performing universities. The shortening of the time lag between discoveries and their application and marketing raises the question of the role and the contribution of universities to the process of technological innovation and the links between them and the business sector.

### *The reorganisation of knowledge*

This is to be seen in particular in two trends which pull in opposite directions. On the one hand, we have the increasing diversification and specialisation of knowledge, and the emergence of research and teaching specialities which are increasingly specific and at the cutting edge. On the other, we see the academic world having an urgent need to adapt to the interdisciplinary character of the fields opened up by society's major problems such as sustainable development, the new medical scourges, risk management, etc. Yet the activities of the universities, particularly when it comes to teaching, tend to remain organised, and more often than not compartmentalised, within the traditional disciplinary framework.

The reorganisation of knowledge can also be seen in a certain blurring of the borders between fundamental research and applied research. This does not go so far as totally to remove the meaning of the difference between, on the one hand, the pursuit of knowledge essentially for its own sake, and on the other its development with a view to specific objectives, particularly the conversion of existing knowledge into products, processes and technologies.

Fundamental research therefore remains a major area for university research activity. It is this capacity in the big American research universities that makes them attractive partners for industry, which in turn provides them with substantial funding for it. Fundamental research in this context is therefore conducted with its application very much in mind, but at the same time without losing its fundamental character. In Europe, universities tend to undertake directly applied research for the business sector, extending even to the provision of scientific services, which if taken to excess could endanger their capacity to contribute to the progress of knowledge.

### *The emergence of new expectations*

Alongside its fundamental mission of initial training, universities must cater for new needs in education and training stemming from the knowledge-based economy and society. These include an increasing need for scientific and technical education, horizontal skills, and opportunities for lifelong learning, which require greater permeability between the components and the levels of the education and training systems. European universities are directly concerned by scientific education, in particular because they train science teachers for secondary education. In addition, the contribution expected of universities to lifelong learning strategies leads them gradually to widen the conditions of access to this area of tuition (in particular to allow access to those not coming through the route of upper secondary education, through better recognition of skills acquired outside university and outside formal education); to open up more to industry; to improve student

services; and to diversify their range of training provision in terms of target groups, content and methods.<sup>16</sup>

The growth of the knowledge economy and society also leaves universities to become more closely involved in community life. Alongside and as a natural result of the exercise of its fundamental missions to produce and transmit knowledge, the university today functions particularly as a major source of expertise in numerous areas. It can and must increasingly become a forum of reflection on knowledge, as well as of debate and dialogue between scientists and people.

Given that they live thanks to substantial public and private funding, and that the knowledge they produce and transmit has a major impact on the economy and society, universities are also accountable for the way they operate and manage their activities and budgets to their sponsors and to the public. This leads to increasing pressure to incorporate representatives of the non-academic world within universities' management and governance structures.

## **4. What is at stake for Europe?**

### *4.1. Universities and the European dimension*

Responsibilities for universities lie essentially in the Member States at national or regional level. The most important challenges facing the universities, by contrast, are European, and even international or global. Excellence today is no longer produced or measured at the national level, even in the biggest European countries, but at the level of the European or world community of teachers and researchers.

The question arises in this context as to the compatibility and the transparency of the systems whereby qualifications are recognised (which lies at the core of the Bologna process of convergence), and that of the obstacles to the mobility of teachers and researchers<sup>17</sup> in Europe. Student mobility, for instance, is still marginal in Europe. In 2000, a mere 2.3% of European students were pursuing their studies in another European country<sup>18</sup> and while the mobility of researchers is higher than that of the average of the population concerned, it is still lower than it is in the USA. The divergence between the organisation of universities at Member State level and the emergence of challenges which go beyond national frontiers has grown over the past few years and will continue to do so, as a result of a combination of factors:

- the emergence of a true European labour market in which the people of Europe must be free to move around as they wish<sup>19</sup> and in which problems concerning the recognition of qualifications become a thing of the past;

---

<sup>16</sup> European Commission, Communication "Making a European area of lifelong learning a reality", COM(2001) 678 of 21.10.2001.

<sup>17</sup> Strategies in favour of Mobility within the European Research Area, Communication from the Commission, COM(2001) 331 final of 26 June 2001.

<sup>18</sup> This low average masks substantial disparity across the Member States. For instance, 68% of Luxemburgish students, 10% of Greek students and 9% of Irish students were studying outside their own country. Conversely, only 0.7% of UK students and 1.2% of Spanish students went to study beyond their own borders.

<sup>19</sup> In this connection, the European Commission has submitted an action plan on skills and mobility, COM(2002)72 of 13.2.2002.

- the expectations with regard to recognition which have been created by action taken by the European Union itself to encourage mobility, particularly through the ERASMUS initiative;
- the emergence of a globalised provision of a wide range of university courses, the continuing brain drain leading to the loss of top-level students and researchers, and a continuing comparatively low level of activity by European universities at the international level;
- the worsening of these factors which will come with the enlargement of the Union, owing to the greater level of heterogeneity of the European university landscape which will ensue.

The nature and scale of the challenges linked to the future of the universities mean that these issues have to be addressed at European level. More specifically, they require a joint and coordinated endeavour by the Member States and the candidate countries, backed up and supported by the European Union, in order to help to move towards a genuine Europe of knowledge.

#### *4.2. European Union action for the universities*

Support is available to universities from a variety of Community initiatives in the areas of research and education. On the research front, they receive around one third of the funding under the framework programme for technological research and development, and particularly the support actions for research training and mobility (Marie Curie actions).

The advantages of the Framework Programme for the universities should further increase with the Sixth Framework Programme<sup>20</sup> with the stepping up of training and mobility support actions, the introduction of a support structure for the creation of young teams with a potential for excellence, and the increased focus that will be placed on fundamental research within "networks of excellence" or "integrated projects"<sup>21</sup>, and particularly as part of action to promote research "at the frontiers of knowledge" (NEST action).

The universities also have a major role to play in initiatives under the "Science and Society" action plan<sup>22</sup>, designed to foster the development and improve the coordination of national activities and policies in areas such as scientific opinion and dialogue with the people, ethics, science education, and "women and science".

Universities are also involved in certain of the actions pursued by the Union relating to technological innovation, e.g. the support actions for utilising R&D results achieved by science parks, through the Framework Programme or with the support of the Structural Funds or the European Investment Bank (EIB).

---

<sup>20</sup> Decision of the Council and of the European Parliament 1513/2002 in OJ L 232 of 29.8.2002, p. 1.

<sup>21</sup> The "networks of excellence" are an instrument of integration of European research capacity designed to further knowledge, the "integrated projects" a tool for conducting research targeting a specific objective. Both are designed to gather a critical mass of resources and are used in the seven "priority thematic areas" under the sixth Framework Programme.

<sup>22</sup> European Commission, Communication "Science and Society Action Plan", COM (2001) 714 of 4.12.2001.

As far as education and training are concerned, universities are very much involved in all the actions of the SOCRATES programme, particularly the ERASMUS action. Since it was launched, over a million students have benefited from this action and every year some 12 000 teachers opt for ERASMUS mobility. Many thematic inter-university networks also contribute to strengthen cooperation at European level, acting as a think tank for the future or the development of their subject area. The Community has provided support for the European course credit transfer system (ECTS) for the recognition of periods of study. The LEONARDO programme provides support for mobility projects between universities and the business sector, involving 40 000 people between 1995 and 1999. Universities are also involved in the eEurope initiative and its eEurope 2005 Action Plan, which encourages all universities to develop on-line access ("virtual campus") for students and researchers<sup>23</sup>.

This cooperation also extends to other regions of the world. Most of the Community research Framework Programme is open to every country in the world and in particular provides support for cooperation with the countries with the Mediterranean region, Russia and the Newly Independent States, as well as developing countries. Through the TEMPUS programme the Union supports university cooperation with the countries of the former Soviet Union, southeast Europe and, since its extension in 2002, the Mediterranean region. There are also initiatives covering relations with other geographical areas, e.g. ALFA and Asia-Link. All these activities help to project the European academic universe around the world. It is also worth mentioning the proposal for the "Erasmus World" programme, which will enable the Union to support "European masters" in order to attract to Europe some of the world's best students for studies pursued in at least two European countries.

Lastly, the Commission supports and helps to foster the Bologna process which is designed to create between now and 2010 a European higher education area which is consistent, compatible and competitive, through reforms which converge around certain defining objectives.

## **5. Making European Universities a World Reference**

If they are to play their full role in the creation of a Europe of knowledge, European universities must, with the help of the Member States and in a European context, rise to a number of challenges. They can only release their potential by undergoing the radical changes needed to make the European system a genuine world reference. There are three objectives to be pursued simultaneously:

- ensuring that European universities have sufficient and sustainable resources and use them efficiently;
- consolidating their excellence in research and in teaching, particularly through networking;
- opening up universities to a greater extent to the outside and increasing their international attractiveness.

<sup>23</sup> The eEurope Action Plan - Designing tomorrow's education, Communication from the Commission, COM(2001)172 final, 28 March 2001.

## 5.1 Ensuring that the European universities have sufficient and sustainable resources

### *Insufficient means*

On average the Member States spend 5% of their GDP on public expenditure for education in general. This figure is comparable to that of the USA and higher than Japan's (3.5%). Public expenditure, however, has not increased with GDP in recent years in Europe, and has even dropped in the past decade. Total expenditure on higher education alone has not in any member state increased in proportion to the growth in the number of students. A substantial gap has opened up with the USA: 1.1% of GDP for the Union compared with 2.3%, i.e. more than double, for the USA. This gap stems primarily from the low level of private funding of higher education in Europe. This stands at a meagre 0.2% of European GDP compared with 0.6% in Japan and 1.2% in the USA.

American universities have far more substantial means than those of European universities – on average, two to five times higher per student. The resources brought by the students themselves, including by the many foreign students, partly explain this gap. But American universities benefit both from a high level of public funding, including through research and defence credits, and from substantial private funding, particularly for fundamental research, provided by the business sector and foundations. The big private research universities also often have considerable wealth, built up over time through private donations, particularly those from graduate associations.

The worsening under-funding of European universities jeopardises their capacity to keep and attract the best talent, and to strengthen the excellence of their research and teaching activities<sup>24</sup>. Given that it is highly unlikely that additional public funding can alone make up the growing shortfall, ways have to be found of increasing and diversifying universities' income. The Commission plans to conduct a study on the funding of European universities, in order to examine the main trends in this area and identify examples of best practice.

At the March 2002 Barcelona European Council, the Union set as its target to increase Europe's research effort to 3% of its GDP<sup>25</sup>. This implies a special effort as regards human resources for research.

### 5.1.1. Increasing and diversifying universities' income

Four main sources of university income can be identified:

- Public funding for research and teaching in general, including research contracts awarded on a competitive basis: this is traditionally the main source of funding for European universities. However, given the budgetary situation in the Member States and the candidate countries, there is a limited margin of manoeuvre for increasing public support. And while the Member States did in Lisbon in March 2000 give a commitment to substantially increase human resource investment, it is highly unlikely

<sup>24</sup> The Commission sets out ideas for consideration and discussion on the matter of university funding in its Communications "Investing efficiently in education and training: an imperative for Europe" (COM(2002)779 of 10 January 2003) and "More research for Europe: towards 3% of GDP" (COM(2002) 499 of 11.9.2002).

<sup>25</sup> European Commission, Communication "More research for Europe: towards 3% of GDP", COM (2002) 499 of 11.9.2002.

that this effort alone can cover the anticipated increase in the number of students or make it possible to catch up with the USA.

- As is the case in the USA, private donations can prove a substantial source of income for universities. However, this solution comes up against a whole range of problems in Europe, particularly the low fiscal attractiveness of private donations, and the status of the universities, which does not always allow them to amass private funds and wealth. These problems also explain, at least in part, the absence of a philanthropic tradition on the scale of that to be found in the USA, where former students often remain linked to their universities long after they have qualified.
- The universities can also generate income by selling services (including research services and flexible lifelong learning possibilities), particularly to the business sector, and from using research results. But these sources do not today contribute in any substantial way to the funding of European universities, partly because of a regulatory framework which does not allow them to really take advantage of their research activities, or does not encourage them to do so, e.g. because the royalties are paid to the state and not to the university or the researchers themselves.
- Lastly, contributions from students, in the form of tuition and enrolment fees. In Europe, these contributions are generally limited or even prohibited, in order to allow democratic access to higher education.

#### *Questions for the debate*

- How can adequate public funding of universities be secured, given the budgetary constraints and the need to ensure democratic access?
- How can private donations be made more attractive, particularly from a tax and legal point of view?
- How can universities be given the necessary flexibility to allow them to take greater advantage of the booming market in services?

#### *5.1.2. Using the available financial resources more effectively*

Universities must use the limited financial resources they have as efficiently as possible. They have a duty to their "stakeholders": the students they train, the public authorities that provide their funding, the labour market which uses the qualifications and skills they transmit and society as a whole, for whom they fulfil important functions related to economic and social life. The objective must be to maximise the social return of the investment represented by this funding. There are many signs<sup>26</sup> which show that it is not currently used in the most efficient way.

- A high dropout rate among students, standing at an average of around 40% in the Union. The "education for everybody" approach in higher education has resulted in huge expansion of the student population, with no fundamental change in university structures and living conditions. In most Member States, a successful secondary school

---

<sup>26</sup> These are analysed in detail in the Communication "Investing efficiently in education and training: an imperative for Europe".

career gives automatic right of access to university studies with no additional selection. This right is considered as an essential element of democracy to guarantee equality for all citizens. Many students thus embark upon higher education without any real academic vocation and do not get what they need from university training. In certain Member States, the universities themselves apply selection systems, in particular certain subject areas<sup>27</sup> sometimes apply additional selection criteria.

- A mismatch between the supply of qualifications (which is shaped by a medium-term perspective, as a result of the duration of studies) and the demand (which often reflects very short term needs and is more volatile) for qualified people, which may result in particular lasting deficits in certain broad types of qualifications, especially in the area of science and technology. University training in fact does not only affect the people who benefit from it: society at large must endeavour to optimise the social return on the investment represented by the studies it pays for. A mismatch between the qualifications offered and those requested is thus an illustration of non-optimum use of resources.
- The duration of studies for a specific qualification can vary in the ratio of one to two in Europe. This explains the huge disparities in the total cost of a student calculated on the basis of an average number of years of study. In Germany, for instance, it usually takes five to six years to train a civil engineer and this training is totally funded from the public purse. In the United Kingdom, it takes up only three years of university studies paid for from public funds, followed by three to five years of training in a company, this training attested to by a state-recognised exam – all paid by the employer, and backed up by on-the-job experience. These differences in duration, even between countries which mutually recognise their qualifications, are striking when one considers that there is widespread support for the Bologna process which is designed to create a European area of higher education by 2010. The difference in cost for the public purse prompts scrutiny of what constitutes optimum use of resources.
- In the same line of thinking, the disparity of status and conditions of recruitment and work for researchers at the pre and post-doctoral levels in Europe is not conducive to the best allocation possible of the means granted to them.
- Europe also suffers from the lack of a transparent system for calculating the cost of research in European universities. This is because of the disparity, the opacity and complexity of the accounting systems used. This prompted the high level group of Commission advisers on research (EURAB, European Research Advisory Board) to suggest the development of a simple and transparent accounting system to calculate the real cost of research and to allow comparisons.

#### *Questions for the debate*

- How can the maintenance of democratic access to higher education be combined with a reduction in failure and dropout rates among students?
- How can a better match be achieved between supply of and demand for university qualifications on the labour market, through better guidance?

---

<sup>27</sup> Particularly medicine and veterinary science.

- Is there a case for levelling out the duration of courses for identical qualifications?
- How can the transparency of research costs in the universities be enhanced?

### *5.1.3. Applying scientific research results more effectively*

#### *Application of research and insufficient creation of spin-off companies*

The universities are one of the primary sources of new knowledge and as such play an ever stronger part in the process of technological innovation. But they do not do so in Europe to the extent they could and should. Since the mid-1990s, the number of young technological ("spin-off") companies created by universities has been on the rise in Europe, particularly around certain of them. Their average density nevertheless is far smaller than it is around the American campuses. Fewer companies are set up in Europe by researchers or in association with them, and those created in Europe tend to grow less quickly and not to last as long.

A major obstacle to better application of university research results is the way intellectual property issues are handled in Europe. In the USA, the "Bayh-Dole" Law has given organisations in which research is conducted using federal funds, particularly the universities, ownership of their results in order to encourage application of academic research results. In recent years, in Europe, several national legislations have converged towards solutions of the Bayh-Dole Act type, and other Member States where provisions of this type have not yet been adopted are about to do so. The actual effect of these measures cannot yet be evaluated. However, the divergences which continue in relation to the provisions enforced in certain Member States, and the national nature of the regulations concerned, have in Europe complicated and limited the transfer of technology and transnational cooperation. More broadly, while the Community patent opens up opportunities for European scale application, it is a matter which is still under discussion.

In addition, European universities do not have well-developed structures for managing research results. They are less well developed, for instance, than those of public research bodies. Another contributory factor is the lack of familiarity of many university staff with the economic realities of research, particularly the managerial aspects and issues regarding intellectual property. The idea of applying research results is moreover still looked upon with distrust by many researchers and university leaders, particularly because of the delicate balance to be struck between the requirements of economic use on the one hand, and on the other the need to preserve, in the common interest, the autonomy of universities and freedom of access to knowledge.

#### *Questions for the debate*

- How could it be made easier for universities and researchers to set up companies to apply the results of their research and to reap the benefits?
- Is there a way of encouraging the universities and researchers to identify, manage and make best use of the commercial potential of their research?
- What are the obstacles which today limit the realisation of this potential, whether legislative in nature or as regards intellectual property rights? How can they be overcome, particularly in countries where the university is funded almost exclusively from the public purse?

## 5.2. Consolidating the excellence of European universities

### 5.2.1. Creating the right conditions for achieving excellence

If Europe is to have and to develop real excellence within its universities, a number of conditions need to be in place. Some of these exist already in some Member States; and the list itself does not claim to be all-inclusive. Nonetheless, it sets out a reference for the debate. As with many other areas mentioned in this Communication, these issues need to be tackled within the structures of the universities themselves, as well as within the structure of regulation within which they operate. However, if this is not done in a convergent and coherent manner across Europe these efforts will lose much of their value. The aim must be to bring all universities to the peak of their potential, not to leave some behind; and piecemeal implementation of these issues will reduce the momentum of the university world in Europe generally. Such a convergent process would also, as with the structural reforms that have followed the Bologna Declaration, provide a supporting context within which Member States could achieve such change.

#### *Need for long term planning and financing.*

The precondition for the development and support of excellence is a context in which long-term planning is possible. Excellence does not grow overnight. Building up a reputation for excellence in any discipline (or sub-discipline) takes years, and is dependent on the critical attitude of peers, measured not country-wide, but Europe-wide and indeed world-wide. Accumulating the intellectual capital represented by effective and world-class teams of researchers, led by the best combination of vision and doggedness, and operated by individuals whose contributions complement each other in the best way, takes a long time and requires that worldwide recruitment to teams be possible.

And yet governments, which are still the major paymasters of universities, budget on an annual basis, and have difficulties in looking beyond a limited number of years. Although a number of Member States have moved to multi-annual contracts with universities, the time period involved rarely exceeds 4 years. Equally, at the end of the four-year period elections may have intervened, the position of the government may have changed, the objectives sought previously may have diminished in importance or, in extreme cases, been discarded.

Member States thus need a general consensus within political and civil society as to the contribution which excellence in research and in universities makes, and the need to enable it. Such consensus should seek in part to insulate the research sector from the hazards of changing financial circumstances, insofar as this is possible. The period within which universities should be enabled to plan, to develop their own strategies, and to exercise the autonomy suggested in Section 5.1 above, could rise to 6 or even 8 years where possible.

#### *Need for efficient management structures and practices.*

A second condition is that the governing structures of a university must respond both to the varied needs of that institution and to the expectations of society - those who provide its core funding. That implies that they should have an effective decision-making process, a developed administrative and financial management capacity, and the ability to

match rewards to performance. Equally, the system should be designed with issues of accountability clearly in mind. Managing a modern university is a complex business, and one which should be open to professionals from outside the purely academic tradition, provided that confidence in the university's management remains strong. It should also be said that freedom of funding will of itself change the financial culture of a university; but it will not by itself increase the quality of that management.

*Need to develop interdisciplinary capability.*

A third condition needed for excellence is that universities be enabled, and encouraged, to develop more work falling between the disciplines. As has been noted above (Section 3.3), advanced research increasingly falls outside the confines of single disciplines, partly because problems may be more complex, more because our perception of them has advanced, and we are more aware of the different specialisations required to examine different facets of the same problem.

Organising work on an inter-disciplinary basis requires that universities have flexibility in their organisation, so that individuals from different departments can share their knowledge and work together, including through the use of ICT. It also requires flexibility in the way careers are evaluated and rewarded, so that inter-disciplinary work is not penalised for being outside normal departmental frames. Finally, it requires that departments themselves should accept "cross-border" work as contributing to faculty-wide objectives.

*Questions for the debate*

- How can the consensus be strengthened around the need to promote excellence in the universities in conditions which make it possible to combine autonomy and management efficiency?
- Is there a way of encouraging the universities to manage themselves as efficiently as possible while taking due account simultaneously of their own requirements and the legitimate expectations of society in their regard?
- What are the steps which would make it possible to encourage an interdisciplinary approach in university work, and who should take them?

*5.2.2. Developing European centres and networks of excellence*

A combination of the absolute need for excellence, the effects of the precariousness of resources and the pressure of competition, forces universities and Member States to make choices. They need to identify the areas in which different universities have attained, or can reasonably be expected to attain, the excellence judged to be essential at European or at international level – and to focus on them funds to support academic research. This type of policy would make it possible to obtain appropriate quality at national level in certain areas, while ensuring excellence at the European level, as no Member State is capable of achieving excellence in all areas.

As to which areas should be given preference, this should be based on an evaluation within each university system. If it is to be objective and reflect the perception of the European and international scientific and academic community, this evaluation should be carried out by panels including people from outside the national system concerned.

The academic excellence to be evaluated could in fact include that of other universities with which the institutions examined are associated through transnational cooperation arrangements. The choice of areas and institutions should be reviewed regularly, in order to ensure that excellence is maintained and to allow new teams of researchers to show their potential.

The concentration of research funding on a smaller number of areas and institutions should lead to increased specialisation of the universities, in line with the move currently observed towards a European university area which is more differentiated and in which the universities tend to focus on the aspects situated at the core of their research and/or teaching skills. While the link between research and teaching naturally continues to define the ethos of the university as an institution and while training through research must remain an essential aspect of its activity, this link is nevertheless not the same in all institutions, for all programmes or for all levels.

The support for excellence and its dissemination, particularly academic excellence is a key principle of the Sixth Community Framework Research Programme. Through this programme's "networks of excellence" the Union is endeavouring to foster the building up of "virtual" capacity for excellence which has the critical mass needed and is, whenever possible, multi-disciplinary.

#### *Questions for the debate*

- How can providers of university funds be encouraged to concentrate their efforts on excellence, particularly in the area of research, so as to attain a European critical mass which can remain competitive in the international league?
- How should this excellence be organised and disseminated, whilst managing the impact of the steps taken on all institutions and research teams?
- How can the European Union contribute more and better to the development and maintenance of academic excellence in Europe?

#### *5.2.3. Excellence in human resources*

In order to maintain its position and strengthen its role internationally, the Union needs a pool of top-level researchers/teachers, engineers and technicians. The university remains the focal point for training such people. In terms of quantity, the Union is in the paradoxical situation of producing slightly more scientific and technical graduates than the USA, while having fewer researchers than the other major technological powers. The explanation for this apparent paradox lies in the smaller number of research posts open to scientific graduates in Europe, particularly in the private sector: 50% only of European researchers work in the business sector, compared with 83% of American researchers and 66% of Japanese researchers.

The situation in Europe could well get worse in the years ahead. The absence of career prospects will alienate young people from scientific and technical studies, while science graduates will look to other more lucrative careers. Furthermore, around one third of the current European researchers will retire over the next 10 years. As the situation is similar in the United States, the competition between universities internationally is set to become even keener.

One way of stemming this trend would be to increase the number of women in scientific and technical careers, where they are substantially under-represented, particularly at the top end of the ladder. On average, in the countries of the Union, there are two to four times more men than women graduates in the sciences. Also, women represent only a quarter to a third of laboratory research personnel in Europe. Action is being taken under the "women and science" initiative<sup>28</sup>, to encourage women to participate in the European research drive, by pinpointing the obstacles to their presence and generally applying the most effective steps taken by Member States to remove these obstacles.

Another solution would be to enhance the pool of resources by strengthening not only intra-European academic mobility, but also mobility between university and industry. In this context virtual mobility based on the use of ICT has also an important role to play.

Although the situation has improved slightly in the wake of initiatives taken in a number of Member States, European universities continue essentially to recruit people from the country or region in which they are established, or even within the institution itself. Furthermore, the evaluation of researchers is based on criteria which neither stress the advantages of nor encourage periods in other European universities.

In this context there is also the core issue of recognition of studies and qualifications at European level. Not having a quick, simple system of recognition for academic or professional purposes is today a major obstacle to research and mobility \_ and therefore to a greater cross-fertilisation of ideas and research between European universities, and to their wider influence. Specific instruments (such as ECTS, the Diploma Supplement, NARICs, Community directives) have been developed and almost all Member States and candidate countries have invested in quality assurance systems which are networked within the ENQA (European Network for Quality Assurance). It is urgent to examine whether and how a solution could be found (within the framework of the Bologna process for greater transparency and compatibility) to the problem of recognition, which is currently preventing the universities from using their potential and resources efficiently and limiting their wider audience.

In qualitative terms, excellence in human resources depends largely on available financial resources, but is also affected by working conditions and career prospects. Generally speaking, career prospects in European universities, characterised by the multiplicity of configurations, are limited and shrouded in uncertainty. The Commission supports the Bologna process, including its extension to doctorate level training, and is interested to note the experiments in progress on dual doctorates or doctorates under joint supervision. It also stresses the need to train prospective doctorate candidates to a greater extent in an interdisciplinary work perspective.

European universities also offer fewer possibilities at post-doctorate level than their American counterparts. There would be a case for expanding the range of opportunities for holders of doctorates outside research careers.

---

<sup>28</sup> ETAN working party report "Science policies in the European Union: promoting excellence through mainstreaming gender equality", 1999; Resolution of the European Parliament on Women and Science of 3 February 2000 (EP 284.656); Commission working document "Women and science: the gender dimension as a leverage for reforming science" SEC (2001) 771 of 15 May 2001; Council Resolution on science and society and on women in science of 26 June 2001; OJ C 199, p.1 of 14.7.2001; Report by the Helsinki Group on Women and Science "National policies on women and science in Europe" - March 2002.

The Union has pursued a number of initiatives to encourage and facilitate research and mobility in Europe. Under the project on the European Research Area, it has defined a strategy to foster research and mobility through a range of tangible measures. Moreover, the Commission will shortly submit a Communication on the matter of scientific careers.

#### *Questions for the debate*

- What steps could be taken to make scientific and technical studies and careers more attractive, and to strengthen the presence of women in research?
- How \_ and by whom\_ should the lack of career development opportunities following doctoral studies be addressed in Europe, and how could the independence of researchers in carrying out their tasks be fostered? What efforts could universities make in this regard, taking particular account of the needs of Europe as a whole?
- What ways are there of helping European universities to gain access to a pool of resources (students, teachers and researchers) having a European dimension, by removing obstacles to mobility?

### *5.3. Broadening the perspective of European universities*

#### *5.3.1. A broader international perspective*

European universities are functioning in an increasingly "globalised" environment and find themselves competing with universities of the other continents, particularly American universities, when it comes to attracting and keeping the best talent from all over the world. While European universities host only slightly fewer foreign students than American universities, in proportion they attract fewer top-level students and a smaller proportion of researchers.

All in all, the environment offered by the European universities is less attractive. Financial, material and working conditions are not as good; the financial benefits of the use of research results are smaller and career prospects are poorer<sup>29</sup>; there is also the inappropriate and poorly harmonised nature of arrangements with regard to visas and residence permits for students, teachers and researchers from other countries \_ be they from the Union or from other countries in the world. Several Member States have recently taken steps to enhance the attraction of their universities, their laboratories and their businesses for top-level researchers and students and qualified workers from third countries, e.g. through "scientific visas".

Similarly, the Commission has submitted a proposal for a Council directive on the conditions of entry and residence of students from third countries. A parallel initiative for researchers from these countries is expected in 2003. The Union will also step up support to enhance the attractiveness of European universities through action to support mobility under the Sixth Framework Programme, which will enable over 400 researchers and doctoral students from third countries to come to European universities between 2003 and 2006, and under the "Erasmus World" initiative.

---

<sup>29</sup> See also Section 5.1.3 on the management of intellectual property.

*Questions for the debate*

- How can European universities be made more attractive to the best students and researchers from all over the world?
- In a context of increasing internationalisation of teaching and research, and of accreditation for professional purposes, how should the structures, study programmes and management methods of European universities be changed to help them retain or recover their competitiveness?

*5.3.2. Local and regional development*

There are universities throughout the Union's regions. Their activities often permeate the local economic, social and cultural environment. This helps to make them an instrument of regional development and of strengthening European cohesion. The development of technology centres and science parks, the proliferation of regional cooperation structures between the business sector and the universities, the expansion of university regional development strategies, the regional networking of universities, are all illustrations of this dimension of university activity.

The regional dimension of the university activity is thus set to get stronger, given its essential role in achieving the Europe of knowledge, particularly looking ahead to enlargement. The European Union supports these developments, particularly through the Structural Funds and the Sixth Framework Programme.

In addition, the role played by the universities as a source of expertise and a catalyst for multiple partnerships between economic and social players within a range of networks is very relevant at the regional and local levels.

The increased involvement of the universities locally and regionally should not, however, overshadow a more outward-looking international perspective and a constant endeavour to improve their excellence in research and education. These remain essential and will indeed enable the universities to make a more effective contribution to the development of their local and regional environment.

*Questions for the debate*

- In what areas and how could the universities contribute more to local and regional development?
- What ways are there of strengthening the development of centres of knowledge bringing together at regional level the various players involved in the production and transfer of knowledge?
- How can greater account be taken of the regional dimension in European research, education and training projects and programmes?

**6. Conclusions**

This Communication makes a number of points which reflect the profound changes taking place in the European university world. After remaining a comparatively isolated universe for a very long period, both in relation to society and to the rest of the world,

with funding guaranteed and a status protected by respect for their autonomy, European universities have gone through the second half of the 20th-century without really calling into question the role or the nature of what they should be contributing to society.

The changes they are undergoing today and which have intensified over the past ten years prompt the fundamental question: can the European universities, as they are and are organised now, hope in the future to retain their place in society and in the world?

If it is to achieve its ambition of becoming the world's most competitive and dynamic knowledge-based economy and society, Europe simply must have a first-class university system -- with universities recognised internationally as the best in the various fields of activities and areas in which they are involved.

The questions raised in this document are intended to help in determining what action should be taken for a move in this direction within the enlarged EU.

All interested parties -- institutions, public authorities, individuals or representative associations -- are therefore urged to give their points of view on this subject, and describe their experiences and their "best practices".

### **How to Contribute**

The Commission intends to review the contributions it has received up to the end of May 2003.

These contributions can be sent to either of the following two dedicated e-mail addresses:

- eac-consult-univ@cec.eu.int
- rtd-consult-univ@cec.eu.int

They can also be sent by physical mail to:

European Commission  
EAC A1 (Consult-Univ)  
(B7 - 9/58)  
B - 1049 BRUXELLES

# Realising the European Higher Education Area

Communiqué of the Conference of Ministers responsible for Higher Education  
in Berlin on 19 September 2003

## Preamble

On 19 June 1999, one year after the Sorbonne Declaration, Ministers responsible for higher education from 29 European countries signed the Bologna Declaration. They agreed on important joint objectives for the development of a coherent and cohesive

European Higher Education Area by 2010. In the first follow-up conference held in Prague on 19 May 2001, they increased the number of the objectives and reaffirmed their commitment to establish the European Higher Education Area by 2010. On 19 September 2003, Ministers responsible for higher education from 33 European countries met in Berlin in order to review the progress achieved and to set priorities and new objectives for the coming years, with a view to speeding up the realisation of the European Higher Education Area. They agreed on the following considerations, principles and priorities:

Ministers reaffirm the importance of the social dimension of the Bologna Process. The need to increase competitiveness must be balanced with the objective of improving the social characteristics of the European Higher Education Area, aiming at strengthening social cohesion and reducing social and gender inequalities both at national and at European level. In that context, Ministers reaffirm their position that higher education is a public good and a public responsibility. They emphasise that in international academic cooperation and exchanges, academic values should prevail.

Ministers take into due consideration the conclusions of the European Councils in Lisbon (2000) and Barcelona (2002) aimed at making Europe "the most competitive and dynamic knowledge-based economy in the world, capable of sustainable economic growth with more and better jobs and greater social cohesion" and calling for further action and closer co-operation in the context of the Bologna Process.

Ministers take note of the Progress Report commissioned by the Follow-up Group on the development of the Bologna Process between Prague and Berlin. They also take note of the Trends-III Report prepared by the European University Association (EUA), as well as of the results of the seminars, which were organised as part of the work programme between Prague and Berlin by several member States and Higher Education Institutions, organisations and students. Ministers further note the National Reports, which are evidence of the considerable progress being made in the application of the principles of the Bologna Process. Finally, they take note of the messages from the European Commission and the Council of Europe and acknowledge their support for the implementation of the Process.

Ministers agree that efforts shall be undertaken in order to secure closer links overall between the higher education and research systems in their respective countries. The emerging European Higher Education Area will benefit from synergies with the European Research Area, thus strengthening the basis of the Europe of Knowledge. The aim is to preserve Europe's cultural richness and linguistic diversity, based on its heritage of

diversified traditions, and to foster its potential of innovation and social and economic development through enhanced co-operation among European Higher Education Institutions.

Ministers recognise the fundamental role in the development of the European Higher Education Area played by Higher Education Institutions and student organisations. They take note of the message from the European University Association (EUA) arising from the Graz Convention of Higher Education Institutions, the contributions from the European Association of Institutions in Higher Education (EURASHE) and the communications from ESIB – The National Unions of Students in Europe.

Ministers welcome the interest shown by other regions of the world in the development of the European Higher Education Area, and welcome in particular the presence of representatives from European countries not yet party to the Bologna Process as well as from the Follow-up Committee of the European Union, Latin America and Caribbean (EULAC) Common Space for Higher Education as guests at this conference.

### **Progress**

Ministers welcome the various initiatives undertaken since the Prague Higher Education Summit to move towards more comparability and compatibility, to make higher education systems more transparent and to enhance the quality of European higher education at institutional and national levels. They appreciate the co-operation and commitment of all partners - Higher Education Institutions, students and other stakeholders - to this effect.

Ministers emphasise the importance of all elements of the Bologna Process for establishing the European Higher Education Area and stress the need to intensify the efforts at institutional, national and European level. However, to give the Process further momentum, they commit themselves to intermediate priorities for the next two years. They will strengthen their efforts to promote effective quality assurance systems, to step up effective use of the system based on two cycles and to improve the recognition system of degrees and periods of studies.

### *Quality Assurance*

The quality of higher education has proven to be at the heart of the setting up of a European Higher Education Area. Ministers commit themselves to supporting further development of quality assurance at institutional, national and European level. They stress the need to develop mutually shared criteria and methodologies on quality assurance.

They also stress that consistent with the principle of institutional autonomy, the primary responsibility for quality assurance in higher education lies with each institution itself and this provides the basis for real accountability of the academic system within the national quality framework.

Therefore, they agree that by 2005 national quality assurance systems should include:

- A definition of the responsibilities of the bodies and institutions involved.
- Evaluation of programmes or institutions, including internal assessment, external review, participation of students and the publication of results.
- A system of accreditation, certification or comparable procedures.

- International participation, co-operation and networking.

At the European level, Ministers call upon ENQA through its members, in co-operation with the EUA, EURASHE and ESIB, to develop an agreed set of standards, procedures and guidelines on quality assurance, to explore ways of ensuring an adequate peer review system for quality assurance and/or accreditation agencies or bodies, and to report back through the Follow-up Group to Ministers in 2005. Due account will be taken of the expertise of other quality assurance associations and networks.

#### *Degree structure: Adoption of a system essentially based on two main cycles*

Ministers are pleased to note that, following their commitment in the Bologna Declaration to the two-cycle system, a comprehensive restructuring of the European landscape of higher education is now under way. All Ministers commit themselves to having started the implementation of the two cycle system by 2005.

Ministers underline the importance of consolidating the progress made, and of improving understanding and acceptance of the new qualifications through reinforcing dialogue within institutions and between institutions and employers.

Ministers encourage the member States to elaborate a framework of comparable and compatible qualifications for their higher education systems, which should seek to describe qualifications in terms of workload, level, learning outcomes, competences and profile. They also undertake to elaborate an overarching framework of qualifications for the European Higher Education Area.

Within such frameworks, degrees should have different defined outcomes. First and second cycle degrees should have different orientations and various profiles in order to accommodate a diversity of individual, academic and labour market needs. First cycle degrees should give access, in the sense of the Lisbon Recognition Convention, to second cycle programmes. Second cycle degrees should give access to doctoral studies.

Ministers invite the Follow-up Group to explore whether and how shorter higher education may be linked to the first cycle of a qualifications framework for the European Higher Education Area.

Ministers stress their commitment to making higher education equally accessible to all, on the basis of capacity, by every appropriate means.

#### *Promotion of mobility*

Mobility of students and academic and administrative staff is the basis for establishing a European Higher Education Area. Ministers emphasise its importance for academic and cultural as well as political, social and economic spheres. They note with satisfaction that since their last meeting, mobility figures have increased, thanks also to the substantial support of the European Union programmes, and agree to undertake the necessary steps to improve the quality and coverage of statistical data on student mobility.

They reaffirm their intention to make every effort to remove all obstacles to mobility within the European Higher Education Area. With a view to promoting student mobility, Ministers will take the necessary steps to enable the portability of national loans and grants.

*Establishment of a system of credits*

Ministers stress the important role played by the European Credit Transfer System (ECTS) in facilitating student mobility and international curriculum development. They note that ECTS is increasingly becoming a generalised basis for the national credit systems. They encourage further progress with the goal that the ECTS becomes not only a transfer but also an accumulation system, to be applied consistently as it develops within the emerging European Higher Education Area.

*Recognition of degrees: Adoption of a system of easily readable and comparable degrees*

Ministers underline the importance of the Lisbon Recognition Convention, which should be ratified by all countries participating in the Bologna Process, and call on the ENIC and NARIC networks along with the competent National Authorities to further the implementation of the Convention.

They set the objective that every student graduating as from 2005 should receive the Diploma Supplement automatically and free of charge. It should be issued in a widely spoken European language.

They appeal to institutions and employers to make full use of the Diploma Supplement, so as to take advantage of the improved transparency and flexibility of the higher education degree systems, for fostering employability and facilitating academic recognition for further studies.

*Higher education institutions and students*

Ministers welcome the commitment of Higher Education Institutions and students to the Bologna Process and recognise that it is ultimately the active participation of all partners in the Process that will ensure its long-term success.

Aware of the contribution strong institutions can make to economic and societal development, Ministers accept that institutions need to be empowered to take decisions on their internal organisation and administration. Ministers further call upon institutions to ensure that the reforms become fully integrated into core institutional functions and processes.

Ministers note the constructive participation of student organisations in the Bologna Process and underline the necessity to include the students continuously and at an early stage in further activities.

Students are full partners in higher education governance. Ministers note that national legal measures for ensuring student participation are largely in place throughout the European Higher Education Area. They also call on institutions and student organisations to identify ways of increasing actual student involvement in higher education governance.

Ministers stress the need for appropriate studying and living conditions for the students, so that they can successfully complete their studies within an appropriate period of time without obstacles related to their social and economic background. They also stress the need for more comparable data on the social and economic situation of students.

*Promotion of the European dimension in higher education*

Ministers note that, following their call in Prague, additional modules, courses and curricula with European content, orientation or organisation are being developed.

They note that initiatives have been taken by Higher Education Institutions in various European countries to pool their academic resources and cultural traditions in order to promote the development of integrated study programmes and joint degrees at first, second and third level.

Moreover, they stress the necessity of ensuring a substantial period of study abroad in joint degree programmes as well as proper provision for linguistic diversity and language learning, so that students may achieve their full potential for European identity, citizenship and employability.

Ministers agree to engage at the national level to remove legal obstacles to the establishment and recognition of such degrees and to actively support the development and adequate quality assurance of integrated curricula leading to joint degrees.

*Promoting the attractiveness of the European Higher Education Area*

Ministers agree that the attractiveness and openness of the European higher education should be reinforced. They confirm their readiness to further develop scholarship programmes for students from third countries.

Ministers declare that transnational exchanges in higher education should be governed on the basis of academic quality and academic values, and agree to work in all appropriate fora to that end. In all appropriate circumstances such fora should include the social and economic partners.

They encourage the co-operation with regions in other parts of the world by opening Bologna seminars and conferences to representatives of these regions.

*Lifelong learning*

Ministers underline the important contribution of higher education in making lifelong learning a reality. They are taking steps to align their national policies to realise this goal and urge Higher Education Institutions and all concerned to enhance the possibilities for lifelong learning at higher education level including the recognition of prior learning. They emphasise that such action must be an integral part of higher education activity.

Ministers furthermore call those working on qualifications frameworks for the European Higher Education Area to encompass the wide range of flexible learning paths, opportunities and techniques and to make appropriate use of the ECTS credits.

They stress the need to improve opportunities for all citizens, in accordance with their aspirations and abilities, to follow the lifelong learning paths into and within higher education.

## **Additional Actions**

### *European Higher Education Area and European Research Area – two pillars of the knowledge based society*

Conscious of the need to promote closer links between the EHEA and the ERA in a Europe of Knowledge, and of the importance of research as an integral part of higher education across Europe, Ministers consider it necessary to go beyond the present

focus on two main cycles of higher education to include the doctoral level as the third cycle in the Bologna Process. They emphasise the importance of research and research training and the promotion of interdisciplinarity in maintaining and improving the quality of higher education and in enhancing the competitiveness of European higher education more generally. Ministers call for increased mobility at the doctoral and postdoctoral levels and encourage the institutions concerned to increase their cooperation in doctoral studies and the training of young researchers.

Ministers will make the necessary effort to make European Higher Education Institutions an even more attractive and efficient partner. Therefore Ministers ask Higher Education Institutions to increase the role and relevance of research to technological, social and cultural evolution and to the needs of society.

Ministers understand that there are obstacles inhibiting the achievement of these goals and these cannot be resolved by Higher Education Institutions alone. It requires strong support, including financial, and appropriate decisions from national Governments and European Bodies.

Finally, Ministers state that networks at doctoral level should be given support to stimulate the development of excellence and to become one of the hallmarks of the European Higher Education Area.

### *Stocktaking*

With a view to the goals set for 2010, it is expected that measures will be introduced to take stock of progress achieved in the Bologna Process. A mid-term stocktaking exercise would provide reliable information on how the Process is actually advancing and would offer the possibility to take corrective measures, if appropriate.

Ministers charge the Follow-up Group with organising a stocktaking process in time for their summit in 2005 and undertaking to prepare detailed reports on the progress and implementation of the intermediate priorities set for the next two years:

- quality assurance · two-cycle system · recognition of degrees and periods of studies

Participating countries will, furthermore, be prepared to allow access to the necessary information for research on higher education relating to the objectives of the Bologna Process. Access to data banks on ongoing research and research results shall be facilitated.

## **Further Follow-up**

### *New members*

Ministers consider it necessary to adapt the clause in the Prague Communiqué on applications for membership as follows:

Countries party to the European Cultural Convention shall be eligible for membership of the European Higher Education Area provided that they at the same time declare their willingness to pursue and implement the objectives of the Bologna Process in their own systems of higher education. Their applications should contain information on how they will implement the principles and objectives of the declaration.

Ministers decide to accept the requests for membership of Albania, Andorra, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Holy See, Russia, Serbia and Montenegro, "the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and to welcome these states as new members thus expanding the process to 40 European Countries.

Ministers recognise that membership of the Bologna Process implies substantial change and reform for all signatory countries. They agree to support the new signatory countries in those changes and reforms, incorporating them within the mutual discussions and assistance, which the Bologna Process involves.

#### *Follow-up structure*

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.

A Board also chaired by the EU Presidency shall oversee the work between the meetings of the Follow-up Group. The Board will be composed of the chair, the next host country as vice-chair, the preceding and the following EU Presidencies, three participating countries elected by the Follow-up Group for one year, the European Commission and, as consultative members, the Council of Europe, the EUA, EURASHE and ESIB. The Follow-up Group as well as the Board may convene ad hoc working groups as they deem necessary.

The overall follow-up work will be supported by a Secretariat which the country hosting the next Ministerial Conference will provide.

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.

#### *Work programme 2003-2005*

Ministers ask the Follow-up Group to co-ordinate activities for progress of the Bologna Process as indicated in the themes and actions covered by this Communiqué and report on them in time for the next ministerial meeting in 2005.

#### *Next Conference*

Ministers decide to hold the next conference in the city of Bergen (Norway) in May 2005.

# From Berlin to Bergen

## The EU Contribution

European Commission, Directorate General for Education and Culture  
Higher Education: Socrates-Erasmus-Jean Monet Project

Brussels, 8 November 2003

### 1. Introduction

On 19 September 2003, the Ministers of Higher Education of the Bologna Signatory States gathered in Berlin and adopted a Communiqué taking note of progress made so far and defining three intermediate priorities for the next two years: quality assurance, two-cycle system and recognition of degrees and periods of studies. A stocktaking exercise will be organised before the next Ministerial meeting in Bergen, Norway in May 2005.

Ministers also decided that the doctoral phase will be covered by the Bologna Reforms (transparency, quality assurance etc.) and to promote closer links between the European Higher Education Area (EHEA) and the European Research Area (ERA).

The Bologna process coincides with Commission policy in higher education supported through European programmes and notably Socrates-Erasmus. The Commission supports and stimulates Bologna activities at European level and participates as a full member in the Bologna Follow-up Group and the Bologna Board.

From an EU perspective the Bologna process fits into a broader agenda defined in Lisbon in March 2000, when EU Heads of State and Government decided on an objective and a strategy to make Europe by 2010 *"the most competitive and dynamic knowledge-based economy in the world, capable of sustainable economic growth with more and better jobs and greater social cohesion"*. In Barcelona, in March 2002, they added that the European education and training systems should become a "world quality reference".

EU Education Ministers have translated this far-reaching ambition into a series of shared objectives for the different education and training systems in Europe. Progress in reaching these objectives will be evaluated against "Reference Levels of European Average Performance" or "European Benchmarks".

The Commission presented in November 2003 a draft for the Interim Report on the implementation of the shared objectives, to be submitted jointly by the Commission and the EU Ministers of Education and Training to the European Council in spring 2004. Although its overall scope is wider, the Interim Report will also recall commitments made by Ministers in Bologna, Prague and Berlin; will stress the link with the Copenhagen process on enhanced European co-operation in Vocational Education and Training, launched in December 2002, and look for possible synergies in important fields such as transparency of qualifications, credit transfer and quality assurance.

In Berlin, four countries from the Western Balkans joined the Bologna process: Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, "the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and Serbia and Montenegro, as well as Andorra, the Holy See and Russia. The Commission is considering specific support measures for the countries covered by Tempus-Cards and Tempus-Tacis.

**The current paper sets out the EU contribution to the Bologna process, provided by the European Commission, in partnership with the higher education sector and endorsed by the Member States represented in the Socrates Programme Committee.**

The paper starts with the Commission contribution to the realisation of the three intermediate priorities defined in Berlin: quality assurance, two-cycle system and recognition of degrees and periods of study. In addition, the paper describes Commission initiatives on promoting mobility, raising the attractiveness of European higher education and developing the doctoral phase (EHEA-ERA). The paper also addresses horizontal issues, such as the Stocktaking exercise, the training of Bologna Promoters and support to Bologna Seminars and Conferences. Relevant sections of the Berlin Communiqué are quoted in italics.

## **2. Quality Assurance**

"The quality of higher education has proven to be at the heart of the setting up of a European Higher Education Area. Ministers commit themselves to supporting further development of quality assurance at institutional, national and European level. They stress the need to develop mutually shared criteria and methodologies on quality assurance."

### *2.1 ENQA Mandate*

"At the European level, Ministers call upon ENQA through its members, in co-operation with the EUA, EURASHE and ESIB, to develop an agreed set of standards, procedures and guidelines on quality assurance, to explore ways of ensuring an adequate peer review system for quality assurance and/or accreditation agencies or bodies, and to report back through the Follow-up Group to Ministers in 2005. Due account will be taken of the expertise of other quality assurance associations and networks."

The Commission will support and contribute to the realisation of this Mandate given by Ministers to ENQA. Two Working Groups organised by ENQA will examine proposals prepared by experts on the different elements of the Mandate. Most likely one Working Group on standards, procedures and guidelines and one Working Group on setting up an adequate peer review system. Experts would draw on existing studies and on experiences of ENQA and its members, organised in regional (North and Eastern Europe) or specialised networks (European Consortia for Accreditation). They will examine EUA Institutional Evaluations, the competence based approach of the Tuning Project as well as the work of subject specific professional accrediting agencies such as EQUIS. Experiences in other parts of the world, notably the United States, will be considered as well.

ENQA will present its Work Plan for the Mandate to the Bologna Follow-up Group on 14/15 October 2003 and report on progress made in the first and second half of 2004. A Pre-final Report would need to be presented by the beginning of 2004 in order to be finalised in advance of the Ministerial meeting in Bergen in May 2005.

## 2.2 Networking of Agencies

*"Therefore, they [Ministers] agree that by 2005 national quality assurance systems should include:*

- A definition of the responsibilities of the bodies and institutions involved.*
- Evaluation of programmes or institutions, including internal assessment, external review, participation of students and the publication of results.*
- A system of accreditation, certification or comparable procedures.*
- International participation, co-operation and networking."*

The Commission has no role in setting up national systems but contributes to the realisation of this objective by supporting the networking of agencies and systems through ENQA, the European Network for Quality assurance in Higher Education, established on the basis of the 1998 Council Recommendation on European Cooperation in Quality Assurance in Higher Education. ENQA supports its members through exchange of information and good practice, staff training and seminars. ENQA undertakes and publishes studies and surveys on quality assurance developments in Europe and maintains a web site.

ENQA also functions as a Policy Forum on European quality assurance developments. For this purpose higher education sector organisations are represented in the ENQA Steering Committee and government officials take part in the annual General Assembly.

ENQA intends to transform itself into an association and extend its membership to agencies from all 40 Bologna Signatory States. The General Assembly of May 2004 will decide which reforms are needed for ENQA to carry out its triple task of service provider to its members, policy forum and organiser of transnational evaluations. A first outline of these reforms was discussed at the General Assembly of 29/30 September 2003 in Budapest and decisions will be taken at the next General Assembly in June 2004 in Stockholm.

ENQA intends to set up a European Register for Quality Assurance Agencies, covering public, private and professional agencies, operating on a regional, national, European or international basis. The register would be based on the outcomes of the Mandate received in Berlin.

## 2.3 Quality Culture within Institutions

*"They [Ministers] also stress that consistent with the principle of institutional autonomy, the primary responsibility for quality assurance in higher education lies with each institution itself and this provides the basis for real accountability of the academic system within the national quality framework."*

The Commission supports higher education institutions building up their own internal quality assurance capacity through a pilot scheme, organised by the European University Association EUA. In annual rounds, six groups of universities and other higher education institutions work together on themes such as "research management", "teaching and learning" and "implementing Bologna reforms". The pilot scheme helps institutions to introduce internal quality assurance mechanisms, improve their quality levels and being better prepared for external evaluations. The first round in 2002-2003 demonstrated the need for strong university leadership and university autonomy in developing a quality culture. A second round takes place in 2003-2004 and a third round is foreseen for 2004-2005, thus spreading this experience across a variety of institutions in Europe.

#### *2.4. Transnational Evaluation and Accreditation*

Most evaluation and accreditation is carried out on a national or regional basis. It is expected that these local exercises will become more comparable and more European through the use of "an agreed set of standards, procedures and guidelines" and the involvement of foreign experts. In a limited number of cases there is scope for transnational evaluation and accreditation. For instance in highly internationalised fields of study like business and engineering or in cases where universities or sponsors (public or private) seek to obtain a label for reasons of branding or consumer protection. Integrated study programmes, like joint masters, obviously require a collaborative effort of the respective quality assurance agencies.

The Commission supports the setting up and testing phase of transnational evaluation and accreditation. As an experiment, ENQA has carried out in 2002-2003 an external evaluation of 14 departments against sets of common evaluation criteria in three subject areas: History, Physics and Veterinary Science. The Transnational European Evaluation Project (TEEP 2002) has shown that it is possible to evaluate study programmes across borders against sets of common criteria as long as the universities concerned agree to take the common criteria as a starting point for the evaluation.

ENQA intends to organise more transnational evaluations of single, double and joint degrees. The Commission would welcome such proposals as well as proposals from subject specific professional organisations setting up European accreditation in fields like medicine or engineering.

In January 2004, the Commission will present a Report to the Parliament and the Council of Ministers on the implementation of the Council Recommendation of September 1998 on European co-operation in quality assurance in higher education. Drawing lessons from the experiences acquired, the Commission Report will contain proposals on how to make European quality assurance more coherent in line with the commitments made by Ministers in Bologna, Prague and Berlin.

### **3. The Two Cycle System – Towards a European Qualifications Framework**

*"All Ministers commit themselves to having started the implementation of the two cycle system by 2005."*

*"Ministers encourage the member States to elaborate a framework of comparable and compatible qualifications for their higher education systems, which should seek to describe qualifications in terms of workload, level, learning outcomes, competences and profile. They also undertake to elaborate an overarching framework of qualifications for the European Higher Area."*

The Commission supports initiatives enhancing the comparability and compatibility of qualifications and notably the university project "Tuning Educational Structures in Europe" in which professors from 135 universities seek to describe the content of qualifications in nine different subject areas in terms of workload, level, learning outcomes, competences and profile. The Commission supported the Copenhagen Bologna Seminar on Qualification Structures in March 2003 and will support an initiative to design an overarching framework of qualifications for the European Higher Area against which national frameworks would articulate.

#### 4. Recognition of Degrees and Periods of Study

*"Ministers stress the important role played by the European Credit Transfer System (ECTS) in facilitating student mobility and international curriculum development. They note that ECTS is increasingly becoming a generalised basis for the national credit systems. They encourage further progress with the goal that the ECTS becomes not only a transfer but also an accumulation system, to be applied consistently as it develops within the emerging European Higher Education Area."*

*"They set the objective that every student graduating as from 2005 should receive the Diploma Supplement automatically and free of charge. It should be issued in a widely spoken European language."*

The Commission has taken several initiatives to promote ECTS. Institutions wishing to introduce ECTS for the first time may apply for an ECTS Introduction Grant. Institutions which use ECTS in all first and cycle degree programmes may apply for the ECTS label. Label holding institutions (50 to 100 in 2004) may apply for an ECTS Accumulation Grant. They will form a fast growing Pilot Group, testing the use of "ECTS for Lifelong Learning".

In 2004, the Commission will launch a special Campaign to promote the wide and consistent use of ECTS throughout Europe. A short brochure "ECTS Key Features" is available on the web and will be distributed widely in hard copy. The ECTS Users Guide on the web will be restyled and completed with examples from the ECTS practice. Country Teams of ECTS/DS Counsellors, active in 31 countries will be reinforced and given extra support in their task of advising universities on how to introduce ECTS correctly and how to prepare for the label.

In parallel, the Diploma Supplement is being promoted, leading to a Diploma Supplement label. By the end of 2003, the Commission will come forward with a proposal to integrate different transparency instruments developed for vocational training (like Europass, European Portfolio and the European CV) and bring them together into a single European Framework for Transparency of Qualifications and Competences, called EUROPASS, which will include the Diploma Supplement, used in higher education.

The Commission continues to support the NARIC network of credential evaluators, cooperating closely with the parallel network of ENIC centres coordinated by Council of Europe/UNESCO-CEPES. The Commission will support measures to enhance the visibility and effectiveness of the centres and welcomes in particular the cooperation between ENIC/NARIC and ENQA, exploring the links between recognition and quality assurance.

#### 5. Promotion of Mobility

*"They [Ministers] note with satisfaction that since their last meeting, mobility figures have increased, thanks also to the substantial support of the European Union programmes, and agree to undertake the necessary steps to improve the quality and coverage of statistical data on student mobility."*

*"They reaffirm their intention to make every effort to remove all obstacles for mobility within the European Higher Education Area. With a view to promoting student mobility, Ministers take the necessary steps to enable the portability of national loans and grants."*

The Commission will seek to increase mobility figures even further, based on the use of both public and private funding. A Call will be launched in the framework of Socrates

Action 6 (Observation of education systems, policies and innovation) to support activities aiming at mapping student and teacher mobility, eliminating obstacles to mobility and enabling the portability of national loans and grants.

## **6. European Higher Education Area and European Research Area – Two Pillars of the Knowledge Based Society – Cooperation at Doctoral Level**

*"Ministers call for increased mobility at the doctoral and postdoctoral levels and encourage the institutions concerned to increase their co-operation in doctoral studies and the training of young researchers."*

The Commission welcomes the proposed extension of the Bologna reforms (transparency, credits, quality assurance, recognition etc.) to the doctoral level. In February 2003, the Commission adopted a Communication "The Role of the Universities in the Europe of Knowledge"<sup>1</sup>, exploring the challenges universities are faced with at the crossroads between education, advanced training, research and innovation. In July 2003, the Commission adopted a Communication "Researchers in the European Research Area, One Profession, Multiple Careers"<sup>2</sup>, which recommends that doctoral programmes take into account broader needs of the labour market and integrate structured mentoring as an integral part. The time may indeed be right to take a fresh look at the notion of "European doctorates" and the recognition of doctoral degrees in Europe for the purpose of careers in R&D. Bologna Signatory States are called upon to adjust the legislative framework so that joint doctorates can be implemented more easily and obstacles to recognition removed. The Commission will present proposals for follow-up measures in the first half of 2004.

As a concrete step, the Commission will support in 2003-2004 a pilot project examining the status of doctoral candidates, the functioning of doctoral programmes in Europe, ways to improve them and to promote pooling of resources in cross-border activities and programmes, possibly leading to a "European Doctorate".

## **7. Promotion of the European Dimension in Higher Education**

*"Ministers agree to engage at the national level to remove legal obstacles to the establishment and recognition of such degrees and to actively support the development and adequate quality assurance of integrated curricula leading to joint degrees."*

The Commission helps universities developing integrated study programmes through Socrates-Erasmus Curriculum Development Projects. The implementation of integrated programmes is supported through Socrates-Erasmus student and staff mobility and Intensive Programmes (like summer courses). Special support for the implementation of Joint Masters will be provided as from 2004 through the proposed programme Erasmus Mundus, building inter alia on the Joint Masters Pilot Project 2002-2003.

---

<sup>1</sup> COM(2003) 58 final of 05.02.2003

<sup>2</sup> COM(2003) 436 final of 18.07.2003

## **8. Promoting the Attractiveness of the European Higher Education Area**

*"Ministers agree that the attractiveness and openness of the European higher education should be reinforced. They confirm their readiness to further develop scholarship programmes for students from third countries."*

The Commission will award up to 8000 scholarships to students and scholars from other continents and from Europe in the framework of the Erasmus Mundus programme. Through this programme, the Commission will also support a marketing strategy for European Higher Education, bringing European quality and distinctiveness higher up the attention scale of the best partners, students and scholars world-wide.

## **9. Stocktaking**

*"Ministers charge the Follow-up Group with organising a stocktaking process in time for their summit in 2005 and undertaking to prepare detailed reports on the progress and implementation of the intermediate priorities set for the next two years."*

The Commission will help to undertake a coherent stocktaking exercise in close cooperation with the Bologna Board and the Bologna Secretariat. The result should be a clear overview of the progress made in the signatory states ("Bologna Scoreboard") and an analytic report to be presented at the Bergen Ministerial Conference in May 2005. The Commission will also consider establishing a Compendium of institutions having successfully introduced the Bologna reforms.

## **10. Bologna Promoters**

*"Ministers welcome the commitment of Higher Education Institutions and students to the Bologna Process and recognise that it is ultimately the active participation of all partners in the Process that will ensure its long-term success."*

The Trends III report and the Eurydice Survey have demonstrated that Bologna is gaining ground, but, being a top-down process it has in many cases not yet reached the work floor. In too many cases, the reforms are so far only plans or promises, without real steps to implement them. The Commission therefore will take the initiative to support the training of National Teams of Bologna Promoters. Senior Academics, (Vice-)Rectors, Deans and Directors of Study and International Relations Officers who are successful in introducing the Bologna reforms in their institution will be invited to advise colleagues in their country and occasionally abroad. The Bologna Promoters would also function as ECTS/DS Counsellors.

## **11. Bologna Seminars and Conferences**

The Commission will support a limited number of official Bologna Seminars in priority areas, the Pre-Bergen Higher Education Convention and the Bergen Ministerial Conference.

## **BOLOGNA ACTION LINES**

### **Bologna Declaration**

1. Adoption of a system of easily readable and comparable degrees
2. Adoption of a system essentially based on two cycles
3. Establishment of a system of credits
4. Promotion of mobility
5. Promotion of European cooperation in quality assurance
6. Promotion of the European dimension in higher education

### **Prague Communiqué**

7. Lifelong learning
8. Higher education institutions and students
9. Promoting the attractiveness of the European Higher Education Area

### **Berlin Communiqué**

10. European Higher Education Area and European Research Area – two pillars of the knowledge based society.

### **Relevant Web Sites**

DG Education and Culture

[http://europa.eu.int/comm/dgs/education\\_culture/index\\_en.htm](http://europa.eu.int/comm/dgs/education_culture/index_en.htm)

Objectives of Education and Training

[http://europa.eu.int/comm/education/policy\\_en.html#programme](http://europa.eu.int/comm/education/policy_en.html#programme)

Lifelong Learning

<http://europa.eu.int/comm/education/life>

Bologna Process

[http://europa.eu.int/comm/education/bologna\\_en.html](http://europa.eu.int/comm/education/bologna_en.html)

<http://www.bologna-berlin2003.de>

Bruges-Copenhagen Process

[http://europa.eu.int/comm/education/copenhagen/index\\_en.html](http://europa.eu.int/comm/education/copenhagen/index_en.html)

[http://europa.eu.int/comm/education/copenhagen/resolution\\_en.pdf](http://europa.eu.int/comm/education/copenhagen/resolution_en.pdf)

Communication on the role of the universities in the knowledge society

[http://europa.eu.int/comm/education/com\\_2003\\_0058\\_f\\_en.pdf](http://europa.eu.int/comm/education/com_2003_0058_f_en.pdf)

Communication on Investment

[http://europa.eu.int/eur-lex/en/com/cnc/2002/com2002\\_0779en01.pdf](http://europa.eu.int/eur-lex/en/com/cnc/2002/com2002_0779en01.pdf)

Communication on Benchmarking

[http://europa.eu.int/comm/education/keydoc/2002/bench\\_en.pdf](http://europa.eu.int/comm/education/keydoc/2002/bench_en.pdf)

Erasmus World programme proposal

[http://europa.eu.int/comm/education/world/index\\_en.html](http://europa.eu.int/comm/education/world/index_en.html)

E-learning programme proposal

[http://europa.eu.int/eur-lex/en/com/pdf/2002/com2002\\_0751en01.pdf](http://europa.eu.int/eur-lex/en/com/pdf/2002/com2002_0751en01.pdf)

ENIC and NARIC networks

<http://www.enic-naric.net>

PLOTEUS

<http://www.ploteus.net>

Tuning educational structures in Europe

<http://odur.let.rug.nl/TuningProject/>

<http://www.relint.deusto.es/TuningProject/index.htm>

ENQA

<http://www.enqa.net/>

EUA

<http://www.unige.ch/eua>

EURASHE

<http://www.eurashe.be/info/info.htm>

ESIB

<http://www.esib.org>

# Forward from Berlin: the Role of Universities

**European University Association Brussels Office – Rue de la Loi 42,  
BE -1040 Brussels tel +32-2 230 55 44 - fax +32-2 230 57 51  
e-mail: info@eua.be**

## **To 2010 and Beyond**

1. Universities are central to the development of European society. They create, safeguard and transmit knowledge vital for social and economic welfare, locally, regionally and globally. They cultivate European values and culture.
2. Universities advocate a Europe of knowledge, based on a strong research capacity and researchbased education in universities – singly and in partnership – across the continent. Cultural and linguistic diversity enhances teaching and research.
3. The development of European universities is based on a set of core values: equity and access; research and scholarship in all disciplines as an integral part of higher education; high academic quality; cultural and linguistic diversity.
4. Students are key partners within the academic community. The Bologna reforms will: facilitate the introduction of flexible and individualised learning paths for all students; improve the employability of graduates and make our institutions attractive to students from Europe and from other continents.
5. European universities are active on a global scale, contributing to innovation and sustainable economic development. Competitiveness and excellence must be balanced with social cohesion and access. The Bologna reforms will only be successful if universities address both the challenge of global competition and the importance of fostering a stronger civic society across Europe.
6. Universities must continue to foster the highest level of quality, governance and leadership.

## **Universities as a Public Responsibility**

7. Governments, universities and their students must all be committed to the long-term vision of a Europe of knowledge. Universities should be encouraged to develop in different forms and to generate funds from a variety of sources. However, higher education remains first and foremost a public responsibility so as to maintain core academic and civic values, stimulate overall excellence and enable universities to play their role as essential partners in advancing social, economic and cultural development.
8. Governments must therefore empower institutions and strengthen their essential autonomy by providing stable legal and funding environments. Universities accept accountability and will assume the responsibility of implementing reform in close cooperation with students and stakeholders, improving institutional quality and strategic management capacity.

### **Research as an Integral Part of Higher Education**

9. The integral link between higher education and research is central to European higher education and a defining feature of Europe's universities. Governments need to be aware of this interaction and to promote closer links between the European Higher Education and Research Areas as a means of strengthening Europe's research capacity, and improving the quality and attractiveness of European higher education. They should therefore fully recognise the doctoral level as the third "cycle" in the Bologna Process. Universities need to keep pressing the case for research-led teaching and learning in Europe's universities. Graduates at all levels must have been exposed to a research environment and to research-based training in order to meet the needs of Europe as a knowledge society.
10. The diversity of universities across Europe provides great potential for fruitful collaboration based upon different interests, missions and strengths. Enhancing European collaboration and increasing mobility at the doctoral and post-doctoral levels are essential, for example through the promotion of joint doctoral programmes, as a further means of linking the European Higher Education and Research Areas.

### **Improving Academic Quality by Building Strong Institutions**

11. Successful implementation of reforms requires leadership, quality and strategic management within each institution. Governments must create the conditions enabling universities to take long-term decisions regarding their internal organisation and administration, e.g. the structure and internal balance between institutional level and faculties and the management of staff. Governments and universities should enter negotiated contracts of sufficient duration to allow and support innovation.
12. Universities for their part must foster leadership and create a structure of governance that will allow the institution as a whole to create rigorous internal quality assurance, accountability and transparency. Students should play their part by serving on relevant committees. External stakeholders should serve on governing or advisory boards.

### **Pushing Forward the Bologna Process**

13. The Bologna Process must avoid over-regulation and instead develop reference points and common level and course descriptors.
14. Implementing a system of three levels (the doctoral level being the third) requires further change. Universities see the priorities for action as:
  - Consolidating ECTS as a means to restructure and develop curricula with the aim of creating student-centred and flexible learning paths including lifelong learning;
  - Discussing and developing common definitions of qualification frameworks and learning outcomes at the European level while safeguarding the benefits of diversity and institutional autonomy in relation to curricula;
  - Involving academics, students, professional organisations and employers in redesigning the curricula in order to give bachelor and master degrees meaning in their own right;
  - Continuing to define and promote employability skills in a broad sense in the

curriculum and ensuring that first-cycle programmes offer the option of entering the labour market;

- Introducing the Diploma Supplement more widely, and in major languages, as a means to enhance employability, making it widely known among employers and professional organisations.

### **Mobility and the Social Dimension**

15. Student mobility in itself promotes academic quality. It enables diversity to be an asset, enhancing the quality of teaching and research through comparative and distinctive approaches to learning. It increases the employability of individuals. Staff mobility has similar benefits.
16. If the EHEA is to become a reality governments must: tackle the current obstacles to mobility, amend legislation on student support, e.g. to make study grants and loans portable and improve regulations on health care, social services and work permits.
17. Governments and institutions together must give incentives to mobility by improving student support (including social support, housing and opportunities for part-time work) academic and professional counselling, language learning and the recognition of qualifications. Institutions must ensure that full use is made of tools which promote mobility, in particular ECTS and the Diploma Supplement. Possibilities also need to be increased for short-term mobility, and mobility of part-time, distance and mature students.
18. Career paths for young researchers and teachers, including measures to encourage young PhDs to continue working in/return to Europe, must be improved. Gender perspectives require special measures for dual career families. Restrictions on transfer of pension rights must be removed through portable pensions and other forms of social support.
19. Increasing the participation of women in research and teaching is essential in a competitive Europe. Gender equality promotes academic quality and universities must promote it through their human resource management policies.
20. The Trends 2003 report demonstrates that the information base, in particular in relation to mobility issues, is inadequate. National governments should cooperate to improve statistical data and work with the European Commission to review existing monitoring mechanisms. There should be more research on issues related to the development of the EHEA.
21. Joint programmes and degrees based on integrated curricula are excellent means for strengthening European cooperation. Governments must remove legal obstacles to the awarding and recognition of joint degrees and also consider the specific financial requirements of such collaboration.
22. Institutions should identify the need for and then develop joint programmes, promoting the exchange of best practice from current pilot projects and ensuring high quality by encouraging the definition of learning outcomes and competences and the widespread use of ECTS credits.

**Quality Assurance: a Policy Framework for Europe**

23. Quality assurance is a major issue in the Bologna process, and its importance is increasing. The EUA proposes a coherent QA policy for Europe, based on the belief: that institutional autonomy creates and requires responsibility, that universities are responsible for developing internal quality cultures and that progress at European level involving all stakeholders is a necessary next step.
24. An internal quality culture and effective procedures foster vibrant intellectual and educational attainment. Effective leadership, management and governance also do this. With the active contribution of students, universities must monitor and evaluate all their activities, including study programmes and service departments. External quality assurance procedures should focus on checking through institutional audit that internal monitoring has been effectively done.
25. The purpose of a European dimension to quality assurance is to promote mutual trust and improve transparency while respecting the diversity of national contexts and subject areas.
26. QA procedures for Europe must: promote academic and organisational quality, respect institutional autonomy, develop internal quality cultures, be cost effective, include evaluation of the QA agencies, minimise bureaucracy and cost, and avoid over regulation.
27. EUA therefore proposes that stakeholders, and in particular universities, should collaborate to establish a provisional "Higher Education Quality Committee for Europe". This should be independent, respect the responsibility of institutions for quality and demonstrate responsiveness to public concerns. It would provide a forum for discussion and, through the appointment of a small board, monitor the application of a proposed code of principles, developing a true European dimension in quality assurance.

**Universities at the Centre of Reform**

28. The Bologna Process was initially politically driven. But it is now gaining momentum because of the active and voluntary participation of all interested partners: higher education institutions, governments, students and other stakeholders. Top down reforms are not sufficient to reach the ambitious goals set for 2010. The main challenge is now to ensure that the reforms are fully integrated into core institutional functions and development processes, to make them self-sustaining. Universities must have time to transform legislative changes into meaningful academic aims and institutional realities.
29. Governments and other stakeholders need to acknowledge the extent of institutional innovation, and the crucial contribution universities do and must make to the European Research Area and the longerterm development of the European knowledge society as outlined in the Lisbon declaration of the European Union. By united action, European higher education – which now touches the lives of more than half the of the population of Europe – can improve the entire continent.

*Leuven, 4 July 2003*

# Concerning the Advisory Committee on Education and Training in the Field of Architecture

Statement of Experts Assembled in Koln 3 May 2003

## 1. Introduction

Following the refusal of the Commission to co-operate in facilitating a meeting of the Advisory Committee, which its President sought to convene in accordance with the Committee's Rules of Procedure, the President then informally met with four other experts in Koln on 3 May 2003. Arising from that meeting, this statement is addressed to the Member States, the European Parliament, the Council and the Commission and represents the considered and unanimous opinion of the five experts whose names are appended hereto with regard to:

- (a) the Commission's proposal for a European Parliament and Council Directive on the recognition of professional qualifications, COM(2002)119-2002-061(COD), insofar as it relates to the field of architecture, and
- (b) the Commission's disregard for the role and function of the Advisory Committee in recent years.

## 2. Proposal for a Directive on the Recognition of Professional Qualifications

- 2.1 This proposal, insofar as it relates to professional qualifications in architecture, is inadequate in that it fails to amend deficiencies which already exist in Directive 85/384/EEC in relation to the duration of courses and the omission of reference to practical training and experience.
- 2.2 It is also inadequate in that it creates new deficiencies, particularly in the relegation of the principles of Article 3 (of Directive 85/384/EEC) to a mere annexe status, in the introduction of different "levels" of qualifications for provision of services vis-à-vis establishment, in the lack of relevance to the consultation process of 2001, in the denial of the established right of the Member States to raise doubts as to compliance of qualifications with standards and in the priority given to the "market" over consumer protection and over all that architecture means and stands for in terms of concepts of protection of the environment with particular reference to Europe's architectural heritage – a philosophy which is enshrined in the preambles to Directive 85/384/EEC and is now proposed to be replaced by an ill-considered new order driven only by market conditions.
- 2.3 The proposal is at variance with the findings of all previous studies undertaken into the performance of the existing Architects' Directive and, in particular, with the findings of the Commission's own report on the SLIM initiative.
- 2.4 The proposal is at variance with the Council Resolution on architectural Quality in

the Urban and Rural Environment, adopted in February 2001 (2001/C 73/04) which specifically called on the Commission to "ensure that architectural quality and the specific nature of architectural services are taken into consideration in all policies, measures and programmes".

- 2.5 The proposal is furthermore at variance with UNESCO-UIA Charter for Architectural Education (July 1996) and with the UNESCO-UIA Validation System for Architectural Education (July 2002).
- 2.6 The repeal of the existing Architects' Directive is neither required nor justified on grounds that enlargement of the EU will make an Advisory Committee unworkable.
- 2.7 Having regard to all of the above, it is recommended that the existing Directive, in its entirety, be retained and that Council's Decision 85/385/EEC be amended to provide for a more appropriately constituted Advisory Committee consistent with the enlargement of the European Union. It is noted that the European Parliament's Committee on Legal Affairs and the Internal Market also advocates the retention of the existing Architects' Directive.

### **3. The Commission's Disregard of the Role and Function of the Advisory Committee**

- 3.1 The Advisory Committee was established by Council Decision 85/385/EEC of 10 June 1985 for the purposes of advising the Commission in relation to architectural education and training and especially to assess and to advise on doubts which might, from time to time, be expressed by Member States as to the compliance of any diploma in architecture with the standards set down in the Directive. Meetings are normally convened by the Commission but may be convened by the President of the Committee.
- 3.2 Whereas the rules of Procedure require that the Committee meet at least once a year, it last met on 26 November 2001! When the President, in accordance with the Rules, sought (on 30 December 2002) to convene a meeting, it took the Commission until 27 March 2003 to make a substantive reply to the President's letter. The Commission concluded that it was not now appropriate to seek the advice of the Committee in relation to the proposal for a new Directive, on grounds (inter alia) that it has consulted other (unnamed) "representatives" on an "ad hoc" basis.
- 3.3 In November 2001 the Committee advised that further information be sought from the competent authorities of Spain in respect of six diplomas about which doubts had been expressed by the Governments of the Netherlands and Norway. Notwithstanding this, the Commission unilaterally caused these diplomas to be listed in the Official Journal of 10/09/02 as "recognised" diplomas.
- 3.4 More recently, certain Finnish diplomas were listed as "recognised" notwithstanding doubts expressed by the Government of Italy. In this case, the diplomas had not even been referred for assessment or advice to the Advisory Committee in contravention of the specific provisions of the Directive!
- 3.5 The above instances are cited merely as examples. They do not constitute an exhaustive list but are indicative of the Commission's negative attitude towards the Committee especially established by the Council for the purpose of advising the Commission in relation to education and training in the field of architect. Above all,

this attitude and the consequent approval of the diplomas mentioned in points 3.3 and 3.4 above has made it possible for new types of professionals to enter the market, nominally as architects but with qualifications different from those envisaged by directive 384/85.

- 3.6 Having regard to all of the above, it is recommended that the Parliament and Council stay the legislative procedure in which they are currently involved in relation to the draft Directive (COM (2002) 119 final) until such time as the Advisory Committee on Education and Training in the Field of Architecture has formally been convened, has met and has issued its advice in relation to the proposed new Directive, in so far as that Directive deals with the matter of architectural education and training and the free movement of architects.

GUNTHER UHLIG Dr Ing. Professor an der Universität Frideriziana Karlsruhe, Architect, President Advisory Committee

MARIO DOCCI Architect, Past President Advisory Committee, Director RADAAR Department at Roma University "La Sapienza"

ROLAND SCHWEITZER Architect, Past President Advisory Committee, formerly Member of SLIM Committee, Member UNESCO-UIA Council for the Validation of Architectural Education

JOHN E. O'REILLY Architect, Chairman, Working Group 'Formation' (of the Advisory Committee), formerly President CLAEU and formerly Vice-President ACE.

JAMES HORAN Architect, Chairman, Working Group 'Diplomas' (of the Advisory Committee), Vice-President and President-elect EAEE.

# **EAAE Chania Statement 2001**

## **Regarding the Architectural Education in the European Higher Education Area**

**The Heads of Schools of Architecture in Europe assembled in the 6<sup>th</sup> meeting of Heads of European Schools of Architecture in Hania, Crete from 3 until 6 September 2003, reaffirmed the Hania Statement of 2001.**

The Heads of Schools of Architecture in Europe assembled in the 4<sup>th</sup> meeting of Heads of European Schools of Architecture in Chania, Crete from 1 until 4 September 2001, discussed in depth the future of architectural education within the European Higher Education Area and its implications for architectural education.

Most of the ideas expressed in the EHEA have since 25 years been the 'raison d'être' of EAAE and the focus of its collective efforts, its conferences, workshops, projects and publications. Today EAAE is representing more than 155 schools of architecture.

Having reviewed the EU initiatives so far concerning the profession and education of an architect, namely:

1. The Architects' Directive 85/384/CEE (1985) and the advices produced by its advisory committee
2. The UIA/UNESCO Charter for architectural education (1996)
3. The UIA Accord and Recommendations (2000)

Being informed about the recent state of the art of the Bologna implementation process.

Being fully aware that architectural education can lead to a wide variety of professional and academic careers,

Within the framework of:

The Magna Charta Universitatum, 1988

The Joint Declaration of the European Ministers of Education, Bologna 1999

The Salamanca Convention of European Higher Education Institutions, 2001

The Student Göteborg declaration, 2001

The Meeting of European Ministers in Charge of Higher Education, Prague 2001

Committed to the exchange of ideas and methods in teaching and research as well as of students and staff among the schools in the prospect of a European Higher Education Area based on diversity and mutual understanding,

The Heads of Schools state the following:

1. The studies leading to the diploma of architecture which gives access to the profession of an architect, should be minimum 5 years or 300 ECTS credit points leading to graduate level ('masters'), in order to meet the achievements listed in the above mentioned documents 1, 2, 3.

2. Following a comparable but flexible qualification framework each school may decide to structure their curriculum as a 5-years integrated (i.e. unbroken) programme or subdivided in two cycles (3+2 years or 180 ECTS + 120 ECTS credit points), in which case the first cycle can not give access to the profession of an architect.
3. EAAE will actively collaborate in developing the ECTS-credit system in their schools and considers this system as the keystone towards mobility of students, modularity, flexibility in the curricula, necessary for the cultural, regional and pedagogical diversity they think to be invaluable for the education in architecture in Europe.
4. EAAE is willing to play a role in the development of a quality assurance and assessment system tailored to the needs of architectural education and respecting its diversity. With respect to this a clear distinction should be made between the 'professional/governmental' assessment of the diploma leading to the accreditation and the validation by the professional/governmental bodies of the member states and the 'academic' assessment of the educational programmes by means of a peer review.

The EAAE will install a representative committee at European level and will present its result and proposals regarding the evaluation of the two cycles before the end of the year 2002.

The Heads of School underline their commitment to further elaborate and contribute to the development of the European Higher Education Area.

*Chania, 4 September 2001*

*The Heads of Schools of Architecture in Europe*

# Inaugural Address as President of EAAE

James F Horan

Last year when I was asked to become the Vice-President of EAAE I was reminded of a story of two brothers, one who ran away to sea and the other one they made a Vice-President. Neither was ever heard of again! Fortunately or unfortunately that is not what has happened on this occasion and like it or not I suppose you are now stuck with a Vice-President who has become a President. I thank you for electing me.

The topic we are about to consider relates to the future of EAAE. However, it is not really my intention to engage in discussion about this; at this stage I would merely like to put a position to you and when that position has been articulated there will be an opportunity for members of the General Assembly to establish a communication link with the Council on a more structured basis. I will come to that in a moment.

There is a Chinese saying 'may you live in interesting times'. This in fact is not a well wish, it is a curse. If the Chinese are not happy with you, they say 'may you live in interesting times'. Usually in China when you live in interesting times you were very likely beheaded. We, however, are now in interesting times. I believe that the EAAE finds itself in interesting times.

We are living in times when a lot of things are happening in architectural education both from a philosophical point of view and also from a political point of view. We have discussed this in the Council on a number of occasions during the past year, and consequently one of the major agenda items has been about the future of EAAE.

The EAAE, as you know, was founded in 1975. In the intervening years it has grown into a very significant organisation. It has now reached a point where it has to take stock of where it has come from, where it is now, and where it is going. What in fact do we, the members of EAAE, want it to become in the future?

Let me just perhaps take a few minutes to describe my understanding of the climate in the Europe in which the EAAE finds itself. As you are aware the European Directive on Architectural Education developed by the European Union has been a vehicle used by Member States in the EU as an identification of Schools of Architecture which had reached an acceptable standard. Interestingly enough the UIA, the International Union of Architects, adopted in their charter a directive almost identical to what had been devised in Brussels as long ago as 1985. However, the Commission in Brussels seems to have decided, without officially saying so, that the Directive is no longer important. Some of you may already know that for almost twelve years, with others who are here in this room I have been serving on the Advisory Body to the Commission in Brussels. This Advisory Body was set up to assist the Commission in deciding which Schools of Architecture should be recognised under the Directive. The Advisory Body would meet at least once a year, or more often if specific issues needed to be discussed. These meetings of the Advisory Body have now ceased. There has been no meeting for almost two years, and while no official declaration has been made by Brussels it is clear that it is not the intention of the Commission to have any further meetings. In April of this year a number of the members of the Advisory Body, including three past Presidents, had a meeting in Koln where a letter was written to the Commission expressing dismay at the attitude of Brussels for the

apparent lack of interest in standards in architectural education. This letter is available in four languages English, French, German and Italian. I quote from it as follows:

"The Advisory Committee was established by Council Decision 85/385/EEC of 10 June 1985 for the purposes of advising the Commission in relation to architectural education and training and especially to assess and to advise on doubts which might, from time to time, be expressed by Member States as to the compliance of any diploma in architecture with the standards set down in the Directive. Meetings are normally convened by the Commission but may be convened by the President of the Committee.

Whereas the rules of Procedure require that the Committee meet at least once a year, it last met on 26 November 2001! When the President, in accordance with the Rules, sought (on 30 December 2002) to convene a meeting, it took the Commission until 27 March 2003 to make a substantive reply to the President's letter. The Commission concluded that it was not now appropriate to seek the advice of the Committee in relation to the proposal for a new Directive, on grounds (inter alia) that it has consulted other (unnamed) "representatives" on an "ad hoc" basis."

The full version of this letter is being made available. That has been the position and remains the position.

This situation, in fact, creates a vacuum. The profession of architecture has been continuously expressing a concern about the fact that the directive is not being followed or implemented. Consequently, ACE [the Architect's Council of Europe] has been actively involved in pursuing a position to fill the vacuum left by the Advisory Body. What this ultimately could mean is that an organisation such as the Architect's Council of Europe might seek to be in a position to provide accreditation for all architectural schools. This is a serious situation. It is not acceptable that accreditation or any form of control would be in the hands of one single group such as the Profession. Education is essentially the business of educationalists. Universities and Schools of Architecture must be free to decide how they will educate, and what type of educational programmes they will deliver.

On the other hand, the strength of the Advisory Body came from the fact that it had representatives from the educators, the professionals and the National Governments. This meant that each Member State had three people who sat on the Advisory Body. The Government representative was there because they were responsible to those who made the funds available for education. The professionals were there because they had an interest in what the educators were doing and the type of graduates coming from the Schools, and the educators were there because they were the experts in education. These different groups brought balance to the discussions. If the Advisory Body is now likely to be replaced by any single group then the prognosis for education in Europe is poor. This might appear like a gloomy picture. All of us know individually in our Schools that we may have a sense of educational freedom, and certainly I know in many cases the Ministers for Education have little or no interest in the content of what is being taught. But what they do have an interest in, is how much it is costing to educate architects. I believe it is important that we as educators have a voice in this wider discussion and wider debate. Let me just for a moment illustrate a vision for the future of architectural education in Europe.

I believe that architectural education is a fifty year process. We in the Schools engage mostly with education at a narrow point of great intensity. But the day when someone leaving a School of Architecture – graduating with a Bachelors, a Masters, or a Doctorate

- is regarded to be fully educated are no longer with us. The notion or the concept of continuous lifelong education is becoming increasingly imbedded in the minds of both the professionals and the educators. The courses of continuing professional development provided by Schools and by the professional institutes right across the world have become almost a requirement for graduates of architecture. Certainly those who wish to practice, are obliged to involve themselves in various forms of continuing education on a regular basis. This is an opportunity. It is an enormous opportunity for the educators. If we accept the notion that the education of an architect, irrespective of which branch of architecture they may be involved in, is a lifelong process, then the responsibility for that education has to be a shared responsibility by everyone involved. The responsibility not only lies with the educators, but also with the professions and with the governments, whose funds allow the educational process to take place. A debate and a discussion should occur between these three interested parties. I don't see this as a negative, in fact if the notion of shared educational responsibility is grasped, then the possibilities for Schools of Architecture to expand increases to an enormous degree. Not only will we provide undergraduate, postgraduate, doctorate and post-doctorate programmes, we now can become involved in the process of the continuing educating of graduates, practitioners and everyone involved in the various fields of architecture. Many of you will have had the experiences of Universities or Schools closing down because of lack of numbers. In fact a colleague from Germany yesterday spoke about this very problem. Some Schools have had to amalgamate because of insufficient numbers of students to support and sustain an individual School. If we grasp the notion to expand the level and type of education we provide we assure the future of architectural education in Europe. If we assure the future of its framework we are then free to deliver what we wish within that framework. The minute the framework is threatened we become vulnerable. We must be open to change, I believe that our organisation has reached a state were it is becoming a seriously regarded professional body. I don't mean professional in the sense of Practitioners, I mean professional in the way it does its business. We have now more than 100 Schools as members of EAAE. We have established credibility in the projects that we are pursuing and what we are publishing. The work that has been presented at this conference testifies that we are becoming the guardians of a serious body of knowledge. Knowledge is strength and knowledge is power and the more convincing we become in the way we assemble, collect, archive and disseminate this knowledge the more significant we will be as a group on the European stage. In fact, I would go so far as to say that ultimately our objective would be to make a global impact. There are already established relations with counter organisations in the United States and elsewhere.

During the past year we have examined the sort of subject headings that would form part of a future agenda for the Council of EAAE, and for all its members here. Some of the questions we have asked are as follows:

What is our philosophy? Where have we come from? Where are we now? What is our vision? Where are we likely to go? It is our vision that underpins everything. This is a huge discussion, an enormous debate, it is perhaps the theme of an entire Conference and even then the answers may not be complete. However, the first step now is to begin to ask the questions and open up the discussions.

The second area deals with the activities in which the EAAE is involved. We know from the reports today that these activities are both extensive and wide reaching. We must ask the question whether or not they are the appropriate activities for EAAE. To some

extent the answer to that question will be informed by the answer to the first question about the philosophical position. As these positions become clear I would like to think we would develop a Strategic Plan about the way we engage in activities that is carefully thought through and is a direct consequence of where we want the organisation to go.

The third issue is the structure. We must examine the structure of the organisation, we must examine the structure of Council, we must examine the role of President, the role of the Vice-President and the role of individual Council members and Charges des Missions. A permanent Secretariat will be critical to the identity of EAAE. At present the Secretariat is located in Leuven in Belgium. This location has been partially due to the historic circumstances. However, as the EAAE was set up under the legislation of Belgium law it is probably wise to have the secretariat located there. This secretariat I believe needs to have a recognised place of existence irrespective of the nationality of the President or the members of Council. In order to make the secretariat permanent there must be financial security. The financial structuring of the organisation needs to be examined. This is the fourth point of discussion.

During the past year some exercises have already been carried out to look at business planning. The financial planning of the organisation is critical in order to ensure its growth and development. The cost of membership to individual Schools, the cost of publications, and the cost of our communications generally will form part of this plan. The issue about sponsorship should also be on the agenda. Are we prepared to engage with sponsors? How can we feel comfortable interacting with our sponsors? How do we avoid compromising our philosophical position?

The fifth point deals with communication. This I believe is the point at which we must begin. It is the first thing we should address. Today there are more than 100 people gathered at this conference in Hania discussing matters on architectural education. On Monday morning next each one of us will be at our individual desks in different cities, in different countries, and the problems that await us on that desk will tend to push matters discussed here at EAAE slightly into the background. Let us attempt to keep the channel of communication open. During the past year the Thematic Sub-networks were enormously instrumental in developing a sense of continuity of communication between one general assembly in Hania and the next. I now hope that we will increase the level of communication between us. I invite all members of EAAE to make submissions to Council or directly to myself on any or all of the issues I have identified this morning. It is important that your President and your Council hears the opinions of the members of the organisation. Any action that is taken by Council should be based on the best possible information from the membership. The collective wisdom of the people in this room is an enormous resource from which we must draw.

Because I believe we are at a point of change, and at a watershed about the future, we have taken the unusual step this year of not identifying any new Council member today. What we would like to do is to develop a strategy to the point where the Council will be in a position to identify its new members by the specific skills and abilities that they will bring to the Council table.

Notwithstanding the issues related to developing the organisation of the EAAE itself, I believe there are two priority areas in which we should concentrate our efforts during the next year. Firstly, through the Thematic Sub-networks and through other processes we should explore our philosophical positions on architectural education. The philosophical

discussions about our educational position should be central. I believe that the meeting in Hania this year has already gone a long way to establishing that process.

Secondly, I think we should also engage in discussions with the representatives of the profession to advance the notion of shared responsibility for the total education of the architect, and provide a platform of unity to assist us in dealing with any actions by others which might result in the lowering of educational standards. It is clear, at least across the countries of the European Union that architecture doesn't appear to be a very high priority in the minds of many of the Ministers for Education. These Ministers and the Governments they represent should be fully appraised of the role and function of architecture and architectural education. Like it or not the educators of architects and the practising architects of the profession jointly have responsibility for significant aspects of the quality of the environment in which we live. It is my intention to instigate discussions with the Architects Council of Europe to explore where problems may lie and how we can be of mutual benefit to each other.

I suppose the climate I have described and some of the difficulties I have outlined could to some extent be indicative of what one might refer to as a 'wake-up call' for those of us involved in education. I am reminded of another Chinese proverb that says 'It is much easier to wake a man who is really asleep than a man who is pretending to be asleep'. I would like to think that if anyone among us or in our Schools appears to be asleep that they are actually sleeping so that we have some chance of waking them.

I thank you once again for electing me your President. I look forward to two years of what I hope will be intensive and interesting work. I again issue the invitation to you to communicate. It is our ability to communicate that makes this organisation possible. I think we should use it well, wisely and regularly.

