

towards the european higher education area
bologna process

BFUG5 8a
 8 April 2005

DRAFT BERGEN COMMUNIQUÉ

Draft of 17 March 2005	Comments	Draft of 7 April 2005
<p>The European Higher Education Area - Achieving the Goals</p> <p>17.03.05 Draft Communiqué of the Conference of Ministers responsible for Higher Education, Bergen, 19-20 May 2005</p> <p><i>Draft 17.03.05 with comments from BFUG Members</i></p>		<p>The European Higher Education Area - Achieving the Goals</p> <p>07.04.05 Draft Communiqué of the Conference of Ministers responsible for Higher Education Bergen, 19-20 May 2005 Rev.</p>
<p>1. We, Ministers responsible for higher education in the participating countries of the Bologna Process, have met for a midterm review and for setting goals and priorities towards 2010. At this conference, we have welcomed Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Moldova and Ukraine as new participating countries in the Bologna Process.</p>	<p>-- Comments from Council of Europe:</p> <p>1. We, Ministers responsible for higher education in the participating countries of the Bologna Process, have met for a midterm review and for setting goals and priorities towards 2010. At this conference, we have welcomed Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Moldova and Ukraine as new participating countries in members of [this is the term used in the Berlin Communiqué] the Bologna Process.</p> <p>End of comments from Council of Europe--</p> <p>---- 0000 ----</p> <p>-- Comments from France:</p> <p>1. We, Ministers responsible for higher education in the participating countries of the Bologna Process*, have met for a midterm review and for setting goals and priorities towards 2010. At this conference, we have welcomed Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Moldova and Ukraine as new participating countries in the Bologna Process.</p> <p><i>FR comments: A list of participating countries annexed to this Communiqué could be added for the sake of clarity. Reserve for examination on the principle of these 5 new participating countries so far ; the official French political stance should be soon available.</i></p> <p>*See list of signatory countries annexed to the current Communiqué</p>	<p>1. We, Ministers responsible for higher education in the participating countries of the Bologna Process, have met for a mid-term review and for setting goals and priorities towards 2010. At this conference, we have welcomed Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Moldova and Ukraine as new participating countries in the Bologna Process.</p>

	<p>End of comments from France--</p> <p>---- 0000 ----</p> <p>-- Comments from Greece: We suggest that the first statement should include the vision of the EHEA.</p> <p>1. We, Ministers responsible for higher education in the participating countries of the Bologna Process, share the vision of a European Higher Education Area, visible on the global stage, based on the principles of quality, credibility, and transparency, and its rich tradition and diversity.</p> <p>2. At this conference, we have met for a midterm review and for setting goals and priorities towards 2010. We welcome Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Moldova and Ukraine as new participating countries in the Bologna Process.</p> <p>End of comments from Greece--</p>	
<p>I. The Cooperation: Participating countries and partners</p> <p>2. We confirm our commitment to coordinating our policies through the Bologna Process to establish the European Higher Education Area (EHEA) by 2010. We all share the common understanding of the principles, objectives and commitments of the Process as expressed in the Bologna Declaration and in the subsequent communiqués from the Ministerial Conferences in Prague and Berlin.</p>		<p>I. The Cooperation: Participating countries and partners</p> <p>2. We confirm our commitment to coordinating our policies through the Bologna Process to establish the European Higher Education Area (EHEA) by 2010. We all share the common understanding of the principles, objectives and commitments of the Process as expressed in the Bologna Declaration and in the subsequent communiqués from the Ministerial Conferences in Prague and Berlin.</p>
<p>3. We underline the central role of higher education institutions, their staff and students as partners in the Bologna Process. Their role in the implementation of the process becomes all the more important now that the necessary</p>	<p>-- Comments from the United Kingdom: Paragraph 3 – second sentence – capital “P” for Process to be consistent; add at end of sentence “in the majority of EHEA HE systems”. Final sentence – delete “efforts” and replace “contribution” with “efforts”. End of comments from the United Kingdom--</p>	<p>3. We underline the central role of higher education institutions, their staff and students as partners in the Bologna Process. Their role in the implementation of the Process</p>

<p>legislative reforms are largely in place. We encourage the higher education community and their representative organisations to continue efforts and intensify their contribution to establishing the EHEA</p>	<p>---- 0000 ----</p> <p>-- Comments from ESIB: 3. We underline the central role of higher education institutions and student organisations as partners in Bologna Process and its implementation at all levels. We take note of the message from the EUA arising from its Glasgow Convention of European Higher Education Institutions, the contributions by the European Association of Institutions in Higher Education (EURASHE) and the Luxembourg Declaration from ESIB. We encourage these organisations and their members to continue their efforts to achieve the European Higher Education Area. End of comments from ESIB--</p>	<p>becomes all the more important now that the necessary legislative reforms are largely in place and we encourage them to continue [...] and intensify their efforts to establish the EHEA. <u>We welcome the clear commitment of higher education institutions across Europe to the Process and we recognise that time is needed to optimise the impact of structural change on curricula and thus to ensure the introduction of the innovative teaching and learning processes that Europe needs.</u></p>
<p>4. We welcome the support of organisations representing business and the social partners and we look forward to their continued cooperation in reaching the goals of the Bologna Process.</p>	<p>-- Comments from Belgium, French Community: 4. It seems preferable to refer to "<u>organisations representing the labour market</u>" instead of "<u>business</u>" End of comments from Belgium, French Community --</p> <p>---- 0000 ----</p> <p>-- Comments from Greece: We agree with the comment of the French Community of Belgium that the term "labour market" should be used instead of "business" End of comments from Greece--</p> <p>---- 0000 ----</p> <p>-- Comments from Germany: We support the proposal from Belgium, French Community. End of comments from Germany--</p> <p>---- 0000 ----</p> <p>-- Comments from Sweden: 4. We welcome the support of organisations representing business and the social partners (<i>representatives of business partners are included in the social partnership</i>) and we look forward to their continued cooperation in reaching the goals of the Bologna Process. End of comments from Sweden--</p>	<p>4. We welcome the support of other organisations, including business and the social partners and we look forward to their continued cooperation in reaching the goals of the Bologna Process.</p>

	<p>---- 0000 ----</p> <p>-- Comments from Council of Europe: 4. We welcome the support of organisations representing business and the social partners and we look forward to their continued cooperation in reaching the goals of the Bologna Process. <u>We further acknowledge and welcome the contributions of the European Commission, the Council of Europe and UNESCO/CEPES to the process.</u> End of comments from Council of Europe--</p> <p>---- 0000 ----</p> <p>-- Comments from Cyprus: We welcome the support of organisations representing business and the social partners and we look forward to their continued cooperation in reaching the goals of the Bologna Process. End of comments from Cyprus--</p> <p>---- 0000 ----</p> <p>-- Comments from Switzerland: 4. We welcome the support of organisations representing business and the social partners and we look forward to their continued cooperation in reaching the goals of the Bologna Process. End of comments from Switzerland--</p>	
	<p>-- Comments from Norway: We believe a reference should be made to the general report "From Berlin-Bergen" under this heading, e.g. as a new paragraph, no 5., in order to refer to the progress made and also the activities carried out during this period. End of comments from Norway--</p>	<p>II. Taking stock</p> <p><u>4bis. We take note of the significant progress made towards our goals, as set out in the General Report 2003-2005 from the Follow-up Group and in the EUA's Trends IV report.</u></p>
<p>II. Taking stock</p> <p>5. At our last meeting in Berlin, we asked the Bologna Follow-up Group for a mid-term stocktaking, focussing on three priorities – the degree system, quality assurance and the recognition of degrees and periods of studies.</p>	<p>-- Comments from Belgium, Flemish Community: General remark awaiting the stocktaking report : We suggest that in the presentation of the results of the stocktaking, Ministers would not shy away from recognising that across the EHEA the implementation of the Bologna objectives is developing at an unequal pace, and in this respect, value the possible contribution of "peer pressure". Countries that are advanced in the Bologna reform should actively share their expertise with those countries still lagging behind. The European Commission and the other consultative members may also take responsibilities in encouraging capacity building at both institutional and governmental level. End of comments from Belgium, Flemish Community --</p>	<p>5. At our [...] meeting in Berlin, we asked the Follow-up Group for a mid-term stocktaking, focusing on three priorities – the degree system, quality assurance and the recognition of degrees and periods of studies. <u>While good progress has been made in these three priority areas, it will be important to ensure that it is consistent across all participating</u></p>

	<p>---- 0000 ----</p> <p>-- Comments from Council of Europe: 5. At our last meeting in Berlin, we asked the Bologna Follow-up Group for a mid-term stocktaking, focussing<u>focusing</u> on three priorities – the degree system, quality assurance and the recognition of degrees and periods of studies. End of comments from Council of Europe--</p>	<p><u>countries. We therefore see a need for greater sharing of expertise to build capacity at both institutional and governmental level.</u></p>
<p>The degree system</p> <p>6. Status (<i>Awaiting the stocktaking report.</i>)</p>	<p>-- Comments from the European Commission: <u>Exchange of experience on the labour market function of the bachelor degree should be encouraged.</u> End of comments from the European Commission--</p>	<p>The degree system</p> <p>6. <u>We note with satisfaction that the two-cycle degree system is being implemented on a large scale, with more than half of the students being enrolled in it in most countries. In spite of some remaining procedural problems, there are no major obstacles to access between cycles. There is a need however for greater dialogue, involving Governments, institutions and employers, to increase the employability of graduates with bachelor qualifications.</u></p>
<p><u>Frameworks for qualifications</u></p> <p>7. We adopt the overarching framework for qualifications in the EHEA, comprising three cycles (including the possibility of a shorter period of study within the first cycle), generic descriptors for each cycle based on learning outcomes, and credit ranges. We commit ourselves to elaborating national frameworks of qualifications compatible with the overarching framework for qualifications of the EHEA for 2010, and to have started work on this by 2007. We entrust the Follow-up Group with the maintenance and further development of the framework.</p>	<p>-- Comments from Belgium, French Community: As already mentioned earlier, we do estimate that it is too early for the Ministers to adopt the overarching framework for qualifications, as the countries had not sufficient time to proceed to internal evaluation. We, therefore, suggest the following modification: “ We <u>welcome the idea</u> of an overarching framework(...). We commit ourselves <u>to examine the possibility</u> of elaborating national frameworks (...). End of comments from Belgium, French Community --</p> <p>---- 0000 ----</p> <p>-- Comments from Ireland: 7. We adopt the overarching framework for qualifications of in the EHEA, comprising three cycles (including the possibility of a shorter period of study with <u>additional provision for a short cycle within or linked to</u> the first cycle), generic descriptors for each cycle based on learning outcomes, and <u>guidelines for the association of credit within national frameworks. ranges</u>. We commit ourselves to elaborating national frameworks of qualifications compatible with the overarching framework for qualifications of the EHEA for 2010, and to have started work on this by 2007. We entrust the Follow-up Group with the maintenance and further development of the framework.</p>	<p>7. We adopt the overarching framework for qualifications in the EHEA, comprising three cycles (including the possibility of a <u>separate qualification</u> within or linked to the first cycle), generic descriptors for each cycle based on learning outcomes <u>and competences</u>, and credit ranges <u>in the first and second cycles</u>. We commit ourselves to elaborating national frameworks for qualifications compatible with the overarching framework for qualifications in the EHEA for 2010, and to have started work on this by 2007. We ask the Follow-up Group <u>to report on the implementation and further development of the overarching framework.</u></p>

End of comments from Ireland --

---- 0000 ----

-- Comments from Cyprus:

Cyprus supports the comments made by Ireland

End of comments from Cyprus--

---- 0000 ----

-- Comments from the Netherlands:

As a further elaboration of the frameworks for qualifications we welcome an exploration to transparently link compatible profiles in the overarching framework for qualifications.

End of comments from the Netherlands --

---- 0000 ----

-- Comments from Belgium, Flemish Community:

Please rewrite :

"We adopt the overarching framework for qualification in the EHEA, comprising three cycles (...), generic descriptors for each cycle based on learning outcomes, and credit ranges for the first and second cycle.

As an important step in widening access to higher education, we welcome the inclusion in the overarching qualification framework for higher education of generic descriptors and credit ranges for sub-degrees, involving a shorter period of study within the first cycle".

Rationale :

1. There is no agreement on applying credit ranges to the third cycle.
2. The introduction of shorter periods of study within the first cycle is a new achievement and should therefore be addressed in a separate paragraph.

End of comments from Belgium, Flemish Community --

---- 0000 ----

-- Comments from Council of Europe:

7. We adopt the overarching framework for qualifications in the EHEA, comprising three cycles (including the possibility of a ~~shorter period of study~~ shorter period of study cycle within the first cycle), generic descriptors for each cycle based on learning outcomes, and credit ranges. We commit ourselves to elaborating national frameworks of qualifications compatible with the overarching framework for qualifications of the EHEA for 2010, and to have started work on this by 2007. We entrust the Follow-up Group with the maintenance and further development of the framework.

Comment: the working group uses the term "short cycle within or linked to the first cycle", and this should also be used in the communiqué . A period of study is a part of a qualification, without independent value in degree terms, cf. the Lisboa Recognition Convention, Section I: "Period of study: Any component of a higher education programme which has been evaluated and documented and,

while not a complete program of study in itself, represents a significant acquisition of knowledge or skill". Since short cycle studies lead to a qualification, the term "period of study" is clearly inappropriate. Also, a generic (Dublin) descriptor has been elaborated for short cycle qualifications, so the text as proposed is contradictory also on this point

End of comments from Council of Europe--

---- 0000 ----

-- Comments from the United Kingdom:

Paragraph 7 – insert “in the first and second cycles” after “credit ranges”. This is to reflect the fact that any decision on credit at doctoral level was postponed at the Salzburg seminar until after the Bergen Summit.

End of comments from the United Kingdom--

---- 0000 ----

-- Comments from Spain:

We propose to amend point 7 including the word “competences” in the paragraph after the expression “learning outcomes” (third line in the original text). The full amended paragraph would read as follows: “7.- We adopt the overarching framework for qualifications in the EHEA, comprising three cycles (including the possibility of a shorter period of study within the first cycle), generic descriptors for each cycle based on learning outcomes, competences and credit ranges. We commit ourselves to elaborating national frameworks of qualifications compatible with the overarching framework for qualifications of the EHEA for 2010, and to have started work on this by 2007. We entrust the Follow-up Group with the maintenance and further development of the framework.”

Justification for the proposed change:

Adding the word competences to the paragraph, together with the expression learning outcomes, reinforces and makes more precise the idea that the central issue in defining the qualifications is the set of capacities and skills that students will acquire in every programme.

End of comments from Spain--

---- 0000 ----

-- Comments from Norway:

The phrase “shorter period of study within the first cycle” is used in this paragraph. In order to be consistent with the Dublin descriptors and the report of the working group on an overarching qualification framework where the term cycle is used consistently when referring to this type of qualification, we believe it would be better to use the term short cycle higher education within the first cycle.

End of comments from Norway--

---- 0000 ----

-- Comments from Germany:

The paper on the European “A Framework for Qualification of The European Higher Education Area” should be either included into the text (in particular the descriptors) or be dealt as an interesting

concept, having an impact on the national frameworks of qualification. We therefore suggest the following modification: "We welcome the concept of an overarching framework ..."

We understand the text in brackets as meaning: the shorter periods of studies may be part of a first cycle but not replace it.

End of comments from Germany--

---- 0000 ----

-- Comments from ESIB:

7. We adopt the overarching framework for qualifications in the EHEA, comprising three cycles (including the possibility of a shorter period of study within the first cycle), generic descriptors for each cycle based on learning outcomes, and credit ranges. We commit ourselves to elaborating national frameworks of qualifications compatible with the overarching framework for qualifications (list the 5 elements: profile, workload, credit, etc) of the EHEA for 2010, and to have started work on this by 2007. We entrust the Follow-up Group with the maintenance and further development of the framework.

End of comments from ESIB--

---- 0000 ----

-- Comments from Switzerland:

7. We adopt the overarching framework for qualifications in the EHEA, comprising three cycles (including the possibility of a shorter period of study within the first cycle), generic descriptors for each cycle based on learning outcomes, and credit ranges in the first and second cycles. [Switzerland supports the comments made by the UK] We commit ourselves to elaborating national frameworks of qualifications compatible with the overarching framework for qualifications of the EHEA for 2010, and to have started work on this by 2007. We entrust the Follow-up Group with the maintenance and further development of the framework.

End of comments from Switzerland--

---- 0000 ----

-- Comments from Portugal:

Paragraph 7, line 2

... (including the possibility of a shorter period of study within or linked to the first cycle)...

End of comments from Portugal--

---- 0000 ----

-- Comments from France:

7. We adopt the overarching framework for qualifications in the EHEA, comprising three cycles (including the possibility of a shorter period of study within the first cycle) and the reference to ECTS credits (except for the third cycle, ie doctoral studies) based on 60 credits per an academic year for each cycle. These three cycles should take into account the current and future needs of the labour market and may refer to descriptors for learning outcomes. ~~generic descriptors for each cycle based on learning outcomes, and credit ranges.~~ We commit ourselves to implementing national higher education policies ~~elaborating national frameworks of qualifications compatible with the overarching~~

	<p>framework for qualifications of the EHEA for 2010, <u>in the perspective of lifelong learning</u>, and to have started work on this by 2007. We entrust the Follow-up Group with the maintenance and further development of the framework.</p> <p><i>FR comments : The BFUG cannot be entrusted with such a political responsibility as the further development of qualifications frameworks, a task which must not be locked up by a technical working group of experts either. Generally speaking, the BFUG's role must be defined in the final section (paragraph 22)</i> <i>Bologna reforms which are being implemented are in-depth reforms that must reach the 'grass roots' level' in each HEI, which requires a huge work and time if we want these reforms to make sense and not be superficial. So it is unnecessary at this stage to make the work even more difficult. Concerning ECTS credits, it is worth remembering credits are the reference for the first two cycles on the basis of the 'Bologna rule' of 60 years per academic year, but France will not accept ECTS credits for the third cycle. Concerning descriptors for learning outcomes, this is a methodological issue not to be referred to in a political text such as a Communiqué which is meant to formulate policies even if Communiqués belong to 'soft law'. Besides, the consultation which the European Commission is planning to make on the European framework for qualifications brings the evidence that the descriptors' issue is a matter of utmost importance to be widely discussed. Last but not least, the reference to the LLL perspective is central to the making of an overarching framework for qualifications in the EHEA.</i> End of comments from France--</p> <p>---- 0000 ----</p> <p>-- Comments from Greece: We believe that the phrase in the parenthesis should be deleted considering the fact that there is a strong opposition in Greece to the inclusion of a shorter period of study within the first cycle. End of comments from Greece--</p> <p>---- 0000 ----</p> <p>-- Comments from Austria: The last sentence of paragraph 7 should be combined with paragraph 8 in the following way:</p> <p>We entrust the Follow-up Group with the maintenance (via a working group) and further development of the framework, with the EC as an active partner in order to ensure complementarity(As the EC is already mentioned here, the last sentence (We ask the EC to.....) can be deleted. End of comments from Austria--</p>	
<p>8. We underline the importance of ensuring complementarity between the overarching framework for higher education to the proposed broader European framework of qualifications for lifelong learning encompassing general</p>	<p>-- Comments from Ireland: 8. We underline the importance of ensuring complementarity between the overarching framework for <u>qualifications of the EHEA and higher education</u> to the proposed broader European framework of qualifications for lifelong learning encompassing general education as well as vocational education and training as now being developed within the European Union. We ask the European Commission to</p>	<p>8. We underline the importance of ensuring complementarity between the overarching framework for the EHEA to the proposed broader framework for qualifications for lifelong learning encompassing general education as well as vocational education</p>

<p>education as well as vocational education and training as now being developed within the European Union. We ask the European Commission to consult all parties to the Bologna Process in their work.</p>	<p>consult all parties to the Bologna Process in their work. End of comments from Ireland --</p> <p>---- 0000 ----</p> <p>-- Comments from Cyprus: Cyprus supports the comments made by Ireland End of comments from Cyprus--</p> <p>---- 0000 ----</p> <p>-- Comments from Sweden: 8. We underline the importance of ensuring complementarity between the overarching framework for higher education <u>in the EHEA countries</u> to the proposed broader European framework of qualifications for lifelong learning encompassing general education as well as vocational education and training as now being developed within the European Union. We ask the European Commission to consult all parties to the Bologna Process in their work. End of comments from Sweden--</p> <p>---- 0000 ----</p> <p>-- Comments from Council of Europe: 8. We underline the importance of ensuring complementarity between the overarching framework for higher education to the proposed broader European framework of qualifications for lifelong learning encompassing general education as well as vocational education and training as now being developed within the European Union <i>[We suggest that the term “European” be deleted, to avoid confusion with the overarching EHEA framework, here as it refers to a process within the European Union and thus 25 countries rather than the 40 or 45. If it needs to be qualified, it should be EU framework, in the same way that the EHEA framework should be referred to as such]</i>. We ask the European Commission to consult all parties to the Bologna Process in their work. End of comments from Council of Europe--</p> <p>---- 0000 ----</p> <p>-- Comments from the United Kingdom: Paragraph 8 – last sentence – replace “consult” with “fully involve”. End of comments from the United Kingdom--</p> <p>---- 0000 ----</p> <p>-- Comments from Switzerland: 8. We underline the importance of ensuring complementarity between the overarching framework for higher education to the proposed broader European framework of qualifications for lifelong learning encompassing general education as well as vocational education and training as now being developed within the European Union. We ask the European Commission to consult <u>fully involve</u> all parties to the Bologna Process in their work. <i>[In accordance with the comment made by the UK]</i> End of comments from Switzerland--</p> <p>---- 0000 ----</p>	<p>and training as now being developed within the European Union. We ask the European Commission fully to involve all parties to the Bologna Process in their work.</p>
---	--	--

	<p>-- Comments from ESIB: Delete Paragraph End of comments from ESIB--</p> <p>---- 0000 ----</p> <p>-- Comments from France: 8. We underline the importance of ensuring complementarity between the overarching framework for higher education qualifications in the EHEA to and the proposed broader European framework of qualifications for lifelong learning encompassing general education as well as vocational education and training as now being developed within the European Union. We ask the European Commission to consult all parties to the Bologna Process in their work. End of comments from France--</p> <p>---- 0000 ----</p> <p>-- Comments from the European Commission: 8. We underline the importance of ensuring complementarity between integration of the overarching framework for higher education to the proposed broader European framework of qualifications for lifelong learning encompassing general education as well as vocational education and training as now being developed within the European Union. We ask the European Commission to consult all parties to the Bologna Process in their work. End of comments from the European Commission--</p>	
<p>Quality assurance</p> <p>9. Status (<i>Awaiting the stocktaking report.</i>)</p>	<p>-- Comments from EUA: TO BE INCLUDED We urge higher education institutions to continue their efforts to enhance the quality of their activities through the systematic introduction of internal mechanisms and their direct correlation to external quality assurance mechanisms. End of comments from EUA --</p> <p>---- 0000 ----</p> <p>-- Comments from Greece: We support the comments from EUA End of comments from Greece--</p>	<p>Quality assurance</p> <p>9. <u>Almost all countries have made provision for a quality assurance system based on the criteria set out in the Berlin Communiqué and with a high degree of cooperation and networking. However, there is still progress to be made when it comes to student involvement. Furthermore, we urge higher education institutions to continue their efforts to enhance the quality of their activities through the systematic introduction of internal mechanisms and their direct correlation to external quality assurance.</u></p> <p>[.....]</p>
<p><u>Standards and guidelines for quality assurance</u></p> <p>10. We adopt the standards and guidelines for quality assurance in the European Higher Education Area as</p>	<p>-- Comments from Belgium, French Community: 10. During the last meeting of the BFUG in Mondorf, it was clear that we did not reach an agreement on the ENQA proposal. The governments must be able to examine the different consequences of the proposal and it is, therefore, too early to refer to any formal "adoption" of the document. Therefore, we propose to adapt this paragraph .</p>	<p>10. We adopt the standards and guidelines for quality assurance in the European Higher Education Area as proposed by ENQA [.....]. We commit ourselves to introducing the proposed model for peer review of quality assurance agencies on a national basis and</p>

proposed by ENQA in cooperation with ESIB, EUA and EURASHE. We commit ourselves to introducing the proposed model for peer review of quality assurance agencies on a national basis and will report to the next Ministerial Conference. We welcome the principle of a European register of quality assurance agencies and ask that rules and regulations for this register along with the composition and responsibilities of a European Register Committee be further developed. We underline the importance of mutually recognising accreditation or quality assurance decisions. (*Preliminary formulation.*)

End of comments from Belgium, French Community --

---- 0000 ----

-- Comments from EUA:

COMMENT - we hope that the further clarification provided by ENQA after consultation of the E4 partners will allow progress to be made as follows:

"We welcome the introduction of the European Register of QA agencies (as an instrument of transparency and comparability) to meet the interests of HEIs, students and governments in being able to identify professional and credible QA agencies operating in Europe and ask for the establishment of a European Register Committee that in order to ensure independence, transparency and efficacy should include representatives of HEIs, students, governments, QA agencies and other stakeholders."

End of comments from EUA --

---- 0000 ----

-- Comments from Sweden:

10. We adopt the standards and guidelines for quality assurance in the European Higher Education Area as proposed by ENQA in cooperation with ESIB, EUA and EURASHE. We commit ourselves to introducing the proposed model for peer review of quality assurance agencies on a national basis and will report to the next Ministerial Conference. We welcome the principle of a European register of quality assurance agencies connected to ENQA and ask that rules and regulations for this register along with the composition and responsibilities of a European Register Committee be further developed. We underline the importance of mutually recognising accreditation or quality assurance decisions.

(We do not agree to the Register Committee described in the ENQA report. We should not restrict the discussion on the organisation of the European register in the communiqué). (Sweden can not accept this formulation. It would mean a governmental financial responsibility for higher education that has been accredited or quality assured by foreign agencies, but not by the Swedish authorities. Such a scenario is not acceptable. The focus should be on strengthening the peer review system.)

End of comments from Sweden--

---- 0000 ----

-- Comments from Council of Europe:

10. We adopt the standards and guidelines for quality assurance in the European Higher Education Area as proposed by ENQA in cooperation with ESIB, EUA and EURASHE. We commit ourselves to introducing the proposed model for peer review of quality assurance agencies on a national basis and will report to the next Ministerial Conference. We welcome the principle of a European register of quality assurance agencies and ask that rules and regulations for this register along with the composition and responsibilities of a European Register Committee be further developed [*Comment: this leaves open the question of how these rules are to be adopted, and by whom. If the Register is to be a key element of the EHEA, the Ministers should express a view on how this is to be done, possibly by asking for a proposal in time for the 2007 meeting. This should be clarified*]. We underline the importance of mutually recognising accreditation or quality assurance decisions. (*Preliminary*

will report to the next Ministerial Conference. We welcome the principle of a European register of quality assurance agencies. **We ask that the practicalities of implementation be further developed by ENQA in cooperation with EUA, EURASHE and ESIB with a report back to us through the BFUG.** We underline the importance of **cooperation between nationally recognised agencies with a view to enhancing** the mutual recognition of accreditation or quality assurance decisions.

formulation.)

End of comments from Council of Europe--

---- 0000 ----

-- Comments from the United Kingdom:

Paragraph 10 – penultimate sentence – amend to " We welcome the principle of a European register of quality assurance agencies and ask that the practicalities of implementation be further developed by ENQA, EUA, EURASHE and ESIB". Delete final sentence.

End of comments from the United Kingdom--

---- 0000 ----

-- Comments from Norway:

During the last BFUG-meeting in Mondorf, it was quite clear that no agreement was reached on the ENQA-proposal regarding the European Register for quality assurance agencies and especially the European Register Committee. Norway welcomes the purpose and principle of a European register of quality assurance agencies. However, the composition as well as the responsibilities and regulations of the proposed European Register committee is still unclear, too unclear for the ministers to endorse this in Bergen. In our opinion, this should be elaborated further before being included in a communiqué from the ministers. Thus we suggest deleting the reference to the European Register Committee in this communiqué. As an alternative, and as a first step for the European Register, we suggest asking ENQA to keep a register of the quality assurance agencies that fulfil the standards and guidelines adopted by the ministers. Thus we propose the following after the second sentence of this paragraph:

We welcome the principle of a European register of quality assurance agencies. As a first step, we ask ENQA to keep a register of the member agencies that fulfil the adopted standards and guidelines for quality assurance, and ask the BFUG to explore ways in which such a register might be developed further. We underline the importance of mutually recognising accreditation or quality assurance decisions.

End of comments from Norway--

---- 0000 ----

-- Comments from Germany:

Two characteristic structures and principles of cooperation between the member states and the institutions within the Bologna Process are cross-border networking and mutual trust. This goes for the QA as well. Every country and institution is responsible for establishing the system of QA. In this respect European standards and guidelines for quality assurance describe minimum rules. Every member state is free to define stricter rules. A European register of quality assurance agencies could therefore - for the time being - only function as an instrument for fostering the transparency of the European qualification assurance system, more or less as a list of nationally recognized agencies. The problem of heterogenous structures of quality assurance in the different member states raises the question whether or not we can rely on all national recognitions of agencies. But a European register would not be able to replace a sufficient control and process of recognition on the national level.

After all we recommend the following text:

"We welcome the standards and guidelines for quality assurance in the European Higher Education

Area as proposed by ENQA in cooperation with ESIB, EUA and EURASHE as minimum rules. We commit ourselves to introducing the proposed model of peer review for quality assurance. We underline the importance of mutually recognising accreditation or other quality assurance decisions."

End of comments from Germany--

---- 0000 ----

-- Comments from Italy:

Para 10: we express our support to the comments of Sweden, Norway and Germany

End of comments from Italy--

---- 0000 ----

-- Comments from ESIB:

10. We adopt the standards and guidelines for quality assurance in the European Higher Education Area as proposed by ENQA in cooperation with ESIB, EUA and EURASHE. We commit ourselves to introducing the proposed model for peer review of quality assurance agencies on a national basis and will report to the next Ministerial Conference. We welcome the principle of a European register of quality assurance agencies under the supervision of a European Register Committee. ~~and We~~ ask that rules and regulations for this register along with the composition and responsibilities of a European Register Committee be further developed by ENQA and its partners: EUA, EURASHE and ESIB. We underline the importance of mutually recognising accreditation or quality assurance decisions.

(Preliminary formulation.)

End of comments from ESIB--

---- 0000 ----

-- Comments from Switzerland:

10. We adopt the standards and guidelines for quality assurance in the European Higher Education Area as proposed by ENQA in cooperation with ESIB, EUA and EURASHE. We commit ourselves to introducing the proposed model for peer review of quality assurance agencies on a national basis and will report to the next Ministerial Conference. We ~~consider the possibility of creating~~ ~~welcome the principle of~~ a European register of quality assurance agencies and ask that rules and regulations for this register along with the composition and responsibilities of a European Register Committee be further developed. We underline the importance of mutually recognising accreditation or quality assurance decisions. *(Preliminary formulation.)*

[While Switzerland principally shares the idea that a European register of quality assurance agencies might be a useful tool for improving the overall quality of European higher education, our country needs further clarifications and analysis in order to wholeheartedly support this principle. Moreover, given that at the last BFUG meeting no agreement was reached on this issue, we suggest phrasing this paragraph more openly (as suggested above).

In contrast, we welcome the last sentence that underlines the importance of mutually recognising accreditation of quality assurance decisions.]

End of comments from Switzerland--

	<p style="text-align: center;">---- 0000 ----</p> <p>-- Comments from France: 10. We adopt <u>take note</u> of the standards and guidelines for quality assurance in the European Higher Education Area as proposed by ENQA in cooperation with ESIB, EUA and EURASHE. We commit ourselves to introducing the proposed model for peer review of quality assurance agencies based on quality assurance agencies recognized on a national basis, peer reviews and academic values and will report to the next Ministerial Conference. We welcome the principle of a European register of quality assurance agencies and ask that rules and regulations for this register along with the composition and responsibilities of a European Register Committee be further developed. We underline the importance of mutually recognising accreditation or quality assurance decisions <u>made by agencies or bodies recognized by national authorities.</u> (Preliminary formulation.)</p> <p><i>FR comments : It is too early to adopt such a report based notably on a register and a European register Committee at this stage. France anyway won't accept the idea of having national authorities dispossessed to the advantage of a 'meta-Committee' which will decide on the QA agencies to be registered or not or not any longer.</i></p> <p>End of comments from France--</p> <p style="text-align: center;">---- 0000 ----</p> <p>-- Comments from Greece: We express our reservations as to the composition and responsibilities of the European Register Committee. This issue along with the ownership of the European Register should be further examined by governments. We believe that it is too early for the Ministers to commit on such an important issue.</p> <p><i>The meaning of the last sentence is unclear. Decisions made by whom? (the QA national agencies? The national QA agencies members of ENQA or the QA agencies in the European Register?)</i></p> <p>End of comments from Greece--</p>	
<p>Recognition of degrees and study periods</p> <p>11. We note that 36 of the 45 participating countries have now ratified the Lisbon Recognition Convention. We urge participating countries that have not already done so to ratify the Convention without delay and we call on all participating countries to ensure the full implementation of its principles. We express support for the subsidiary texts to the Lisbon Recognition Convention and call upon all national authorities and other</p>	<p>-- Comments from Finland: Para 11: the reference to the Lisbon Recognition Convention and its annex is unclear: the annex leaves two possibilities as the grounds of recognition of joint degrees, and we think it is important to respect the text of the Convention</p> <p>End of comments from Finland --</p> <p style="text-align: center;">---- 0000 ----</p> <p>-- Comments from Council of Europe: 11. We note that 36 of the 45 participating countries have now ratified the Lisbon Recognition Convention. We urge participating countries that have not already done so to ratify the Convention without delay and, <u>where appropriate, to incorporate the principles of the Convention in their national legislation.</u> We call on all participating countries to ensure the full implementation of its principles. We express support for the subsidiary texts to the Lisbon Recognition Convention and call upon all national</p>	<p>Recognition of degrees and study periods</p> <p>11. We note that 36 of the 45 participating countries have now ratified the Lisbon Recognition Convention. We urge <u>those</u> that have not already done so to ratify the Convention without delay. We call on all participating countries to ensure the full implementation of its principles <u>and to address persistent recognition problems identified by the ENIC/NARIC networks. We will draw up national action plans to improve the quality of the process associated with the recognition</u></p>

<p>stakeholders to accept joint degrees recognised by two or more countries in the European higher Education Area.</p>	<p>authorities and other stakeholders to accept recognize joint degrees recognised awarded by two or more countries in the European higher Education Area. End of comments from Council of Europe--</p> <p>---- 0000 ----</p> <p>-- Comments from the United Kingdom: Paragraph 11 – final sentence – stop the sentence after “Convention”. The subsidiary texts to the Lisbon Convention include recommendations on joint degrees, so the rest is unnecessary. End of comments from the United Kingdom--</p> <p>---- 0000 ----</p> <p>-- Comments from Greece: Greece expresses reservations about this paragraph End of comments from Greece--</p> <p>---- 0000 ----</p> <p>-- Comments from Austria: We suggest the keep the wording as proposed before the first Mondorf meeting: We note that 36 of the 45 participating countries have now ratified the Lisbon Recognition Convention. We urge participating countries that have not already done so to ratify the Convention without delay. We express support for the <u>ongoing work of the Committee of the Convention on the Recognition of Qualifications concerning Higher Education in the European Region</u> and call upon all National Authorities and other stakeholders as appropriate in each country <u>to fully implement the Lisbon Recognition Convention</u> and to eliminate still existing recognition problems as identified by the ENIC-NARIC networks. End of comments from Austria--</p>	<p>of foreign qualifications. These plans will form part of each country's national report for the next Ministerial Conference. We express support for the subsidiary texts to the Lisbon Recognition Convention and call upon all national authorities and other stakeholders to recognise joint degrees awarded by two or more countries in the EHEA.</p>
<p>12. We urge participating countries and all higher education institutions to recognise relevant qualifications from non-formal learning as giving access to and as elements in higher education programmes. We see the development of national frameworks as an opportunity to further embed lifelong learning within all levels of the education system, and in particular higher education.</p>	<p>-- Comments from Ireland: 12. We urge participating countries and all higher education institutions to recognise relevant qualifications from non-formal learning as giving access to and as elements in higher education programmes. We see the development of national frameworks <u>of qualifications</u> as an opportunity to further embed lifelong learning within all levels of the education system, and in particular higher education. End of comments from Ireland --</p> <p>---- 0000 ----</p> <p>-- Comments from Turkey: We propose that , in item 12, lines 2&3, "as giving access to and" is deleted. End of comments from Turkey --</p> <p>---- 0000 ----</p> <p>-- Comments from Sweden: 12. We urge participating countries and all higher education institutions to recognise relevant qualifications from non-formal learning as giving access to and as elements in higher education</p>	<p>12. We urge participating countries and all higher education institutions to recognise prior learning or relevant qualifications from non-formal learning as giving access to and as elements in higher education programmes. We see the development of national[.....] and European frameworks for qualifications as an opportunity to further embed lifelong learning[.....] in higher education.</p>

programmes. We see the development of national frameworks as an opportunity to further embed lifelong learning in ~~within all levels of the education system, and in particular~~ higher education. **End of comments from Sweden--**

---- 0000 ----

-- Comments from Belgium, Flemish Community:

Please rewrite :

We urge... to **validate prior professional and learning experiences and qualifications acquired in a non-formal setting** giving access to...programmes, **in order to open up higher education to non-traditional student publics.**

End of comments from Belgium, Flemish Community --

---- 0000 ----

-- Comments from Council of Europe:

12. We urge participating countries and all higher education institutions to recognise relevant qualifications from non-formal learning as giving access to and as elements in higher education programmes. We see the development of national qualifications frameworks as an opportunity to further embed lifelong learning within all levels of the education system, and in particular higher education. **End of comments from Council of Europe--**

---- 0000 ----

-- Comments from Lithuania:

12. We urge participating countries and all higher education institutions to recognise relevant qualifications from non-formal learning ~~as in~~ giving access to and as elements in higher education programmes. (We see the development of national frameworks as an opportunity to further embed lifelong learning within all levels of the education system, and in particular higher education.) *Last sentence seems to be more relevant to the section Frameworks for qualifications as additional paragraph or complementary to the paragraph 8.* **End of comments from Lithuania--**

---- 0000 ----

-- Comments from ESIB:

12. We urge participating countries and all higher education institutions to recognise relevant qualifications from non-formal and informal learning as giving access to and as elements in higher education programmes. We see the development of national frameworks as an opportunity to further embed lifelong learning within all levels of the education system, and in particular higher education.

End of comments from ESIB--

---- 0000 ----

-- Comments from Greece:

We recommend keeping the formulation of the previous draft

"We urge participating countries and all higher education institutions to recognise relevant qualifications from lifelong learning as elements in higher education programmes."

Greece cannot accept that non-formal learning should give access to higher education **End of comments from Greece--**

---- 0000 ----

-- Comments from the European Commission:

	<p>12. We urge participating countries and all higher education institutions to <u>address persistent recognition problems identified by the ENIC-NARIC Networks and</u> recognise relevant qualifications from non-formal learning as giving access to and as elements in higher education programmes. We see the development of national frameworks <u>and the European framework</u> as an opportunity to further embed lifelong learning within all levels of the education system, and in particular higher education. End of comments from the European Commission--</p>	
	<p>-- Comments from EUA: After 12. Add new paragraph based on the results of TRENDS IV</p> <p>“We welcome the clear commitment of higher education institutions all across Europe to implementing the Bologna process as shown by TRENDS IV. We recognise that time is needed to optimise the impact of structural change on curricula and thus to ensure the introduction of the innovative teaching and learning processes that Europe needs and undertake to ensure that higher education institutions enjoy the necessary autonomy to be able to continue to implement the agreed reforms. We note that the efforts to introduce structural change and improve the quality of teaching should not be undertaken to the detriment of the quality of research, and recognise that success depends on sustainable and reliable funding to the institutions End of comments from EUA --</p>	
<p>III. Further challenges</p> <p>The third cycle and research</p> <p>13. We emphasise the importance of research and research training in maintaining and improving the quality and enhancing the competitiveness of the EHEA.</p>	<p>-- Comments from Slovenia: <i>We propose to add the social dimension as a first priority in this chapter with the following text:</i> The process of building the EHEA needs to improve its social dimension and is therefore set as a priority. When talking about social dimension, we need to take into account social cohesion objectives regarding access to higher education, living and studying conditions, financial and material support, services for students such as information, guidance and advice, and also mobility support at European and the national level alike. End of comments from Slovenia --</p> <p>--- 0000 ---</p> <p>-- Comments from Belgium, Flemish Community: Please change the title of this paragraph as it suggests that the synergy between higher education is limited to the third cycle only. End of comments from Belgium, Flemish Community --</p> <p>--- 0000 ---</p> <p>-- Comments from the United Kingdom: Paragraph 13 – delete. This does not add anything that is not included in para 14. End of comments from the United Kingdom--</p>	<p>III. Further challenges</p> <p><u>Higher education</u> and research</p> <p><u>[13 deleted and incorporated under 14]</u></p>

	<p>--- 0000 ---</p> <p>-- Comments from ESIB: 13. We emphasise the importance of research and research training in maintaining and improving the quality and enhancing the <u>attractiveness competitiveness</u> of the EHEA. End of comments from ESIB--</p> <p>--- 0000 ---</p> <p>-- Comments from EURASHE: On III Further challenges <i>We would like to propose that the title here is : "<u>Synergy between education and research</u>", which leaves open the possibility of a research (and innovation) dimension in all 3 cycles of HE.</i> End of comments from EURASHE--</p> <p>--- 0000 ---</p> <p>-- Comments from Portugal: Paragraph 13, line 1 ... the importance of research and research training <u>in maintaining in improving</u> the quality and enhancing the competitiveness of the EHEA End of comments from Portugal--</p>	
<p>14. We underline the importance of the higher education sector in further enhancing research for the economic and cultural development of our societies and for social cohesion. We stress their dual function in carrying out high quality research and research training. To further enhance both the quality and relevance of research in our emerging knowledge-based society we recognise the need to improve the synergy between the higher education and the research sectors in our respective countries, and we advocate a similar cooperation between the European Higher Education Area and the European Research Area.</p>	<p>-- Comments from EUA: COMMENT – by talking about the synergy between the higher education and research sectors we give the impression that they are separate, whereas in all HEIs they are inextricably linked, and this is the important point that was underlined in Berlin and needs to be highlighted</p> <p>Proposal to reformulate the 2nd sentence as follows: To further enhance.....we need to improve the synergy etc....in our countries, in particular by strengthening the links between higher education and research in HEIs. We advocate furthermore increased co-operation...(which is a different issue)</p> <p>Add a final sentence: We will work together with HEIs to ensure that the Bologna reforms do not have a negative impact on research capacity". End of comments from EUA --</p> <p>--- 0000 ---</p> <p>-- Comments from EURASHE: <i>14. We agree with the comments made by the EUA under paragraph 14, but would like it to be even more specific and therefore propose the following as an addition:</i></p> <p>"Qualifications for doctoral programmes and the disciplines eligible for these must be in line with societal evolutions, in view of a valorisation of the capacities for research available in all Higher</p>	<p>14. We underline the importance of higher education in further enhancing research for the economic and cultural development of our societies and for social cohesion [.....] <u>We note that the efforts to introduce structural change and improve the quality of teaching should go hand in hand with the effort to improve the quality of research.</u> <i>We therefore emphasise the importance of research and research training in maintaining and improving the quality and enhancing the competitiveness and attractiveness of the EHEA (former 13) <u>With a view to achieving critical mass</u> we recognise the need to improve the synergy between the higher education sector and <u>other</u> research sectors throughout our respective countries and[.....] between the EHEA and the European Research Area.</i></p>

Education Institutions". **End of comments from EURASHE--**

---- 0000 ----

-- Comments from Sweden:

14. We underline the importance of the higher education sector in further enhancing research for the economic and cultural development of our societies and for social cohesion. We stress their dual function in carrying out high quality research and research training. To further enhance both the quality and relevance of research in our emerging knowledge-based society we recognise the need to improve the synergy between the higher education and the research sectors (*What does sectors mean? What will be the consequences?*) in our respective countries, and we advocate a similar cooperation link between the European Higher Education Area and the European Research Area. **End of comments from Sweden--**

---- 0000 ----

-- Comments from Belgium, Flemish Community:

Paragraph should be made stronger and appeal for concrete action in order to create synergies (not mere cooperation) between the EHEA and the ERA. **End of comments from Belgium, Flemish Community --**

---- 0000 ----

-- Comments from the United Kingdom:

Paragraph 14 – final sentence – insert “other” before “research sectors” in recognition that research is not completely separate from HE. **End of comments from the United Kingdom--**

---- 0000 ----

-- Comments from Portugal:

Paragraph 14, line 4 ff
... quality and relevance of research in our emerging increasingly knowledge-based society, we recognise the need to *expand the human resources for Science and Technology* and to improve the synergy between the ...
End of comments from Portugal--

---- 0000 ----

-- Comments from the European Commission:

14. We underline the importance of the higher education sector ~~in further enhancing for research, for the economic and cultural development of our societies and for social cohesion. We stress their dual function in carrying out high quality research and research training. To further enhance both the quality and relevance of research in our emerging knowledge-based society we recognise the need to improve the synergy between the higher~~ Education and the research sectors in our respective countries, and ~~can not be separated and we therefore advocate a similar cooperation~~ Education and research can not be separated and we therefore advocate strong links between the European Higher Education Area

	<p>and the European Research Area. End of comments from the European Commission--</p>	
<p>15. To achieve these objectives, doctoral level qualifications need to be transparent and fully aligned with the EHEA overarching framework for qualifications. Considering the need for structured doctoral programmes, the normal workload of the third cycle should correspond to 3-4 years full time. We urge universities to ensure that their doctoral programmes are designed to meet new challenges for research and for professional careers. We need to achieve an overall increase in the numbers of doctoral students across the EHEA. We see participants in third cycle programmes both as students and as early stage researchers.</p>	<p>-- Comments from Belgium, French Community: During the last meeting of the BFUG, it was asked and , I believe, agreed on, that no reference to any duration would be fixed for the third cycle, so we strongly ask to delete it. End of comments from Belgium, French Community --</p> <p>---- 0000 ----</p> <p>-- Comments from Ireland: 15. To achieve these objectives, doctoral level qualifications need to be transparent and fully aligned <u>through national frameworks of qualifications with the overarching framework for qualifications of the EHEA.</u> EHEA overarching framework for qualifications. Considering the need for structured doctoral programmes, the normal workload of the third cycle should correspond to 3-4 years full time. We urge universities to ensure that their doctoral programmes are designed to meet new challenges for research and for professional careers. We need to achieve an overall increase in the numbers of doctoral students across the EHEA. We see participants in third cycle programmes both as students and as early stage researchers.</p> <p><i>*Ireland has a problem with the use of 3 – 4 years to denote duration of programmes. The Overarching Framework for Qualifications of the EHEA is built around the language of learning outcomes and competences. This is also the language of the Berlin communiqué. If BFUG reverts to the 'comfort zone' of time etc, it is unlikely that the overarching framework will deliver on objectives such as mobility and recognition.</i></p> <p>End of comments from Ireland --</p> <p>---- 0000 ----</p> <p>-- Comments from EUA: REDRAFT "Research training and in particular Doctoral Programmes play an important role in reaching these objectives. We endorse the ten basic principles adopted in Salzburg and recognise the ownership felt by universities for the organisation of their third cycle programmes. We urge universities to implement these principles that recognise that doctoral training must increasingly meet the needs of an employment market that is wider than academia, that the duration of doctoral programmes should correspond to 3-4 years full time work and that the status of doctoral candidates should be both as students and as early stage researchers with commensurate rights." End of comments from EUA --</p> <p>---- 0000 ----</p> <p>-- Comments from Switzerland: Switzerland fully supports the redraft made by EUA End of comments from Switzerland--</p>	<p>15. To achieve these objectives, doctoral level qualifications need to be [.....]fully aligned with the EHEA overarching framework for qualifications <u>using the outcomes-based approach</u> . Considering the need for <u>organised</u> doctoral programmes <u>and the need for transparent supervision and assessment, we note that</u> the normal workload of the third cycle <u>in most countries would</u> correspond to 3-4 years full time. We urge universities to ensure that their doctoral programmes <u>promote innovative structures to meet the challenge of interdisciplinary training, the development of transferable skills thus meeting the needs of the wider employment market.</u> We need to achieve an overall increase in the numbers of doctoral students across the EHEA. We see participants in third cycle programmes both as students and as early stage researchers.</p>

---- 0000 ----

-- Comments from Sweden:

15. To achieve these objectives, doctoral level qualifications need to be transparent and fully aligned with the EHEA overarching framework for qualifications. Considering the need for structured doctoral programmes, the normal workload of the third cycle should correspond to 3-4 years full time. We urge universities to ensure that their doctoral programmes are designed to meet new challenges for research and for other professional careers. We need to achieve an overall increase in the numbers of doctoral students across the EHEA. We see participants in third cycle programmes both as students and as early stage researchers.

End of comments from Sweden--

---- 0000 ----

-- Comments from Belgium, Flemish Community:

Please rewrite the first sentences :

“To achieve these objectives, doctoral level qualifications need to be (...) fully aligned with the EHEA overarching framework for qualifications, **in order to facilitate international cooperation at this level.**

Considering the **increase** of structured doctoral programmes **and in a context of joint international curriculum development** , the normal workload...”

Rationale :

The main challenge with doctoral studies is not transparency (recognition of doctoral degrees across Europe is not a problem at all) but international cooperation. The paragraph lacks at least a general reference to this aspect.

End of comments from Belgium, Flemish Community --

---- 0000 ----

-- Comments from Council of Europe:

15. To achieve these objectives, doctoral level qualifications need to be transparent and fully aligned with the EHEA overarching framework for qualifications. Considering the need for structured doctoral programmes, the normal workload of the third cycle should correspond to 3-4 years of full time study. We urge universities to ensure that their doctoral programmes are designed to meet new challenges for research and for professional careers. We need to achieve an overall increase in the numbers of doctoral students [*comment: is not what we need rather an increased number of people holding doctoral qualifications? A high number of doctoral students is a way to achieve this, not an end in itself*] across the EHEA. We see participants in third cycle programmes both as students and as early stage researchers.

End of comments from Council of Europe--

---- 0000 ----

-- Comments from the United Kingdom:

Paragraph 15 – delete second sentence on the grounds that references to periods of study are not

helpful and fail to acknowledge the importance of recognising qualifications based on learning outcomes rather than time spent studying.

End of comments from the United Kingdom--

---- 0000 ----

-- Comments from Spain:

We propose to amend point 15 replacing the expressions “considering the need for structured doctoral studies” (second and third line in the original text) and “doctoral programmes” (fourth and fifth line in the original text) by the expressions “considering the need for organized doctoral studies” and “doctoral studies”. The full amended paragraph would read as follows:

“15.- To achieve these objectives, doctoral level qualifications need to be transparent and fully aligned with the EHEA overarching framework for qualifications. Considering the need for organized doctoral studies, the normal workload of the third cycle should correspond to 3-4 years full time. We urge universities to ensure that their doctoral studies are designed to meet new challenges for research and for professional careers. We need to achieve an overall increase in the numbers of doctoral students across the EHEA. We see participants in third cycle programmes both as students and as early stage researchers.”

Justification for the proposed change:

This is a proposal based only on linguistic considerations. The word “organized” has, especially in Spanish, a less rigid connotation than “structured” and we believe that an adequate amount of flexibility in the configuration of the third cycle is crucial for the success of the new system. The same goes for the word “programme” and as a consequence we propose to use the word “studies” instead.

End of comments from Spain--

---- 0000 ----

-- Comments from Lithuania:

15. To achieve these objectives, doctoral level qualifications need to be transparent and fully aligned with the EHEA overarching framework for qualifications. ~~Considering~~ We acknowledge the need for structured doctoral programmes and ~~the normal workload of the third cycle should correspond to 3-4 years full time.~~ We urge universities to ensure that their doctoral programmes are designed to meet new challenges for research and for professional careers. We need to achieve an overall increase in the numbers of doctoral ~~students~~ candidates across the EHEA. We see participants in third cycle programmes both as students and as early stage researchers.

The first sentence should be redrafted whereas a present statement is too narrow considering targets in paragraphs 13 and 14. Last 2 sentences of this paragraph also mean actions to achieving objectives.

Second sentence could be redrafted by deleting a piece on workload and duration whereas as pointed in para7 and this one, EHEA overarching framework for qualifications will comprise three cycles, so it might be left to define third cycle qualifications on workload within EFQ but not in this Communiqué alike a second cycle is. In this chapter it could be proposed to the Ministers to endorse conclusions of the Salzburg seminar as a good basis for the further follow-up.

The provisions of last 2 sentences of this paragraph could be replaced to paragraph 14.

End of comments from Lithuania--

---- 0000 ----

-- Comments from ESIB:

15. To achieve these objectives, doctoral level qualifications need to be transparent and fully aligned with the EHEA overarching framework for qualifications. ~~Considering the need for structured doctoral programmes, the normal workload of the third cycle should correspond to 3-4 years full time.~~ We urge universities HEIs to ensure that their doctoral programmes are designed to meet new challenges for research and for professional careers. ~~We need to achieve an overall increase in the numbers of doctoral students across the EHEA. We consider/regard see~~ participants in third cycle programmes both as students and as early stage researchers.

End of comments from ESIB--

---- 0000 ----

-- Comments from France:

15. To achieve these objectives, doctoral level qualifications need to be transparent and fully aligned with the EHEA overarching framework for qualifications. Considering the need for structured doctoral programmes, the normal workload of the third cycle should correspond to 3-4 years full time. We urge universities to ensure that their doctoral programmes are designed to meet new challenges for research and for professional careers. We need to achieve an overall increase in the numbers of doctoral students across the EHEA. We see participants in third cycle programmes both as students and as early stage researchers.

End of comments from France--

---- 0000 ----

-- Comments from Greece:

If any reference to the duration of the third cycle needs to be made, that should be "minimum 3 years full time"

End of comments from Greece--

---- 0000 ----

-- Comments from the European Commission:

15. To achieve these objectives, doctoral level qualifications need to be transparent and fully aligned with the EHEA overarching framework for qualifications. Considering the need for structured doctoral programmes, the normal workload of the third cycle should correspond to 3-4 years full time. We urge universities to ensure that their doctoral programmes are designed to meet new challenges for research and for professional careers. We need to achieve an overall increase in the numbers of doctoral students across the EHEA. We see participants in third cycle programmes both as students and as early stage researchers. We suggest to explore the possibility of awarding "European Doctorate" status to joint programmes with a strong European Dimension.

End of comments from the European Commission--

	<p>---- 0000 ----</p> <p>-- Comments from Germany: <i>We are not certain whether there is really a lack of doctoral students. But we are sure that we should increase the number of doctoral programmes. Therefore:</i> <i>"... for professional careers. We need to increase the number of doctoral study programmes across the EHEA. ..."</i> <i>We support the Irish comment on the duration of the programmes.</i> End of comments from Germany--</p>	
<p>Mobility</p> <p>16. We recognise that mobility of students and staff among all participating countries remains one of the cornerstones of the Bologna Process. Awaiting jurisdiction from the European Court of Justice has made cooperation to increase mobility more difficult than expected. Aware of the many remaining challenges to be overcome, we shall intensify our efforts in the fields of portability of loans and grants, visa and work permits, mobility programmes. We see the need for more reliable data for monitoring the progress and call for collaboration on improving the statistics. We urge institutions and students to make full use of existing mobility programmes, advocating full recognition of study periods abroad within such programmes.</p>	<p>-- Comments from Belgium, French Community: The second sentence "Awaiting jurisdiction from the European Court (...)" should be deleted as it has no place in such a Communiqué. End of comments from Belgium, French Community --</p> <p>---- 0000 ----</p> <p>-- Comments from Cyprus: Cyprus supports the comments made by the Belgium French Community End of comments from Cyprus--</p> <p>---- 0000 ----</p> <p>-- Comments from Ireland: 16. We recognise that mobility of students and staff among all participating countries remains one of the cornerstones <u>key objectives</u> of the Bologna Process. Awaiting jurisdiction from the <u>We recognise that decisions of the</u> European Court of Justice <u>may have implications for the mobility agenda amongst EU Member State and has made cooperation to increase mobility more difficult than expected aware of the many remaining challenges to be overcome, we shall intensify our efforts in the fields of portability of loans and grants <u>and mobility - visa and work permits, mobility</u> programmes. We <u>recognise see</u> the need for more reliable data for monitoring the progress <u>towards the achievement of our objectives</u> and call for collaboration on improving the statistics. We urge institutions and students to make full use of existing mobility programmes, advocating full recognition of study periods abroad within such programmes. End of comments from Ireland --</u></p> <p>---- 0000 ----</p> <p>-- Comments from Germany: We support the comment from Ireland. End of comments from Germany--</p> <p>---- 0000 ----</p> <p>-- Comments from Finland: We would like to stress the importance of developing mobility in the first cycle too. There is a threat that the (fee free) mobility schemes will concentrate on the second cycle, which would be contrary to the</p>	<p>Mobility</p> <p>16. We recognise that mobility of students and staff among all participating countries remains one of the <u>key objectives</u> of the Bologna Process.[.....] Aware of the many remaining challenges to be overcome, we <u>reconfirm our commitment to facilitate</u> the portability of grants and loans, <u>where appropriate through joint action</u>. We shall intensify our efforts to lift obstacles for mobility by facilitating the delivery of visa and work permits and by encouraging participation in mobility programmes. We see the need for more reliable data for monitoring the progress and call for collaboration on improving the statistics. We urge institutions and students to make full use of existing mobility programmes, advocating full recognition of study periods abroad within such programmes.</p>

spirit of the Bologna Process.

End of comments from Finland --

---- 0000 ----

-- Comments from the Netherlands:

The recent European Court of Justice ruling in the Bidar-case necessitates more than before a co-ordinating mechanism in the EU-framework to tackle the problem of portability of loans and grants. A proposal to this end is welcome.

Next to the qualification instrument a typology of higher education providers would facilitate transparency. An exploration of the possibility is welcome. **End of comments from the Netherlands -**
-

---- 0000 ----

-- Comments from Belgium, Flemish Community:

Please rewrite (in the light of the recent decision of the ECJ on the Bidar case and making a distinction between the general problems of mobility and the specific legal issues with regard to the portability of grants) :

"Recent jurisdiction from the ECJ has made the implementation of the objective of the portability of grants and loans according to the "money-follows-student" principle more difficult than expected. We call for pan-European cooperation to overcome these legal obstacles (...) and reconfirm our commitment in joint action facilitating the portability of grants and loans.

We welcome the adoption of the EU Council Directive of 13.12.2004 on the conditions of admission of third-country nationals for the purpose of studies, pupil exchange, unremunerated training or voluntary service and look forward to the future adoption of a similar directive for researchers.

We shall intensify our efforts in lifting obstacles for mobility by facilitating the delivery of visa and work permits and encouraging participation in mobility programmes"

End of comments from Belgium, Flemish Community --

---- 0000 ----

-- Comments from Council of Europe:

16. We recognise that mobility of students and staff among all participating countries remains one of the cornerstones of the Bologna Process. Awaiting jurisdiction from the European Court of Justice has made cooperation to increase mobility more difficult than expected [*Comment: What does this sentence mean? We take jurisdiction to mean legal competence – does it mean we are waiting to see whether the Court has legal competence in the matter, or are we waiting for the Court to exercise its competence? Are we saying the Court is laying obstacles to mobility? If so, how, and how could these obstacles be overcome?*]. Aware of the many remaining challenges to be overcome, we shall intensify our efforts in the fields of portability of loans and grants, visa and work permits and mobility programmes. We see the need for more reliable data for monitoring the progress and call for

collaboration on improving the statistics. We urge institutions and students to make full use of existing mobility programmes, advocating full recognition of study periods abroad within such programmes.
[Comment: we would have liked to see a stronger commitment to addressing the issue of visas and work permits, something like "We undertake to address the complicated issue of visa and work permits, with a view to making mobility within the European Higher Education Area a reality for all its members".]
End of comments from Council of Europe--

--- 0000 ---

-- Comments from the United Kingdom:

Paragraph 16 – delete second sentence as the ECJ ruling on Bidar has now appeared.
Third sentence – delete “visa and work permits” and replace with “and” as these fall outside the competence of the 45 member EHEA.
Penultimate sentence – add “and comparable” after “reliable”; delete “the” before “progress”.
End of comments from the United Kingdom--

--- 0000 ---

-- Comments from Norway:

The beginning of the second sentence, “Awaiting the jurisdiction of the European Court of Justice.....” should either be deleted, as it, in our opinion, does not belong in a communiqué, or it should at least be rephrased as the court of Justice of the European Communities has passed judgement in the Bidar-case.

We also propose to include a sentence referring to the social dimension of the Bologna Process under this heading, since there is a clear connection between mobility and the social dimension. We propose to add the following sentence at the end of the paragraph:

Proper consideration of the social dimension is a prerequisite for increasing mobility within the EHEA and for ensuring that mobility is a real opportunity for all students, irrespective of their social background and economic situation.

End of comments from Norway--

--- 0000 ---

-- Comments from Switzerland: We support the comments made by Norway End of comments from Switzerland--

--- 0000 ---

-- Comments from ESIB:

16. We recognise that mobility of students and staff among all participating countries remains one of the cornerstones of the Bologna Process. ~~Awaiting jurisdiction from the European Court of Justice has made cooperation to increase mobility more difficult than expected.~~ Aware of the many remaining challenges to be overcome, we shall intensify our efforts in the fields of, ~~amongst others,~~ portability of loans and grants, visa and work permits, mobility programmes. We see the need for more reliable data for monitoring the progress and call for collaboration on improving the statistics. We urge institutions and students to make full use of existing mobility programmes, advocating full recognition of study

	<p>periods abroad within such programmes.</p> <p><i>We also ask the BFUG to establish a Working Group in order to explore the possibility of establishing a European mobility fund in order to reduce financial obstacles to mobility. End of comments from ESIB--</i></p> <p>---- 0000 ----</p> <p>-- Comments from Greece: The sentence "Awaiting jurisdiction from the European Court of Justice has made cooperation to increase mobility more difficult than expected." should be deleted. Non-EU members participate in the Bologna Process in which the ECJ decisions are not obligatorily implemented End of comments from Greece--</p> <p>---- 0000 ----</p> <p>-- Comments from the European Commission: 16. We recognise that mobility of students and staff among all participating countries remains one of the cornerstones of the Bologna Process. Awaiting jurisdiction from the European Court of Justice has made cooperation to increase mobility more difficult than expected. Aware of the many remaining challenges to be overcome, we shall intensify our efforts in the fields of portability of loans and grants, visa and work permits, mobility programmes. We see the need for more reliable data for monitoring the progress and call for collaboration on improving the statistics. We urge institutions and students to make full use of existing mobility programmes, advocating full recognition of study periods abroad within such programmes through the use of learning agreements. End of comments from the European Commission--</p>	
<p>The external dimension of the Bologna Process</p> <p>17. The European Higher Education Area should be open and attractive to the rest of the world. Our contribution to achieving education for all should be based on the principle of sustainable development and be in accordance with the ongoing international work on developing guidelines for quality provision of cross-border higher education. We reiterate that in international academic cooperation, academic values should prevail.</p>	<p>-- Comments from Belgium, French Community: The reference to "sustainable development " is not clear and should be deleted or re-phrased. End of comments from Belgium, French Community --</p> <p>---- 0000 ----</p> <p>-- Comments from Switzerland: <i>Referring to the comment made by the French Community of Belgium, Switzerland appreciates the reference to sustainable development.</i> End of comments from Switzerland--</p> <p>---- 0000 ----</p> <p>-- Comments from EUA: AMEND TITLE "<u>Positioning Europe in the rest of the world</u>" End of comments from EUA --</p> <p>---- 0000 ----</p>	<p><u>The attractiveness of EHEA and cooperation with the rest of the world</u></p> <p>17. The European Higher Education Area should be open and attractive to the rest of the world. Our contribution to achieving education for all should be based on the principle of sustainable development and be in accordance with the ongoing international work on developing guidelines for quality provision of cross-border higher education. We reiterate that in international academic cooperation, academic values should prevail.</p>

	<p>-- Comments from Council of Europe: 17. The European Higher Education Area should <u>must</u> be open and attractive to the rest of the world. Our contribution to achieving education for all should be based on the principle of sustainable development and be in accordance with the ongoing international work on developing guidelines for quality provision of cross-border higher education. We reiterate that in international academic cooperation, academic values should prevail. End of comments from Council of Europe--</p> <p>---- 0000 ----</p> <p>-- Comments from Cyprus: Change the title heading to : The attractiveness of EHEA and global cooperation Comment: The proposed heading describes in a better way the contents of this section End of comments from Cyprus--</p> <p>---- 0000 ----</p> <p>-- Comments from ESIB: 17. The European Higher Education Area should be open and attractive to the rest of the world. Our contribution to achieving education for all should be based on the principle of sustainable development and be in accordance with. <u>It should also take</u> the ongoing international work on developing guidelines for quality provision of cross-border higher education <u>into account</u>. We reiterate that in international academic cooperation, academic values should prevail. End of comments from ESIB--</p>	
<p>18. We want the European Higher Education Area to be a partner to higher education systems in other regions of the world, stimulating student and staff exchange and cooperation between higher education institutions. We underline the importance of mutual understanding and respect. We declare our willingness to enhance the understanding of the Bologna Process in other continents and to share our experiences with reform processes in neighbouring regions. We stress the need to initiate dialogue on issues of mutual interest.</p>	<p>-- Comments from Council of Europe: 18. We want the European Higher Education Area to be a partner to higher education systems in other regions of the world, stimulating student and staff exchange and cooperation between higher education institutions. We underline the importance of mutual understanding and respect. We declare our willingness to enhance the understanding of the Bologna Process in other continents and to share our experiences with reform processes in neighbouring regions. We stress the need to initiate <u>continue</u> dialogue on issues of mutual interest. End of comments from Council of Europe--</p> <p>---- 0000 ----</p> <p>-- Comments from the United Kingdom: Paragraph 18 – delete final sentence. End of comments from the United Kingdom--</p> <p>---- 0000 ----</p> <p>-- Comments from ESIB: 18. We want the European Higher Education Area to be a partner to higher education systems in other</p>	<p>18. We want the European Higher Education Area to be a partner to higher education systems in other regions of the world, stimulating <u>balanced</u> student and staff exchange and cooperation between higher education institutions. We underline the importance of mutual understanding and respect. We <u>look forward to</u> enhancing the understanding of the Bologna Process in other continents <u>by</u> sharing our experiences with reform processes in neighbouring regions. We stress the need <u>for</u> dialogue on issues of mutual interest.</p>

	<p>regions of the world, stimulating <u>balanced</u> student and staff exchange and cooperation between higher education institutions. We underline the importance of mutual understanding and respect. We declare our willingness to enhance the understanding of the Bologna Process in other continents and to share our experiences with reform processes in neighbouring regions.</p> <p>End of comments from ESIB--</p>	
<p>IV. Taking stock on progress for 2007</p> <p>19. We charge the Follow-up Group with continuing and widening the stocktaking process. We expect stocktaking to take place in the domains of the degree system, quality assurance and recognition of degrees and study periods. Within these three categories, we shall also look for progress in the implementation of the national qualifications frameworks, in recognition of non-formal learning paths as well as of joint degrees and in the transparency of the third cycle. We ask for a new stocktaking report in time for the next Ministerial Conference.</p>	<p>-- Comments from Ireland: 19. We charge the Follow-up Group with continuing and widening the stocktaking process. We expect stocktaking to take place in the domains of the degree system, quality assurance and recognition of degrees and study periods. Within these three categories, we shall also look for progress in the implementation of the national <u>qualifications frameworks of qualifications</u>, in recognition of non-formal learning paths as well as of joint degrees and in the transparency of the third cycle. We ask for a new stocktaking report in time for the next Ministerial Conference. End of comments from Ireland --</p> <p>---- 0000 ----</p> <p>-- Comments from EUA: Given the goals outlined in §20 for 2010 we propose adding following issues on which demonstrable progress is needed by 2007:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Mobility of students and staff in Europe - Doctoral programmes and research training - The relation between staff time spent on implementing Bologna & time spent on research - The autonomy of HEIs to implement the agreed reforms - Financial support for the implementation of the Bologna reforms <p>End of comments from EUA --</p> <p>---- 0000 ----</p> <p>-- Comments from Cyprus: We propose to add the following item to the suggestions of EUA: - Efficient use of resources in higher education and research Comment: There is limited information on this issue while best practices are not widely known End of comments from Cyprus--</p> <p>---- 0000 ----</p> <p>-- Comments from Finland: Finland would like to emphasise the social dimension of the Bologna Process and suggest that this be made part of the stocktaking exercise after Bergen. End of comments from Finland --</p> <p>---- 0000 ----</p> <p>-- Comments from Sweden:</p>	<p>IV. Taking stock on progress for 2007</p> <p>19. We charge the Follow-up Group with continuing and widening the stocktaking process <u>and to report in time for the next Ministerial Conference.</u> We expect stocktaking to take place in the domains of the degree system, quality assurance and recognition of degrees and study periods. Within these three categories, we shall also look for progress in the implementation of the national frameworks for qualifications, in recognition of non-formal learning paths as well as of joint degrees and in the transparency of the third cycle. <u>Therefore by 2007 each participating country should have completed the implementation of the three intermediate priorities as formulated in Berlin for the 2005 stocktaking.</u></p> <p><u>Moreover, each country should have:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <u>put in place legislation, where needed, for the awarding of joint degrees, including at the</u>

19. We charge the Follow-up Group with continuing and widening the stocktaking process. We expect stocktaking to take place in the domains of the degree system, quality assurance and recognition of degrees and study periods. Within these three categories, we shall also look for progress in the implementation of the national qualifications frameworks, in recognition of non-formal learning paths as well as of joint degrees and in the transparency (*what does transparency mean? The concept must be explained*) of the third cycle. In addition stocktaking should take place also in the domain of the social dimension of the EHEA. We ask for a new stocktaking report in time for the next Ministerial Conference.
End of comments from Sweden--

---- 0000 ----

-- Comments from Slovenia:

We propose to add the social dimension as a theme of stocktaking in 2007. As well, we would like to include again in this chapter the content of article 39 of the previous draft:

39. In particular, we charge the Follow-up Group with

- organising a study on the provision of better conditions for student and staff mobility through structural reform;
- establishing comparable data on the social and economic situation of students in participating countries.

End of comments from Slovenia --

---- 0000 ----

-- Comments from EURASHE:

We fully endorse the additions made by Slovenia on the social dimension. **End of comments from EURASHE--**

---- 0000 ----

-- Comments from Belgium, Flemish Community:

We would like to have this paragraph rewritten in the following sense :

- (1) indicate that the intermediate targets set in Berlin remain valid and will be taken again into account in the 2007 stocktaking
- (2) define the goals for 2007 more concretely

Therefore we would like to include the following paragraph :

"By 2007 each partner country should:

- have implemented the three targets as formulated in Berlin for the 2005 stocktaking.

Moreover, each country should have :

- put in place a legislation making the awarding of joint degrees possible, including at the doctorate level.
- established possibilities for flexible learning paths in higher education, including procedures for the validation of prior learning.

doctorate level

- established opportunities for flexible learning paths in higher education, including procedures for the recognition of prior learning.
- made progress in the organisation of the third cycle.

We also charge the Follow-up Group with establishing comparable data on the social and economic situation of students in participating countries and to report in time for the next Ministerial Conference.

- made progress in the establishment of a national qualification framework for higher education according to the principle of the overarching EHEA framework for qualifications".

End of comments from Belgium, Flemish Community --

---- 0000 ----

-- Comments from the United Kingdom:

Paragraph 19 – second sentence – replace “domains” with “areas”. **End of comments from the United Kingdom--**

---- 0000 ----

-- Comments from Norway:

We believe it is important to include the social dimension in the stocktaking exercise. Thus we propose to add the following sentence before the last sentence in paragraph 19:

Furthermore, we want stocktaking to be carried out also for the social dimension of the Bologna Process with the progress made in establishing reliable, relevant and easily comparable data for monitoring the social dimension.

End of comments from Norway--

---- 0000 ----

-- Comments from Switzerland:

We share the opinion brought forward by Norway that stocktaking should also be carried out for the social dimension of the Bologna process **End of comments from Switzerland--**

---- 0000 ----

-- Comments from ESIB:

~~19. We charge the Follow-up Group with continuing and widening the stocktaking process. We expect stocktaking to take place in the domains of the degree system, quality assurance and recognition of degrees and study periods. Within these three categories, we shall also look for progress in the implementation of the national qualifications frameworks, in recognition of non-formal learning paths as well as of joint degrees and in the transparency of the third cycle.~~

Comment: ESIB considers that all action lines are equally important. It is important that stock is taken of other action lines and measures. One of those should be the social dimension since it is one of the action lines that was quite neglected until now.

We ask for a new stocktaking report in time for the next Ministerial Conference. **End of comments from ESIB--**

---- 0000 ----

-- Comments from France: Delete paragraph End of comments from France--

---- 0000 ----

	<p>-- Comments from Greece: Delete the sentence: "Within these three categories.....third cycle". End of comments from Greece--</p> <p>---- 0000 ----</p> <p>-- Comments from Austria: <i>The stocktaking priorities for Bergen should not be subject to stocktaking again, but to the general monitoring (general report). So the following text is proposed:</i> <u>With a view for the goals set for 2010, we charge the Follow-up Group with organising a stocktaking process on the progress and implementation of national qualifications frameworks, including the third cycle and provisions for joint degrees and diplomas, and report back to us at the next Ministerial Conference</u> End of comments from Austria--</p> <p>---- 0000 ----</p> <p>-- Comments from Germany: For the time being there is a lack of sufficiently developed criteria for the recognition of non-formal learning. Therefore we recommend to delete the words "... in recognition of non-formal learning paths".</p> <p>Moreover we feel that the stocktaking should be concentrated on certain subjects as defined in the draft. End of comments from Germany--</p>	
	<p>-- Comments from Spain: <i>We propose to include a new paragraph 19 bis in point 19 which would read as follows:</i> <u>"19 bis.- Ministers invite the Follow Up Group to further explore the connections between the professional activities and the higher education qualifications with a view to identify common trends and divergences and analyse possible actions in this area as a way to facilitate mobility in the labour market."</u></p> <p>Justification for the proposed change: The objective of this new paragraph would be to allow the BFUG to undertake in the future some activity in studying the relationship, in the different national contexts, between qualifications and professional exercise and how this connection is organized and functions. This has important effects as to how mobility in the labour market may take place and it could lead as a minimum to a better comprehension of national realities and perhaps to some harmonization in a more distant future. End of comments from Spain--</p>	
	<p>-- Comments from France: <u>V. Preparing for 2010</u></p>	

	<p><u>19. We, Ministers, commit ourselves to both continuing and widening the stocktaking process. We expect stocktaking to further take place in the domains of the degree system, quality assurance and recognition of degrees and study periods ; we shall also look for progress on the implementation of the national qualifications frameworks, in recognition of non-formal learning paths as well as of joint degrees and in the transparency of the third cycle. We shall also look for progress in student and staff mobility, and in doctoral programmes and research training. We ask for a new stocktaking report in time for the next Ministerial Conference.</u></p> <p><i>FR comments : Formally, the initial IVth proposed section is only made of one paragraph. Also, taking stock of progress for 2007 is part of the whole process of preparing for 2010. Therefore, it seems more logical to put this paragraph 19 into this new final IVth section.</i></p> <p>End of comments from France--</p>	
<p>V. Preparing for 2010</p> <p>20. Building on the achievements so far in the Bologna Process, we wish to establish a European Higher Education Area based on the principles of quality, integrity and transparency. We must cherish our rich tradition and cultural diversity while at the same time contributing to a knowledge-based society. As higher education is situated at the crossroads of research, education and innovation, it also is the key to Europe's competitiveness. The structuring of higher education into three cycles, where each level has a double function, namely preparing the student for the labour market and for further competence building is a defining element of the European dimension of higher education. So are the European Qualifications Framework, the agreed set of standards and guidelines for national quality assurance arrangements and the recognition of degrees and periods of study.</p>	<p>-- Comments from Ireland:</p> <p>20. Building on the achievements so far in the Bologna Process, we wish to establish a European Higher Education Area based on the principles of quality, integrity and transparency. We must cherish our rich tradition and cultural diversity while at the same time contributing to a knowledge-based society. As higher education is situated at the crossroads of research, education and innovation, it also is the key to Europe's competitiveness. The structuring of higher education into three cycles, where each level has a double function, namely preparing the student for the labour market and for further competence building is a defining element of the European dimension of higher education. So are the overarching framework for qualifications of the EHEA European Qualifications Framework, the agreed set of standards and guidelines for national quality assurance arrangements and the recognition of degrees and periods of study. End of comments from Ireland --</p> <p>---- 0000 ----</p> <p>-- Comments from EUA:</p> <p>ADD "As we move closer to 2010, we recognise that our priority is to support, steer, and monitor the actions of autonomous institutions that assume their responsibility in the implementation of those reforms that will contribute to realising the EHEA, ensuring its link to the ERA and thus to promoting a European knowledge society." End of comments from EUA --</p> <p>---- 0000 ----</p> <p>-- Comments from Finland:</p> <p>Para 20: The sentence starting with the words "The structuring of higher education into three cycles..." may lead readers think that three cycles are needed in all types of higher education institutions. Finland would like to stress the need to guarantee high quality of doctoral studies, which entails the need to secure a decent level of resourcing for all doctoral programmes, both in terms of human capital and money. Thus we are in favour of networking and to some extent of concentrating resources to the institutions that have the best possibilities to offer doctoral programmes. In the Europe of Knowledge, is it not the quality and relevance of doctoral programmes we would like to increase rather than the number of institutions offering the programmes?</p> <p>End of comments from Finland --</p>	<p>V. Preparing for 2010</p> <p>20. Building on the achievements so far in the Bologna Process, we wish to establish a European Higher Education Area based on the principles of quality [.....]and transparency. We must cherish our rich heritage and cultural diversity while at the same time contributing to a knowledge-based society. <u>We commit to upholding the principle of public responsibility for higher education while recognising the need for it to adapt to complex modern societies.</u> As higher education is situated at the crossroads of research, education and innovation, it is also the key to Europe's competitiveness.</p> <p><i>(redrafted to improve the style of writing)</i>The EHEA is structured around three cycles, where each level has the[...] function of preparing the student for the labour market, for further competence building and for active citizenship. The overarching framework for qualifications, the agreed set of standards and guidelines for national quality assurance arrangements, and the recognition of degrees and periods of study are also key characteristics of the structure of the EHEA.</p>

---- 0000 ----

-- Comments from Sweden:

20. Building on the achievements so far in the Bologna Process, we wish to establish a European Higher Education Area based on the principles of bottom-up procedures, intergovernmental cooperation, quality, integrity (what does integrity mean? why introduce a new concept here??) and transparency. We must cherish our rich tradition and cultural diversity while at the same time contributing to a knowledge-based society. As higher education is situated at the crossroads of ~~research~~, education, research and innovation, it also is the key to Europe's competitiveness. The structuring of higher education into three cycles, where each level has a double function, namely preparing the student for the labour market and for further competence building is one of the defining elements of the European dimension of higher education. So are the European Qualifications Framework, the agreed set of standards and guidelines for national quality assurance arrangements, ~~and~~ the recognition of degrees and periods of study and the linguistic plurality of EHEA. **End of comments from Sweden--**

---- 0000 ----

-- Comments from Council of Europe:

20. Building on the achievements so far in the Bologna Process, we wish to establish a European Higher Education Area based on the principles of quality, integrity and transparency. We must cherish our rich ~~tradition~~ heritage and cultural diversity while at the same time contributing to a knowledge-based society. We commit to upholding the principle of public responsibility for higher education while exploring new ways to make it a reality in modern, complex societies. As higher education is situated at the crossroads of research, education and innovation, it also is the key to Europe's competitiveness. The structuring of higher education into three cycles, where each level has a double function, namely preparing the student for the labour market and for further competence building is a defining element of the European dimension of higher education. So are the European Qualifications Framework, the agreed set of standards and guidelines for national quality assurance arrangements and the recognition of degrees and periods of study. **End of comments from Council of Europe--**

---- 0000 ----

-- Comments from the United Kingdom:

Paragraph 20 – last sentence – replace “European Qualifications Framework” with “overarching framework for qualifications in the EHEA”. **End of comments from the United Kingdom--**

---- 0000 ----

-- Comments from ESIB:

20. Building on the achievements so far in the Bologna Process, we wish to establish a European Higher Education Area based on the principles of quality, integrity and transparency. We must cherish our rich tradition and cultural diversity while at the same time contributing to a knowledge-based society. As higher education is situated at the crossroads of research, education and innovation, it also is the key to Europe's ~~competitiveness~~ attractiveness. (The structuring of higher education into three cycles, where each ~~level cycle~~ has a ~~double~~ variety of functions, namely personal development, preparing the student for the labour market with a long term perspective, as an active and critical citizen and for further competence building is a defining element of the European dimension of higher education. So are the ~~European Qualifications Framework, the agreed set of standards and guidelines for national quality assurance arrangements and the recognition of degrees and periods of study~~. other action lines.

End of comments from ESIB--

---- 0000 ----

-- Comments from Portugal:

Proposal for splitting paragraph 20 into two paragraphs:

Paragraph 20 seems too long and indeed it conveys two main messages – one related to the first three sentences and another related to the last two sentences.

Hence we propose to split the paragraph into two:

the first one corresponding to the first three sentences of the original paragraph without changes and the second one corresponding to the last two sentences with a small change in the first of these two:

Paragraph 20 a)

Building on the achievements so far in the Bologna Process, we wish to establish a European Higher Education Area based on the principles of quality, integrity and transparency. We must cherish our rich tradition and cultural diversity while at the same time contributing to a knowledge-based society. As higher education is situated at the crossroads of research, education and innovation, it also is the key to Europe's competitiveness.

Paragraph 20 b)

The structuring of higher education into three cycles, where each level has a ~~double function, namely preparing the student for the labour market and for further competence building~~ the purpose of preparing the student for the labour market or for further competence building and for the development of active citizenship, is a defining element of the European dimension of higher education. So are the European Qualifications Framework, the agreed set of standards and guidelines for national quality assurance arrangements and the recognition of degrees and periods of study. **End of comments from Portugal--**

---- 0000 ----

-- Comments from France:

20. Building on the achievements so far in the Bologna Process, we wish to establish a European Higher Education Area based on the principles of quality, equity, integrity and transparency. We must cherish our rich tradition and cultural diversity while at the same time contributing to a knowledge-based society.

As higher education is situated at the crossroads of research, education and innovation, it also is the key to Europe's competitiveness. The structuring of higher education into three cycles, where each level has a double function, namely preparing the student for the labour market and for further competence building is a defining element of the European dimension of higher education. So are the European Qualifications Framework, the agreed set of standards and guidelines for national quality assurance arrangements and the recognition of degrees and periods of study.

Making real this knowledge-based Europe and EHEA requires an increasing number of graduates in higher education, which requires the removal of all social barriers for the access to higher education. So the social dimension is an overarching priority as it is a constituent element of the EHEA and a necessary condition of its attractiveness to the rest of the world. Therefore we renew our commitment to making higher education equally accessible to all and stress the need for appropriate conditions for

	<p><u>the students, so that they can complete their studies without obstacles related to their social and economic background.</u></p> <p>End of comments from France--</p> <p>---- 0000 ----</p> <p>-- Comments from Greece: We recommend changing the first sentence as follows: "Building on the achievements so far in the Bologna Process, we wish to establish a European Higher Education Area of high quality, integrity and transparency." End of comments from Greece--</p> <p>---- 0000 ----</p> <p>-- Comments from Austria: <i>Add the following text as EUA has already done a lot of preliminary work in the field of doctoral programmes:</i> <u>We call upon EUA through its members to prepare a report under the responsibility of BFUG on the further development of the basic principles for doctoral programmes mentioned above to be presented to Ministers in 2007.</u></p> <p>End of comments from Austria--</p> <p>---- 0000 ----</p> <p>-- Comments from the European Commission: 20. Building on the achievements so far in the Bologna Process, we wish to establish a European Higher Education Area based on the principles of quality, integrity and transparency. We must cherish our rich tradition and cultural diversity while at the same time contributing to a knowledge-based society. As higher education is situated at the crossroads of research, education and innovation, it also is the key to Europe's competitiveness. <u>The European Higher Education Area is structured around structuring of higher education into three cycles, where each level has a double function, namely preparing the student for the labour market and for further competence building. is a defining element of the European dimension of higher education.</u> So are the European Qualifications Framework, the agreed set of standards and guidelines for national quality assurance arrangements and the recognition of degrees and periods of study.</p> <p>End of comments from the European Commission--</p>	
<p>21. In view of the social dimension of the Bologna Process we renew our commitment to making higher education equally accessible to all and stress the need for appropriate conditions for the students, so that they can complete their studies without obstacles related to their social and economic background.</p>	<p>-- Comments from Council of Europe: 21. In view of the social dimension of the Bologna Process we renew our commitment to making higher education equally accessible to all and stress the need for appropriate conditions for the students, so that they can complete their studies without obstacles related to their social and economic background. <u>As the socio-economic situation varies greatly between countries, and as social cohesiveness creates the basis for sustainable policies in higher education in Europe, we ask the BFUG building on existing initiatives to organise an analytical study based on the collection of comparable data on the social and economic situation of students in all Bologna Member Countries and report back at our next conference in 2007.</u></p> <p>End of comments from Council of Europe--</p>	<p>21. In view of the social dimension of the Bologna Process we renew our commitment to making higher education equally accessible to all and stress the need for appropriate conditions for the students, so that they can complete their studies without obstacles related to their social and economic background.</p>

---- 0000 ----

-- Comments from Switzerland:

Switzerland supports the comments made by the Council of Europe. However, we suggest linking the analytical study closer to the stocktaking process in paragraph 19

End of comments from Switzerland--

---- 0000 ----

-- Comments from Cyprus:

We support the comment made by the Council of Europe

End of comments from Cyprus--

---- 0000 ----

-- Comments from ESIB:

21. Ministers admit that Strengthening the social dimension of higher education is one of the conditions for letting the knowledge society become a reality which implies to increase the number of graduates from higher education by lifelong learning.

The social dimension in the EHEA at the national level and the European level as well contributes to the creation of a balanced and attractive European higher education area.

In view of the social dimension of the Bologna Process we renew our commitment to making higher education equally accessible to all and stress the need for appropriate conditions for the students, so that they can complete their studies without obstacles related to their social and economic background. We also call on the Follow-up Group to organise a study on the provision of better conditions for student and staff mobility through structural reform; establish comparable data on the social and economic situation of students in participating countries.

End of comments from ESIB--

---- 0000 ----

-- Comments from Portugal:

Paragraph 21, 3 ff

...so that they can complete their studies without obstacles related to their social and economic background and fully explore the opportunities for personal development.

End of comments from Portugal--

---- 0000 ----

-- Comments from France:

Delete paragraph **End of comments from France--**

<p>22. We endorse the steering structure set up in Berlin (<i>with the possible inclusion of XX in the Follow-up Group</i>). As the Bologna Process leads to the establishment of the EHEA, we have to consider the appropriate arrangements needed to support the continuing development beyond 2010 and we ask the Follow-up Group to explore such alternatives.</p>	<p>-- Comments from Belgium, French Community: We do estimate that any inclusion of other stakeholders as partners/observers in the steering structure would be counter-productive. Other organisations should be entitled to attend seminars but not to become members of the BFUG. End of comments from Belgium, French Community --</p> <p>---- 0000 ----</p> <p>-- Comments from Finland: Para 22: Finland repeats her earlier comments: Do we really need the same, rather multi-tier follow-up structure as now? Would it not be simpler and more transparent with the secretariat and the BFUG as the only actors?</p> <p>Perhaps the ministers would like to give some kind of indication as how they think the work should continue after 2010, the present formulation is too open End of comments from Finland --</p> <p>---- 0000 ----</p> <p>-- Comments from the United Kingdom: Paragraph 22 – last sentence – replace “such alternatives” with “these issues”. End of comments from the United Kingdom--</p> <p>---- 0000 ----</p> <p>-- Comments from France: 21. We endorse the <u>steering follow-up</u> structure set up in Berlin (<i>with the possible inclusion of XX in the Follow-up Group</i>). As the Bologna Process leads to the establishment of the EHEA, we have to consider the appropriate arrangements needed to support the continuing development beyond 2010 and we ask the Follow-up Group to explore such alternatives.</p> <p><i>FR comments : What was agreed on in Berlin was a follow-up structure and not a steering one, which is already an evolution of the BFUG's vocation to be considered after Bergen regarding the reflection on 'appropriate arrangements' referred to in the 2nd sentence. Generally speaking, the role of the BFUG should be more specified and centered on the preparation of the next ministerial conference and the setting up of a work programme from Bergen to London. Besides, the widening of the BFUG's composition to new consultative members after Bergen (beyond of course the 5 new participating countries) will make the BFUG more and more difficult to manage and to make efficient ; the BFUG may consult any relevant party according to its agendas and Bologna seminars of course remain open to any relevant party.</i></p> <p>End of comments from France--</p> <p>---- 0000 ----</p>	<p>22. We endorse the <u>follow - up</u> structure set up in Berlin (<i>with the possible inclusion of XX in the Follow-up Group</i>). As the Bologna Process leads to the establishment of the EHEA, we have to consider the appropriate arrangements needed to support the continuing development beyond 2010 and we ask the Follow-up Group to explore <u>these issues</u>.</p>
--	--	--

	<p>-- Comments from Greece: We share the concern that the inclusion of more consultative members in the BFUG structure would be counter-productive. Of course other organizations should be invited to attend Bologna seminars. End of comments from Greece--</p>	
23. We decide to hold the next Ministerial Conference in London in 2007.		23. We will hold the next Ministerial Conference in London in 2007.
	<p>-- Comments from France: ANNEX : List of signatory countries of the current Bergen Communiqué :(< enumerating list in alphabetical order) <i>FR comments : regarding the number of participating countries and the fact that such Communiqués should not be formally signed as treaties by responsible Ministers, we suggest to list participating countries as it was done for the Bologna Declaration for the sake of clarity.</i> End of comments from France--</p>	