



BFUG (ES) 20\_14b

DGIV/EDU/HE (2010)) Orig. Eng. Strasbourg, February 08,2008

## **BOLOGNA PROCESS**Coordination Group for Qualifications Framework

# Second Synthesis of the replies received from national QF correspondents February 2010

Directorate General IV: Education, Culture and Heritage, Youth and Sport (Directorate of Education and Languages – Higher Education and Research Division)

Distribution: BFUG Working Group

#### Introduction

The present document provides a synthesis of the reports submitted by national QF correspondents to the Council of Europe in

Countries/systems <sup>1</sup>	that sent	40
their answers		
Countries/systems	that	47
appointed a	NQF	
correspondent		

January 2010. It follows the one issued one year ago on the same subject. Individual answer are not published but this document presents some challenges and questions related to the actual stage of development of National Qualifications Framework

#### SUMMARY OVERVIEW OF COUNTRIES AND STEPS

#### - 11 steps:

Step completed Action/step Step indicated as planned with an indication of timing No of answers 40 countries/systems; 0 1. Decision to start 40 2. Setting the agenda 35 countries: 4 countries which indicate step to be completed in 2010 40 1 country indicates that no formal agenda has been set 3. Organizing the 4 countries, which indicate step to be completed end 2010 35 countries; 40 process 5 countries in different stages of development 4. Design Profile 35 countries 40

•

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Because of the location of the competent public authorities in higher education matters, there are separate reports from the Flemish and French Communities of Belgium as well as from Scotland on the one hand and the rest of the United Kingdom on the other.

5. Consultation	25 countries; plus 11 which say that the process	4 countries, with various indications of timing;	40
	is on going		
6. Approval	16 countries;	20 countries which indicate an approval for 2010, 3 with various	39
		indications of timing, 1 gives no answer	
7. Administrative set-	20 countries	13 countries plan to develop the structure in 2010; 4 plan without	35
up		indication of date, 5 provide no answer	
8. Implementation	12 countries; plus 3 which indicate under	10 countries plan to implement NQF in 2010, 12 plan it with various	35
_	process	indications of timing, 3 did not answer	
9. Inclusion of	16 countries;	9 countries plan to include the qualifications in 2010, 12 with	37
qualifications		various indications of timing, 3 did not answer	
10. Self-certification	8 countries/systems say that they have	28 countries plan the self certification process with different timing:	37
	completed the self certification	• 2010 : 8 countries	
		• 2011: 8 countries	
		• 2012: 8 countries	
		• 2013: 1 country	
		No time indication: 4	
		1 country answers "not yet planned"	
		3 countries did not answer	
11. NQ web site	24 countries;	11 countries, with various indications of timing or under	36
-		development; 1 answered "no; 4 did not answered	

### DETAILED OVERVIEW OF COUNTRIES AND STEPS

Country	1.Decision to start	2.Setting the agenda	3.Organizing the process	4.Design Profile	5.Consultation	6.Approval	7.Administrative set-up	8.Implementation	9.Inclusion of qualifications	10.Self- certification	11.NQ web site
Albania *	07/2006	07/2006	Done	Done	09-10/2008	12/2008	06/2008	01/2009	06/2009	To be completed in 09/2009	Under construction
ANDORRA	2007	06/2008	Done	June 2010	Under progress	01/2010	02/2010	06/2011	To be done	To be done	02/2010
ARMENIA	Spring 2007	2007		To be completed in 2009	12/2009	To be completed for 2010	To be complete	To be completed	To be completed	To be completed	Under construction
AUSTRIA	07/06	07/2010	10/2010	06 /2008	12/2009	06/2009	06/2010	12/2010	08/2010	11/2010	Done
AZERBAIJAN											

BELGIUM	2000	2000	2001	04/2003	2001-2002	4/2003	4/2003	2004-2005	4/2003	2009	Done
(FLEMISH COMMUNITY)											
BELGIUM (FRENCH COMMUNITY)	3/2007		03/2007	04/2008	03/2007	05/2008		Under progress		2010-2011	Done
BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA	2006-2008	2010	To be done	To be completed	ongoing	2007	2007-2010	Under progress	End of 2010	2010/2011	2010
BULGARIA											
CROATIA	03/2006	07/2007	07/2007- 04/2008	07/2007- 12/2008	11/2007-2009	Done in 2009	2010	To be done in 2010-2012	2012	2011	Done 12/2008
CYPRUS											
CZECH REPUBLIC	2005-2009		2009	2009	2010	2010	2010	2011	After 2011	After 2012	
DENMARK	2002	2003	2002	2003- 2008/2009	2003 2007/2009	2008-2009	2003	2003	2008	2009	2003
ESTONIA	11/2006	11/2006	11/2006	Winter 2007	2007	2007		2007-2009	09/2009	2010-2011	2011
FINLAND	HE 2004 NQF 2008	HE 02/2005 NQF 2008	HE 2004 NQF 2008	HE 2005 NQF 2008	EQF 2005 NQF on going	NQF: 2010	NQF 2008	Ongoing	NQF 06/2008	For 210	2009
FRANCE	2002	2002	2002	2002	Done	2002	Done	2002	2006	The process starts on 12/2006	done
GEORGIA	2006	2007	2007	2007	2007-2009	NQF 2010	To be done	2007-2010	2009/2013- 2014	2010	done
GERMANY	2003	2003	2003	2003- 2005		04/ 2005	04/2005	12/2005 (accreditation Council HRK)		10/ 2008	done
GREECE											
HOLY SEE	2005	2005	2005-2006	2009	10/2006	To be decided	To be done in 10/2010	10/2010	10/2010	To be completed in 2011	10/2010
HUNGARY	06/2008	2008	2006-2009	2003-2006	To be done 2010	End of 2010	2010	Since 2006		2012	Done
ICELAND	2004-2005	2004- 2005	2004-2005	2006	2006-2008	2006	2006	Done	done	07/2010	2010
IRELAND	1999	1999	2003	Done	Done	10/2003	2008	done	done	Completed in 2006	Done
ITALY	2008	To be completed in 2008	2008	03/ 2008	First part of 2010		Partially done in 2008, to be completed in 2010	Partially done in 2008, to be completed in 2010	To be concluded in 2009	2010	To be concluded in 2010
LATVIA	2004	2004- 2006	2004	2004-2005	2005 on QF 2006-2008 on	Starts 2008 For adoption	Done	Starts in 2009 EQF 2013	done	Probably 2011	To be done in 2010

					the draft	in 2009- 2010					
LIECHTENSTEIN	End 2007	01- 02/2008	05/2008	05/2008- 08/2010	12/2008- 07/2010	10/ 2010	From 09/ 2010	Ongoing Until 07/ 2011	10/2010	Fully in 2011	done
LITHUANIA											
LUXEMBOURG	10/2007	10/2007	done	On going	On going	Spring 2010	No	Spring 2010	Ongoing	2012	
MALTA	2005	2008	Done	2008-2009	11/2006- 06/2007	10/ 2005	Done 2008-2009	Done 2007	06/2007	Nov 2009	Done
MOLDOVA	2006	2006- 2008/2010	10/2006	10/2006 2008-2009 for the NQF for HE	10/2009			2005-2006	07/2005	To be done	Done
MONTENEGRO	2008-2010	2008	Done	WG establish	2008-2010	2008-2010					Not yet
NETHERLANDS	March 2005	done	Done	done						01/2010	
NORWAY	12/ 2005	12/2005	12/2005	04/ 2007	07 – 11/2007	03/2009	03/2010	To be fully implemented d in all programmes in all HEIS by 2012	To be done 2009-2012	To be completed by 2013	Under construction
POLAND	2006	2006	2006	01/2008	2008-2009- 2010	2009-2010	2010	2010	2011	2012	2009
PORTUGAL											
ROMANIA	2005	done	2005-2006	2007	2007	approved by government decision in 2009	Done in 2008	2008-2010	2010	2010-2012	Done
RUSSIAN FEDERATION	06/2007	27/2007	07/2007	07/2007- 03/2008	04-06/2008	2008-2010	2008-2011	2008-2011	07/2007- 03/2008	2011-2012	Done
SERBIA	Summer 2008	Summer 2008	Autumn 2008	Spring 2009	Autumn 2009	Spring 2010	Autumn 2010		Done	Summer 2011	Done
SLOVAK REPUBLIC											
SLOVENIA	2004	2009	01/2010	03- 09/2010	09-12/2010	2011	2011	2012	2012	To be started in 2012	March 2010
SPAIN											
SWEDEN	2009	Under progress 2010	Under progress 2010	Under progress 2010	Under progress 2010	Autumn 2010	2010-2011	2011	2011	2011-2012	2012
SWITZERLAND	09/2005	2005- 2006	2005	2006-2008	07-10/2008	2009-2010	2010	2010-2012	2010-2012	2012	done

"THE FORMER YUGOSLAV REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA"	2008	2008	completed	Completed Will continue till 2012	To be completed in 2010	2010	June 2010	June2011	To be completed 2011	2011-2012	Done
TURKEY	Done 04/2006	2008	Done 2006-2008	Done 2009	Done 2009	05/2009	01/2010	Pilot implementation in 2010 and full implementation by 12/2012	To be done in 2010-2015	To be done in 2010-2012	To be completed in 2010
UKRAINE	July 2008	July 2008	July 2008	2008	04/2009	10-11/2009					
UNITED KINGDOM	2001	done	Done	done	done	2001	?	done	Done?	11/2008	done
UNITED KINGDOM SCOTLAND	1997	done	Done in 1998	Completed in 1999	1999-2000	2000-2001	2003-2004	2003	2001	2006-2007	done

Since 2008, countries have continued to develop their Qualifications Frameworks, something which is reflected in the previous table. It must be noted that the ways chosen can vary quite significantly from one country to another. In some countries, the developments of NQF is clearly perceived as part of the Bologna "reform package". The timetables presented seem more realistic than the ones transmitted in 2008 and they have been readjusted to take into account the difficulties of the process, including the challenge of having national experts to be able to lead it.

Amongst other difficulties, some can be mentioned:

- In some countries, the Dublin descriptors are still an abstraction for some stakeholders
- The risk exists that the NQF is perceived as a catalogue of professions and not at all presented in terms of learning outcomes
- The recognition of prior learning within the NQF in terms of learning outcomes still seems problematic
- The relationship and articulation between different parts of the national framework, in particular between a higher education framework and a general one, can still be perceived as difficult mainly due to the challenge of the dialogue between universities and vocational training institutions and perhaps the existence of two overarching frameworks.
- When NQFs are included in law, the legal consequences are sometimes not completely clear both for students and for HEI. The parliamentary debates can be difficult due to the technicality of the subject.

Progress has been made in several aspects, taking into account the difficulties faced:

• In terms of learning outcomes; efforts are made to define and to formulate them, glossaries are developed in several countries. The challenge here is to make them a reality in the way that HEI describe their programmes

- The importance of the involvement of the different stakeholders is more and more recognised, even if students' organisations seem less involved. The challenge is to make QFs a useful tool to the stakeholders, including those in the labour market
- Regarding the web sites, it seems that they are developed to really be a tool both to inform stakeholders and to have a deeper understanding and knowledge of QFs

In terms of possible future challenges, 3 can be mentioned:

- The implementation of QF on the level of the presentation of the ifferent programmes at HEIs, taking into account the institutional autonomy;
- The practicality and acceptance of NQFs for the national labour market: Is NQF a proper tool for the labour market?
- The acceptance of NQFs by the general public: how to guarantee that societies are well informed of the value and the advantages of NQF?