

BOLOGNA MINISTERIAL CONFERENCE: LONDON 17-18 MAY 2007 FEEDBACK FROM PANEL SESSIONS

Introduction

1. During the London Ministerial conference, all delegates were invited to take part in panel discussion groups, to start to develop the overall vision for the European Higher Education Area (EHEA) in a more coherent and outcome focused way. This paper records the main points arising from those discussions. It is intended that this summary will provide background for the next Bologna Follow Up Group Work Programme.

Background

2. The panels were asked to identify:
- their overall vision for the EHEA;
 - what they believe the definitive characteristics of the EHEA should be; and
 - what more needs to be done to support the development of the EHEA.

A background briefing paper, attached at Annex A, was issued to all delegates in advance of the conference.

3. The discussion groups were led by a Chair and a panel comprising a Minister, a Rector, a student, a business or staff representative and a higher education stakeholder from outside the EHEA. Each group also included a Rapporteur, and a UK Bologna Promoter. Details of panel membership are attached at Annex B.

Summary of emerging themes

4. Recurrent themes arising from the panel discussions that should underpin the future development of the EHEA include:
- An ever evolving, unbureaucratic EHEA based on principles, not regulations
 - A focus on student- centred learning and knowledge transfer
 - Equity and access
 - Responsiveness and flexibility
 - Delivering lifelong learning and employability
 - Widely recognised qualifications, based on learning outcomes
 - Open and attractive
 - Comparability and transparency
 - Quality improvement
 - Autonomous and accountable higher education institutions
 - Academic freedom
 - Partnership and collaboration.

5. To quote Sir Roderick Floud from the plenary session after the panel sessions, this might be summarised as “a continually evolving, flexible European

Higher Education Area, based on the autonomy of universities and the principles of academic freedom and student-centred learning.”

Outputs from panel sessions

6. The main points from each of the six panel groups, recorded by the Rapporteurs, are listed below. This is followed by the remarks made by Sir Roderick Floud and Lars Lyng Nielsen in the plenary session following the panel sessions.

Panel 1

Vision

- HE is equitable in access, progress and completion, and it caters for social mobility.
- HE responds to the needs of the individual, the society, and the economy.
- Public responsibility for high quality HE is conducted in partnership of HEIs, students and stakeholders.
- HE provides flexible opportunities for lifelong learners.
- Diverse HEIs are comparable to allow mobility.
- The EHEA is attractive.

Panel 2

Definitive Characteristics

- Successful in driving change
 - Ref extent of change since 1999
- Guided by principles (not regulations)
 - Enable and support diversity and flexibility
- Autonomous, accountable HE institutions
 - Autonomous, well-resourced, sustainable, well-governed, evaluative, accountable
 - And within institutions, autonomy for staff, in terms of academic freedom
- Students are individuals!
 - Most important focus should be on students; remember they are individuals
 - Opportunities open to all throughout their lifetime
 - Students should have a genuine voice in all aspects
 - Educate the whole person: for employment, citizenship, personal development
- Emphasis on employment

- Legitimate and important expectation for stakeholders
- Include focus on teaching and learning
 - Consider processes that promote achievement of learning outcomes
 - Link teaching to research activities, to develop graduates who can be objective, evidence-based, creative, innovative – skills greatly valued by employers.

Action Points

A set of actions that are continuations from the present

- Remove barriers to mobility for students and staff
- For Students
 - Recognition of prior learning and credits
 - Visas and work permits
 - Finance, including consideration of different living costs across EHEA
- For Staff
 - Employment practices and employer attitudes
 - Pension, social security, health services etc
- Emphasise social dimension
- Higher education is a public social good
- Keep driving change

New Points

- Engage with Employers
 - especially SMEs who are less (or not) knowledgeable about Bologna and implications for employers, especially in countries where 1st cycle bachelors degree is new.
- Consider adding knowledge-transfer
 - opportunity to add knowledge transfer as a dimension
- Meaningful embedding of qualification and credit frameworks
 - focus on learning outcomes
 - be realistic regarding metrics of credit (i.e. ECTS credits re student hours). Concepts based on numbers of hours of attendance are outdated, in context of different paces of learning on individual, subject and mode of delivery
- Different types of institutions and sectors
 - differences between colleges and universities is a concern for some countries. Need guidance in relating to frameworks

- opportunities to engage with schools sector, develop early awareness of Bologna opportunities, start formation of skills (inc languages) and attitudes to promote engagement with European dimension and mobility opportunities.

Panel 3

- Bologna has reached a point where the need to re-confirm a vision for the European Higher Education Area is crucial:
- Vision needs to be ambitious and inspiring, but also related to the diverse reality of countries in the European Higher Education Area.
- Need to move away from a focus on structures, to a focus on contents/curriculum and especially people/students. Genuine student-centred higher education must become the feature of the EHEA.
- EHEA must be relevant throughout society. This implies much greater communication and information: with employers, parents, citizens, and with other regions of an inter-connected globe.
- Employability is crucial, and must be understood in a broad sense: curricula must not become narrowly focused on the needs of short-term employment and soon out-dated knowledge, but rather students must be equipped with knowledge, skills and competences to prosper in a fast-changing global knowledge society.
- Mobility is a key aspect of employability, equipping individuals with a range of competences invaluable in the workplace today and tomorrow.
- EHEA must also be consciously constructed on the firm foundations of humanistic values: institutional autonomy and academic freedom are fundamental, as is the ability for critical reflection on society.
- Concrete action on lifelong learning and on measures to broaden social inclusion are absolutely imperative if the EHEA is to be realised.
- Issues must be addressed not only in pan-European configuration but also with more regional cooperation.

Panel 4

EHEA beyond 2010 - Characteristics

- Broadened access, participation and mobility of academic staff, students and social partners.
- Improved quality of HE through improved quality assurance which encompasses the views of students, academic staff and stakeholders.
- Improved autonomy of HEIs and increased diversity.
- Improvement of employability of students through closer cooperation between HEIs, students and employers.

Instruments needed to achieve this

- The Bologna Process should continue in the same form after 2010 – coordination is needed.
- Clear policy goals have to be set up for the future.
- Incentives for HEIs have to be set up in order to foster their dynamism.
- Indicators and qualification frameworks have to be further developed to allow benchmarking/comparison between HEIs/HE systems.
- Enlarge the discussion on EHEA/education goals beyond the HE world and beyond the geographical area of the Bologna Process.

Panel 5

Characteristics of a successful EHEA

- See the Social Dimension from a student perspective (re fair access, dropping out, skills that make graduates employable): it should be their free choice whether or not to continue in a chosen direction, and to develop appropriate skills for the labour market, depending on their abilities and strengths.
- Governance of HEIs: structures that are in place now were set up in a national context (organisation in faculties, funding arrangements, election or appointment of the leader of the institution). Autonomous institutions are now accountable towards all stakeholders, and also have to compete on the international scene. Only autonomous HEIs can deal with such challenges.
- Output of the Bologna Process: a perfect match between HE and the world of employment is not possible, in a continually evolving society. We have to produce flexible, multipurpose graduates. Generic skills are to include entrepreneurial attitudes and linguistic competencies, and this holds for all graduates.
- Communication with the external world (outside the EHEA) has to improve: Outside the EHEA the 'Bologna terminology' is not understood, as people interpret things differently (transparency, learning outcomes, descriptors).
- What is the 'thinking' behind Bologna? There is a need for more extensive knowledge of the substance of the Bologna Process, not only of the tools and instruments.
- The emerging EHEA is perceived as a power block. The response to the Bologna policy and strategy differs depending on who is talking: e.g. USA & other regions with a developed HE system want to see more concrete proposals for cooperation (Qualifications Frameworks, Quality Assurance standards).

- Lifelong learning: with an ageing population and a growing need for advanced learners, the age categories of potential learners have shifted to include those who are now in their forties and fifties. Formal HE providers may not all be ready for this.

The improvements for the next few years/ future of the EHEA:

- How to remedy current deficiencies in our HE? It may help to articulate more closely with secondary education. Some issues are tackled in HE, when it is already too late, and graduates miss skills and aptitudes that can better be developed at a younger age. E.g. proficiency in several European languages, interest in science and technology and awareness that these are factors in terms of employment prospects.
- Find a proper balance between demands from the economy and academic/educational priorities, in research and teaching.
- The real and lasting achievement of the Bologna Process can only be measured in terms of implementation of practical goals (by 2010 or 2020?): increased mobility figures, enhanced employability, and a competitive advantage over other 'knowledge regions'.
- See the Bologna Process on a long term: in a lifelong learning context, the graduates do not only need to be prepared for an immediate place in the job market. Give them skills that make them employable in different contexts, on a longer term, throughout their lives.

Panel 6

- Social Dimension – Access and Equity: The main aspects in this respect are financial and cultural issues.
- Mobility Issues: Mobility of staff and students is essential for the success of the EHEA. Governments should be encouraged to finance student mobility, in particular where EU Programmes do not apply, and in terms of financing mobility in a complementary manner to EU Programmes e.g. co-financing, financing non-EU initiatives.
- Data Collection: Availability and reliability of data, performance indicators, for better comparability and assessment. Also necessary in helping us identify the gravity of the problems faced (e.g. social dimension).
- External Dimension: As well as competition and competitiveness, it is important to address the idea of initially providing better information on the Bologna Process to non-EHEA countries and secondly and more importantly, the idea of cooperation, dialogue and partnership.
- Recognition: Governments should be encouraged to develop mutual recognition agreements on the basis of the Bologna tools (e.g. diploma

supplement, qualification framework, ECTS, etc). In the future there will be more predictability, though we cannot speak of automatic recognition.

- Reconcile diversity and comparability: E.g. the case of Qualification Framework was put forward as a tool to maintain diversity while understanding the value and meaning of different qualifications. However, the (imminent) existence of both an EQF (EU Qualifications Framework) and EHEA – QF is seen as an issue to be taken into consideration in light of the commitments made at the Bergen Ministerial Meeting.
- Employability: All employers have to be encouraged to increase employability of 1st cycle graduates, including the Government.
- Involvement of all Stakeholders: Including Employers (as opposed to referring to only business or industry). The notion is that of involving all ‘other interested stakeholders’ in society.

Plenary session

By Professor Sir Roderick Floud, Vice-President, European University Association and President Emeritus, London Metropolitan University

“Like the panels themselves, I want to reflect on the achievements of Bologna, on the challenges that lie ahead and on the possible scope and development of the EHEA during the next decade.

The Bologna achievement

First, the achievement. Self-congratulation is often unattractive, but I think that, on this occasion and almost certainly in 2010, we are justified in congratulating ourselves and all the higher education ministries, higher education institutions, staff and students in Europe. All the panels emphasised that – as the stocktaking, Trends and ESU contributions showed – there is still much to do before 2010. But that is on the important basis that so much has already been done. It is because of past achievement that we are all therefore confident that the job can be completed, at least approximately by 2010.

This is very different from the position in Bologna in 1999 when, as I remember, we all agreed on objectives but we were all equally sceptical that they would be achieved. I, and others, have attended the subsequent ministerial meetings with a growing sense of incredulity at the progress that we have made.

It was not that the task was easy. On the contrary, to transform the degree structures of European higher education – let alone all the other Bologna action lines – in a sector that had a reputation for conservatism and for moving slowly – has been a minor miracle. So too, and here perhaps there are lessons for other forms of international collaboration, has been the fact that it was achieved by partnership between government and higher education, with no treaties or legal obligations, and with a remarkably small, though very efficient, bureaucracy. The Bologna secretariat, I would remind you, is probably smaller than the private offices of many ministers here. And even now, as the discussion on the communique shows, we agree almost

completely on the immediate tasks ahead. So I think that the panels – implicitly or explicitly – but certainly correctly, congratulated ourselves and encouraged us to compete the task. If I were a politician, rather than a sober academic, I think I would call for a round of applause!

Tasks to be completed

There was general agreement, I believe, in the panels that success will breed success and that the process should continue after 2010. It has been too valuable for us to allow it to stop.

There was less agreement within the panels, inevitably, on what the process should aim to do after 2010. Some of the suggestions were, essentially, that we should do better, between 2010 and 2020, in some of the areas in which we have already made a start. There was general agreement that we needed greater engagement with business, the public sector and society in general, to ensure the understanding of the Bologna reforms and the employability of graduates. We also need to enhance the design of university curricula and courses and to learn from each other. We need to enhance also our relationships with the rest of the world. We need, in each of our countries and as a common endeavour, to make a reality of the social dimension – the achievement of equity in access to and success within higher education – though we all recognise the height of the mountains that we, and the pre-university sectors of education, have to climb to achieve that goal.

New challenges

Let me turn now to the new challenges that confront us; they will be the tasks for the “New Bologna” after 2010. Here I think it is perhaps most interesting, and most revealing, to reflect on what was NOT said in the panel discussions and on challenges which we have not so far confronted. This may be because they are so obvious that no-one needed to mention them. Or it may be that they are only reaching the fringes of our collective consciousness. Many of the panel discussions were relevant to what I now want to discuss and I will bring that out later.

Demography

First, I did not hear a single reference in either the plenary sessions or in the panel discussions, to demography, either of our populations in general or in relation to higher education staff and students. Yet the challenges here for us are immense. Almost all our populations are stable or falling, or would be except for high levels of immigration. In particular, in the majority of our countries, the number of young people is declining at the same time as the expectation of life, and therefore the number living, of older people is rising rapidly. It is inevitable that, particularly in the context of a Europe of knowledge based on the competitiveness of our skills, this will lead to a demand for reskilling our populations and thus to more lifelong learning. This will have to become the concern of universities as well as other higher education institutions; universities will no longer be able to take the relatively easy option of concentrating on bright and eager young people. They will need to serve all age-groups and to adapt their curricula and teaching methods to the learning needs and methods of all generations.

Student demography is challenging enough, but we need to add to it the consequences of staff demography. In almost all our countries, whether because of periods of expansion and contraction, or of brain-drain, we have ageing workforces. In some countries, there are hardly any young academic staff, while the older staff are rapidly reaching the age of retirement. They will soon need to be replaced. But, at exactly the same time as this is likely to happen, the Lisbon agenda of the European Union and the European Research Area is calling for the production and employment of perhaps 200,000 extra researchers. Where are they going to come from? What are we doing to stimulate, perhaps through structured doctoral programmes, the researchers and academic staff of the next few decades?

Gender

A second topic that has not been mentioned is sex, or rather gender. One of the most amazing transformations of European higher education is that, over the last 20 years, we have reversed 2 millenia of discrimination against women in higher education. I believe that, in almost every country represented here, there are now more female than male students. In one country, Iceland, there are 160 females to every 100 males, but in Europe as a whole there are probably between 120 and 130 females to every male. It will take longer, of course, for this to work through to staff as well as students, but the signs are that this is happening, as it is in many other professions.

We cannot claim great credit for this transformation; in fact mostly we didn't notice that it was happening. But a major societal change of this kind has consequences. It is not simply a curiosity. Women have different career patterns to men, and therefore different needs for education and training. It is arguable that, because of societal conditioning rather than genetic differences, men and women have different learning styles. What are we doing to adapt our universities to this new position? – almost nothing. Meanwhile, in many of our societies we are seeing the increasing alienation of young men, particularly from lower socio-economic groups among the white population, as they find themselves outclassed by women. This is a serious problem for the whole of European education at all levels.

Funding

A third issue which was only occasionally discussed was funding. If we are serious about making European universities competitive on a world scale, we must tackle this problem. I have a simple explanation for why so many of the universities which lead world rankings, such as those of Shanghai or the Times Higher, are from the United States and so few from Europe. In one word: money.

I obtained last year a list of the annual expenditure of the 100 largest – in monetary terms - American universities. I then obtained the annual expenditures of some of the leading European universities. The highest spending European university would have reached about 60th place on the American list. Imperial College, one of the leading European institutions in the field of science and technology, had roughly the same annual expenditure as the University of Hawaii.

Now, I know that it is true that most of the difference between US and European expenditure on higher education lies not in public funding but in private contributions, from business contracts, alumni giving and above all tuition fees. I also know that much of the money is spent on the university football coach. But in one important sense this is irrelevant. It is most of the governments of Europe that have consistently starved their universities of the funds which they need to compete on a world scale. They have done this either deliberately or by neglect or by the fear of political consequences. Unless this is corrected, and it will not be done just by such initiatives as the European Institute of Technology, all talk of making Europe the world leader in science is, as we say in Britain, so much hot air.

The business model

A final challenge which was not discussed, except by Brenda Gourley (Vice-Chancellor of the UK Open University) in her plenary speech, was that of what Brenda described as the “business model” of the university in the next decade. To my taste, Brenda put too much emphasis on the technology – both as a threat to and as a possible saviour of higher education. I think the deeper issue is the need to explore the role of the university in the modern world. Because of the internet, and before it the book, the universities no longer possess the monopoly of knowledge creation and validation. This can make one very depressed. “Peer production” as Brenda put it, in the form of wikipedia or of the millions of blogs which are now being produced, is flooding the internet with almost as much nonsense as pornography. There is no validation of knowledge, no scientific method, and one person’s opinion is as good as another’s, whatever their qualifications or experience.

But, if universities have lost their role in validating knowledge, if they are no longer seen as the fount of wisdom, what have they got left? They become simply centres of research, competing with better funded research agencies in China or India, while they cling tenaciously to the one monopoly that they still possess, the ability to assess students and to award degrees. But is this monopoly enough to sustain them, in the face of private universities, corporate universities and the increasing disdain for qualifications in a world of “peer production”?

I could go on, perhaps to discuss the need to modernise the management and governance of European universities. I could discuss the role of the university in technology transfer. I could assert, as I believe, that we have far too many small universities and that we could realise large economies of scale through mergers. But I would try your patience and stray even further from the panel discussions. Nevertheless, I believe that it is these issues which will dominate European higher education in the next decade. Some of these issues are considered in the Lisbon declaration of the EUA, which I trust you will find useful.

The “new Bologna”

So what then should be the Bologna response; what should be the “New Bologna” from 2010 to 2020?

First, all the panels felt that Bologna should continue – it is too valuable as a tool for mutual learning and mutual development to be allowed to decay.

Second, it is already clear that Europe needs to confront the demographic challenges to which I referred on a European scale. The UK Secretary of State for Education and Skills, Alan Johnson, referred last night at the Guildhall dinner to the fact that my university, London Metropolitan, has students from 160 different countries, several thousand of them from other EU countries. The adjustments to slightly different employment situations, and slightly different demographic regimes, of the kind which have recently brought so many young people from Poland to England, can be carried out most efficiently across the whole continent, rather than by action in any individual country. So Europe's higher education institutions need to respond collectively to the demographic challenge and how better than through the new Bologna.

Third, I think one of the lasting legacies of the first decade of Bologna will prove to have been the rewriting of the curriculum and the focus on defining and promoting specific learning outcomes. There will need to be much more of this in the "new Bologna", not least to respond to the increasing feminisation of European higher education, but I think it is pre-eminently an area where, as Brenda Gourley implied, we would be mad not to collaborate in the exploitation of new learning technologies.

Fourth, money. I know how sensitive this issue is; I remind you that even in the UK, the introduction of higher tuition fees nearly brought down the Labour government. But, unless we can ensure that Europe's universities and colleges are properly funded to do the job which you tell us that you want us to do, everything else will be wasted. Again, we need a collective approach to what is a collective, and European-wide, problem.

Finally, the new Bologna will have to confront the question of what is the university for, what is its competitive or comparative advantage in the world of 2010? Can it maintain its monopoly on the validation of knowledge by the award of degrees when it has lost its monopoly in knowledge creation and its authority in separating truth from falsehood?

A new vision for Bologna?

Finally, does the new Bologna need a new vision? The panels were asked to explore what it might be. But here I am going to be really heretical, in the age of visions and mission statements. I don't think we need a new vision. I do think that we need to be clear-headed and clear-sighted about the challenges that we face, and about the possible responses which we need to make. But I think we could waste a lot of time in trying to articulate a better vision than that of a continually evolving, flexible European Higher Education Area, based on the autonomy of universities and the principles of academic freedom and student-centred learning.

I have perhaps exceeded my brief, but that is because I feel so strongly that Bologna has been a transformative experience for European higher education and that its continuation, to meet new challenges, is vital for Europe's future. I think we are engaged in a noble common purpose; long may it continue."

By Lars Lyngne Nielsen, President of EURASHE

“I will focus on three issues: the social dimension, lifelong learning and the quality framework.

When moving around the different panel discussions yesterday, it was sometimes difficult to realise that you had actually gone into another room, because the discussions in all the rooms were very much centred around the same issues. One of the issues that came up: Higher education cannot solve the problems of widening access alone. We need to focus also on secondary and primary education, if we are to address the problems of students without traditional academic backgrounds entering higher education. We need to break the academic code at an earlier stage.

As a child psychologist by education, I know that looking at whether parents read out books to their children at the age of two or leave them in front of TV to watch the cartoon network, will give you a fairly good idea on which children will later on in life continue in higher education. Kindergarten education should not be an issue for higher education institutions, but it should be an issue for governments (and that's why it's mentioned here). Many of the ministers present here today are also responsible for secondary, primary, and some even Kindergarten education. Please be aware that there is a connection between what you do at the very early stages of a child's life and how that child as juvenile, as student and later as an adult can contribute to society.

Further, it was suggested that the social dimension is not only about financial issues. It is also about cultural issues. Financial issues, of course, are important when it comes to financially underprivileged groups of society and their possibility to access higher education, and this should be addressed by governments. Cultural issues are, however, as important - especially when we look at the high proportion of drop outs. Higher education institutions need to address this problem of preserving a certain academic code. There seems to be a notion that the more complicated a text to read, the higher the quality, which should not be the case. We must investigate thoroughly, what are the real academic values that we should not let go and where do we keep up the academic higher education language simply to protect ourselves and our privileges.

EURASHE believes that the social dimension of Bologna should not be related only to individual students' rights and possibilities to enter higher education but should also deal with the obligations toward society that are embedded within higher education institutions, given their status as regional, and national centres of knowledge. When we deal with lifelong learning, we have to realise that we are dealing with people. Students are people, students are individuals and more and more they act as individuals. I believe it was correctly stated yesterday that higher education is not a commodity, but students treat it as one. They treat higher education institutions as warehouses where they go shopping, and if they like what they see, they will buy it. We are providers to students, and they will ask what we have on offer to further improve their personal development and their possibilities to contribute to society.

Also, we see in the lifelong learning context an ageing population and a growing demand from advanced learners, who now to include even those in their 40s and

50s. People have to be prepared not only for an immediate place in the job market, but we also need to give them skills that make them employable in different contexts on the longer term. This all boils down to two issues for EURASHE: lifelong learning and the obligation for governments to remove all financial and legal obstacles. The obligation for higher education institutions is to remove all cultural and elitist obstacles for people, and especially people from underprivileged groups to access higher education. However, lifelong learning should not be seen as a threat to the quality of higher education. To ensure that, the other important issue here is to develop a national set of qualification frameworks, and we really urge countries to do so in next coming years. National qualifications frameworks, compatible with the EHEA framework and the EQF, are essential to the further development of the EHEA.

Finally, the Bologna Process applies to all sectors of higher education. It should not be confined only to universities and university colleges, but should actually be applied into all sectors of education and lifelong learning.”

Bologna Secretariat, June 2007

BRIEFING PAPER FOR PANEL SESSIONS: FOR ALL DELEGATES

All delegates are invited to attend the panel discussions. They will take place in the conference venue.

Purpose: to start to develop the overall vision for the European Higher Education Area (EHEA) in a more coherent and outcome focused way, and identify the definitive characteristics of a strong, dynamic, diverse, coherent, attractive and competitive EHEA.

Format: open, participative discussion session, led by a Chair and a panel comprising a Minister, a Rector, a student, a business or staff representative and a higher education stakeholder from outside the EHEA. There will also be a Rapporteur, and a UK Bologna Promoter in support.

Each panel member will initially be asked to talk for 5 minutes, offering their views on definitive characteristics of the EHEA. Panel members are asked to identify:

- their overall vision for the EHEA;
- what they believe the definitive characteristics of the EHEA should be; and
- what more needs to be done to realise the EHEA.

This will be followed by comments and questions from other delegates to panel members.

Based on the discussion, the Chair and Rapporteur will be asked to identify a number of definitive characteristics for a successful EHEA. The outputs from each discussion group will be collated by the Rapporteurs, and a summary of the emerging themes will be fed back to all delegates during the first session on Friday 18 May. The feedback will then be posted in summary format on the Bologna Secretariat website. The summary will provide background for the next BFUG Work Programme.

Background to discussion on the definitive characteristics of a strong, dynamic, diverse, coherent, attractive and competitive EHEA

When the European Ministers of Higher Education met in Bologna in June 1999, they agreed to work collaboratively to create a EHEA by 2010. They identified the following 6 Action Lines to help realise that vision:

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

Three further Action Lines were introduced, when the Ministers met in Prague in May 2001. These are:

7. Lifelong learning
8. Higher education institutions and students
9. Promoting the attractiveness of the EHEA.

A tenth Action Line was added in Berlin in September 2003:

10. Doctoral studies and the synergy between the EHEA and the European Research Area.

Essentially, these Action Lines describe processes, primarily to be taken at national level, to underpin the realisation of the EHEA. Working toward these objectives, in line with the inter-governmental, partnership approach characterised by the Bologna Process, has resulted in substantial changes at national and institutional level. They are creating a series of independent, but increasingly compatible, higher education systems.

These Action Lines are raising the quality of European higher education, supporting curricula reform, increasing the autonomy for higher education institutions, and creating greater openness and transparency through compatible qualifications frameworks based on learning outcomes and robust quality assurance systems. Taken together, these Action Lines are increasing the attractiveness and competitiveness of European higher education.

Now that we are approaching 2010 and the achievement of these individual objectives, there is a need to define our overall vision for the EHEA in a more coherent and outcome focused way. This vision should take into account fact that higher education systems will continue to need to adapt and develop in response to new societal, economic and global demands, if we are to ensure the continuing attractiveness and competitiveness of European higher education beyond 2010.

Identifying the definitive characteristics of a successful EHEA at this stage will help set the context for the further development of the Bologna Process, and inform discussions about how we might assess the overall progress made and work together in future to maintain the strength and coherence of the EHEA.

Bologna Secretariat
May 2007

ANNEX B

MEMBERSHIP OF PANEL SESSIONS

Panel One								
Chair	Minister	Rector	Student	Business Rep	Staff Rep	Outwith EHEA	Rapporteur	Support
Sjur Bergan, Council of Europe	Bill Rammell, UK	Jean Pierre Finance, France	Katerina Binz (Germany)	Tim Melville-Ross		Grahame Cook (Australia)	Colin Tuck, ESIB	Stephen Adam
Panel Two								
Chair	Minister	Rector	Student	Business Rep	Staff Rep	Outwith EHEA	Rapporteur	Support
Paul Bennett, EI	Ute Erdsiek-Rave, Germany (Lander)	Drummond Bone, UK	Sanja Brus (Slovenia)	Sir Brian Fender		Carol Nicoll (Australia)	Alan Davidson	Alan Davidson
Panel Three								
Chair	Minister	Rector	Student	Business Rep	Staff Rep	Outwith EHEA	Rapporteur	Support
Peter Williams, ENQA	Oystein Djupedal, Norway	Vladimir, Bales, Slovakia	Bruno Carapinha (Portugal)	Dr Alan Gillespie	Martin Romer, ETUCE	Yves Beaudin, ENIC Network	David Crosier, EUA	Graeme Roberts
Panel Four								
Chair	Minister	Rector	Student	Business Rep	Staff Rep	Outwith EHEA	Rapporteur	Support
Julia Gocke,	Frank Vandenbroucke,	Georg	Wes	Dr DeAnne	Jens Vraa	Roxana Pey	Emmi	Huw

BUSINESS EUROPE	Belgium Flemish Com	Winckler, Austria	Streeting, (UK)	Julius CBE	Jensen, EI	Tumanoff, Chile	Helle, ENQA	Morris
Panel Five								
Chair	Minister	Rector	Student	Business Rep	Staff Rep	Outwith EHEA	Rapporteur	Support
Andreas Orphanides, EURASHE	Francois Biltgen, Luxembourg	Rolf Tarrach, Luxembourg	Mads Svaneclink Nielsen (Denmark)	Susan Anderson, BUSINESS EUROPE		Frances Kelly, New Zealand	Stefan Delplace, EURASHE	Anne Davies
Panel Six								
Chair	Minister	Rector	Student	Business Rep	Staff Rep	Outwith EHEA	Rapporteur	Support
Klaus Huefner, UNESCO CEPES	Alexander Lomaia, Georgia	Margret Wintermantel, Germany	Caroline Carlot (France)	Sir Paul Judge		Claire Morris, Canada	Monique Fouilhoux, EI	Howard Davies