

Focus on Higher Education in Europe 2010

The Impact of the Bologna Process





**Focus on Higher Education
in Europe 2010:
The Impact of the Bologna Process**

This document is published by the Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA P9 Eurydice).

Available in English (Focus on Higher Education in Europe 2010: The Impact of the Bologna Process), French (*Focus sur l'enseignement supérieur en Europe 2010: L'impact du processus de Bologne*) and German (*Fokus auf die Hochschulbildung in Europa 2010: die Auswirkungen des Bologna Prozesses*).

ISBN 978-92-9201-086-7
DOI 10.2797/38158

This document is also available on the Internet (<http://www.eurydice.org>).

Text completed in February 2010.

© Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency, 2010.

The contents of this publication may be reproduced in part, except for commercial purposes, provided the extract is preceded by a reference to 'Eurydice network', followed by the date of publication of the document.

Requests for permission to reproduce the entire document must be made to EACEA P9 Eurydice.

Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency
P9 Eurydice
Avenue du Bourget 1 (BOU2)
BE-1140 Brussels
Tel. +32 2 299 50 58
Fax +32 2 292 19 71
E-mail: eacea-eurydice@ec.europa.eu
Website: <http://www.eurydice.org>

PREFACE



2010 is a momentous year for education in Europe. At the end of the first decade of this new millennium, we have reached the deadline set for a number of European processes. It is therefore an appropriate moment to look back to see where we have progressed and where we have fallen short of our aspirations.

As the Commissioner responsible for Education, Culture, Multilingualism and Youth in the new Commission, I consider this as an important opportunity for me to look forward to the challenges facing the European Higher Education Area over the next decade.

Like other Eurydice publications, this Focus report draws on authoritative information from each country. It provides a clear, comparative view of how higher education reform and development has been addressed at national level. It is also the only major report on the impact of the Bologna process that shows not only a European picture but also provides concise information on each national system at the end of the first 'Bologna decade'.

The report illustrates how the Bologna process has ensured that national action keeps pace with our European ambition. The Bologna process has been driving forward the most important reforms in higher education in the modern era, and all of the 46 signatory countries have today made significant moves towards establishing the European Higher Education Area. This is vital if we are to provide our continent and its citizens with the levels of education and skills required in a globally competitive, knowledge-based society.

The European Commission is a committed member of the Bologna process and has consistently supported it. The Commission has, for example, played a key role in developing the main tools – the European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System (ECTS), the Diploma Supplement and National Qualifications Frameworks. The Commission will remain a committed supporter of the European Higher Education Area over the next decade as well.

This Focus report clearly shows that the foundations of the European Higher Education Area are now in place. Nevertheless, this is no time to take our foot off the pedal. Indeed, notwithstanding the progress made during the past decade, we need to intensify our European cooperation to ensure that this Area functions in practice. We must strive for continued improvement in quality, in the relevance of the education and outcomes provided, in ensuring access to higher education and mobility for students across Europe.

We must also ensure – and this is for each country to decide in the light of its own circumstances and systems – that higher education benefits from sufficient levels of investment. Education is the key to a better future, and such investment will both speed up the process of recovery and equip people and countries with the competences to prosper in a post-crisis world.

I am convinced that we in Europe will continue to advance through greater cooperation and by learning from each other. The creation of the European Higher Education Area is a success story, which clearly shows the benefits of European cooperation. I hope that together we can build on this achievement and even exceed expectations for the next decade.

Androulla Vassiliou

Commissioner responsible for
Education, Culture, Multilingualism and Youth

CONTENTS

Preface	3	National Higher Education System Diagrams and Information	
Contents	5	AD	Andorra 50
Introduction	7	AL	Albania 52
Overview of the Bologna Process	9	AM	Armenia 54
		AT	Austria 56
		AZ	Azerbaijan 58
Comparative Overview	15	BA	Bosnia and Herzegovina 60
Section 1: Bologna Structures and Tools	15	BE de	Belgium – German-speaking Community 62
Section 2: Quality Assurance	24	BE fr	Belgium – French Community 64
Section 3: The Social Dimension of Higher Education	27	BE nl	Belgium – Flemish Community 66
Section 4: Lifelong Learning in Higher Education	34	BG	Bulgaria 68
Section 5: Student Mobility	38	CH	Switzerland 70
Section 6: The Economic Crisis and Higher Education	43	CY	Cyprus 72
Guide to the Diagrams	48	CZ	Czech Republic 74
		DE	Germany 76
		DK	Denmark 78
		EE	Estonia 80

National System Diagrams and Information (continued)

EL	Greece	82
ES	Spain	84
FI	Finland	86
FR	France	88
GE	Georgia	90
HR	Croatia	92
HU	Hungary	94
IE	Ireland	96
IS	Iceland	98
IT	Italy	100
LI	Liechtenstein	102
LT	Lithuania	104
LU	Luxembourg	106
LV	Latvia	108
MD	Moldova	110
ME	Montenegro	112
MK	Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	114
MT	Malta	116
NL	Netherlands	118

National System Diagrams and Information (continued)

NO	Norway	120
PL	Poland	122
PT	Portugal	124
RO	Romania	126
RS	Serbia	128
RU	Russia	130
SE	Sweden	132
SI	Slovenia	134
SK	Slovakia	136
TR	Turkey	138
UA	Ukraine	140
UK-ENG/WLS/NIR	United Kingdom – England, Wales and Northern Ireland	142
UK-SCT	United Kingdom – Scotland	144
VA	Holy See	146
Glossary		149
	Country Codes	149
	Definitions	149
Acknowledgements		153

INTRODUCTION

This 2010 edition of the *Focus* report has been prepared for the European Ministerial Conference in Budapest/Vienna, 11-12 March 2010, that officially launches the European Higher Education Area.

The report has been developed as a fully collaborative exercise between the Eurydice Network and the Bologna Follow-up Group (BFUG), with the aim of ensuring that information is as comprehensive, reliable and consistent as possible. We should like to express our warm gratitude to the Eurydice National Units and to all members of the Bologna Follow-Up Group for providing and checking information within an extremely tight timetable. We also wish to thank the members of the BFUG Secretariat for their considerable assistance throughout the process (see Acknowledgements).

The **main aim** of the report is to provide concise and clear information on key aspects of higher education systems in all 46 countries of the emerging European Higher Education Area at the end of the first Bologna decade. It focuses on the impact of Bologna process reforms, taking account of other significant contextual factors.

Information was gathered and checked in all countries between the end of August 2009 and February 2010. The report is based mainly on official information of an administrative nature (such as legislation, regulations and recommendations). Consequently, it provides information on national systems and analysis of national policies, but cannot explore the impact on higher education institutions in any substantial depth.

The publication is divided into two main parts.

The first part consists of a comparative overview of the main issues related to the implementation of the Bologna process. These

aspects include the Bologna three-cycle degree structure, the implementation of the main Bologna tools – the European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System (ECTS), the Diploma Supplement and National Qualifications Frameworks – the development of quality assurance systems, the social dimension of higher education, lifelong learning in higher education, student mobility and the impact of the economic crisis.

The comparative overview is preceded by a short historical **overview of the Bologna process** mapping out the main developments of the bi-annual conferences of Education Ministers accompanying the Bologna process throughout the past decade.

The second part of the publication consists of comparable system information for all signatory countries giving an overview of key issues associated with the Bologna process. Each country table is accompanied by a **higher education system diagram** showing the higher education degree structures and qualifications most commonly offered by higher education institutions. The diagrams illustrate clearly where the three main cycles are now integrated features of higher education systems and also show those programmes that remain outside the typical Bologna models.

The country descriptions and diagrams are arranged in the **alphabetical order of the country codes** which can also be found in the glossary. This has been done to ensure uniformity of presentation in all language versions of the publication.

The **glossary** of country codes and abbreviations, as well as definitions of specific terms, can be found at the end of the publication.

OVERVIEW OF THE BOLOGNA PROCESS

The Bologna process is the product of a series of meetings of Ministers responsible for higher education at which policy decisions have been taken with the goal to establish a European Higher Education Area by 2010. The process also includes the European Commission as a full member. The Council of Europe and UNESCO-CEPES, along with a range of stakeholder organisations are also involved as consultative members. There is thus full and active partnership with higher education institutions, represented by the European University Association (EUA) and the European Association of Institutions in Higher Education (EURASHE), students represented by the European Students' Union (ESU), academics represented by Education International (EI) as well as the European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA) and Business Europe representing employer organisations.

Since 1998, six ministerial conferences devoted to mapping out the Bologna process have been held in different European cities, namely Paris (at the Sorbonne University), Bologna, Prague, Berlin, Bergen, London and Leuven/Louvain-la-Neuve.

Sorbonne Declaration (1998)

The basic precepts of the Bologna process date back to the Sorbonne Joint Declaration on Harmonisation of the Architecture of the European Higher Education System, signed on 25 May 1998 by the education ministers of four countries: France, Germany, Italy and the United Kingdom.

The Sorbonne Declaration focused on:

- Improving the international transparency of programmes and the recognition of qualifications by means of **gradual convergence towards a common framework of qualifications and cycles of study**;
- Facilitating the **mobility of students and teachers** in the European area and their integration into the European labour market;
- Designing a **common degree level system** for undergraduates (bachelor degree) and graduates (master and doctoral degrees).

Bologna Declaration (1999)

The Bologna Declaration on the European Higher Education Area, largely inspired by the Sorbonne Declaration, was signed in June 1999 by ministers responsible for higher education in 29 European countries. This Declaration became the primary document used by the signatory countries to establish the general framework for the modernisation and reform of European higher education. The process of reform came to be called the Bologna process.

In 1999, the signatory countries included the then 15 EU Member States, three EFTA countries (Iceland, Norway and Switzerland) and 11 EU candidate countries (Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia). International institutions such as the European Commission, the Council of Europe and associations of universities, rectors and European students also participated in drafting the Declaration.

The Bologna Declaration also formulates the objective of increasing the international competitiveness of the European system of higher education and stresses the need to ensure that this system attracts significant attention from around the world.

In the Bologna Declaration, ministers affirmed their intention to:

- Adopt a system of **easily readable and comparable degrees**;
- Implement a system based essentially on **two main cycles**;
- Establish a **system of credits** (such as ECTS);
- Support the **mobility of students, teachers, researchers and administrative staff**;
- Promote **European cooperation in quality assurance**;
- Promote the **European dimensions in higher education** (in terms of curricular development and inter-institutional cooperation).

Prague Communiqué (2001)

In May 2001, the meeting in Prague was convened to assess the progress accomplished to date (particularly as indicated in the respective national reports) and identify the main priorities that should drive the Bologna process in the years ahead. 33 countries participated, with Croatia, Cyprus and Turkey accepted as new members. Liechtenstein was also included, having committed to the process between the Bologna and Prague conferences, and the European Commission also became a member.

The education ministers also decided to establish a Bologna Follow-up Group (BFUG) responsible for the continuing development of the process. The BFUG is composed of representatives of all signatory countries and the European Commission and is chaired by the rotating EU Presidency. The Council of Europe, the European University Association (EUA), the European Association of Institutions in Higher Education (EURASHE) and the National Unions of Students in Europe (ESIB), later renamed the European Students Union (ESU), take part as consultative members in the work of the BFUG.

The Prague Communiqué emphasised three elements of the Bologna process:

- Development of **lifelong learning**;
- Involvement of **higher education institutions and students**;
- Promotion of the **attractiveness of the European Higher Education Area**.

Berlin Communiqué (2003)

Held in September 2003, the Berlin Conference was an important stage in the follow up to the Bologna process. With the inclusion of seven new signatory countries (Albania, Andorra, Bosnia and Herzegovina, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, the Holy See, Montenegro, Russia and Serbia), 40 countries were then involved.

In the Berlin Communiqué, ministers charged the BFUG with preparing detailed reports on the progress and implementation of the intermediate priorities and organising a stocktaking process before the following ministerial conference in 2005. The UNESCO European Centre for Higher Education (UNESCO-CEPES) joined the work of the BFUG as a consultative member.

With the Berlin Communiqué, the Bologna process gained additional momentum by setting certain priorities for the next two years:

- Development of **quality assurance at institutional, national and European levels**;
- Implementation of the **two-cycle system**;
- **Recognition of degrees and periods of studies**, including the provision of the Diploma Supplement automatically and free of charge for all graduates as of 2005;
- Elaboration of an overarching **framework of qualifications for the European Higher Education Area**;
- Inclusion of the **doctoral level as the third cycle** in the process;
- Promotion of closer **links between the European Higher Education Area and the European Research Area**.

Bergen Communiqué (2005)

By May 2005, the Bologna process extended to 45 signatory countries with the inclusion of Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Moldova and Ukraine. The ministers responsible for higher education met in Bergen to discuss the mid-term achievements of the Bologna process. The commissioned Stocktaking Report was submitted by the BFUG for the occasion. The Bergen Conference also marked the adoption of the Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area (ESG) and the Framework of Qualifications for the European Higher Education Area (FQ-EHEA).

The European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA), the Education International Pan-European Structure and the Union of Industrial and Employers' Confederations of Europe (UNICE, later to become Business Europe) joined the BFUG as consultative members.

In the Bergen Communiqué, ministers enlarged their priorities for 2007, which now also include:

- **Reinforcing the social dimension** and removing obstacles to mobility;
- Implementing the **standards and guidelines for quality assurance** as proposed in the ENQA report;
- Developing **national frameworks of qualifications in compatibility with the adopted Framework of Qualifications for the European Higher Education Area**;
- Creating opportunities for **flexible learning paths in higher education**, including procedures for recognition of prior learning.

London Communiqué (2007)

The London Ministerial meeting, held on 17 and 18 May 2007, provided a landmark in establishing the first legal body to be created through the Bologna process – the European Quality Assurance Register (EQAR). This is to become a register of quality assurance agencies that comply substantially with the standards and guidelines for quality assurance in the European Higher Education Area (ESG) on the basis of external evaluation.

London also saw developments in two key areas – the social dimension, where Ministers agreed to develop national strategy and action plans, and the global dimension, where Ministers agreed on a strategy to develop the global dimension of European higher education.

In the London Communiqué, ministers:

- Welcomed the creation of the **European Quality Assurance Register (EQAR)**;
- Committed to completing **national frameworks of qualifications** in compatibility with the adopted Framework of Qualifications for the European Higher Education Area by 2010;
- Promised to report **on national action to remove obstacles to the mobility** of students and staff;
- Pledged to implement and report on **national strategies for the social dimension**, including action plans and measures to evaluate their effectiveness;
- Adopted a strategy for the European Higher Education Area in global setting.

The country membership expanded to 46 with the recognition of the Republic of Montenegro as an independent State in the European Higher Education Area.

Leuven/Louvain-la-Neuve Communiqué (2009)

The Leuven/Louvain-la-Neuve Ministerial meeting, held on 28 and 29 April 2009, took stock of the achievements of the Bologna process and laid out the priorities for the European Higher Education Area for the next decade.

Looking back to ten years of European higher education reform, Ministers emphasised the achievements of the Bologna process, highlighting in particular the increased compatibility and comparability of European education systems through the implementation of structural changes and the use of ECTS and the Diploma Supplement. Acknowledging that the European Higher Education Area is not yet a reality, the Leuven/Louvain-la-Neuve Communiqué also established the priorities for the decade until 2020.

The organisational structures of the Bologna process were endorsed as being fit for purpose, and ministers decided that in the future the Bologna process would be co-chaired by the country holding the EU presidency and a non-EU country.

In the Leuven/Louvain-la-Neuve Communiqué, ministers agreed that:

- Each country should set **measurable targets for widening overall participation and increasing the participation of under-represented social groups** in higher education by the end of the next decade;
- **By 2020 at least 20 % of those graduating in the EHEA should have had a study or training period abroad;**
- **Lifelong learning and employability** are important missions of higher education;
- **Student-centred learning** should be the goal of ongoing curriculum reform.

Timeline of the Bologna process

Mobility of students and teachers	Mobility of students, teachers, researchers and administrative staff	Social dimension of mobility	Portability of loans and grants Improvement of mobility data	Attention to visa and work permits	Challenges of visa and work permits, pension systems and recognition	Benchmark of 20 % by 2020 for student mobility
A common two-cycle degree system	Easily readable and comparable degrees	Fair recognition Development of recognised Joint degrees	Inclusion of doctoral level as third cycle Recognition of degrees and periods of studies Joint degrees	FQ-EHEA adopted National Qualifications Frameworks launched	National Qualifications Frameworks by 2010	National Qualifications Frameworks by 2012
		Social dimension	Equal access	Reinforcement of the social dimension	Commitment to produce national action plans with effective monitoring	National targets for the social dimension to be measured by 2020
		Lifelong learning (LLL)	Alignment of national LLL policies Recognition of Prior Learning (RPL)	Flexible learning paths in higher education	Work towards a common understanding of the role of higher education in LLL Partnerships to improve employability	LLL as a public responsibility requiring strong partnerships Call to work on employability
Use of credits	A system of credits (ECTS)	ECTS and Diploma Supplement (DS)	ECTS for credit accumulation		Need for coherent use of tools and recognition practices	Continuing implementation of Bologna tools
	European cooperation in quality assurance	Cooperation between quality assurance and recognition professionals	Quality assurance at institutional, national and European level	European Standards and Guidelines for quality assurance adopted	Creation of the European Quality Assurance Register (EQAR)	Quality as an overarching focus for EHEA
Europe of Knowledge	European dimensions in higher education	Attractiveness of the European Higher Education Area	Links between higher education and research areas	International cooperation on the basis of values and sustainable development	Strategy to improve the global dimension of the Bologna process adopted	Enhance global policy dialogue through Bologna Policy Fora
1998	1999	2001	2003	2005	2007	2009
Sorbonne Declaration	Bologna Declaration	Prague Communiqué	Berlin Communiqué	Bergen Communiqué	London Communiqué	Leuven/Louvain-la-Neuve Communiqué

COMPARATIVE OVERVIEW

SECTION 1: BOLOGNA STRUCTURES AND TOOLS

Main messages

- The Bologna process has brought about fundamental and dramatic change in higher education structures across the European Higher Education Area.
- The Bologna reforms have been implemented at a time of unprecedented and rapid expansion in higher education systems.
- Access to higher education, mobility and funding have been consistent priorities throughout the last decade.

Context: Expanding higher education systems and evolving policy priorities

Since the beginning of the Bologna process, higher education systems in the European Higher Education Area have grown significantly. Although the trend towards mass higher education began before the launch of the Bologna process, the speed of transition has certainly accelerated during the last decade. The student populations in Armenia, Lithuania, Montenegro and Romania have practically doubled in size. In another 20 systems, student participation has increased by more than 20 percent. Only in Spain has the number of students decreased. Overall, this picture across the European Higher Education Area fits well with acknowledged global massification trends in higher education, and indeed the rapid speed of European change in higher education demography is being out-paced by other world regions.

As the size of the student population has grown, so too has the number of higher education institutions – at least in most countries. Indeed in Armenia, the Czech Republic, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Italy, Malta, Montenegro and Slovenia, the number of higher education institutions has expanded by more than 100 %. A large part of this growth has been in vocational and professional higher education programmes, and the sector has also seen growth in private, government-recognised higher education institutions. In Italy, although 20 universities have been established in the past 10 years, the dramatic increase in institutions can mostly be explained by the recognition of academies of music and fine arts (Afam system) as higher education institutions.

However, trends regarding higher education institutions are not universal. While some higher education systems have seen significant increases in numbers of institutions, 13 have reported reductions in their number, usually as a result of another trend – the merging of higher education institutions to create greater critical mass.

Over this same period, changes in policy priorities reflect developments in the emphasis laid on different action lines in the ministerial communiqués. In 1999, just after the Bologna Declaration, implementing Bologna degree structures or acceding to the Bologna process itself were among the main policy goals for thirteen countries. This Bologna priority was, however, much less prominent in 2008/09 (although still relevant for five countries), when the focus had shifted to other Bologna issues, particularly quality assurance and the development of National Qualification Frameworks. Questions of mobility, access, participation and funding remain consistently important over time when looking at all Bologna countries. The

general shift in national higher education policy priorities also indicates that countries have already begun to look forward to giving reality to the European Higher Education Area in the next decade.


The Bologna three-cycle-structure

Central to the Bologna process is the commitment of countries to establish a three-cycle degree structure in higher education. Contrary to persisting misconceptions, neither the Bologna Declaration nor subsequent ministerial communiqués rigidly prescribe the length of these cycles. They merely state that first cycle qualifications should last a 'minimum of three years', while Master degrees should range between 60-120 ECTS credits.

The Framework for Qualifications of the European Higher Education Area (FQ-EHEA), adopted by the Ministers in Bergen in May 2005, reflects this focus on the three-cycle structure. Typically, first cycle qualifications comprise 180-240 ECTS credits while second cycle qualifications comprise 60-120 ECTS credits. These typical models are referred to in this report as the 'typical Bologna structure'.

The three-cycle structure has been overwhelmingly introduced in most institutions and programmes in Bologna countries. However, most of them report that they still have long programmes in specific disciplines that are not in line with the typical Bologna cycle structures. This applies most often to medicine and related fields, and sometimes to other regulated professions, theology, music and fine arts. Nevertheless, as far as medicine is concerned, Belgium (both Flemish and French Communities), the Netherlands and Switzerland have introduced the three-cycle structure.

Figure 1: Three-cycle structure in 1999 and 2009



Despite these exceptions, the current situation is a fundamental and dramatic change, as in 1999/2000 the majority of institutions and programmes across the European Higher Education Area were not organised according to the three-cycle structure. Figure 1 shows that the introduction of the three-cycle structure has had the most significant impact on the higher education systems in central continental Europe. Most higher education systems in south-east and north-west Europe already had some form of a three-cycle structure in place in 1999, albeit a very different system to the Bologna model in countries such as former Yugoslavia.

Despite ongoing debate about the implementation of these fundamental reforms, it is possible at this stage to identify commonalities between higher education systems concerning the workload/duration of the majority of programmes at Bachelor and Master Level. While the doctoral level has been a focus of increasing attention since 2005, developments remain at a relatively early stage, and, as they are largely being driven from within autonomous universities, dominant national patterns are quite difficult to discern. Nevertheless, most third-cycle degrees last officially between three and four years (with a slight official preference for the three-year model) and only five countries report the use of ECTS within doctoral programmes – presumably for taught elements of third-cycle programmes. Most countries also emphasise that in reality most doctoral candidates take longer than the foreseen time to complete their doctoral degree.


The following analysis of the first two cycles focuses on the most common national patterns, considering the situation where more than 65 % of programmes follow one structural model. Such a presentation does not give a comprehensive picture of institutional and programme

variety, but rather aims to identify – where it exists – a reference model that is applied to the majority of programmes. In some countries, this picture may hide significant aspects of the reality. For example, typical length of a degree cycle may be consistent within a type of institution, but differ between types of institution. If one institutional type occurs more frequently in the higher education landscape, this presentation will hide the reality of degree structures in the numerically smaller higher education institutions. Nevertheless, for most countries, the picture shows the changing reality that has been brought about through the implementation of Bologna reforms.

Figure 2 shows that the structure of Bachelor programmes can be differentiated into two models: 180 ECTS credits in 25 higher education systems and 240 ECTS credits in 13 higher education systems. In the remaining systems no single model dominates, but institutions and programmes draw upon both preceding models.

Many countries also offer some Bachelor programmes of lengths other than 180 or 240 ECTS, but their occurrence is generally rather rare, and such programmes therefore do not play a significant role. The national exceptions in this respect are Hungary with 34 % of programmes with a different length, Andorra with 20 % and Sweden with 12 %. In Sweden, these programmes are all professionally oriented qualifications.

Figure 2: Workload/duration for the most common Bachelor programmes in the Bologna countries, 2009/10



At the Master level (Figure 3) in 27 Bologna countries, the 120 ECTS credits model is most common, although most countries also offer second cycle programmes of a different length. In Bulgaria, Serbia and Ukraine, the dominant Master degree model has 60 ECTS credits. This is also the case for Montenegro, although the 60 ECTS Master is commonly followed by a 60 ECTS specialist second-cycle

qualification. Switzerland and the United Kingdom fall between these groups as most of their Master degrees are assigned 90 ECTS. In the remaining countries, a mix of different lengths is offered with no dominant model emerging.

Figure 3: Workload/duration for the most common Master programmes in the Bologna countries, 2009/10





Figure 4: Overall Bologna structure model implemented in the most common programmes in the Bologna countries, 2009/10



In combining the two cycles, three models can be identified to show how the Bologna process has been implemented in the signatory states:

1. The 180 + 120 ECTS (3 + 2 academic years) has been implemented in 19 higher education systems.
2. The 240 + 120 ECTS (4 + 2 academic years) model has been implemented in six countries (Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Lithuania, Russia and Turkey).
3. The 240 + 60/90 ECTS (4 + 1/1.5 academic years) model has been implemented in four higher education systems (Bulgaria, Spain, Ukraine and the United Kingdom (Scotland)).

In the remaining higher education systems, no unique dominant model can be identified. In some of them, the Bachelor programmes have a fixed length, while the length of Master programmes varies. In others, there is variation in both cycles. In other systems again, there may be two equally dominant models applied in different types of higher education institution. Where there is variation in programme structures, responsibility for their duration rests largely with the institutions and study fields concerned.

Professional and vocational programmes in the Bologna model

Depending on the country in question, professional and vocational programmes may or may not be considered as part of the higher education system. Their inclusion in the Bologna structures has been equally variable and not always transparently managed. The reasons for this lie in the many different national understandings of

'professional' or 'vocational' programmes, and the blurring of distinctions between academic and professional programmes in some countries, as the entire higher education sector focuses more consciously on employability concerns and on providing relevant education for the labour market.

Several countries have specifically identified problems in linking vocationally-oriented programmes to their Bologna model. The most common problem articulated is that many vocational and professional qualifications are offered in short-cycle programmes that require less than 180 ECTS. However, as long as the qualifications resulting from these programmes can be recognised within a Bologna first-cycle programme, there should be no problem of integration within the Bologna cycle system. The problems therefore arise in countries where such progression routes are not a part of the system architecture.

There are, however, a number of countries that can be said to have successfully integrated their professional programmes into the Bologna structures. In Denmark, for example, all short-cycle programmes (of 120 ECTS duration) are part of the first cycle. A transfer into a second-cycle programme, however, will require additional credits. Other countries, such as Latvia, have integrated their professional higher education programmes into the Bologna degree-cycle structure and allow their graduates access to academically-oriented second-cycle programmes. The situation is equally positive for those countries which have explicitly referenced their professional programmes to their National Qualifications Framework – illustrating the importance of this tool.

The Bologna tools: ECTS, Diploma Supplement and National Qualification Frameworks

On the structural level, the Bologna process has led to greater convergence in the architecture of national higher education systems. The overall broadness of the guidelines expressed in communiqués and related texts, however, allows countries and institutions to maintain specific characteristics for most programmes. In order to help the development of comparable and understandable degrees and systems, a number of pre-existing 'tools' were introduced in the Bologna process to foster transparency and mutual recognition. These aim to make education systems and programmes more transparent and render them understandable for all.

As the full picture on these topics could only be gained from an in-depth study of higher education institutions, this overview, although simplified, can be seen as the best possible information available through national-level reporting.

European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System and the Diploma Supplement: Two tools brought to work for the Bologna process

Two long established elements of the 'Bologna toolkit' are the European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System (ECTS) and the Diploma Supplement (DS). ECTS was developed at the end of the 1980s to facilitate credit transfer in the Erasmus programme and thus to foster student mobility. The decision to establish a European Higher Education Area came a decade later and, since then, ECTS has become a core element in its implementation. In the Berlin Communiqué (2003), ministers stressed that ECTS should not only be

used for credit transfer, but also for credit accumulation, and in Bergen in 2005, they agreed on indicative credit ranges for the first two cycles. These were the last steps to establish ECTS as a cornerstone in the implementation of the Bologna reforms. In 2007 and 2009, the ministers noted that 'there has been progress in the implementation' to 'increase transparency and recognition'.

This report, however, looks beyond the primary question of whether or not ECTS is used in higher education institutions and programmes, as such information would merely confirm that all countries make use of ECTS or a compatible national credit system. Rather, the report emphasises the extent to which the system is used in institutions and programmes and its purposes (accreditation and/or transfer). Based on the commitments made by the ministers in the various communiqués, ECTS is regarded as fully implemented when more than 75 % of institutions and programmes use ECTS for credit accumulation and transfer, and when it satisfies the requirements of credits being awarded on the basis of defined learning outcomes and/or student workload.

In 1999/2000, 31 countries reported they did not use ECTS for either credit accumulation or transfer. Even for transfer (which was at that time the only recognised function of the ECTS), only Belgium (Flemish Community), Iceland, Latvia, Spain and Sweden reported a significant use by higher education institutions, with use in higher education programmes even weaker.


This situation has now changed radically. Today, 24 countries report using ECTS as a credit accumulation and transfer tool in more than 75 % of higher education institutions, while 29 report this for programmes. In the majority of countries/regions, ECTS has been introduced through national legislation – although in many systems

this is only the first step towards implementation in reality. However, at this level, ECTS can be shown to be a strong feature of education systems. It is also gradually replacing more and more national credit systems, even those that are fully compatible with ECTS (Estonia and Latvia).

The Diploma Supplement, the second important Bologna 'tool', was developed by the European Commission, the Council of Europe and UNESCO-CEPES in the 1990s. It is a standardised template containing a description of the nature, level, context, content and status of the studies completed by the individual noted on the original diploma. The goal of the Diploma Supplement is to increase transparency of education acquired for the purposes of securing employment and facilitating academic recognition for further studies (Berlin Communiqué, 2003). The intention is thus to improve understanding of the knowledge, skills and competences acquired by the learner. The Diploma Supplement should be attached to the original national diploma, together with a description of the national higher education system within which the diploma was awarded.

In Berlin, in 2003, the ministers agreed that from 2005 all graduates should receive the Diploma Supplement automatically and free of charge. The Eurydice 2009 report on higher education showed that it has been implemented in most signatory states and that it is being issued in English and/or the language of instruction. In 2005, eight countries (Belgium – Flemish Community, Estonia, Finland, France, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg and Slovenia) issued it to all students. By 2009, this number had grown to 25.

Figure 5: Implementation of ECTS and the Diploma Supplement, 2009/10



The remaining countries either did not provide data or do not issue it to *all* graduates. The use of the Diploma Supplement is, however, clearly growing. Twenty-two countries monitor the extent to which it is being issued. Most often the relevant ministries are responsible for data collection, but in many countries also the National Europass

Centre (NEC) is strongly involved. Monitoring may take the form of one-off surveys among universities and higher education institutions, while other countries collect information annually.

Most relevant for students, however, is whether the Diploma Supplement is issued free of charge. The map in Figure 5 therefore considers the DS to be implemented when it has been introduced in the vast majority of study programmes and is issued free of charge.

Figure 5 shows that a large majority (36 higher education systems) fully implement the two instruments. Among the 11 systems that have fully implemented only one of the two tools, all have implemented the Diploma Supplement whereas ECTS implementation still lags behind. Only Cyprus and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia admit to having considerable progress to make in implementing both tools. Overall this widespread use indicates that these two instruments have played an important role in embedding aspects of the Bologna reforms and facilitating the understanding of national higher education systems.

National Qualification Frameworks: Moving forward, albeit slightly behind schedule


The third tool to have been introduced and developed in the Bologna process is the National Qualifications Framework (NQF). It is a tool for describing and clearly expressing the differences between qualifications in all cycles and levels of education. Ideally NQFs work in close conjunction with the aforementioned ECTS and Diploma Supplement. The development of National Qualifications Frameworks has been encouraged in recent years by a range of initiatives and processes. In Bergen, in May 2005, European ministers of education

adopted the overarching Framework for Qualifications of the European Higher Education Area (FQ-EHEA) and committed to the development of National Qualification Frameworks. National Qualification Frameworks should include a reference to the three-cycle structure and the use of generic descriptors based on learning outcomes, competences and credits for the first and second cycle.

This task was made more challenging by the later adoption in the context of the EU Lisbon strategy of the European Qualifications Framework for lifelong learning (EQF), which is structurally compatible to the FQ-EHEA, but has different descriptors. Thus the task for countries when developing or adapting their national qualifications frameworks is far from simple: not only should these new national instruments reflect the shift from traditional input-based approaches of categorising qualifications to a focus on learning outcomes, credits and the profile of qualifications, but care should also be taken to ensure that national developments are compatible with both overarching European frameworks.

Initially, the ministers foresaw the implementation of NQFs in all countries by 2010. But even the 2009 Stocktaking report called this deadline 'too ambitious' (Bologna Process Stocktaking Report 2009, p. 41) and identified the establishment of NQFs in all countries as one of the biggest challenges for the coming years. Eurydice data supports this assessment. Using a model adapted from the BFUG working group on Qualifications Frameworks, Figure 6 shows that eight higher education systems now have a fully self-certified NQF, while 11 are well advanced in the process of implementation. The other countries are still in the preparatory stages of defining purposes and structures. While at first sight this picture may not seem too positive, developments over time are promising. Indeed since the

Figure 6: Stage towards establishing a National Qualification Framework compatible with the FQ-EHEA, 2009/10



Ministerial Conference in Leuven/Louvain-la-Neuve in 2009, Denmark and Malta have self-certified their NQF (Malta is the first country to self certify against the FQ-EHEA and reference against the EQF in the same operation) and Albania, Cyprus, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, the Holy See, Norway and Portugal have all made progress towards establishing their NQF.

SECTION 2: QUALITY ASSURANCE

Main messages

- The growth of external quality assurance in higher education has been one of the most notable features of the Bologna decade.
- European cooperation in quality assurance is exemplified by agreement on European Standards and Guidelines and the creation of a European Quality Assurance Register.
- In the majority of EHEA countries, quality assurance is concerned with granting permission to higher education institutions or programmes to operate on the basis of threshold quality standards. Only a minority of countries exclusively follow an improvement-oriented approach.

Introduction

This section of the report gives an overview of the rapid rise of external quality assurance in Europe. As already reported in the introduction to Section 1, ensuring and improving quality of higher education and establishing quality assurance systems remains a high priority for many countries. However, measures taken to strengthen quality within institutions (i.e. internal quality assurance) are beyond the scope of the national level sources that inform this report.

While it is a moot question whether quality in higher education has improved during the past Bologna decade, there is no doubt whatsoever that quality assurance has seen dramatic developments. In higher education, quality assurance can be understood as policies, procedures and practices that are designed to achieve, maintain or enhance quality as it is understood in a specific context. During the Bologna period, quality assurance in higher education has been clearly linked to establishing stakeholder confidence. Indeed the following principles outlined in the Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area (ESG) adopted in May 2005 stress stakeholder interest, institutional autonomy and minimum burden on higher education institutions. Thus Quality Assurance should focus on:

- the interests of students as well as employers and the society more generally in good quality higher education;
- the central importance of institutional autonomy, tempered by a recognition that this brings with it heavy responsibilities;
- the need for external quality assurance to be fit for its purpose and to place only an appropriate and necessary burden on institutions for the achievement of its objectives.

Creation of Quality Assurance agencies in the last decade

Although nearly all Bologna countries now have a system of external quality assurance in place, usually with one or more independent agencies charged with prime responsibility, a quick glance through the dates of establishment of these bodies shows that this is a recent and fast-developing phenomenon. Indeed only a handful of countries

had already established clear external quality assurance systems prior to the Bologna process.

During the Bologna decade, 22 countries have established national agencies for quality assurance, with half of these being set up since 2005. In a few countries, such as Denmark and France, new agencies have replaced or built on existing agencies.

Few countries have stayed outside this quality assurance revolution. Countries with a small higher education sector such as Cyprus, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg and Malta have not established agencies. However, Liechtenstein has developed strong cooperation with Switzerland to ensure that external quality assurance is fully implemented. Luxembourg has also developed a progressive approach of improvement-oriented evaluation that is both inclusive of stakeholders and extremely international.

Development of ENQA and creation of EQAR

Developments at national level have also been accompanied by major changes at European level. The European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA) was established in 2004 after four years as a more informal network. It works to promote European co-operation in the field of quality assurance.

The launch of the European Quality Assurance Register for Higher Education (EQAR) in March 2008 represents the culmination of efforts to promote European cooperation in quality assurance through the Bologna process. EQAR aims at enhancing trust and confidence in European higher education by listing quality assurance agencies that operate in Europe and have proven their credibility and reliability in a review against the Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in

the EHEA (ESG). After less than two years of existence, EQAR includes 17 quality assurance agencies based in ten European countries.

EQAR is also notable for its governance structures, as it is governed and supported by an international non-profit association that comprises all major European higher education stakeholders and European governments. This inclusive approach to governance is a strong symbol of the close partnership that has developed through the Bologna process and offers a model for other world regions.

Independence of Quality Assurance agencies

The European debate on quality assurance during the last decade has emphasised the importance of establishing agencies that are able to perform their work in an independent manner. In most cases, this has led to the development of agencies that are legally and operationally independent from governments as well as from higher education institutions. Only six countries – Azerbaijan, Iceland, Moldova, Slovakia, Turkey and Ukraine – have maintained a system of central management for quality by ministries. Meanwhile, the situation for two countries – Bosnia and Herzegovina and Italy – is currently in a process of transition. In Bosnia and Herzegovina, an agency was established in law in 2006 but is not yet operational. In Italy, following legislation in 2008, considerable action has been undertaken to ensure that a new improvement-oriented quality assurance agency should soon be fully functioning. Notwithstanding these exceptions, it is clear that the European Higher Education Area is now largely full of national external quality assurance systems with independent agencies.

Orientation of Quality Assurance systems

Although practically all Bologna countries have established some form of external quality assurance system, there are significant differences in the philosophy and approach behind systems. Common Standards and Guidelines have been agreed for the EHEA, yet systems are still quite diverse in their orientation. Two main distinctions are drawn in this overview and can be seen in Figure 7.


The main element that distinguishes the orientation of systems in this representation is whether or not the QA agency or national body is invested with the power to grant permission for institutions or programmes to operate. Although certain national system features make this reality more complex (for example, whether or not governments retain the power to issue degrees at central level), these orientations give a good sense of the approach to quality assurance.

In systems where responsible QA bodies/agencies have the power to permit or refuse programmes and/or institutions to operate, quality assurance can, in broad terms, be perceived as supervisory in character, and generally aims to ensure that minimum quality thresholds are met. Agencies may of course play other roles – including giving advice on the enhancement of quality. This is indeed specifically mentioned in a number of countries, but all these additional roles are likely to be subordinate to the decision of permitting programmes and/or institutions to operate.

In other systems, QA agencies report on institutions' management of quality, and although having 'only' an advisory role, aim to support quality enhancement. In such a construction, the primary emphasis is thus on empowering higher education institutions with responsibility for quality improvement. These are systems that will be more likely to

use 'light touch' external quality assurance processes, aiming to ensure that necessary measures to improve quality have been established within institutions, and interfering less in the decision-making processes at institutional level.

Figure 7: Main approach to Quality Assurance, 2009/10



It is interesting to note that, despite the growing emphasis on autonomy for higher education institutions in European-level discourse on higher education, three-quarters of countries – including those that have most recently established their external quality assurance system – have constructed their QA systems in the logic of supervision and ensuring minimum standards, while only 14 higher education systems currently follow an improvement-oriented approach, placing the primary responsibility for improving quality at institutional level.

This finding suggests that the development of external quality assurance systems has been a central feature of evolving governance structures in higher education. Whereas institutions were previously 'supervised' directly by the state, the steering mechanisms now are much more likely to involve quality assurance agencies. Moreover, just as there has been increasing convergence towards particular models of degree structures, so too there appears to have been convergence towards a particular model of external quality assurance. No doubt this has been facilitated by the increased communication between governments, agencies and other quality assurance actors throughout the Bologna period.

SECTION 3: THE SOCIAL DIMENSION OF HIGHER EDUCATION`

Main messages

- The social dimension of higher education presents the most significant challenge to European cooperation as it is understood so differently from one country to another.
- Very few countries have linked their policy on the social dimension to the Bologna commitment of raising the participation of under-represented groups to the point where the higher education population mirrors the overall societal distribution.
- Very few countries have set specific targets to improve the participation of under-represented groups in higher education, and only about half of the Bologna countries systematically monitor their participation.
- The most common national measures to widen participation are the provision of targeted financial support and the development of alternative access routes and/or admission procedures.

Introduction

Although not mentioned in the 1999 Bologna Declaration, the social dimension has been an integral part of the Bologna process since the first ministerial follow-up meeting in Prague in 2001. In the subsequent Communiqués, the importance of the social dimension has increased, although clarity about the nature of the concept was only brought about in 2007, when the London Communiqué defined the objective of the social dimension as the 'societal aspiration that the student body entering, participating in and completing higher

education at all levels should reflect the diversity of our populations'. In order to move towards this objective, countries agreed that the social dimension should be understood as 'an evolutionary process leading to the objective that requires the ongoing commitment and effort from all relevant stakeholders' (Report from the Bologna Process Working Group on Social Dimension, 2007). On this basis, each country pledged to develop its own strategy and action plan for the social dimension, which would initially call for the identification of possible under-represented groups.

Following this rationale, countries were asked to report whether and how the participation of particular societal groups is monitored, as well as about the understanding of the reasons for under-representation. Countries were then asked about policies and actions that have been developed with the specific aim of increasing the representation of under-represented groups, and how the impact of these policies and actions is measured.

Definitions of under-represented social groups

Although national definitions of under-represented societal groups vary from country to country, there are important points of convergence in priorities and approaches. In most cases, national authorities identify several categories of under-represented groups. Austria, Georgia, Germany and the United Kingdom routinely use more than five distinct categories for monitoring student participation. Greece also uses more than five categories to collect information about students upon registration, but none of these categories of students – including students from weaker socio-economic background and people with disabilities – have been identified as under-represented. However, special measures have been put in

place and are applied in order to prevent under-representation of certain social groups and to safeguard social equity in higher education.

At the other end of the spectrum are France, Luxembourg and Sweden that consider as potential under-represented groups only students from socio-economically disadvantaged backgrounds (although Luxembourg draws an explicit link between low socio-economic status and immigrant background).

Across the Bologna countries, under-representation is most often linked to socio-economic background or parents' educational attainment, minority status or disability. Other categories like gender (with targeted groups being either men or women depending on the country and field of studies), mature age, insufficient formal educational qualifications for entry into higher education and geographical region (particularly isolated rural areas) are also relatively common. In addition, several countries focus also on particular situations, for instance students with children or war veterans (Bosnia and Herzegovina and Georgia). In a few countries (including Germany and Switzerland), foreign students are defined as a specific group whose participation rates need to improve, and this concern may sometimes be addressed under the heading of mobility rather than social policy.

The differences in approach to identifying under-represented groups illustrate that this can be a highly sensitive area, making pan-European comparison impossible in practice. For example, interpretations of the concept of ethnicity vary greatly both between and even within countries, and the term 'ethnic group' is therefore not fixed in the same way as, for example, gender. Instead, the concept is historically contingent and national perceptions, categories and

approaches may be formed in relation to, for example, changes to national territories after the two world wars, colonial and post-colonial history or recent conflicts. It is therefore no surprise to find that a considerable number of countries in Europe make no attempt to identify the ethnic status of students (and indeed, this may be prohibited by national data protection legislation) while other countries consider such a categorisation as a necessary tool to understand societal development. Sensitivities and potential risks of stigmatising effects can also be encountered in relation to other under-represented groups – including people with disabilities.

Depending on the purpose, public authorities and higher education institutions use various methods to attribute individuals to particular groups. Many countries base their information on 'subjective' self-declaration, especially for personal characteristics such as ethnicity, gender and disability. However, some countries make their category decisions in these areas on the basis of other 'objective' administrative sources. For example, in the Netherlands, ethnicity status for all individuals is determined by the place of birth of parents rather than by self declaration.

Reasons for under-representation

Countries identify a variety of reasons for the under-representation of particular societal groups – but there may be others. For students with socio-economic disadvantages, often-cited reasons for under-representation are poor performance at school, lack of motivation to complete secondary level education or to attend university and lack of family experience of the benefits of higher education. Thus, the main explanations for under-representation lie in educational and societal failure prior to higher education. Research in the United Kingdom also

suggests that the main factors for under-representation of students from a low socio-economic background include lack of aspiration and the gap in educational attainment between different socio-economic classes. There are particular government measures designed to raise aspiration and attainment, including narrowing the gap in educational attainment between different socio-economic classes.

Some countries (including Austria, France, Germany, Hungary, Ireland and Switzerland) specifically mention features of their educational systems that have a negative impact on equal opportunity and widening participation. The most commonly mentioned features relate to the early streaming of children and selection policies in secondary schools. In systems that tend towards early educational stratification, students from lower socio-economic status backgrounds are statistically more likely to 'opt for' (or to have no option but) a vocational training route, from where it is more difficult to continue to higher education. As a consequence, some countries (including Finland, Ireland and Sweden) have focused on diversifying the entry routes to higher education. Policy measures in this area include easing access for mature students and people with vocational and other non-traditional educational qualifications, as well as developing part-time and flexible learning options (see Section 4 on Lifelong Learning).

Several countries mention the combination of factors that may lead to under-representation. For example, when socio-economic disadvantage is combined with minority or immigrant status, the resulting barriers can be very strong. Moreover, countries often mention that attention is lacking to stereotyping and ethnically biased perspectives in school curricula.

Selection and/or admissions procedures to higher education are mentioned by some countries as leading to bias against representatives of some groups. In the United Kingdom (Scotland), this issue is consciously addressed by a range of measures under the heading of 'fair admission initiatives'. Other institutional factors are also perceived as constituting significant barriers for widening access to particular societal groups. France, for example, points out that students from disadvantaged backgrounds may be more affected by academic failure during the first cycle which can be, in part, due to insufficient knowledge of the range of study options. This has led France to develop policies of active guidance to potential students. Thus some of the efforts in widening participation aim also at developing awareness among prospective and current students of available support in terms of financial aid and guidance.

It is interesting to note that, although countries most commonly perceive problems of participation related to low socio-economic status, the costs of higher education are rarely explicitly mentioned as a potential reason for under-representation.

For people with disabilities the most common reasons cited by countries for under-representation are insufficiently adapted infrastructure, lack of appropriate teaching and learning materials and funding problems. The same issues are also perceived in compulsory education with several countries, including Estonia and Hungary, mentioning the negative impact of segregated education. Interestingly, very few countries mentioned psychological barriers created by perceived negative attitudes towards disability. The exceptions are Liechtenstein and the United Kingdom (Scotland) that mention the lack of a 'disability acceptance culture' within higher education institutions and the negative impact of stereotyping. These countries'

statements chime with empirical qualitative research findings with students with disabilities that stress that creating an inclusive higher education environment is at least as significant as adapting physical infrastructure.

Benchmarks and targets for social dimension objectives

It is clear that defining and identifying under-represented groups is a topic that needs to be examined and understood in relation to each country's specific socio-economic and cultural context. However, beyond this are also the higher level policy questions regarding the purposes for identifying under-represented groups in the first place, and the measures being taken to improve their participation in and completion of higher education.

Although most countries express a general policy concern to improve the social dimension of higher education, very few appear to have actually linked this concern to the Bologna commitment of raising the participation of under-represented groups to the point where the higher education population mirrors the overall societal distribution. Indeed, it is more common for countries to take measures to increase overall participation in higher education and to hope that in so doing the numbers of students from under-represented groups will also rise.

Where specific targets or benchmarks have been formulated they tend to relate to the increase of participation of students with lower socio-economic status and/or students whose parents have relatively low educational attainment levels. Belgium (Flemish Community) France, Ireland and the United Kingdom (Scotland) are all good examples in this respect. Especially with regard to science and technology disciplines, issues of gender balance are often mentioned.

In Belgium (Flemish Community), the 'Pact 2020 Flanders' has defined 20 goals and one of them is to reach 60 % participation in higher education among students whose parents do not hold a higher education qualification. In the United Kingdom (Scotland), specific goals have been set for 2008-2010 to increase the level of applications and participation from the most deprived 20 % of the population and also from men. Scottish higher education also aims to increase the proportion and successful completion of higher education for students from 'non-traditional' backgrounds during the same period.

In France, the government has set a target for the percentage of young people (20/21 years of age) with parents of low occupational status (*ouvrier/employé*) enrolled in higher education to rise to 46 % of this group in 2009 and then to 50 % in 2012. While these targets concern all higher education institutions, additional targets have been set for the more selective higher education institutions (*Grandes Écoles*) where the objective is for 30 % of students in the preparatory programmes for these institutions (*classes préparatoires des Grandes Écoles*) to be recipients of social scholarships. In addition, the number of students enrolled in courses leading to a qualification that gives access to university studies should also double by 2012. By focusing targets and measures on the admission routes and continuing to increase overall participation in higher education, the expectation is that the numbers of students under-represented for reasons of socio-economic status will diminish.

In Ireland, targets for several groups are set out in the National Plan for Equity of Access to Higher Education 2008-2013. The overall objective is for all socio-economic groups to have entry rates of at least 54 % by 2020. This objective means that for certain groups large


increases in participation must be made. For example, the participation of 'non-manual workers' has to double to reach this target. Ireland has also set targets for other societal groups – in particular for students with sensory, physical and multiple disabilities (participation to double by 2013) and for mature students (participation to rise to at least 20 % of total full-time entrants by 2013).

Monitoring of participation of particular societal groups in higher education

If benchmarks and targets are to be effective in helping to address social dimension challenges, it is essential that specific measures are also taken and that their impact is carefully monitored. At the same time, monitoring can itself reveal previously hidden or ignored aspects of under-representation, and bringing this to light can be the source of new action to stimulate participation.

As Figure 8 illustrates, 31 of the 46 Bologna countries answered that they monitor the participation of under-represented groups. However, this group of countries can be sub-divided into those that systematically and routinely gather data related to under-represented groups (22 countries) and those whose data comes from more occasional sources of information – such as survey data (9 countries). Taking this into account, the European Higher Education Area currently appears to be fairly evenly split between those that have the necessary information at their disposal to develop appropriate measures addressing social dimension challenges and those who, for whatever reason, lack this basic information.

Figure 8: Monitoring of participation of societal groups, 2009/10



Monitoring is not, however, synonymous with, or restricted to, gathering information. If information were to be routinely gathered and routinely ignored, it would hardly constitute an effective monitoring instrument. Thus it is also important to see how public authorities use

the information that they capture. The impact of policies to overcome under-representation is usually monitored by the Ministry of Education or an equivalent institution. Impact assessment, however, is not undertaken in every country. Nevertheless, a number of governments have put in place a range of direct and indirect steering mechanisms. In the United Kingdom, there are performance indicators on widening participation that measure the proportion of entrants to higher education who are from different socio-economic groups, state schools and low participation neighbourhoods. The central authorities in the Flemish Community of Belgium have established management agreements with higher education institutions on diversity targets and entrust the institutions to take appropriate actions to meet these targets.

The systematic collection of data on the number of students of each under-represented group and their completion rates has started only recently and currently takes place only in a minority of countries. In Ireland, for instance, progress has been made over recent years in the development of a student record system within the Higher Education Authority and, in 2007, higher education institutions began to collect access-relevant data for the first time using a common template. This 'equal access' student data initiative will provide comparable information on the social, economic and cultural background of entrants to higher education as well as information relating to disabilities. This will underpin future funding allocations for access and will allow target setting to be undertaken. It also aims to improve the understanding of the impact of existing strategies.

In Belgium (French Community), a Higher Education Observatory was created in law in 2008 and has been operational since 1 January 2009. It is responsible for collecting data, statistics and information

related to all aspects of higher education and the student population, and should provide, in the near future, systematic data on the social dimension that facilitates the implementation of specific policies. A number of other measures – particularly targeted at supporting first generation higher education students – were also brought into effect through the same legislation.

Ukraine is also worthy of mention, as it is one of the few countries where the participation of students from rural areas is monitored.

Even though there are great differences in approach between systems that have developed policy, measures, monitoring and steering mechanisms to widen participation and those that have not, it is not possible to conclude from this that one set of countries is addressing social dimension challenges more effectively than another. While some may consider that the wide-ranging challenges presented by the social dimension agenda can only be addressed coherently on the basis of relevant information, the relative lack of transparency in the 14 countries that do not monitor the participation of particular groups may also conceal system features and measures that have a significant impact on widening participation.

Countries such as Finland, for example, aim to ensure equity of opportunity through the general measures and support services that are provided, and these may benefit groups that in other countries would be identified as under-represented. In other countries, the situation may be similar.

However, it is also equally possible that lack of information and data covers up the negative reality of under-representation of some groups in some countries. It is also curious to note that Cyprus and Turkey indicate that improving access is an important higher education

priority, but also state that they do not monitor under-represented groups. This would indicate that, at least in these countries, monitoring is an undervalued policy instrument. Similarly, in a number of countries (Andorra, Bulgaria, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, the Holy See, Latvia, Montenegro, Serbia and Slovakia), the measures that have been implemented to stimulate participation have not been accompanied by the establishment of monitoring mechanisms.

Targeted measures

The majority of countries that monitor participation of under-represented groups systematically, as well as some of the countries that do not, have developed specific actions to widen access. Two of these measures are clearly far more widespread than the others: the use of special admission procedures and targeted scholarships and grants for members of under-represented groups. Other measures that are frequently mentioned include outreach programmes, the provision of guidance and counselling services, and undertaking information campaigns directed at members of under-represented groups.

In many countries, the responsibility for the organisation and implementation of many of these measures is delegated to higher education institutions and, as a consequence, collation of information and reports at national level is often lacking.

Overall, the use of financial or other incentives for higher education institutions to increase participation of particular groups is not very common. However, four countries report that they aim to link some of the public funding for higher education institutions to the number of students from under-represented groups that are enrolled in each

institution. In Belgium (Flemish Community) and Poland, when determining the operational budget of higher education institutions, extra weight is given to students with low socio-economic background and disabilities. In addition, in Belgium (Flemish Community), extra funding is available for projects that establish structural provisions for diversity within higher education institutions. The Romanian Ministry of Education maintains dialogue with Roma associations and provides specific grants for young people in these communities.

Several other countries provide extra funding to help higher education institutions meet the additional needs of disabled students. In Ireland, a new policy of 'access weighting' will result in a shift of resources towards institutions that have achieved greater equality within their student bodies. In the United Kingdom, the Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE) Widening Access Allocation is intended to meet some of the additional cost incurred by institutions for outreach activity to raise aspirations and attainment among potential students from under-represented groups. In the academic year 2009/10, this allocation is worth £143 million. It is provided as part of the recurrent teaching grant and institutions have autonomy to choose how it is spent. In the Netherlands, some higher education institutions also receive additional funding for activities to improve the academic success of ethnic minority students.

SECTION 4: LIFELONG LEARNING IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Main messages

- The term 'lifelong learning' is still understood in many different ways across the European Higher Education Area.
- Lifelong learning has become a recognised mission of higher education institutions in nearly all countries during the Bologna decade, but nevertheless remains a peripheral concern in many countries.
- Information on the funding of lifelong learning is difficult to obtain, partly as a result of lack of conceptual clarity and partly because diverse funding sources are involved. Where information on public funding is available, investment in lifelong learning appears to be relatively low.
- Approximately half of the Bologna countries have taken measures to stimulate cooperation between higher education institutions and business/industry in the field of lifelong learning.

Introduction

Lifelong learning has recently re-emerged at the forefront of the Bologna process agenda. In 2009, the ministers emphasised that *widening participation shall also be achieved through lifelong learning as an integral part of our education systems*. This section looks at the efforts made by governments and institutions to integrate lifelong learning into the mission of higher education providers, to increase the offer of services and to promote participation in lifelong learning through higher education. Countries have been asked to report on the

key aspects of national responsibility for lifelong learning as outlined in the European University Association's Charter for Lifelong Learning. Actions that are considered include creating favourable legislative and regulatory frameworks, provision of financial and other incentives to higher education institutions, as well as measures to encourage participation and to stimulate cooperation with the private sector.

Understanding lifelong learning

Although discussion on lifelong learning has grown rapidly in frequency and importance in recent years, the range of national responses to this topic suggest that there is still no widely accepted European or international definition of the concept in the context of higher education. Indeed the term 'lifelong learning' can be very wide-reaching, may often be understood in different ways in different countries and may evolve as contextual factors change. Depending on the national context, it can refer to adult learning (Malta) or more broadly to 'non-traditional' students whether in a formal or informal environment (the Netherlands and the United Kingdom (Scotland)). It can also be limited to 'supplementary (non-degree) study programmes' (Czech Republic and Slovakia). In some countries, a wide range of activities and services can be included under this concept, including part-time, distance, 'mixed-mode', adult, e-learning, open learning, evening/weekend learning, community/outreach learning and more. In other countries, the scope of lifelong learning study options is more limited, with evening or distance learning being the more common modalities. The term 'part-time' student may also be variously defined with very different consequences for the potential student population from one country to another.

There is no doubt that economic reality has driven the recent push for attention to lifelong learning, as national policy discussions focus on the development of an effective and sustainable workforce for the knowledge society. This is reflected, for example, in Armenia, where lifelong learning programmes aim at professional upskilling. This lifelong learning agenda challenges countries and institutions to reorient provision to enable a broader range of individuals to fulfil their potential. The lack of a common definition of lifelong learning in higher education also hinders the identification of coherent policies on this issue.


Lifelong learning as a recognised mission of institutions

The growing preoccupation of governments and stakeholders with the lifelong learning perspective has led to concrete developments in most Bologna countries. Figure 9 shows that, almost everywhere, lifelong learning is currently a recognised mission of either all or some higher education institutions. Where lifelong learning is a mission of some institutions, this is often related to questions of institutional autonomy, with some institutions choosing to focus on the mission of lifelong learning and others to avoid it. Consequently, the extent to which programmes and courses are oriented to potential lifelong learners can vary considerably, but the mission is acknowledged almost everywhere.

Furthermore, in 24 countries, at least some higher education institutions are legally required to offer lifelong learning services. The earliest such legal act was adopted in France in 1968 – with further modernising legislation in 2002 creating the current comprehensive system of Recognition of Prior Learning. By 1990, only two other

countries – Malta (1988) and Italy (1990) – had adopted similar legislation to encourage the development of lifelong learning in higher education.

Figure 9: Lifelong learning as a mission for higher education institutions, 2009/10



However, a significant number of countries have adopted legislation related to the higher education responsibility for lifelong learning during the current decade. These laws either generically define lifelong learning as a mission for higher education institutions or compel institutions to offer special access routes, provide certain types of programmes or engage in activities aimed at the general and working population.

Funding lifelong learning

Data on funding of lifelong learning activities remains scattered and is often unavailable at national level. In most cases, public budgets for higher education do not contain specifically earmarked funding for lifelong learning. As institutions have become more autonomous they now more often receive lump sum funding and it is up to them to decide on the allocation of funds in line with the legal requirements in place. As a consequence, data on overall spending on lifelong learning is available in only nine countries: Andorra, Armenia, Belgium (French Community), Croatia, Cyprus, France, Moldova, Romania and Serbia report that between 0.1 and 2.5 percent of their respective total higher education budgets are dedicated for specific lifelong learning activities. In the United Kingdom (Scotland), this percentage is higher – between 2.6 and 5 percent.

Another reason for the lack of overall data is the great diversity of funding sources for lifelong learning activities. Lifelong learning activities are financed through municipal, regional or national public funds as well as private sources. These can be contributions from business/industry or from individuals through tuition and variously named fees. The Czech Republic, the Netherlands, Poland and Spain are among countries where higher education institutions are free to

set fees for lifelong learning programmes. Denmark emphasises that employers often pay for employee participation in lifelong learning programmes offered by higher education institutions, thus confirming the relevance of the programme offer in the sector. Finally, as in the Netherlands, expenses incurred through participation in lifelong learning programmes may be tax deductible or otherwise indirectly supported by the state.

From the point of view of potential lifelong learning students, barriers to lifelong learning may exist through age restrictions for student support measures and social benefits. This issue is being specifically addressed in the Czech Republic, where the restriction of social benefits to students under the age of 26 is set to be removed.

From a policy perspective, however, the need for comprehensive and reliable data on the amounts and types of spending on lifelong learning cannot be overemphasised. Such information would permit improving the monitoring of lifelong learning activities. Knowledge about the way and the extent that lifelong learning is implemented in higher education institutions would provide a more coherent picture about the degree to which the goal set by the ministers has been achieved and would help further policy development.

Overall, it could be said that the progress that has been made in integrating lifelong learning as an aspect of the missions of institutions has not yet led everywhere to positioning it at the core of higher education learning.

Promoting lifelong learning

Various channels and actors are informing the public about lifelong learning opportunities. Some countries leave it to higher education institutions and local offices of labour agencies, other countries organise information campaigns centrally. A majority of the Bologna countries have dedicated websites providing information to interested parties.

About half of the governments in the Bologna countries have implemented some form of measures to stimulate cooperation between the private sector (i.e. business and industry) and higher education institutions. This cooperation ranges from developing the content of lifelong learning programmes (e.g. Hungary) via regular fora between employer representatives and education institutions (e.g. Czech Republic) to close cooperation between governmental institutions, higher education institutions and employers (e.g. the United Kingdom (England, Wales and Northern Ireland)).

The promotion of lifelong learning is inextricably linked to the social dimension of higher education. Equal opportunity in higher education can only become a reality when study paths are more flexible and the world of higher education is more closely aligned to societal developments. In particular, higher education must be responsive to the demands of European knowledge society and the challenges of demographic change. This requires sustained attention to increasing and widening participation in higher education.

SECTION 5: STUDENT MOBILITY

Main messages

- Despite its importance in the European Higher Education Area, student mobility is rarely a topic that is addressed comprehensively at national level, and information on the reality of student mobility is rarely complete.
- European policy and programme developments have been an extremely important catalyst for national action on student mobility.
- While most countries have some financial measures in place to support student mobility, the economic disparity between countries in the European Higher Education Area creates major problems for the less wealthy countries and citizens.
- Relatively few countries have set targets for mobility as a part of their higher education development strategy.

Introduction

Student mobility has been an over-arching goal of the Bologna process since its inception, and the drive to promote mobility has been consistent throughout the last decade. Yet despite both the high profile of mobility issues in the Bologna Ministerial meetings and the sustained growth of European programmes (including Erasmus and Erasmus Mundus) promoting and funding mobility – there has been surprisingly little attempt made to analyse national policies and measures to promote mobility. This section of the report aims to address that gap.

Countries were asked whether they have explicit policies to promote both 'outbound' and 'incoming' mobility and, if so, whether such policies are targeted at all students or at a section of the student population. Countries were also invited to outline the main measures of their mobility policies and to explain how the outcomes are monitored.


Relationship of policy, information and the reality of student mobility flows

Questions of policy and information are clearly related, and it is to be expected that information on mobility would be provided in support of policy objectives. However, many of the information gaps that have been highlighted at European level are also mirrored at national level. As Figures 10 and 11 show, even where countries claim to have mobility policies in place, it is the exception rather than the rule that these policies are backed up by comprehensive and reliable information on the reality of student mobility. In fact, it is a very clear majority of countries (25) that only routinely gather information on some rather than all main forms of student mobility. Moreover, even among countries that gather information on all main forms of mobility, very little information can be captured about the reality of 'free movers' – those who leave a country and enrol in a higher education programme in another country without taking part in any organised mobility programme. Yet this phenomenon appears from European-level statistical information to be growing significantly. Hence the many factors affecting mobility, flows remain difficult to gauge with certainty.

Given the complexity of individual decisions related to mobility choices, it would be a mistake to assume a direct causal relationship between the existence of national policy on mobility and the phenomenon of student mobility itself. However, it would be reasonable to assume that mobility will more likely be stimulated when actively encouraged through policy measures. In most countries, when comparing information with Eurostat statistical data on mobility (see Eurostat/Eurostudent Key indicators on the social dimension and mobility, 2009 section C1, p. 99), there are positive correlations between the existence of policy and information and the growth of student mobility, and conversely between the lack of policy and information and relative lack of growth in student mobility.


However, such relationships are not always the case. A few countries appear to have taken considerable policy initiatives, but with little evident impact on mobility patterns, while Iceland is an example of a country that has no overt policy in place but experiences considerable mobility flows. Likewise, while in general the countries that monitor mobility flows carefully do so within the framework of a defined mobility policy, there are also countries that gather considerable data on mobility even in the absence of explicit policy.

Figure 10: Policy on student mobility, 2009/10



Source: Eurydice.

**Figure 11: Information on mobility,
2009/10**



Nature of mobility policy

For a country to be able to have a clear policy on mobility, it must have a sense of how it would like mobility phenomena to change and, therefore, a vision of the situation that it considers desirable. While this is an obvious statement, it is nevertheless surprisingly rare for a country to express clear objectives related to student mobility, and it is more common to find general expressions of desires for more mobility – whether incoming or outgoing. It may also be mistaken to assume that countries all share the same basic objectives in this field, despite the fact that they may be able to reach common goals at the level of the EHEA. For example, some countries may focus on incoming mobility while putting in place few measures to encourage outgoing mobility (e.g. the United Kingdom (England, Wales and Northern Ireland)). Other countries, such as Belgium (Flemish Community), may be more concerned to stimulate outgoing mobility, and others still may aim to encourage both incoming and outgoing mobility.

Certain forms of mobility may also be more favoured in some countries – for example, mobility within a degree cycle, mobility between degree cycles or mobility within joint programmes. Although no countries drew attention to such preferences in describing their policies, it is clear from the measures enacted that certain forms of mobility are favoured in certain countries. For example, it is common to see that students may be eligible for financial support in the form of loans or grants if studying a part of a degree cycle in another country, but not if studying an entire cycle abroad. This is no doubt a complex area for policy-makers, and comparison of national situations has to bear in mind the reality that desired outcomes may not be shared.

Policies in the area of mobility, even when given a high priority, tend not to be complete in the way that might be expected. A distinction can be drawn between the relatively small number of countries that have incorporated policy measures for student mobility within a wider internationalisation strategy (e.g. the United Kingdom (Scotland)) and those that have focused more specifically on mobility. Those that set policy for internationalisation tend to gather together a number of related elements of policy (such as degree structure, ECTS implementation and recognition procedures), but may be quite vague about benchmarks and targets. On the other hand, those that focus on policy to increase and/or improve mobility tend to be more likely to have set specific targets.

Overall, however, an analysis of all countries with a policy commitment to mobility reveals that there are many measures that can be brought into a mobility or internationalisation strategy. The following list gathers together the issues mentioned spontaneously by countries when invited to outline their mobility policy:

- amending immigration legislation to facilitate visa procedures for students/researchers;
- a panoply of financial measures, from scholarships, grants and fee waivers to ensuring the portability of student support;
- information campaigns, directed either at encouraging national students to study abroad or attracting international students to the country;
- bi-lateral or multi-lateral cooperation agreements;
- support to institutions in considering internationalisation in curriculum design;

- focus on fair and simple recognition procedures and on the good use of ECTS;
- strengthening implementation of the Bologna measures;
- support for language learning (both incoming and outgoing students);
- encouraging language learning among staff in higher education; provision of programmes in other languages (particularly English);
- supporting higher education institutions in their mobility strategies;
- attention to mobility in quality assurance procedures;
- promotion of joint and double degrees;
- adaptation of information and counselling services for mobile students;
- support for accommodation.

Of the measures outlined above, financial measures are by far the most frequently mentioned. However, while this is significant, the widespread existence of financial measures needs to be considered in relation to the enormous socio-economic diversity within and especially between countries in the European Higher Education Area. The International Monetary Fund (IMF) and World Bank rankings of countries by GDP per capita both include 6 of the EHEA countries in the top 10 world economies, while other EHEA countries rank as low as 114 out of the 166 countries included. This means that, even with the best political will to promote mobility and with some financial measures in place, less wealthy countries are simply unable to bridge the funding gaps that would be required for a substantial number of their citizens to be able to cover costs to study in some of the more wealthy countries. Thus, it is primarily the sources of funding available

from host countries in the form of scholarships and grants that currently enable mobility flows in this direction to take place.

It is also interesting to note that very few countries appear to have mounted specific information campaigns to encourage students of the benefits of studying abroad. France and Germany are two major exceptions to this trend. In Germany, a campaign called 'Go Out' has been organised through the Federal Ministry of Education (BMBF) and the German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD), putting together information on scholarship and cooperation programmes. Similar initiatives are undertaken regularly in France.

In no single country do all the measures outlined above come together in the form of comprehensive mobility policy – at least not in explicit terms. This suggests that the commitment made for the EHEA to develop mobility opportunities extensively and aiming at the goal of 20 % of students benefitting from mobility during her/his studies (however this goal is eventually measured) requires a major push in policy making and implementation of measures if the European Higher Education Area is to meet the aspirations for an open and inclusive space for mobility.

Link to other policy areas

Another feature that should be highlighted regarding policy for mobility is that it cannot be made in a vacuum. While all areas of policy-making can be seen to be inter-related, this is particularly true with mobility and a number of areas of social welfare policy, and in particular with the relationship between mobility and immigration policy. Many countries that have developed policy to stimulate mobility in the higher education sector have also implemented policy

to control and limit immigration – but few mention any tension or even the relationship between these policy areas. Indeed, despite the close relationship of mobility and immigration policy, only six countries (Estonia, Finland, Greece, Latvia, the Netherlands and Portugal) mention attention to immigration legislation to create a supportive legal environment favouring mobility.

Target setting

Relatively few countries have set targets as a part of their strategy for mobility and of those that have, only Belgium (Flemish Community), France, Malta and Switzerland have specifically aligned themselves to the 20 % by 2020 benchmark set for the EHEA. However, some countries have set targets for their national systems that go beyond this 20 % overall ambition for the EHEA. This is the case for the Netherlands where an outbound mobility target of 25 % has been set for the year 2013, and for Austria and Germany which aim for 50 % of their student population being able to spend at least a semester abroad by 2020. The Czech Republic had set this ambitious benchmark already for 2006-2010.

However, there are also countries that appear content with a lower level of ambition. Estonia aims for 4-5 % participation in mobility programmes by 2015 and Finland for 6-8 % of both inward and outbound mobility. Ireland, Poland and the United Kingdom have no outbound mobility targets, but have set numerical targets for incoming mobility. Other countries have more vague targets, such as 'increasing mobility'. Although it could be claimed that these non-numerical targets are not really targets at all, it is also possible to argue that countries are unable to determine all of the factors that would enable realistic numerical targets to be set at national level.

Given the fluid nature of mobility and mobility policy, it may therefore be perfectly coherent for a cumulative target for mobility to be set at the European level without these targets being replicated in national policy.

Impact of EU programmes

Whatever the state of policy on mobility, there can be no doubt that European programmes and action continue to have an extremely strong impact on national policy and action in this field. Indeed, it would be fair to conclude that, in some countries, national policy does not extend very far beyond implementing particular European mobility programmes. Moreover, hardly any countries failed to mention at least one European programme as a part of their national policy measures, with Erasmus, Erasmus Mundus and Tempus featuring very strongly.

European mobility programmes also appear to have an important impact on the availability of information on student mobility. Even if student numbers for certain forms of mobility extend far beyond the numbers participating in European programmes, in several countries the only data that is systematically collected is data required for participation in European programmes.

This suggests that European-level policy and programme developments as far as mobility is concerned are acting as extremely important catalysts in stimulating national action. And where countries have been taking serious initiatives to develop their own policy, they are constructing onto the already existing European programmes and actions.

SECTION 6: THE ECONOMIC CRISIS AND HIGHER EDUCATION

Main messages

- Initial national responses to the economic crisis have taken radically different paths – from increased investment in higher education through stimulus packages, to severe cuts in expenditure. The likely impact of these different policy approaches on the European Higher Education Area is at this stage difficult to discern.
- Economic crisis has also had an impact on enrolment rates, staffing and infrastructure issues, and the continued development of lifelong learning. The nature of this impact has not been uniform across countries.
- Through their responses to the crisis, governments have in general demonstrated that they are aware of the social importance of higher education and have neither reduced student support nor scaled back enrolment in the higher education system.
- Understanding the impact of economic changes on higher education requires more systematic monitoring.

This report has shown that advances in degree structures and quality assurance systems have been particularly remarkable over the past decade. Meanwhile the development of lifelong learning systems, with attention to social dimension issues and mobility will require continuous attention in the years ahead.


The global economic crisis that began in 2008 adds a further dimension to these challenges. In the last two years, public budgets have come under immense pressure, and the higher education sector is being, and will continue to be, affected by this new economic reality

along with all other areas of public responsibility. As the higher education sector can help societies adapt to a new and changing economic situation, there are important political choices for countries to make, particularly with regard to investment.

The most prominent impact of the crisis reported by most countries is linked to changes in the higher education budget. However, as Figure 12 illustrates, these changes do not all go in the same direction. Indeed a clear majority of countries report positive developments in their higher education budgets for 2009/10 compared to the academic year 2008/09, even though a number also hint that budgetary decreases can be expected in the coming years. Five higher education systems report no changes to their budget and ten report cuts in their budget.

For the higher education systems that report an increase in the budget allocated to higher education, the extent of these changes varies considerably. Eleven countries (Austria, Azerbaijan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cyprus, France, Georgia, the Holy See, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Portugal and Switzerland) report budgetary increases of 5 % or more – often indicating the inclusion of higher education in economic stimulus package measures – while 18 countries have increased their budget by less than 5 % over the last year, and five report no budgetary change. For those countries reporting a decreased budget, four report cuts of less than 5 %, while seven countries (Croatia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Iceland, Ireland, Latvia, Moldova and Ukraine) report decreases that in some cases extend significantly beyond 5 %.

Figure 12: Budgetary changes from 2008/09 to 2009/10



These figures should, however, be seen as merely indicative, and there are two reasons for being particularly cautious about the number of countries where trends initially appear to be positive. Firstly, countries that report stable or increasing budgets tend to consider that there has been no immediate impact of the economic

crisis on higher education. In the longer term, however, many expect that the readjustment of public funding priorities will continue as demands for expenditure in education will have to compete with other areas of big public spending, such as age-related public health and climate change.

Secondly overall budget changes are only significant when related to demographic developments. Belgium (Flemish Community), Cyprus, Czech Republic and the United Kingdom explicitly report a decrease in the per capita spending on students, despite reporting either no change or slight increases to the annual budget: thus the number of enrolled students has increased while the budget has more or less stayed the same, or the budget has decreased while student numbers have remained stable or increased. Other countries stretch out planned spending over a longer time period. Belgium (French Community), for example, reported that the investment of an additional €30 million in higher education initially planned over a period of 8 years would be extended to a period of 15 years as a result of the economic crisis – effectively halving the annual sum to be invested.

At this stage it is difficult to discern overall budgetary trends for the European Higher Education Area. However, if significant funding cuts are continued in some countries, the long-term sustainable development of these higher education systems could come under major stress.

The reported impact of the crisis extends beyond changes to national higher education budgets, and a number of countries draw attention to issues such as changes in enrolment rates, impact on staffing and infrastructure, and an increased focus on the social dimension and lifelong learning. It is clear that the reaction to the crisis has varied

considerably, depending on the context, economic situation and political strategy in different countries.

A number of countries have focused attention on the role of higher education in re-skilling citizens for the challenges of a transforming labour market. Additional study places are being funded to upskill the unemployed in Ireland. Incentives for industry to transfer scientific staff to universities are a policy response in Denmark and the Netherlands. In Finland and the United Kingdom (England, Wales and Northern Ireland), new study places have also been funded in areas thought to be relevant for the future of the national economies. More negative trends in participation are reported in Estonia and Latvia, where lower numbers of fee-paying students and/or increases in the time students take to finish their degree have been noted due to economic constraints.

Some countries have experienced reductions in staffing as a result of the economic situation. In Ireland and Latvia, budgetary cuts will reduce the numbers of people employed by higher education institutions. In Estonia, the crisis is perceived as providing an opportunity for higher education institutions to close down only those study programmes that may lack critical mass and also to reduce the workload of some staff in order to improve efficiency. This contrasts with neighbouring Latvia, where severe cuts and consequent measures have been implemented. Indeed, a number of higher education institutions and/or faculties/departments have been or are expected to be closed. The freezing of funds despite increasing student numbers has also resulted in Serbia in the postponement of a foreseen increase in staff.

The crisis, however, is in practically no country explicitly taken as an excuse to reduce student support or to scale back enrolment in the higher education system. Indeed most countries reaffirm their determination to increase participation in higher education. In order to cushion the effects of the economic crisis, some countries are increasing the number of publicly funded places for students or increasing social support for students. This is clearly necessary, as several countries have reported increasing numbers of students that have problems paying fees for higher education, while Ireland reports increased demand for part-time programmes. The French Community of Belgium, Finland, Ireland, Norway, Portugal, Slovakia, Spain and the United Kingdom (England, Wales and Northern Ireland) will fund extra places for students at public or government dependent universities (Cyprus is still in deliberation on this topic) with Ireland and Finland focusing in particular on professional and vocational training.

Belgium (French Community), Estonia, Georgia, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Portugal, Spain and the United Kingdom (Scotland) have taken measures to improve the situation of students by extending direct and indirect student support. However, Moldova has reduced the relative number of supported students.

One cause for concern is that the effect of these crisis impacts are only monitored systematically in eight countries (Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Ireland, Romania and the United Kingdom). This is a very low number and it raises some questions over how national action to support the higher education sector in responding to the economic crisis can be adequately assessed.

While raw budgetary numbers need to be considered with caution, they clearly show that attaining the objectives set for the decade up to 2020 will require increased dedication. In their immediate reaction to the economic crisis with regard to the higher education sector, countries have demonstrated that they are aware of the social costs of the economic crisis. The focus on the social dimension and lifelong learning will be even more important through the next decade if the crucial goal to establish a Europe of knowledge is to be achieved.


NATIONAL HIGHER EDUCATION SYSTEM DIAGRAMS AND INFORMATION



GUIDE TO THE DIAGRAMS

The intention of the following diagrams is to present clear and comparable information about higher education systems, illustrating the impact of the Bologna process on contemporary degree structures. They do not provide comprehensive information on all qualifications in a higher education system, and for such information, the reader should consult existing National Qualifications Frameworks.

The basis for reading country diagrams is the **three-cycle structure** as agreed in ministerial communiqués. The diagrams present the main possible study paths through each higher education system. Starting on the left, the three cycles are shown consecutively. The first cycle generally leads to a Bachelor degree, the second cycle to a Master and the third cycle to a Doctoral qualification.



GUIDE TO THE DIAGRAMS

The **duration of cycles** reflects the typical Bologna model. First-cycle qualifications comprise 180-240 ECTS credits while second-cycle qualifications comprise 60-120 ECTS credits. The third cycle is shown in years, as are those programmes outside the typical Bologna model.

Vertical lines show the end of a qualification, usually indicating access both to the labour market and to the next cycle. Some short-cycle degree-awarding programmes may require additional studies in order to continue to the following Bologna cycle. These cases are represented by a vertical line **within** a degree cycle box. Where **programmes extend across two cycles**, e.g. for integrated long programmes, this is indicated by a broken line between the two cycles.

The '**most common duration of a Bologna cycle**' in a national higher education system is shown first in each diagram.

'**Other durations of a Bologna cycle**' reflect programmes in the typical Bologna model that are less common in a higher education system.

'**Programmes outside the typical Bologna model**' deviate from the three-cycle structure or differ in length from the typical Bologna model. For these programmes, the corresponding **fields of study** are provided on the right hand side of the diagram.

'**Professional programmes**' are shown when countries consider that professional and academic programmes are differentiated in a national system and when these professional programmes are an integral part of the higher education system.

The **generic degree title awards** are named in the diagram. This does not preclude further specification of degrees, for example by subject area, in individual higher education systems. The generic **names of institutions** are also provided for all programmes in each cycle.

All boxes representing programmes are of **equal height**. Qualitative differences are shown by colours. Where study programmes are offered for various lengths of time (e.g. a first cycle degree of 180 and 240 ECTS), this is indicated by a box with staggered height levels. Where programme lengths are not clearly defined (most often in the third cycle), a sloping line indicates the normal range of duration.


The existence of **admission requirements** for programmes is indicated by a triangle. An **upward pointing triangle** indicates that selection procedures exist at institutional level. A **downward pointing triangle** indicates that selection procedures exist at national level. A **filled-in triangle** means that this is always the case and an **empty triangle** means that it is the case in some programmes and/or some institutions.

Lines between cycles indicate possible connections within programmes. They do not imply automatic or necessary progression.

Diagrams do not indicate opportunities that may exist for students to undertake several programmes at the same level simultaneously, to embark on fresh first and/or second-cycle studies after obtaining a first or second-cycle qualification, or to transfer between programmes leading to a first-cycle qualification.

ANDORRA

Higher education structure – 2010



- Most common length of a Bologna cycle
- Other length of a Bologna cycle
- Programme outside the typical Bologna model
- Professional programme

ECTS
Credits according to the European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System

		regulated at national level	decided at institutional level
ALL	programmes have admission requirements	▼	▲
SOME		▽	△

ANDORRA

AD

System overview and key information

Number of students in higher education 2008/09	230
Most common starting age for 1st cycle students	18 years
Main categories of students monitored as part of social dimension policy	No
Number of recognised higher education institutions	2
Quality Assurance Agency membership of the European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA)	No
Name of Quality Assurance Agency membership of the European Quality Assurance Register (EQAR)	No
Other National Quality Assurance Agency	No
Lisbon Recognition Convention	
Ratification	22 April 2008
Entry into force	01 June 2008

Regulation of the Recognition of Prior Learning	No legislation/regulation/policy
Status of Recognition of Prior Learning	Not possible in higher education
National Qualifications Framework	Under development
Credit system in place	Legislation to introduce the ECTS system has been adopted in 2009
Diploma Supplement	Issued in the vast majority of study programmes, automatically, free of charge and in the language of instruction and/or more official EU languages
National mobility benchmarks and/or targets	No
Priority regions for attracting students	EU

ALBANIA

AL

Higher education structure – 2010

ECTS
0 60 120 180 240 300

University

Bachelor

Years

0 1 2 3 4 5

University

ECTS
0 60 120 180

University

Master

Years

0 1 2 3

University

Years

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

University

PhD

Field of study

>>> medicine, architecture

-  Most common length of a Bologna cycle
-  Other length of a Bologna cycle
-  Programme outside the typical Bologna model
-  Professional programme

ECTS

Credits according to the European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System

		regulated at national level	decided at institutional level
ALL	programmes have admission requirements	▼	▲
SOME		▽	△

ALBANIA

AL

System overview and key information

Number of students in higher education 2008/09	89 849
Most common starting age for 1st cycle students	18 years
Main categories of students monitored as part of social dimension policy	N/A
Number of recognised higher education institutions	27
Quality Assurance Agency membership of the European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA)	No
Name of Quality Assurance Agency membership of the European Quality Assurance Register (EQAR)	No
Other National Quality Assurance Agency	Public Accreditation Agency for Higher Education Accreditation Council
Lisbon Recognition Convention	Ratification 06 March 2002 Entry into Force 01 May 2002

Regulation of the Recognition of Prior Learning	N/A
Status of Recognition of Prior Learning	N/A
National Qualifications Framework	Under development
Credit system in place	ECTS on a legislative basis
Diploma Supplement	Issued in the vast majority of study programmes, automatically, free of charge and in the language of instruction and/or more official EU languages
National mobility benchmarks and/or targets	N/A
Priority regions for attracting students	N/A

ARMENIA

AM

Higher education structure – 2010



University, institute, academy, conservatoire



University, institute, academy, conservatoire




University, institute, academy, conservatoire



University, institute, academy, conservatoire



University, institute, academy, conservatoire



Field of study

>>> humanities, social sciences, mathematics,
natural sciences and professional disciplines

- Most common length of a Bologna cycle
- Other length of a Bologna cycle
- Programme outside the typical Bologna model
- Professional programme

ECTS

Credits according to
the European
Credit Transfer and
Accumulation System

		regulated at national level	decided at institutional level
ALL	programmes have admission requirements	▼	▲
SOME		▽	△

ARMENIA

AM

System overview and key information


Number of students in higher education 2008/09	118 000
Most common starting age for 1st cycle students	17 years
Main categories of students monitored as part of social dimension policy	– Disability – Socio-economic status – Ethnicity – Geography
Number of recognised higher education institutions	60
Quality Assurance Agency membership of the European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA)	No
Name of Quality Assurance Agency membership of the European Quality Assurance Register (EQAR)	No
Other National Quality Assurance Agency	No
Lisbon Recognition Convention	
Ratification	07 January 2005
Entry into force	01 March 2005

Regulation of the Recognition of Prior Learning	No legislation/regulation/policy
Status of Recognition of Prior Learning	N/A
National Qualifications Framework	Under development
Credit system in place	ECTS on a legislative basis
Diploma Supplement	Partial and gradual introduction, issued automatically and free of charge in the language of instruction and/or English
National mobility benchmarks and/or targets	No
Priority regions for attracting students	Non-EU European countries, Middle East

AUSTRIA

AT

Higher education structure – 2010



- Most common length of a Bologna cycle
- Other length of a Bologna cycle
- Programme outside the typical Bologna model
- Professional programme

ECTS

Credits according to the European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System

		regulated at national level	decided at institutional level
ALL	programmes have admission requirements	▼	▲
SOME		▽	△

AUSTRIA

System overview and key information

Number of students in higher education 2008/09	280 191
Most common starting age for 1st cycle students	19 years
Main categories of students monitored as part of social dimension policy	– Educational background of parents – Occupational background of parents – Type of higher education accession prerequisite – Immigrant/migrant status – Dependent children – Special needs/handicapped
Number of recognised higher education institutions	75
Quality Assurance Agency membership of the European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA)	<i>Fachhochschulrat</i> (FHR, FH-Council) http://www.fhr.ac.at <i>Österreichischer Akkreditierungsrat</i> (AR) / Austrian Accreditation Council http://www.akkreditierungsrat.at/ <i>Österreichische Qualitätssicherungsagentur</i> (AQA) / Austrian Agency for Quality Assurance http://www.aqa.ac.at
Name of Quality Assurance Agency membership of the European Quality Assurance Register (EQAR)	<i>Österreichische Qualitätssicherungsagentur</i> (AQA) / Austrian Agency for Quality Assurance

Other National Quality Assurance Agency	No
Lisbon Recognition Convention	
Ratification	03 January 1999
Entry into force	01 April 1999
Regulation of the Recognition of Prior Learning	– Universities of Applied Sciences Act (FHStG as amended) – Universities Act 2002 (UG 2002)
Status of Recognition of Prior Learning	Permitted, but not a right
National Qualifications Framework	Under development (Step 2)
Credit system in place	ECTS on a legislative basis
Diploma Supplement	Issued in the vast majority of study programmes, automatically and free of charge in German and English
National mobility benchmarks and/or targets	50 % of all graduates should have spent a study or research-related stay abroad by 2020
Priority regions for attracting students	Non-EU European countries, Asia, USA/Canada

AZERBAIJAN

AZ

Higher education structure – 2010

ECTS
0 60 120 180 240 300

University, academy, institute

Bachelor

Bachelor

Years

0 1 2 3 4 5

University, academy, institute

ECTS
0 60 120 180

University, academy, institute

Master

Years

0 1 2 3

University, academy, institute

Doctor med.

Years

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

University, academy, institute

PhD

Field of study

>>> medicine

-  Most common length of a Bologna cycle
-  Other length of a Bologna cycle
-  Programme outside the typical Bologna model
-  Professional programme

ECTS

Credits according to the European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System

		regulated at national level	decided at institutional level
ALL	programmes have admission requirements	▼	▲
SOME		▽	△

AZERBAIJAN

System overview and key information

AZ

Number of students in higher education 2008/09	136 587
Most common starting age for 1st cycle students	17-18 years
Main categories of students monitored as part of social dimension policy	– Refugees and internally displaced persons – Disabled people – National minorities
Number of recognised higher education institutions	53
Quality Assurance Agency membership of the European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA)	No
Name of Quality Assurance Agency membership of the European Quality Assurance Register (EQAR)	No
Other National Quality Assurance Agency	No
Lisbon Recognition Convention	Ratification 10 March 1998 Entry into force 01 February 1999

Regulation of the Recognition of Prior Learning	No legislation/regulation/policy
Status of Recognition of Prior Learning	Legal right
National Qualifications Framework	Under development
Credit system in place	ECTS on a legislative basis
Diploma Supplement	Partial and gradual introduction; issued on request and free of charge to all graduating students in the language of instruction and/or English
National mobility benchmarks and/or targets	Higher education policy stipulates a regular increase of number of students studying abroad. Within the framework of the Presidential Programme on study of Azerbaijani youth abroad (2007-2015), 5 000 students will receive education abroad with state-support. No numerical targets on incoming mobility.
Priority regions for attracting students	All countries/regions are of equal priority.

BA



BA

BA

BA

BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA

System overview and key information

Number of students in higher education 2008/09	105 358
Most common starting age for 1st cycle students	18-19 years
Main categories of students monitored as part of social dimension policy	– Children of war veterans – Veterans – Roma population
Number of recognised higher education institutions	39
Quality Assurance Agency membership of the European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA)	Agency for Development of Higher Education and Quality Assurance http://www.heg.gov.ba/
Name of Quality Assurance Agency membership of the European Quality Assurance Register (EQAR)	No
Other National Quality Assurance Agency	No
Lisbon Recognition Convention	
Ratification	09 January 2004
Entry into force	01 March 2004

Regulation of the Recognition of Prior Learning	No legislation/regulation/policy
Status of Recognition of Prior Learning	Not possible in higher education
National Qualifications Framework	Under development
Credit system in place	ECTS on a legislative basis
Diploma Supplement	Issued in the vast majority of study programmes, automatically and free of charge in the language of instruction and/or English
National mobility benchmarks and/or targets	N/A
Priority regions for attracting students	South East Europe, EU, USA/Canada, Middle East, Asia

BA

BELGIUM – GERMAN-SPEAKING COMMUNITY

Higher education structure – 2010



University college

Diplom



-  Most common length of a Bologna cycle
-  Other length of a Bologna cycle
-  Programme outside the typical Bologna model
-  Professional programme

ECTS

Credits according to the European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System

		regulated at national level	decided at institutional level
ALL	programmes have admission requirements	▼	▲
SOME		▽	△

BELGIUM – GERMAN-SPEAKING COMMUNITY

System overview and key information


Number of students in higher education 2008/09	143
Most common starting age for 1st cycle students	18 years
Main categories of students monitored as part of social dimension policy	No
Number of recognised higher education institutions	1
Quality Assurance Agency membership of the European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA)	No
Name of Quality Assurance Agency membership of the European Quality Assurance Register (EQAR)	No
Other National Quality Assurance Agency	No
Lisbon Recognition Convention	
Ratification	22 July 2009
Entry into force	01 September 2009

Regulation of the Recognition of Prior Learning	N/A
Status of Recognition of Prior Learning	N/A
National Qualifications Framework	Under development The decision to establish a NQF has been taken in 2009. Process has just started.
Credit system in place	ECTS on a legislative basis
Diploma Supplement	Issued in the vast majority of study programmes, automatically and free of charge in the language of instruction and/or more official EU languages
National mobility benchmarks and/or targets	N/A
Priority regions for attracting students	N/A

BE de

BELGIUM – FRENCH COMMUNITY

Higher education structure – 2010



- Most common length of a Bologna cycle
- Other length of a Bologna cycle
- Programme outside the typical Bologna model
- Professional programme

ECTS

Credits according to the European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System

		regulated at national level	decided at institutional level
ALL	programmes have admission requirements	▼	▲
SOME		▽	△

BELGIUM – FRENCH COMMUNITY


System overview and key information

Number of students in higher education 2008/09	153 399
Most common starting age for 1st cycle students	18 years
Main categories of students monitored as part of social dimension policy	None
Number of recognised higher education institutions	45
Quality Assurance Agency membership of the European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA)	AEQES – <i>Agence pour l'Évaluation de la Qualité de l'Enseignement Supérieur organisé ou subventionné par la Communauté française</i> (Agency for the Assessment of the Quality of Higher Education) http://www.aeqes.be
Name of Quality Assurance Agency membership of the European Quality Assurance Register (EQAR)	No
Other National Quality Assurance Agency	No
Lisbon Recognition Convention	
Ratification	19 July 2007
Entry into force	01 September 2009
Regulation of the Recognition of Prior Learning	In higher education, recognition of non-formal and informal learning was introduced in adult education by the Act of 16 April 1991, in universities by the act of 5 September 1994 and in the <i>hautes écoles</i> by the Act of 5 August 1995.

Regulation of the Recognition of Prior Learning	Universities are authorised to organise, under specific conditions, access without the required degree to a limited number of second-cycle programmes, as well as to grant exemptions in order to reduce the length of programmes. Concerning the recognition of non-formal and informal learning by the <i>hautes écoles</i> , the Act specified more precisely the recognition procedure: in the case of entering a second-cycle programme, applicants have to prove at least 4 years of professional experience and the required knowledge and skills through an assessment procedure; in the case of exemptions, applicants have to prove 3 years of professional experience and exemptions cannot exceed 20 % of the total programme duration. Recognition of non-formal and informal learning in art schools was introduced by the Government Act of 17 July 2002 and it regulates access to a second-cycle programme based on professional experience.
Status of Recognition of Prior Learning	Permitted, but not a right
National Qualifications Framework	Completed
Credit system in place	ECTS
Diploma Supplement	Issued in all study programmes, automatically and free of charge in the language of instruction and/or English
National mobility benchmarks and/or targets	No
Priority regions for attracting students	All countries/regions are of equal priority.

BELGIUM – FLEMISH COMMUNITY

Higher education structure – 2010



- Most common length of a Bologna cycle
- Other length of a Bologna cycle
- Programme outside the typical Bologna model
- Professional programme

ECTS

Credits according to the European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System

		regulated at national level	decided at institutional level
ALL	programmes have admission requirements	▼	▲
SOME		▽	△

BELGIUM – FLEMISH COMMUNITY


System overview and key information

Number of students in higher education 2008/09	183 031
Most common starting age for 1st cycle students	18 years
Main categories of students monitored as part of social dimension policy	– Socio-economic status – Migrant background – Disability – Gender
Number of recognised higher education institutions	38
Quality Assurance Agency membership of the European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA)	VLHORA – Flemish Council of University Colleges http://www.vlhora.be VLIR – Flemish Interuniversity Council http://www.vlir.be NVAO – Accreditation Organisation of the Netherlands and Flanders http://nvaio.net
Name of Quality Assurance Agency membership of the European Quality Assurance Register (EQAR)	VLHORA – Flemish Council of University Colleges VLIR – Flemish Interuniversity Council NVAO – Accreditation Organisation of the Netherlands and Flanders
Other National Quality Assurance Agency	No

Lisbon Recognition Convention	Ratification 15 December 2006 in Flanders Entry into force 01 September 2009 in Belgium
Regulation of the Recognition of Prior Learning	The Law on Flexible Learning Paths 2004 stipulates that institutions may grant students exemptions on the basis of previously acquired qualifications (EVK) and/or prior learning (EVC). EVC is the valorisation of prior learning.
Status of Recognition of Prior Learning	Legal right
National Qualifications Framework	Completed
Credit system in place	ECTS and national system on a legislative basis
Diploma Supplement	Issued to all graduates automatically, free of charge and in the language of instruction and/or English
National mobility benchmarks and/or targets	Flanders aims to reach a student mobility of 10 % in 2010, 15 % in 2015 and, in accordance with the Bologna process benchmark, 20 % in 2020.
Priority regions for attracting students	EU, Non-EU European countries, USA/Canada, Latin America, Asia

BULGARIA

Higher education structure – 2010



- Most common length of a Bologna cycle
- Other length of a Bologna cycle
- Programme outside the typical Bologna model
- Professional programme

ECTS

Credits according to the European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System

		regulated at national level	decided at institutional level
ALL	programmes have admission requirements	▼	▲
SOME		▽	△

BULGARIA

System overview and key information


Number of students in higher education 2008/09	274 247
Most common starting age for 1st cycle students	19 years
Main categories of students monitored as part of social dimension policy	According to the Higher Education Act, disabled students and students with a low socio-economic background are treated with preference, taking into account entrance exams results. For them, studying is free at state universities. Other monitored groups are – Orphans – People with disabilities – Mothers of many children (3 and more)
Number of recognised higher education institutions	51
Quality Assurance Agency membership of the European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA)	NEAA – National Evaluation and Accreditation Agency www.neaa.government.bg/en/
Name of Quality Assurance Agency membership of the European Quality Assurance Register (EQAR)	NEAA – National Evaluation and Accreditation Agency

Other National Quality Assurance Agency	No
Lisbon Recognition Convention	
Ratification	19 April 2000
Entry into force	01 July 2000
Regulation of the Recognition of Prior Learning	N/A
Status of Recognition of Prior Learning	N/A
National Qualifications Framework	Under development
Credit system in place	ECTS on a legislative basis
Diploma Supplement	Issued to students on request, with a fee, in the language of instruction and other languages
National mobility benchmarks and/or targets	No
Priority regions for attracting students	N/A

BG

SWITZERLAND

Higher education structure – 2010



- Most common length of a Bologna cycle
- Other length of a Bologna cycle
- Programme outside the typical Bologna model
- Professional programme

ECTS
Credits according to the European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System

		regulated at national level	decided at institutional level
ALL	programmes have admission requirements	▼	▲
SOME		▽	△

SWITZERLAND


System overview and key information

Number of students in higher education 2008/09	184 756 (ISCED 5A)
Most common starting age for 1st cycle students	19-20 years
Main categories of students monitored as part of social dimension policy	– Students whose parents have a low educational background (different categories) – Other nationalities (different subcategories) – Gender
Number of recognised higher education institutions	41
Quality Assurance Agency membership of the European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA)	Centre for Accreditation and Quality Assurance of the Swiss Universities (OAQ) http://www.oaq.ch
Name of Quality Assurance Agency membership of the European Quality Assurance Register (EQAR)	N/A
Other National Quality Assurance Agency	N/A
Lisbon Recognition Convention	
Ratification	24 March 1998
Entry into force	01 February 1999

Regulation of the Recognition of Prior Learning	For the possibility to get access to a HEI without satisfying the usual entry requirements, cf. for example art. 1b Universities of Applied Sciences Act (6 October 1995), art. 16 Law on the University of Geneva (13 June 2008) or art. 75 Law on the University of Lausanne (6 July 2004).
Status of Recognition of Prior Learning	Permitted, but not a right
National Qualifications Framework	Under development
Credit system in place	ECTS
Diploma Supplement	Issued to all students, automatically and free of charge in the language of instruction and English
National mobility benchmarks and/or targets	Outbound mobility: 20 % in 2020 in line with the Louvain-la-Neuve/Leuven Communiqué
Priority regions for attracting students	All countries/regions are of equal priority.

CYPRUS

Higher education structure – 2010



- Most common length of a Bologna cycle
- Other length of a Bologna cycle
- Programme outside the typical Bologna model
- Professional programme

ECTS
Credits according to the European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System

		regulated at national level	decided at institutional level
ALL	programmes have admission requirements	▼	▲
SOME		▽	△

CYPRUS

System overview and key information


Number of students in higher education 2008/09	N/A
Most common starting age for 1st cycle students	18-20 years
Main categories of students monitored as part of social dimension policy	None
Number of recognised higher education institutions	41
Quality Assurance Agency membership of the European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA)	Council for Educational Evaluation and Accreditation (SEKAP) sekap@cytanet.com.cy
Name of Quality Assurance Agency membership of the European Quality Assurance Register (EQAR)	No
Other National Quality Assurance Agency	The Evaluation Committee for Private Universities (ECPU)
Lisbon Recognition Convention	
Ratification	21 November 2001
Entry into force	01 January 2002

Regulation of the Recognition of Prior Learning	N/A
Status of Recognition of Prior Learning	N/A
National Qualifications Framework	Under development
Credit system in place	ECTS introduced without legislation
Diploma Supplement	Issued in the vast majority of study programmes, automatically and free of charge in English
National mobility benchmarks and/or targets	N/A for outbound mobility No target for inbound mobility
Priority regions for attracting students	EU, Non-EU European countries, Middle East, Africa, Asia

CY

CZECH REPUBLIC

Higher education structure – 2010



* bakalář (Bc.), bakalář umění (BcA.)

** inženýr (Ing.), inženýr architekt (Ing. arch.), doktor práv (JUDr.), doktor medicíny (MUDr.), doktor veterinární medicíny (MVDr.), magistr (Mgr.), magistr umění (MgA.), doktor farmacie (PharmDr.), doktor filosofie (PhDr.), doktor přírodních věd (RNDr.), doktor teologie (ThDr.), licenciát teologie (ThLic.), zubní lékař (MDDr.)

*** doktor (Ph.D.), doktor teologie (Th.D.)

- Most common length of a Bologna cycle
- Other length of a Bologna cycle
- Programme outside the typical Bologna model
- Professional programme

ECTS

Credits according to the European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System

		regulated at national level	decided at institutional level
ALL	programmes have admission requirements	▼	▲
SOME		▽	△

CZECH REPUBLIC


System overview and key information

Number of students in higher education 2008/09	374 064
Most common starting age for 1st cycle students	19-20 years
Main categories of students monitored as part of social dimension policy	No monitoring
Number of recognised higher education institutions	73
Quality Assurance Agency membership of the European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA)	Accreditation Commission of the Czech Republic http://www.msmt.cz/areas-of-work/akreditacni-komise
Name of Quality Assurance Agency membership of the European Quality Assurance Register (EQAR)	No
Other National Quality Assurance Agency	No
Lisbon Recognition Convention	
Ratification	15 December 1999
Entry into force	01 February 2000

Regulation of the Recognition of Prior Learning	Act on HEIs (No. 111/1998), Act on verification and recognition of further education outcomes (No. 179/2006) and its implementing regulation of September 2007 (No. 208/2007)
Status of Recognition of Prior Learning	Permitted, but not a right
National Qualifications Framework	Under development
Credit system in place	ECTS introduced without legislation
Diploma Supplement	Issued in the vast majority of study programmes, automatically and free of charge in the language of instruction and/or English (or other languages upon request)
National mobility benchmarks and/or targets	Outbound: a student who expresses interest and has the necessary competences should get an opportunity to spend at least one semester at a foreign higher education institution. It is expected that this will concern up to half of all higher education students. The 50 % benchmark was set for 2006-2010. Inbound: 10 % of the overall student body by 2010.
Priority regions for attracting students	All countries/regions are of equal priority.

GERMANY

Higher education structure – 2010



- Most common length of a Bologna cycle
- Other length of a Bologna cycle
- Programme outside the typical Bologna model
- Professional programme

ECTS
Credits according to the European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System

		regulated at national level	decided at institutional level
ALL	programmes have admission requirements	▼	▲
SOME		▽	△

GERMANY

System overview and key information


Number of students in higher education 2008/09	2 025 307	Most common starting age for 1st cycle students	19 years
Main categories of students monitored as part of social dimension policy	– Gender – Social background/educational level of parents – Migrant background – Students who obtained their higher education entrance qualification abroad – Disability and chronic illness – Students with children – Students with vocational qualifications, but not formal higher education entrance qualification		
Number of recognised higher education institutions	355		
Quality Assurance Agency membership of the European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA)	ACQUIN – Accreditation, Certification and Quality Assurance Institute http://www.acquin.org AHPGS – Accreditation Agency for Study Programmes in Health and Social Sciences http://www.ahpgs.de AQAS – <i>Agentur für Qualitätssicherung durch Akkreditierung von Studiengängen</i> http://www.aqas.de ASIIN e.V. – Accreditation Agency Specialised in Accrediting Degree Programmes in Engineering, Informatics, the Natural Sciences and Mathematics http://www.asiin.de EVALAG – <i>Stiftung Evaluationsagentur Baden-Wuerttemberg</i> http://www.evalag.de FIBAA – Foundation for International Business Administration Accreditation http://www.fibaa.org GAC – German Accreditation Council http://www.akkreditierungsrat.de ZevA – Central Evaluation and Accreditation Agency http://www.zeva.org		

Name of Quality Assurance Agency membership of the European Quality Assurance Register (EQAR)	ACQUIN – Accreditation, Certification and Quality Assurance Institute AHPGS – Accreditation Agency for Study Programmes in Health and Social Sciences ASIIN e.V. – Accreditation Agency Specialised in Accrediting Degree Programmes in Engineering, Informatics, the Natural Sciences and Mathematics FIBAA – Foundation for International Business Administration Accreditation ZevA – Central Evaluation and Accreditation Agency		
Other National Quality Assurance Agency	No	Lisbon Recognition Convention Ratification Entry into force	23 August 2007 01 October 2007
Regulation of the Recognition of Prior Learning	N/A	Status of Recognition of Prior Learning	Permitted, but not a right
National Qualifications Framework	Completed	Credit system in place	ECTS
Diploma Supplement	Issued in the vast majority of study programmes, automatically, free of charge in the language of instruction and/or English		
National mobility benchmarks and/or targets	Outbound: 50 % of students should have spent a study-related stay abroad during their studies, and of these 20 % should have studied at least one semester abroad. Inbound: 10 % of all students in Germany should have obtained their higher education entrance exam abroad (<i>Bildungsausländer</i>).		
Priority regions for attracting students	All countries/regions are of equal priority.		

DE

DENMARK

Higher education structure – 2010



- Most common length of a Bologna cycle
- Other length of a Bologna cycle
- Programme outside the typical Bologna model
- Professional programme

ECTS

Credits according to the European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System

		regulated at national level	decided at institutional level
ALL	programmes have admission requirements	▼	▲
SOME		▽	△

DENMARK

System overview and key information


Number of students in higher education 2008/09	199 170
Most common starting age for 1st cycle students	21.9 years
Main categories of students monitored as part of social dimension policy	– Parents' education – Gender – Ethnicity – Geography
Number of recognised higher education institutions	114
Quality Assurance Agency membership of the European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA)	EVA – Danish Evaluation Institute http://www.eva.dk
Name of Quality Assurance Agency membership of the European Quality Assurance Register (EQAR)	No
Other National Quality Assurance Agency	ACE Denmark http://www.acedenmark.dk/
Lisbon Recognition Convention	
Ratification	20 March 2003
Entry into force	01 May 2003

Regulation of the Recognition of Prior Learning	Act no. 556 'Development of the recognition of prior learning in adult education and continuing training' (<i>Udbygning af anerkendelse af realkompetence på voksen- og efteruddannelsesområdet mv</i>). It includes Further Adult Education and the Diploma level. Short-cycle higher education and medium-cycle further education (bachelor-level) can as well since August 2007 be accessed on the basis of RPL. BEK nr 106 af 09/02/2009, § 10 og BEK nr 52 af 28/01/2009, § 7.
Status of Recognition of Prior Learning	Legal right
National Qualifications Framework	Completed
Credit system in place	ECTS
Diploma Supplement	Issued to all students, free of charge in English
National mobility benchmarks and/or targets	Higher education institutions have a responsibility to set their own benchmarks for outbound mobility. Reference: Regeringen (2006, p. 51).
Priority regions for attracting students	All countries are of equal importance.

DK

ESTONIA

Higher education structure – 2010



- Most common length of a Bologna cycle
- Other length of a Bologna cycle
- Programme outside the typical Bologna model
- Professional programme

ECTS

Credits according to the European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System

		regulated at national level	decided at institutional level
ALL	programmes have admission requirements	▼	▲
SOME		▽	△

ESTONIA


System overview and key information

Number of students in higher education 2008/09	68 399
Most common starting age for 1st cycle students	18 years
Main categories of students monitored as part of social dimension policy	– Young people without sufficient knowledge of Estonian – People with physical disabilities – Regional background of students – Gender of students
Number of recognised higher education institutions	34
Quality Assurance Agency membership of the European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA)	EKKA – Estonian Higher Education Quality Agency http://www.ekka.archimedes.ee/
Name of Quality Assurance Agency membership of the European Quality Assurance Register (EQAR)	No
Other National Quality Assurance Agency	No
Lisbon Recognition Convention	
Ratification	01 April 1998
Entry into force	01 February 1999

Regulation of the Recognition of Prior Learning	University Act, Professional Higher Education Institution Act, Higher Education Standard
Status of Recognition of Prior Learning	Permitted, but not a right
National Qualifications Framework	Completed
Credit system in place	ECTS
Diploma Supplement	Issued to all students, free of charge in the language of instruction and in English
National mobility benchmarks &/or targets	Outbound mobility: By 2015: 4-5 % of all students should have the opportunity to participate in exchange programs or short mobility schemes. Each PhD student that graduates should have spent at least one semester abroad. Incoming mobility: The aim is to double the number of foreign students by 2015. At the moment, there are about 1 000 degree students.
Priority regions for attracting students	Non-EU countries, Asia

GREECE

Higher education structure – 2010



- Most common length of a Bologna cycle
- Other length of a Bologna cycle
- Programme outside the typical Bologna model
- Professional programme

ECTS

Credits according to the European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System

		regulated at national level	decided at institutional level
ALL	programmes have admission requirements	▼	▲
SOME		▽	△

GREECE

System overview and key information


Number of students in higher education 2008/09	513 233
Most common starting age for 1st cycle students	18 years
Main categories of students monitored as part of social dimension policy	– Students from lower socio-economic background – Disabled students – Students suffering from serious diseases – Gender – The Muslim students of Thrace – Greek nationals who live abroad – Students of other nationalities
Number of recognised higher education institutions	38
Quality Assurance Agency membership of the European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA)	No
Name of Quality Assurance Agency membership of the European Quality Assurance Register (EQAR)	No
Other National Quality Assurance Agency	Hellenic Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education http://www.hqaa.gr
Lisbon Recognition Convention Ratification Entry into force	N/A

Regulation of the Recognition of Prior Learning	– Law 3191/2003 (FEK 258A): 'National System connecting Vocational Education and Training with Employment' – Law 3369/2005 (FEK 171A): 'The Systematisation of Lifelong Learning and other Provisions'
Status of Recognition of Prior Learning	Permitted, but not a right
National Qualifications Framework	Under development
Credit system in place	ECTS
Diploma Supplement	Issued in the vast majority of study programmes, automatically and free of charge in the language of instruction and/or English
National mobility benchmarks and/or targets	No
Priority regions for attracting students	EU, Non-EU European countries, USA/Canada, Australia/New Zealand, Middle East, Latin America, Africa, Asia

EL

SPAIN

Higher education structure – 2010



- Most common length of a Bologna cycle
- Other length of a Bologna cycle
- Programme outside the typical Bologna model
- Professional programme

ECTS
Credits according to the European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System

		regulated at national level	decided at institutional level
ALL	programmes have admission requirements	▼	▲
SOME		▽	△

SPAIN


System overview and key information

Number of students in higher education 2008/09	1 500 069
Most common starting age for 1st cycle students	18
Main categories of students monitored as part of social dimension policy	Gender / Disability / Socio economic status / Age
Number of recognised higher education institutions	77 universities 123 higher schools
Quality Assurance Agency membership of the European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA)	ANECA – National Agency for Quality Assessment and Accreditation – <i>Agencia Nacional de Evaluación de la Calidad y Acreditación</i> (http://www.aneca.es) ACSUG – Agency for Quality Assurance in the Galician University System – <i>Agencia para la calidad del sistema universitario de Galicia</i> (http://www.acsug.es) AGAE – Andalusian Agency for Quality Assessment and Accreditation – <i>Agencia Andaluza de Evaluación</i> (http://www.agae.es) AQU – Agency for Quality Assurance in the Catalan University System – <i>Agencia per a la Qualitat del Sistema Universitari de Catalunya</i> (http://www.aqu.cat)
Name of Quality Assurance Agency membership of the European Quality Assurance Register (EQAR)	ANECA – National Agency for Quality Assessment and Accreditation AGAE – Andalusian Agency for Quality Assessment and Accreditation AQU – Agency for Quality Assurance in the Catalan University System
Other National Quality Assurance Agency	No

Lisbon Recognition Convention	Ratification	28 October 2009	Entry into force	01 December 2009
Regulation of the Recognition of Prior Learning	The Royal Decree 1393/2007 (http://www.boe.es/boe/dias/2007/10/30/pdfs/A44037-44048.pdf) defines the rules to recognise prior learning (obtained at one university) when entering a university. The Royal Decree 1892/2008 (http://www.boe.es/boe/dias/2008/11/24/pdfs/A46932-46946.pdf) defines the rules to recognise prior learning for access to universities for students older than 25, 40 and 45 years. The Spanish Law of Universities (as amended 2007) explicitly states in article 36 that the ministry will regulate the conditions to recognise prior learning from work experience. This is one of the tasks of the working group devoted to LLL under the 'University Strategy 2015' (see http://www.educacion.es/universidad2015/formacion-continua.html). Recognition of prior learning is seen to come from formal, informal and non-formal learning paths. Spanish universities autonomously recognise prior learning to reduce the number of courses required to obtain a degree (once admission has been granted).			
Status of Recognition of Prior Learning	Permitted, but not a right			
National Qualifications Framework	Under development			
Credit system in place	ECTS			
Diploma Supplement	Issued to all students in the vast majority of study programmes, with a fee in the language of instruction and/or more official EU languages			
National mobility benchmarks and/or targets	To increase Erasmus mobility as much as possible through more and better targeted funding to underrepresented groups			
Priority regions for attracting students	EU, Latin America, Asia			

FINLAND

Higher education structure – 2010



- Most common length of a Bologna cycle
- Other length of a Bologna cycle
- Programme outside the typical Bologna model
- Professional programme

ECTS

Credits according to the European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System

		regulated at national level	decided at institutional level
ALL	programmes have admission requirements	▼	▲
SOME		▽	△

FINLAND

System overview and key information


Number of students in higher education 2008/09	291 547
Most common starting age for 1st cycle students	20-24 years
Main categories of students monitored as part of social dimension policy	No monitoring
Number of recognised higher education institutions	42
Quality Assurance Agency membership of the European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA)	FINHEEC – Finnish Higher Education Evaluation Council http://www.finheec.fi
Name of Quality Assurance Agency membership of the European Quality Assurance Register (EQAR)	No
Other National Quality Assurance Agency	No
Lisbon Recognition Convention	
Ratification	21 January 2004
Entry into force	01 March 2004

Regulation of the Recognition of Prior Learning	Polytechnics decree 2003/352 and Universities act 2009/558
Status of Recognition of Prior Learning	Legal right
National Qualifications Framework	Under development
Credit system in place	ECTS
Diploma Supplement	Issued to all students, automatically and free of charge and solely in English
National mobility benchmarks and/or targets	6 % and 8 % of university and polytechnic students respectively to have had a mobility period abroad by 2015; 7 % of degree students from outside Finland by 2015; 20 % of students in PhD programmes from outside Finland by 2015.
Priority regions for attracting students	All countries/regions are of equal priority.

FI

FRANCE

Higher education structure – 2010



- Most common length of a Bologna cycle
- Other length of a Bologna cycle
- Programme outside the typical Bologna model
- Professional programme

ECTS
Credits according to the European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System

		regulated at national level	decided at institutional level
ALL	programmes have admission requirements	▼	▲
SOME		▽	△

FRANCE

System overview and key information


Number of students in higher education 2008/09	2 231 745
Most common starting age for 1st cycle students	19 years
Main categories of students monitored as part of social dimension policy	Socio-economically disadvantaged students
Number of recognised higher education institutions	4 343
Quality Assurance Agency membership of the European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA)	AERES – <i>Agence d'évaluation de la recherche et de l'enseignement supérieur</i> http://www.aeres-evaluation.fr CTI – <i>Commission des Titres d'Ingénieur</i> http://www.cti-commission.fr
Name of Quality Assurance Agency membership of the European Quality Assurance Register (EQAR)	No
Other National Quality Assurance Agency	No
Lisbon Recognition Convention	
Ratification	04 October 1999
Entry into force	01 December 1999

Regulation of the Recognition of Prior Learning	– Education Law (Art L335-5, L335-6, L613-3 and L613-4) and labour law (art L6111-1) – Decree 85-906 of 23 August 1985 – Decree 2002-590 of 24 April 2002
Status of Recognition of Prior Learning	Legal right
National Qualifications Framework	Under development
Credit system in place	ECTS
Diploma Supplement	Issued automatically to the majority of students, free of charge in the language of instruction and/or more official EU languages
National mobility benchmarks and/or targets	By 2020: 20 % of graduates having completed a part of their studies abroad. By 2012: 17 % of international students enrolled on master programmes including 3.1 % from OECD countries; 33% of international students enrolled on doctoral programmes including 9 % from OECD countries.
Priority regions for attracting students	All countries/regions are of equal priority.

FR

GEORGIA

Higher education structure – 2010



- Most common length of a Bologna cycle
- Other length of a Bologna cycle
- Programme outside the typical Bologna model
- Professional programme

ECTS

Credits according to the European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System

		regulated at national level	decided at institutional level
ALL	programmes have admission requirements	▼	▲
SOME		▽	△

GEORGIA

System overview and key information

Number of students in higher education 2008/09	93 075
Most common starting age for 1st cycle students	18-19 years
Main categories of students monitored as part of social dimension policy	– Students from mountainous regions and regions of ecological migration – Students from occupied territories – Students from ethnic minorities – War and other orphans – Descendents of persons deported from Samtskhe-Javakheti region by the communist regime – Children from families with 4 or more children – Socially disadvantaged persons – Students with disabilities
Number of recognised higher education institutions	70
Quality Assurance Agency membership of the European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA)	No
Name of Quality Assurance Agency membership of the European Quality Assurance Register (EQAR)	No
Other National Quality Assurance Agency	National Education Accreditation Centre of Georgia
Lisbon Recognition Convention	
Ratification	13 October 1999
Entry into force	01 December 1999

Regulation of the Recognition of Prior Learning	Minister's decree No 120 (16.02.2007)
Status of Recognition of Prior Learning	Legal right
National Qualifications Framework	Under development
Credit system in place	ECTS
Diploma Supplement	Issued to all students in the vast majority of study programmes, automatically and free of charge / on request and free of charge, in the language of instruction and/or English
National mobility benchmarks &/or targets	No
Priority regions for attracting students	All countries/regions are of equal priority.

GE

The diagram illustrates the mapping of educational levels between three systems: ECTS (0-300), ECTS (0-180), and Years (0-8). The mapping is as follows:

- ECTS 0-300 System:**
 - University, faculty, academy:**
 - Bachelor (0-180 ECTS, 3-4 years)
 - Bachelor (0-240 ECTS, 4-5 years)
 - Professional college, polytechnic:**
 - Associate Degree (0-120 ECTS, 2-3 years)
 - Bachelor (0-240 ECTS, 4-5 years)
- ECTS 0-180 System:**
 - University, faculty, academy:**
 - Master (0-120 ECTS, 2-3 years)
 - Master (0-180 ECTS, 3-4 years)
 - University:**
 - Master Specialist (0-120 ECTS, 2-3 years)
 - Master Specialist (0-180 ECTS, 3-4 years)
 - Professional college, polytechnic:**
 - Professional specialist (0-120 ECTS, 2-3 years)
- Years 0-8 System:**
 - University, faculty, academy:**
 - PhD (0-3 years)

Additional information provided in the diagram:

- Field of study:**
 - >>> regulated professions, education
 - >>> economics, biotechnology, natural sciences, technical sciences

- Most common length of a Bologna cycle
- Other length of a Bologna cycle
- Programme outside the typical Bologna model
- Professional programme

Credits according to the European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System

		regulated at national level	decided at institutional level
ALL	programmes have admission requirements	▼	▲
SOME		▽	△

- >>> regulated professions, education

- >>> economics, biotechnology, natural sciences, technical sciences

CROATIA


System overview and key information

Number of students in higher education 2008/09	170 500
Most common starting age for 1st cycle students	18 years
Main categories of students monitored as part of social dimension policy	– Disability – Socio economic status (including those affected by war) – Ethnicity (primarily Roma students) – Mature students and persons with full-time employment – Certain geographic regions
Number of recognised higher education institutions	54
Quality Assurance Agency membership of the European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA)	No
Name of Quality Assurance Agency membership of the European Quality Assurance Register (EQAR)	No
Other National Quality Assurance Agency	Agency for Science and Higher Education www.azvo.hr
Lisbon Recognition Convention	
Ratification	01 October 2002
Entry into force	01 December 2002

Regulation of the Recognition of Prior Learning	Recognition of prior learning has not been defined in Croatian legislature. However, the Act on Scientific Activity and Higher Education foresees the possibility for exceptional candidates to waive entrance and/or some course requirements. Recognition of prior learning is a constituent part of the development of the Croatian qualifications framework.
Status of Recognition of Prior Learning	Permitted, but not a right
National Qualifications Framework	Under development
Credit system in place	ECTS
Diploma Supplement	Issued to all students in the vast majority of study programmes, automatically and free of charge in the language of instruction and/or more official EU languages
National mobility benchmarks and/or targets	1 000 outgoing students in 2010/11, 1 800 in 2011/12
Priority regions for attracting students	N/A

HUNGARY

Higher education structure – 2010



- Most common length of a Bologna cycle
- Other length of a Bologna cycle
- Programme outside the typical Bologna model
- Professional programme

ECTS
Credits according to the European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System

		regulated at national level	decided at institutional level
ALL	programmes have admission requirements	▼	▲
SOME		▽	△

HUNGARY


System overview and key information

Number of students in higher education 2008/09	381 033
Most common starting age for 1st cycle students	18 years
Main categories of students monitored as part of social dimension policy	– Disabled students – Disadvantaged students – Students belonging to the Roma ethnic minority – Students rearing a small child/family supporters/students with a large family
Number of recognised higher education institutions	70
Quality Assurance Agency membership of the European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA)	Hungarian Accreditation Committee http://www.mab.hu
Name of Quality Assurance Agency membership of the European Quality Assurance Register (EQAR)	No
Other National Quality Assurance Agency	No
Lisbon Recognition Convention	
Ratification	04 February 2000
Entry into force	01 April 2000

Regulation of the Recognition of Prior Learning	The Act on Higher Education (Act No. CXXXIX. of 2005) regulates the recognition of prior learning (58. §).
Status of Recognition of Prior Learning	Permitted, but not a right
National Qualifications Framework	Under development
Credit system in place	ECTS
Diploma Supplement	Issued in the vast majority of study programmes (mandatory to issue to all students; however, statistics show that only about 70 % of students receive it), automatically and free of charge, in the language of instruction and English
National mobility benchmarks and/or targets	No
Priority regions for attracting students	EU, Non-EU European countries, Middle East, Asia

IRELAND

Higher education structure – 2010



- Most common length of a Bologna cycle
- Other length of a Bologna cycle
- Programme outside the typical Bologna model
- Professional programme

ECTS

Credits according to the European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System

		regulated at national level	decided at institutional level
ALL	programmes have admission requirements	▼	▲
SOME		▽	△

IRELAND


System overview and key information

Number of students in higher education 2008/09	180 000
Most common starting age for 1st cycle students	18 years
Main categories of students monitored as part of social dimension policy	– Students from socio-economically disadvantaged backgrounds, including members of the Travelling Community and refugees – Students with a disability – Mature students
Number of recognised higher education institutions	44
Quality Assurance Agency membership of the European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA)	HEA – Higher Education Authority http://www.hea.ie IUQB – Irish Universities Quality Board http://www.iuqb.ie/en/homepage.aspx NQAI – National Qualifications Authority of Ireland http://www.nqai.ie HETAC – Higher Education and Training Awards Council www.hetac.ie
Name of Quality Assurance Agency membership of the European Quality Assurance Register (EQAR)	HETAC – Higher Education and Training Awards Council www.hetac.ie IUQB – Irish Universities Quality Board http://www.iuqb.ie/en/homepage.aspx
Other National Quality Assurance Agency	No

Lisbon Recognition Convention	
Ratification	08 March 2004
Entry into force	01 May 2004
Regulation of the Recognition of Prior Learning	The Qualifications Act (Education and Training) 1999 enables individuals to seek qualifications made by relevant awarding bodies in Ireland on the basis of RPL.
Status of Recognition of Prior Learning	Permitted, but not a right
National Qualifications Framework	Completed
Credit system in place	ECTS
Diploma Supplement	Partial and gradual introduction of DS, free of charge, solely in English
National mobility benchmarks and/or targets	Target of 12-15 % of student population for incoming mobility
Priority regions for attracting students	EU, USA/Canada, Middle East, Asia

ICELAND

Higher education structure – 2010



- Most common length of a Bologna cycle
- Other length of a Bologna cycle
- Programme outside the typical Bologna model
- Professional programme

ECTS

Credits according to the European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System

		regulated at national level	decided at institutional level
ALL	programmes have admission requirements	▼	▲
SOME		▽	△

ICELAND


System overview and key information

Number of students in higher education 2008/09	18 011
Most common starting age for 1st cycle students	20
Main categories of students monitored as part of social dimension policy	Not monitored
Number of recognised higher education institutions	7
Quality Assurance Agency membership of the European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA)	No
Name of Quality Assurance Agency membership of the European Quality Assurance Register (EQAR)	No
Other National Quality Assurance Agency	No
Lisbon Recognition Convention	
Ratification	21 March 2001
Entry into force	01 May 2001

Regulation of the Recognition of Prior Learning	Yes
Status of Recognition of Prior Learning	Permitted, but not a right
National Qualifications Framework	Under development
Credit system in place	ECTS
Diploma Supplement	Issued to all students free of charge and solely in English
National mobility benchmarks and/or targets	No
Priority regions for attracting students	N/A

ITALY

Higher education structure – 2010



- Most common length of a Bologna cycle
- Other length of a Bologna cycle
- Programme outside the typical Bologna model
- Professional programme

ECTS

Credits according to the European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System

		regulated at national level	decided at institutional level
ALL	programmes have admission requirements	▼	▲
SOME		▽	△

ITALY


System overview and key information

Number of students in higher education 2008/09	1 843 588
Most common starting age for 1st cycle students	19 years
Main categories of students monitored as part of social dimension policy	– Gender – Disability
Number of recognised higher education institutions	219
Quality Assurance Agency membership of the European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA)	CNVSU – <i>Comitato Nazionale per la Valutazione del Sistema Universitario</i> www.cnvsu.it
Name of Quality Assurance Agency membership of the European Quality Assurance Register (EQAR)	No
Other National Quality Assurance Agency	<i>Agenzia Nazionale di Valutazione del sistema Universitario e della Ricerca</i> (Anvur) www.anvur.it
Lisbon Recognition Convention	N/A
Ratification	22 April 2008
Entry into force	01 June 2008

Regulation of the Recognition of Prior Learning	– D.M. 509/1999 (Art. 5) – D.M. 270/2004
Status of Recognition of Prior Learning	Permitted, but not a right
National Qualifications Framework	Under development
Credit system in place	ECTS
Diploma Supplement	Issued to all students, free of charge, in the language of instruction and/or English
National mobility benchmarks and/or targets	Numbers of foreign students enrolled in the 2nd and 3rd cycles are taken into consideration for the allocation of funding to universities. There are no benchmarks aimed at increasing the mobility of foreign students.
Priority regions for attracting students	All countries/regions are of equal priority.

LIECHTENSTEIN

Higher education structure – 2010



- Most common length of a Bologna cycle
- Other length of a Bologna cycle
- Programme outside the typical Bologna model
- Professional programme

ECTS

Credits according to the European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System

		regulated at national level	decided at institutional level
ALL	programmes have admission requirements	▼	▲
SOME		▽	△

LIECHTENSTEIN


System overview and key information

Number of students in higher education 2008/09	722
Most common starting age for 1st cycle students	19 years
Main categories of students monitored as part of social dimension policy	– Gender – Persons with migration background – Persons with low socio-economic status – Disabled persons
Number of recognised higher education institutions	3
Quality Assurance Agency membership of the European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA)	No
Name of Quality Assurance Agency membership of the European Quality Assurance Register (EQAR)	No
Other National Quality Assurance Agency	No
Lisbon Recognition Convention	
Ratification	01 February 2000
Entry into force	01 April 2000

Regulation of the Recognition of Prior Learning	The recognition of Prior Learning is not specifically defined and regulated by legislation. Yet the new reform of the law on higher education provides the possibility to grant access to higher education 'sur dossier' although it is not further defined.
Status of Recognition of Prior Learning	See comment above
National Qualifications Framework	Under development
Credit system in place	ECTS
Diploma Supplement	Issued to all students in the vast majority of study programmes, free of charge, in the language of instruction and/or English
National mobility benchmarks and/or targets	N/A
Priority regions for attracting students	All countries/regions are of equal priority.

LITHUANIA

Higher education structure – 2010



Students holding Professional Bachelors degree need to undertake bridging studies (courses) in order to be able to gain access to Master programmes.

- Most common length of a Bologna cycle
- Other length of a Bologna cycle
- Programme outside the typical Bologna model
- Professional programme

ECTS

Credits according to the European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System

		regulated at national level	decided at institutional level
ALL	programmes have admission requirements	▼	▲
SOME		▽	△

LITHUANIA


System overview and key information

Number of students in higher education 2008/09	210 400
Most common starting age for 1st cycle students	21 years
Main categories of students monitored as part of social dimension policy	– Students with low socio-economic background – Students with disabilities
Number of recognised higher education institutions	49
Quality Assurance Agency membership of the European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA)	SKVC – Centre for Quality Assessment in Higher Education http://www.skvc.lt
Name of Quality Assurance Agency membership of the European Quality Assurance Register (EQAR)	No
Other National Quality Assurance Agency	No
Lisbon Recognition Convention	
Ratification	17 December 1998
Entry into force	01 February 1999

Regulation of the Recognition of Prior Learning	Recognition of prior learning is regulated by the Law on Science and Studies (Official Gazette, 2009, No. 54-2140, Chapter V, Art. 50) and by the order of the Minister of Education and Science 'Recognition of studies achievement' (Official Gazette, 2003, No. 109-4899).
Status of Recognition of Prior Learning	Legal right
National Qualifications Framework	Under development
Credit system in place	National system + ECTS
Diploma Supplement	Issued to all students in the vast majority of study programmes, free of charge in the language of instruction and English
National mobility benchmarks and/or targets	Mobility targets for the year 2010-2012: 1. The proportion of outgoing and incoming students not exceeding 3:1 2. Implementation of bilateral agreements related to mobility (at least 10) 3. New joint degree programmes (at least 7)
Priority regions for attracting students	EU, non-EU European countries (Ukraine, Belarus, Moldova, Russia, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia), USA, Australia, Latin America (Argentina, Brazil), Asia (China, India, Japan)

LUXEMBOURG

Higher education structure – 2010



- Most common length of a Bologna cycle
- Other length of a Bologna cycle
- Programme outside the typical Bologna model
- Professional programme

ECTS

Credits according to the European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System

		regulated at national level	decided at institutional level
ALL	programmes have admission requirements	▼	▲
SOME		▽	△

LUXEMBOURG


System overview and key information

Number of students in higher education 2008/09	4 791
Most common starting age for 1st cycle students	19 years
Main categories of students monitored as part of social dimension policy	Portuguese and Cap Verdian immigrants
Number of recognised higher education institutions	4
Quality Assurance Agency membership of the European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA)	No
Name of Quality Assurance Agency membership of the European Quality Assurance Register (EQAR)	Committee of external evaluation of the University of Luxembourg
Other National Quality Assurance Agency	No
Lisbon Recognition Convention	
Ratification	04 October 2000
Entry into force	01 December 2000

Regulation of the Recognition of Prior Learning	Law of 12 August 2003, article 9 and law of 19 June 2009, article 12
Status of Recognition of Prior Learning	Legal right
National Qualifications Framework	Under development
Credit system in place	ECTS
Diploma Supplement	Issued to all students in the vast majority of study programmes, free of charge and in the language of instruction and/or more official EU languages
National mobility benchmarks and/or targets	No
Priority regions for attracting students	No explicit policy to promote higher education study opportunities to students from other countries

LATVIA

Higher education structure – 2010



- Most common length of a Bologna cycle
- Other length of a Bologna cycle
- Programme outside the typical Bologna model
- Professional programme

ECTS

Credits according to the European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System

		regulated at national level	decided at institutional level
ALL	programmes have admission requirements	▼	▲
SOME		▽	△

LATVIA


System overview and key information

Number of students in higher education 2008/09	125 360
Most common starting age for 1st cycle students	19 years
Main categories of students monitored as part of social dimension policy	N/A
Number of recognised higher education institutions	32
Quality Assurance Agency membership of the European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA)	HEQEC – Higher Education Quality Evaluation Centre http://www.aiknc.lv
Name of Quality Assurance Agency membership of the European Quality Assurance Register (EQAR)	No
Other National Quality Assurance Agency	No
Lisbon Recognition Convention	
Ratification	20 July 1999
Entry into force	01 September 1999

Regulation of the Recognition of Prior Learning	No legislation/regulation/policy
Status of Recognition of Prior Learning	Not possible in higher education
National Qualifications Framework	Under development
Credit system in place	National system + ECTS
Diploma Supplement	Issued to all students in the vast majority of study programmes, free of charge in the language of instruction and English
National mobility benchmarks and/or targets	No
Priority regions for attracting students	All countries/regions are of equal priority.

MOLDOVA

Higher education structure – 2010



- Most common length of a Bologna cycle
- Other length of a Bologna cycle
- Programme outside the typical Bologna model
- Professional programme

ECTS

Credits according to the European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System

		regulated at national level	decided at institutional level
ALL	programmes have admission requirements	▼	▲
SOME		▽	△

MOLDOVA


System overview and key information

Number of students in higher education 2008/09	122 939
Most common starting age for 1st cycle students	18-19 years
Main categories of students monitored as part of social dimension policy	– Ethnicity – Language – Socio-economic status – Disability – Orphans – One-parent families
Number of recognised higher education institutions	30
Quality Assurance Agency membership of the European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA)	No
Name of Quality Assurance Agency membership of the European Quality Assurance Register (EQAR)	No
Other National Quality Assurance Agency	Department of Accreditation of the Higher Education Institutions of the Republic of Moldova
Lisbon Recognition Convention	
Ratification	23 September 1999
Entry into force	01 November 1999

Regulation of the Recognition of Prior Learning	No legislation
Status of Recognition of Prior Learning	Permitted, but not a right
National Qualifications Framework	Under development
Credit system in place	ECTS
Diploma Supplement	Issued to all students in the vast majority of study programmes, free of charge in the language of instruction and/or English
National mobility benchmarks and/or targets	No
Priority regions for attracting students	EU, Non-European countries, US/Canada, Asia

MONTENEGRO

Higher education structure – 2010



Students awarded a Bachelor in applied study programmes are qualified to continue education up to the master level only.

- Most common length of a Bologna cycle
- Other length of a Bologna cycle
- Programme outside the typical Bologna model
- Professional programme

ECTS

Credits according to the European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System

		regulated at national level	decided at institutional level
ALL	programmes have admission requirements	▼	▲
SOME		▽	△

MONTENEGRO


System overview and key information

Number of students in higher education 2008/09	25 400
Most common starting age for 1st cycle students	18-19 years
Main categories of students monitored as part of social dimension policy	No monitoring
Number of recognised higher education institutions	2 universities 9 individual faculty units
Quality Assurance Agency membership of the European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA)	No
Name of Quality Assurance Agency membership of the European Quality Assurance Register (EQAR)	No
Other National Quality Assurance Agency	No
Lisbon Recognition Convention	
Ratification	03 March 2004
Entry into force	06 June 2006

Regulation of the Recognition of Prior Learning	No legislation/regulation/policy
Status of Recognition of Prior Learning	Legal right
National Qualifications Framework	Under development
Credit system in place	ECTS
Diploma Supplement	Issued to all students in the vast majority of study programmes, free of charge and in the language of instruction and English
National mobility benchmarks and/or targets	No
Priority regions for attracting students	EU, USA/Canada

FORMER YUGOSLAV REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA

Higher education structure – 2010



- Most common length of a Bologna cycle
- Other length of a Bologna cycle
- Programme outside the typical Bologna model
- Professional programme

ECTS

Credits according to the European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System

		regulated at national level	decided at institutional level
ALL	programmes have admission requirements	▼	▲
SOME		▽	△

FORMER YUGOSLAV REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA


System overview and key information

Number of students in higher education 2008/09	19 082
Most common starting age for 1st cycle students	18-19 years
Main categories of students monitored as part of social dimension policy	– Disabled students – Orphans
Number of recognised higher education institutions	23
Quality Assurance Agency membership of the European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA)	No
Name of Quality Assurance Agency membership of the European Quality Assurance Register (EQAR)	No
Other National Quality Assurance Agency	Board of Accreditation Evaluation Agency www.board.edu.mk
Lisbon Recognition Convention	
Ratification	29 November 2002
Entry into force	01 January 2003

Regulation of the Recognition of Prior Learning	Within the current Law on Higher Education ('Official Journal of the Republic of Macedonia nr. 35/08'), prior learning is addressed as a process that is undertaken by adults and is mainly understood as returning to learning.
Status of Recognition of Prior Learning	Permitted, but not a right
National Qualifications Framework	Under development
Credit system in place	ECTS
Diploma Supplement	Issued to all students in the vast majority of study programmes, free of charge, in the language of instruction and/or English
National mobility benchmarks and/or targets	N/A
Priority regions for attracting students	Students from Western Balkan countries

MALTA

Higher education structure – 2010



- Most common length of a Bologna cycle
- Other length of a Bologna cycle
- Programme outside the typical Bologna model
- Professional programme

ECTS

Credits according to the European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System

		regulated at national level	decided at institutional level
ALL	programmes have admission requirements	▼	▲
SOME		▽	△

MALTA


System overview and key information

Number of students in higher education 2008/09	11 530
Most common starting age for 1st cycle students	18 years
Main categories of students monitored as part of social dimension policy	– Gender – Locality – School background – Socio-economic background of graduates
Number of recognised higher education institutions	2
Quality Assurance Agency membership of the European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA)	No
Name of Quality Assurance Agency membership of the European Quality Assurance Register (EQAR)	No
Other National Quality Assurance Agency	No
Lisbon Recognition Convention	
Ratification	16 November 2005
Entry into force	01 January 2006

Regulation of the Recognition of Prior Learning	No legislation, the process is still in a pilot phase.
Status of Recognition of Prior Learning	Permitted, but not a right
National Qualifications Framework	Under development
Credit system in place	ECTS
Diploma Supplement	Issued to all students in the vast majority of study programmes, free of charge and solely in English
National mobility benchmarks and/or targets	Outbound mobility: 20 % by 2020 Inbound: 5 000 students to study in Malta between 2009 and 2020
Priority regions for attracting students	N/A

THE NETHERLANDS

Higher education structure – 2010



- Most common length of a Bologna cycle
- Other length of a Bologna cycle
- Programme outside the typical Bologna model
- Professional programme

ECTS

Credits according to the European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System

		regulated at national level	decided at institutional level
ALL	programmes have admission requirements	▼	▲
SOME		▽	△

THE NETHERLANDS


System overview and key information

Number of students in higher education 2008/09	60 1900
Most common starting age for 1st cycle students	18-19 years
Main categories of students monitored as part of social dimension policy	– Socio-economic background – Ethnic minorities (western and non western) – Disability
Number of recognised higher education institutions	213
Quality Assurance Agency membership of the European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA)	QANU – Quality Assurance Netherlands Universities http://www.qanu.nl NQA – Netherlands Quality Agency http://www.nqa.nl NVAO – Accreditation Organisation of the Netherlands and Flanders http://www.nvao.net
Name of Quality Assurance Agency membership of the European Quality Assurance Register (EQAR)	NVAO – Accreditation Organisation of the Netherlands and Flanders http://www.nvao.net
Other National Quality Assurance Agency	No

Lisbon Recognition Convention	
Ratification	19 March 2008
Entry into force	06 May 2008
Regulation of the Recognition of Prior Learning	Legislation (WHW art 7.29): persons above the age of 21 can be admitted on the basis of a test/exam. WHW art 7.13 lid 2 ad r: exam committees need to have a regular exemption policy, also one based on RPL. This need to be published in the Education and Exam Regulation for the HE programmes.
Status of Recognition of Prior Learning	Permitted, but not a right
National Qualifications Framework	Completed
Credit system in place	ECTS
Diploma Supplement	Issued to all students, free of charge and in the language of instruction and/or English
National mobility benchmarks and/or targets	Outbound: 25 % in 2013 (as part of the active student population, not per cohort after graduation). Inbound: HEI's set their own targets. However, the national policy is aimed at providing scholarships for the most talented students.
Priority regions for attracting students	All countries/regions are of equal importance.

NORWAY

Higher education structure – 2010



NO

NORWAY

System overview and key information


Number of students in higher education 2008/09	206 085
Most common starting age for 1st cycle students	19 years
Main categories of students monitored as part of social dimension policy	No
Number of recognised higher education institutions	75
Quality Assurance Agency membership of the European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA)	NOKUT – Norwegian Agency for Quality Assurance in Education http://www.nokut.no
Name of Quality Assurance Agency membership of the European Quality Assurance Register (EQAR)	No
Other National Quality Assurance Agency	No
Lisbon Recognition Convention	
Ratification	29 April 1999
Entry into force	01 June 1999

Regulation of the Recognition of Prior Learning	Act on higher education (http://www.regjeringen.no/upload/kilde/kd/reg/2006/0031/ddd/pdfv/273037-loven_higher_education_act_norway_010405.pdf)
Status of Recognition of Prior Learning	Legal right
National Qualifications Framework	Under development
Credit system in place	ECTS
Diploma Supplement	Issued to all students in the vast majority of study programmes, free of charge, in English
National mobility benchmarks and/or targets	No
Priority regions for attracting students	N/A

NO

POLAND

Higher education structure – 2010



Programmes issue different degrees in different subjects.

The degrees mentioned in the diagram are merely y the generic degree names for the different cycles.

- Most common length of a Bologna cycle
- Other length of a Bologna cycle
- Programme outside the typical Bologna model
- Professional programme

ECTS

Credits according to the European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System

		regulated at national level	decided at institutional level
ALL	programmes have admission requirements	▼	▲
SOME		▽	△

POLAND


System overview and key information

Number of students in higher education 2008/09	1 927 762
Most common starting age for 1st cycle students	19 years
Main categories of students monitored as part of social dimension policy	– Women – Students with disabilities – Students with low socio-economic status
Number of recognised higher education institutions	455
Quality Assurance Agency membership of the European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA)	PKA – <i>Państwowa Komisja Akredytacyjna</i> (State Accreditation Committee) http://www.pka.edu.pl
Name of Quality Assurance Agency membership of the European Quality Assurance Register (EQAR)	PKA – <i>Państwowa Komisja Akredytacyjna</i> (State Accreditation Committee) http://www.pka.edu.pl
Other National Quality Assurance Agency	KRASZM – National Council for Accreditation of Medical Education http://www.mz.gov.pl KAUT – Accreditation Commission for Technical HEIs http://www.kaut.agh.edu.pl UKA – University Accreditation Commission http://www.uka.amu.edu.pl FPAKE – Foundation for the Promotion and Accreditation of Economic Education http://www.fundacja.edu.pl SEM FORUM Association of Management Education FORUM http://www.semforum.org.pl

Lisbon Recognition Convention	
Ratification	17 March 2004
Entry into force	01 May 2004
Regulation of the Recognition of Prior Learning	– Law on Higher Education of 2005 (Article 165) – <i>Ustawa Prawo o szkolnictwie wyższym (Artykuł 165)</i> – Regulation by the Minister of Science and Higher Education of 3 October 2006 on the requirements and procedures for the transfer of student achievements (<i>Rozporządzenie Ministra Nauki i Szkolnictwa Wyższego z dnia 3 października 2006 r. w sprawie warunków i trybu przenoszenia osiągnięć studenta</i>)
Status of Recognition of Prior Learning	Permitted, but not a right
National Qualifications Framework	Under development
Credit system in place	ECTS
Diploma Supplement	Issued to all students in the vast majority of study programmes, free of charge and in the language of instruction and/or English
National mobility benchmarks and/or targets	No
Priority regions for attracting international students	N/A

PORTUGAL

Higher education structure – 2010



- Most common length of a Bologna cycle
- Other length of a Bologna cycle
- Programme outside the typical Bologna model
- Professional programme

ECTS

Credits according to the European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System

		regulated at national level	decided at institutional level
ALL	programmes have admission requirements	▼	▲
SOME		▽	△

PORTUGAL


System overview and key information

Number of students in higher education 2008/09	373 002
Most common starting age for 1st cycle students	17-18 years
Main categories of students monitored as part of social dimension policy	– Adults (non-traditional students) – Students from lower income families
Number of recognised higher education institutions	136
Quality Assurance Agency membership of the European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA)	No
Name of Quality Assurance Agency membership of the European Quality Assurance Register (EQAR)	No
Other National Quality Assurance Agency	<i>Agência de Avaliação e Acreditação do Ensino Superior</i> (Higher Education Evaluation and Accreditation Agency)
Lisbon Recognition Convention	
Ratification	15 October 2001
Entry into force	01 December 2001

Regulation of the Recognition of Prior Learning	– Law 49/2005 – Decree Law 74/2006 – Decree Law 64/2006 – Decree law 88/2006
Status of Recognition of Prior Learning	Permitted, but not a right
National Qualifications Framework	Under development
Credit system in place	ECTS
Diploma Supplement	Issued to all students in the vast majority of study programmes, free of charge and in the language of instruction and/or English
National mobility benchmarks and/or targets	Double the number of Erasmus scholarships
Priority regions for attracting students	All countries/regions are of equal priority.

ROMANIA

Higher education structure – 2010



- Most common length of a Bologna cycle
- Other length of a Bologna cycle
- Programme outside the typical Bologna model
- Professional programme

ECTS

Credits according to the European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System

		regulated at national level	decided at institutional level
ALL	programmes have admission requirements	▼	▲
SOME		▽	△

ROMANIA


System overview and key information

Number of students in higher education 2008/09	891 098
Most common starting age for 1st cycle students	18 years
Main categories of students monitored as part of social dimension policy	– Roma community – Persons from underdeveloped areas – Unemployed persons – Disabled persons
Number of recognised higher education institutions	115
Quality Assurance Agency membership of the European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA)	ARACIS – <i>Agentia Româna de Asigurare a Calitatii în Invatamântul Superior</i> (Romanian Agency for Quality Assurance in Higher Education) http://www.aracis.ro
Name of Quality Assurance Agency membership of the European Quality Assurance Register (EQAR)	ARACIS – <i>Agentia Româna de Asigurare a Calitatii în Invatamântul Superior</i> (Romanian Agency for Quality Assurance in Higher Education) http://www.aracis.ro
Other National Quality Assurance Agency	No
Lisbon Recognition Convention	
Ratification	12 January 1999
Entry into force	01 March 1999

Regulation of the Recognition of Prior Learning	No legislation/regulation/policy However, Romanian legislation foresees the establishment of evaluation and certification mechanisms for professional competences acquired in other contexts than formal education.
Status of Recognition of Prior Learning	Not possible in higher education
National Qualifications Framework	Under development
Credit system in place	ECTS
Diploma Supplement	Issued to all students in the vast majority of study programmes, free of charge, in the language of instruction and/or English
National mobility benchmarks and/or targets	There are indicators relating to internationalisation and performance, aiming to increase inbound student and staff mobility. There are no benchmarks and targets for outbound mobility.
Priority regions for attracting students	EU, Non-EU countries, Middle East, Africa

SERBIA

Higher education structure – 2010



- Most common length of a Bologna cycle
- Other length of a Bologna cycle
- Programme outside the typical Bologna model
- Professional programme

ECTS

Credits according to the European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System

		regulated at national level	decided at institutional level
ALL	programmes have admission requirements	▼	▲
SOME		▽	△

SERBIA


System overview and key information

Number of students in higher education 2008/09	235 940
Most common starting age for 1st cycle students	18-19 years
Main categories of students monitored as part of social dimension policy	– Roma students – Students with disabilities – Students from families with low income and/or with a low parental education level
Number of recognised higher education institutions	88
Quality Assurance Agency membership of the European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA)	No
Name of Quality Assurance Agency membership of the European Quality Assurance Register (EQAR)	No
Other National Quality Assurance Agency	National Council for Higher Education Commission for Accreditation and Quality Assurance CAQA
Lisbon Recognition Convention	
Ratification	03 April 2004
Entry into force	01 May 2004

Regulation of the Recognition of Prior Learning	No
Status of Recognition of Prior Learning	Not possible in higher education
National Qualifications Framework	Under development
Credit system in place	ECTS
Diploma Supplement	Issued to all students in the vast majority of study programmes, free of charge, in the language of instruction and/or English
National mobility benchmarks and/or targets	No
Priority regions for attracting students	Non-EU European Countries, Middle East, Latin America, Africa, Asia

RUSSIA

Higher education structure – 2010



- Most common length of a Bologna cycle
- Other length of a Bologna cycle
- Programme outside the typical Bologna model
- Professional programme

ECTS

Credits according to the European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System

		regulated at national level	decided at institutional level
ALL	programmes have admission requirements	▼	▲
SOME		▽	△

RUSSIA


System overview and key information

Number of students in higher education 2008/09	7 696 359
Most common starting age for 1st cycle students	17 years
Main categories of students monitored as part of social dimension policy	– Disabled people – People from the Chernobyl region – Orphans – People without citizenship – Migrants from the Commonwealth of independent states – Foreign students
Number of recognised higher education institutions	1 046
Quality Assurance Agency membership of the European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA)	NAA – National Accreditation Agency of the Russian Federation http://www.nica.ru
Name of Quality Assurance Agency membership of the European Quality Assurance Register (EQAR)	No
Other National Quality Assurance Agency	– National Accreditation Agency in the sphere of education – Main State Expert Centre on Evaluation of Education – Informational and Methodological Centre on Evaluation of Educational Institutions
Lisbon Recognition Convention	
Ratification	25 May 2000
Entry into force	01 July 2000

Regulation of the Recognition of Prior Learning	N/A
Status of Recognition of Prior Learning	Legal right
National Qualifications Framework	Under development
Credit system in place	ECTS
Diploma Supplement	Partial and gradual introduction free of charge and with a fee in the language of instruction and/or English
National mobility benchmarks and/or targets	No
Priority regions for attracting students	EU, non-EU European countries, USA/Canada

SWEDEN

Higher education structure – 2010



- Most common length of a Bologna cycle
- Other length of a Bologna cycle
- Programme outside the typical Bologna model
- Professional programme

ECTS
Credits according to the European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System

		regulated at national level	decided at institutional level
ALL	programmes have admission requirements	▼	▲
SOME		▽	△

SWEDEN


System overview and key information

Number of students in higher education 2008/09	348 000
Most common starting age for 1st cycle students	22 years
Main categories of students monitored as part of social dimension policy	Socio-economic status
Number of recognised higher education institutions	49
Quality Assurance Agency membership of the European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA)	National Agency for Higher Education (NAHE) http://english.hsv.se/
Name of Quality Assurance Agency membership of the European Quality Assurance Register (EQAR)	No
Other National Quality Assurance Agency	No
Lisbon Recognition Convention	
Ratification	28 September 2001
Entry into force	01 November 2001

Regulation of the Recognition of Prior Learning	Higher education Ordinance, section 7
Status of Recognition of Prior Learning	Legal right
National Qualifications Framework	Under development
Credit system in place	National system
Diploma Supplement	Issued to all students, in the vast majority of study programmes, free of charge in English
National mobility benchmarks and/or targets	No
Priority regions for attracting students	All countries/regions are of equal priority.

SLOVENIA

Higher education structure – 2010



- Most common length of a Bologna cycle
- Other length of a Bologna cycle
- Programme outside the typical Bologna model
- Professional programme

ECTS

Credits according to the European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System

		regulated at national level	decided at institutional level
ALL	programmes have admission requirements	▼	▲
SOME		▽	△

SLOVENIA


System overview and key information

Number of students in higher education 2008/09	95 933
Most common starting age for 1st cycle students	19 years
Main categories of students monitored as part of social dimension policy	– Gender – Students from underdeveloped regions – Roma students – Students with special needs
Number of recognised higher education institutions	32
Quality Assurance Agency membership of the European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA)	No
Name of Quality Assurance Agency membership of the European Quality Assurance Register (EQAR)	No
Other National Quality Assurance Agency	Slovenian Quality Assurance Agency in Higher Education (SQAA), operational from March 2010
Lisbon Recognition Convention	
Ratification	21 July 1999
Entry into force	01 September 1999

Regulation of the Recognition of Prior Learning	Criteria for accreditation of higher education institutions and study programmes, adopted by the Council for Higher Education
Status of Recognition of Prior Learning	Legal right
National Qualifications Framework	Under development
Credit system in place	ECTS
Diploma Supplement	Issued to all students, free of charge, in the language of instruction and/or more official EU languages
National mobility benchmarks &/or targets	No
Priority regions for attracting students	Western Balkans and Euro-Mediterranean region

SLOVAKIA

Higher education structure – 2010



- Most common length of a Bologna cycle
- Other length of a Bologna cycle
- Programme outside the typical Bologna model
- Professional programme

ECTS
Credits according to the European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System

		regulated at national level	decided at institutional level
ALL	programmes have admission requirements	▼	▲
SOME		▽	△

SLOVAKIA


System overview and key information

Number of students in higher education 2008/09	230 519
Most common starting age for 1st cycle students	19-20 years
Main categories of students monitored as part of social dimension policy	No
Number of recognised higher education institutions	33
Quality Assurance Agency membership of the European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA)	Accreditation Commission of the Slovak Republic http://www.akredkom.sk/
Name of Quality Assurance Agency membership of the European Quality Assurance Register (EQAR)	No
Other National Quality Assurance Agency	No
Lisbon Recognition Convention	
Ratification	13 July 1999
Entry into force	01 September 1999

Regulation of the Recognition of Prior Learning	Act no. 568/2009 on lifelong learning
Status of Recognition of Prior Learning	Under development
National Qualifications Framework	Under development
Credit system in place	ECTS
Diploma Supplement	Issued to all students, free of charge, in the language of instruction and English
National mobility benchmarks &/or targets	Annual increase in student mobility under the Erasmus programme by 5 percent
Priority regions for attracting students	N/A

TURKEY

Higher education structure – 2010



- Most common length of a Bologna cycle
- Other length of a Bologna cycle
- Programme outside the typical Bologna model
- Professional programme

ECTS

Credits according to the European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System

		regulated at national level	decided at institutional level
ALL	programmes have admission requirements	▼	▲
SOME		▽	△

TURKEY


System overview and key information

Number of students in higher education 2008/09	2 924 281
Most common starting age for 1st cycle students	17-18 years
Main categories of students monitored as part of social dimension policy	No
Number of recognised higher education institutions	139
Quality Assurance Agency membership of the European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA)	Commission for Academic Assessment and Quality Improvement in Higher Education (YODEK) (associate member) http://www.yodek.org.tr/
Name of Quality Assurance Agency membership of the European Quality Assurance Register (EQAR)	No
Other National Quality Assurance Agency	Association for Evaluation and Accreditation of Engineering Programmes (MUDEK) (www.mudek.org.tr)
Lisbon Recognition Convention	
Ratification	8 January 2007
Entry into force	01 March 2007

Regulation of the Recognition of Prior Learning	No legislation/regulation/policy
Status of Recognition of Prior Learning	No legislation
National Qualifications Framework	Approved by the Council of Higher Education on 21 January 2010.
Credit system in place	National system + ECTS
Diploma Supplement	Issued to all students, on request and free of charge, in the language of instruction and in English, German or French
National mobility benchmarks &/or targets	No
Priority regions for attracting students	EU, USA/Canada for outgoing students. Countries with Turkic languages, Middle Eastern countries and all neighbouring countries for incoming students.

UKRAINE

Higher education structure – 2010



- Most common length of a Bologna cycle
- Other length of a Bologna cycle
- Programme outside the typical Bologna model
- Professional programme

ECTS
Credits according to the European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System

		regulated at national level	decided at institutional level
ALL	programmes have admission requirements	▼	▲
SOME		▽	△

UKRAINE


System overview and key information

Number of students in higher education 2008/09	2 763 900
Most common starting age for 1st cycle students	17 years
Main categories of students monitored as part of social dimension policy	– Students with disabilities – Orphans – Socially disadvantaged people – Students from rural areas
Number of recognised higher education institutions	881
Quality Assurance Agency membership of the European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA)	No
Name of Quality Assurance Agency membership of the European Quality Assurance Register (EQAR)	No
Other National Quality Assurance Agency	– Department for Licensing, Accreditation and Nostrification of the Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine – State Accreditation Commission – State Inspectorate of HEIs – Higher (Supreme) Attestation Board
Lisbon Recognition Convention	
Ratification	25 May 2003
Entry into force	01 July 2003

Regulation of the Recognition of Prior Learning	N/A
Status of Recognition of Prior Learning	Not possible
National Qualifications Framework	Under development
Credit system in place	ECTS
Diploma Supplement	Not yet introduced
National mobility benchmarks and/or targets	No
Priority regions for attracting students	No

THE UNITED KINGDOM – ENGLAND, WALES AND NORTHERN IRELAND

Higher education structure – 2010



- Most common length of a Bologna cycle
- Other length of a Bologna cycle
- Programme outside the typical Bologna model
- Professional programme

ECTS

Credits according to the European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System

		regulated at national level	decided at institutional level
ALL	programmes have admission requirements	▼	▲
SOME		▽	△

THE UNITED KINGDOM – ENGLAND, WALES AND NORTHERN IRELAND


System overview and key information

Number of students in higher education 2008/09	2 010 000
Most common starting age for 1st cycle students	18 years
Main categories of students monitored as part of social dimension policy	– Socio-economic class – Young people in receipt of Free School Meals (FSM) as a proxy measure for low income – Geography - low participation neighbourhoods – Gender – Ethnicity – Disability – Type of School attended
Number of recognised higher education institutions	144
Quality Assurance Agency membership of the European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA)	Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education http://www.qaa.ac.uk/
Name of Quality Assurance Agency membership of the European Quality Assurance Register (EQAR)	No
Other National Quality Assurance Agency	No
Lisbon Recognition Convention	
Ratification	23 May 2003
Entry into force	01 July 2003

Regulation of the Recognition of Prior Learning	There is no legislation that regulates recognition of prior learning in England, Wales and Northern Ireland, but there is a long tradition of recognition of prior learning and encouraging mature students to participate in higher education. Recognition of prior learning is a matter for individual higher education institutions but the Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education (QAA) has published detailed guidelines to support institutions. www.qaa.ac.uk/academicinfrastructure/apl/APL.pdf
Status of Recognition of Prior Learning	Permitted, but not a right
National Qualifications Framework	Completed
Credit system in place	National system and ECTS
Diploma Supplement	Partial and gradual introduction, free of charge and issued in English. Some higher education institutions in Wales issue the DS in the Welsh language upon request.
National mobility benchmarks and/or targets	Outbound: no target Inbound: 70 000 additional international students by 2011 compared to 2006.
Priority regions for attracting students	USA/Canada, Middle East, Latin America, Africa, Asia

THE UNITED KINGDOM – SCOTLAND

Higher education structure – 2010



- Most common length of a Bologna cycle
- Other length of a Bologna cycle
- Programme outside the typical Bologna model
- Professional programme

ECTS
Credits according to the European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System

		regulated at national level	decided at institutional level
ALL	programmes have admission requirements	▼	▲
SOME		▽	△


THE UNITED KINGDOM – SCOTLAND

System overview and key information

Number of students in higher education 2008/09	224 855
Most common starting age for 1st cycle students	18 years
Main categories of students monitored as part of social dimension policy	– Socio-economically disadvantaged – Gender – Ethnicity – Disability – Prior participation in higher education of a family member – Age
Number of recognised higher education institutions	20
Quality Assurance Agency membership of the European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA)	Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education (UK) QAA Scotland http://www.qaa.ac.uk/
Name of Quality Assurance Agency membership of the European Quality Assurance Register (EQAR)	No
Other National Quality Assurance Agency	No
Lisbon Recognition Convention	
Ratification	23 May 2003
Entry into force	01 July 2003

Regulation of the Recognition of Prior Learning	There is no legislation, but the Scottish Curriculum and Qualifications Framework Guidelines for RPL apply to all mainstream educational provision www.scqf.org.uk/Resources/Downloads.aspx (section titled SCQF Handbook Volume 2). The Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education (QAA) has published detailed guidelines to support institutions: www.qaa.ac.uk/academicinfrastructure/apl/APL.pdf
Status of Recognition of Prior Learning	Permitted, but not a right
National Qualifications Framework	Completed
Credit system in place	National system and ECTS
Diploma Supplement	Issued in the vast majority of study programmes, free of charge and solely in English
National mobility benchmarks and/or targets	No numerical targets have been set, but the shared aim of all stakeholders is to increase significantly outward and inbound mobility of students and staff.
Priority regions for attracting students	EU, non-EU European countries, USA/Canada, Middle East, Africa, Asia

Higher education structure – 2010



- Most common length of a Bologna cycle
- Other length of a Bologna cycle
- Programme outside the typical Bologna model
- Professional programme

ECTS
Credits according to the European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System

		regulated at national level	decided at institutional level
ALL	programmes have admission requirements	▼	▲
SOME		▽	△

HOLY SEE


System overview and key information

Number of students in higher education 2008/09	No exact numbers are available as institutions are located in more than 20 European countries
Most common starting age for 1st cycle students	19 years
Main categories of students monitored as part of social dimension policy	No
Number of recognised higher education institutions	Approx. 500
Quality Assurance Agency membership of the European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA)	Agency for the Evaluation and Promotion of Quality in Ecclesiastical Faculties (AVERPO): associate member
Name of Quality Assurance Agency membership of the European Quality Assurance Register (EQAR)	No
Other National Quality Assurance Agency	No
Lisbon Recognition Convention	
Ratification	28 February 2001
Entry into force	01 April 2001

Regulation of the Recognition of Prior Learning	Apostolic Constitution Sapientia Christiana, Rome, 15 April 1979
Status of Recognition of Prior Learning	Permitted, but not a right
National Qualifications Framework	Under development
Credit system in place	ECTS
Diploma Supplement	Partial and gradual introduction; issued free of charge in the language of instruction and/or more official EU languages (usually in English)
National mobility benchmarks &/or targets	No
Priority regions for attracting students	All countries/regions are of equal priority.

GLOSSARY

Country codes



AD	Andorra	BG	Bulgaria	FI	Finland
AL	Albania	CH	Switzerland	FR	France
AM	Armenia	CY	Cyprus	GE	Georgia
AT	Austria	CZ	Czech Republic	HR	Croatia
AZ	Azerbaijan	DE	Germany	HU	Hungary
BA	Bosnia and Herzegovina	DK	Denmark	IE	Ireland
BE de	Belgium – German-speaking Community	EE	Estonia	IS	Iceland
BE fr	Belgium – French Community	EL	Greece	IT	Italy
BE nl	Belgium – Flemish Community	ES	Spain	LI	Liechtenstein

LT	Lithuania	NO	Norway	TR	Turkey
LU	Luxembourg	PL	Poland	UA	Ukraine
LV	Latvia	PT	Portugal	UK-ENG	United Kingdom – England
MD	Moldova	RO	Romania	UK-NIR	United Kingdom – Northern Ireland
ME	Montenegro	RS	Serbia	UK-SCT	United Kingdom – Scotland
MK*	Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	RU	Russia	UK-WLS	United Kingdom – Wales
MT	Malta	SI	Slovenia	VA	Holy See
NL	Netherlands	SK	Slovakia		

* ISO code 3166. Provisional code which does not prejudice in any way the definitive nomenclature for this country, which will be agreed following the conclusion of negotiations currently taking place under the auspices of the United Nations (http://www.iso.org/iso/country_codes/iso_3166_code_lists.htm)

Definitions

Bologna Follow-up Group (BFUG)

The Bologna Follow-Up Group consists of ministerial representatives of all 46 Bologna signatory countries and the European Commission as full members. Consultative members include the Council of Europe, the European University Association (EUA), the European Students' Union (ESU), the European Association of Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA), the European Association of Institutions in Higher Education (EURASHE), the UNESCO European Centre for Higher Education (UNESCO-CEPES), Business Europe (formerly known as UNICE) and Education International. The BFUG is convened at least twice a year and is chaired by the EU Presidency, with the host country of the next (biennial) conference of education ministers as vice-chair. The role of the BFUG is to follow up on the recommendations made at the ministerial conferences and on the general implementation of all issues

covered in the Ministerial Communiqués. In addition, the BFUG produces a work programme which includes a series of conferences and other activities related to the Bologna process. A Board, also chaired by the EU Presidency with the next host country as vice-chair, prepares the agendas for the BFUG and monitors progress between BFUG meetings. Overall follow-up is supported by a Secretariat which is provided by the country/countries hosting the following ministerial conference. For further information, visit <http://www.ond.vlaanderen.be/hogeronderwijs/Bologna/>

Diploma Supplement (DS)

A document attached to a higher education diploma that aims to improve international transparency and facilitate academic and professional recognition of qualifications. Developed by the European Commission, the Council of Europe and UNESCO-CEPES, the DS consists of eight sections ⁽¹⁾ describing in a widely spoken European language the nature, level, context, content and status of the studies that were pursued and successfully completed. The DS provides additional information on the national higher education system concerned, so that the qualification is considered in relation to its own educational context.

European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA)

The association of quality assurance agencies in the European Higher Education Area was set up in 2000. It aims to disseminate information, experiences and good practices in the field of quality assurance in higher education. Membership of the association is open to quality assurance agencies in the signatory states of the Bologna declaration. Full

membership of ENQA represents recognition that an agency complies with the European Standards and Guidelines for quality assurance in higher education. Compliance with these standards is checked every five years through an independent review. For more information, visit <http://www.enqa.eu/about.lasso>

European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System (ECTS)

A student-centred credit system based on the student workload required to achieve specified learning outcomes. ESTC was originally set up in 1989 in order to facilitate the recognition of periods of study abroad. More recently, it has been developing into an accumulation system to be implemented in all programmes at institutional, regional, national and European levels. Further information can be obtained from the ECTS Users Guide published by the European Commission. http://ec.europa.eu/education/lifelong-learning-policy/doc48_en.htm

European Qualifications Framework (EQF)

The European Qualifications Framework is a common European reference framework which enables European countries to link their qualifications systems to one another. It was adopted by the European Parliament and Council on 23 April 2008. The EQF uses eight reference levels based on learning outcomes that are defined in terms of knowledge, skills and competences. It shifts the focus from input (lengths of a learning experience, type of institution) to what a person holding a particular qualification actually knows and is able to do. For further information, see http://ec.europa.eu/education/lifelong-learning-policy/doc44_en.htm#doc

⁽¹⁾ Specifically these sections cover information on the holder of the qualification, the identity of the qualification, its level, its function, the contents and results gained, additional information, the national higher education system concerned and the certification of the DS.

European Quality Assurance Register for Higher Education (EQAR)

The Register aims at increasing transparency of quality assurance in higher education across Europe. It has been founded in 2008 by the European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA), the European Students' Union (ESU), the European University Association and the European Association of Institutions in Higher Education (EURASHE). EQAR publishes and manages a list of quality assurance agencies that substantially comply with the European Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance (ESG) to provide clear and reliable information on quality assurance agencies operating in Europe. For more information, visit <http://www.eqar.eu/>

Framework for Qualifications of the European Higher Education Area (FQ-EHEA)

An 'overarching' framework for the entire European Higher Education Area that clarifies and explains the relationship between the national higher education frameworks of qualifications that are now being developed in the Bologna Process and the qualifications that they cover. It was adopted at the 2005 Conference of European ministers responsible for higher education in Bergen. The FQ-EHEA has descriptors for each of the three cycles of qualifications and includes ECTS credit ranges for the first two cycles.

International Standard Classification of Education (ISCED 1997)

The International Standard Classification of Education (ISCED) was designed by UNESCO in the 1970s and aims to offer a set of criteria suitable for compiling statistics on education internationally. The current version is from 1997 and a new version will be developed for 2011.

ISCED 97 levels covered by the publication:

- **ISCED 5: Tertiary education (first stage)**

Entry to these programmes normally requires the successful completion of ISCED levels 3 or 4. ISCED level 5 includes tertiary programmes with an academic orientation which are largely theoretically based (ISCED 5A) and tertiary programmes with an occupational orientation which are typically shorter than the academic programmes and designed for entry to the employment market (ISCED 5B). Only ISCED 5A programmes give access to doctoral programmes at ISCED level 6.

- **ISCED 6: Tertiary education (second stage)**

This level is reserved for tertiary programmes that lead directly to the award of an advanced research qualification (e.g. a doctorate).

Lisbon Recognition Convention

The Convention on the Recognition of Qualifications concerning Higher Education in the European Region was developed by the Council of Europe and UNESCO and adopted in 1997 in Lisbon. It aims to ensure that holders of a qualification from one European country have that qualification recognised in another. For more information, visit http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/highereducation/Recognition/LRC_en.asp

National Qualifications Framework (higher education)

The single description, at national level or a particular level of an education system, which clarifies and explains the relationship between higher education qualifications. National qualifications frameworks are internationally understood and clearly describe all qualifications and other learning achievements in higher education and relate them coherently to each other.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

A. EDUCATION, AUDIOVISUAL AND CULTURE EXECUTIVE AGENCY P9 EURYDICE

Avenue du Bourget 1 (BOU2)
B-1140 Brussels
(<http://www.eurydice.org>)

Managing editor

Arlette Delhaxhe

Authors

David Crosier (coordinator), Simon Dalferth, Teodora Parveva

Layout and graphics

Patrice Brel

Production coordinator

Gisèle De Le

B. EURYDICE NATIONAL UNITS

BELGIQUE / BELGIË

Unité francophone d'Eurydice
Ministère de la Communauté française
Direction des Relations internationales
Boulevard Léopold II, 44 – Bureau 6A/002
1080 Bruxelles
Contribution of the Unit: Joint responsibility;
BFUG experts: Chantal Kaufmann, Kevin Guillaume (*Direction générale de l'enseignement non obligatoire et de la recherche scientifique*)

Eurydice Vlaanderen / Afdeling Internationale Relaties
Ministerie Onderwijs
Hendrik Consciencegebouw 7C10
Koning Albert II – laan 15
1210 Brussel
Contribution of the Unit: expert: Erwin Malfroy (Staff member of the Division for Higher Education, Flemish Ministry of Education and Training);
BFUG expert: Magalie Soenen

Eurydice-Informationsstelle der Deutschsprachigen Gemeinschaft
Agentur für Europäische Bildungsprogramme VoG
Postfach 72
4700 Eupen
Contribution of the Unit: Johanna Schröder

BULGARIA

Eurydice Unit
European Integration and International Organisations Division
European Integration and International Cooperation Department
Ministry of Education and Science
15, Graf Ignatiev Str.
1000 Sofia
Contribution of the Unit: Vanya Tividosheva;
BFUG expert: Ivana Radonova

ČESKÁ REPUBLIKA

Eurydice Unit
Institute for Information on Education
Senovážné nám. 26
P.O. Box č.1
110 06 Praha 1
Contribution of the Unit: Joint responsibility; BFUG expert: Věra Šťastná

DANMARK

Eurydice Unit
Danish Agency for International Education
Fiolstræde 44
1171 København K
Contribution of the Unit: Joint responsibility

DEUTSCHLAND

Eurydice-Informationsstelle des Bundes
EU-Büro des Bundesministeriums für Bildung und Forschung
(BMBF) / PT-DLR
Carnotstr. 5
10587 Berlin

Eurydice-Informationsstelle der Länder im Sekretariat der
Kultusministerkonferenz
Lennéstrasse 6
53113 Bonn
Contribution of the Unit: Brigitte Lohmar;
BFUG expert: Birger Hendricks

EESTI

Eurydice Unit
SA Archimedes
Koidula 13A
10125 Tallinn
Contribution of the Unit: Heli Aru (BFUG expert, Adviser,
Ministry of Education and Research)

ÉIRE / IRELAND

Eurydice Unit
Department of Education and Science
International Section
Marlborough Street
Dublin 1
Contribution of the Unit: Laura Byrne (expert);
BFUG expert: Laura Casey

ELLÁDA

Eurydice Unit
Ministry of Education, Lifelong Learning and Religious Affairs
Directorate for European Union Affairs
Section C 'Eurydice'
Andrea Papandreou Str. 37 (Office 2168)
15180 Maroussi (Attiki)
Contribution of the Unit: Athina Plessa-Papadaki (Director of
the Directorate for European Union Affairs), Nikolaos
Sklavenitis (Eurydice Unit)

ESPAÑA

Unidad Española de Eurydice
Instituto de Formación del Profesorado, Investigación e
Innovación Educativa (IFIIE)
Ministerio de Educación
Gobierno de España
c/General Oraa 55
28006 Madrid
Contribution of the Unit: experts: Rafael Bonete Perales,
José Ginés-Mora Ruiz and Laureano González Vega

FRANCE

Unité française d'Eurydice
Ministère de l'Éducation nationale, de l'Enseignement
supérieur et de la Recherche
Direction de l'évaluation, de la prospective et de la
performance
Mission aux relations européennes et internationales
61-65, rue Dutot
75732 Paris Cedex 15
Contribution of the Unit: Thierry Damour; expert: Hélène
Bessières;
BFUG expert: Hélène Lagier

ÍSLAND

Eurydice Unit
Ministry of Education, Science and Culture
Office of Evaluation and Analysis
Sölvhólgötu 4
150 Reykjavík
Contribution of the Unit: Margrét Harðardóttir;
BFUG expert: Einar Hreinsson

ITALIA

Unità italiana di Eurydice
Agenzia Nazionale per lo Sviluppo dell'Autonomia Scolastica
(ex INDIRE)
Via Buonarroti 10
50122 Firenze
Contribution of the Unit: Simona Baggiani, Erika Bartolini;
expert: Carlo Finocchietti (*Centro Informazione Mobilità
Equivalenze Accademiche* – CIMEA)

KYPROS

Eurydice Unit
Ministry of Education and Culture
Kimonos and Thoukydidou
1434 Nicosia
Contribution of the Unit: Christiana Haperi; experts:
Efsthios Michael, Despina Martidou-Forcier, Erato Ioannou-
Moustaka

LATVIJA

Eurydice Unit
Valsts izglītības attīstības aģentūra
State Education Development Agency
Valņu street 1
1050 Riga
Contribution of the Unit: Joint responsibility;
expert: Andrejs Rauhvargers (Council of Rectors of Latvia
and the Bologna Follow-up group Representative)

LIECHTENSTEIN

Informationsstelle Eurydice
Schulamt
Austrasse 79
9490 Vaduz
Contribution of the Unit: Eva-Maria Schädler;
experts: Helmut Konrad (Head of the Higher Education
Department, Schulamt, Vaduz); Christoph Jenny (Bologna
Expert, University of Applied Sciences in Liechtenstein,
Vaduz)

LIETUVA

Eurydice Unit
National Agency for School Evaluation
A. Volano g. 2/7
01516 Vilnius
Contribution of the Unit: Vilma Kardauskienė;
experts: Marius Zalieckas, Rimvydas Labanauskis

LUXEMBOURG

Unité d'Eurydice
Ministère de l'Éducation nationale et de la Formation
professionnelle (MENFP)
29, Rue Aldringen
2926 Luxembourg
Contribution of the Unit: Germain Dondelinger (BFUG expert)

MAGYARORSZÁG

Eurydice Unit
Ministry of Education and Culture
Szalay u. 10-14
1055 Budapest

Contribution of the Unit: Krisztina Olasz (coordinator); expert: Csilla Stéger; BFUG expert: János Csirik

MALTA

Eurydice Unit
Directorate for Quality and Standards in Education
Ministry of Education, Culture, Youth and Sport
Great Siege Rd.
Floriana VLT 2000

Contribution of the Unit: Raymond Camilleri (coordination); experts: Jacques Sciberras (CEO National Commission for Higher Education), Veronica Grech (Registrar University of Malta), James Calleja (CEO Malta Qualifications Council)

NEDERLAND

Eurydice Nederland
Ministerie van Onderwijs, Cultuur en Wetenschap
Directie Internationaal Beleid
IPC 2300 / Kamer 08.047
Postbus 16375
2500 BJ Den Haag

Contribution of the Unit: Raymond van der Ree; expert: Marlies Leegwater (BFUG expert, Department for Higher Education, Ministry of Education, Culture and Science)

NORGE

Eurydice Unit
Ministry of Education and Research
Department of Policy Analysis, Lifelong Learning and International Affairs
Akersgaten 44
0032 Oslo

Contribution of the Unit: Joint responsibility; BFUG expert: Tone Flood Strøm

ÖSTERREICH

Eurydice-Informationsstelle
Bundesministerium für Unterricht, Kunst und Kultur
Ref. I/6b
Minoritenplatz 5
1014 Wien

Contribution of the Unit: Joint responsibility; BFUG expert: Gottfried Bacher

POLSKA

Eurydice Unit
Foundation for the Development of the Education System
Mokotowska 43
00-551 Warsaw

Contribution of the Unit: Anna Smoczynska (coordination), Mariusz Luterek (expert), Maria Bołtrusko and Tomasz Saryusz-Wolski (consultation)

PORTUGAL

Unidade Portuguesa da Rede Eurydice (UPRE)
Ministério da Educação
Gabinete de Estatística e Planeamento da Educação (GEPE)
Av. 24 de Julho, 134 – 4.º
1399-54 Lisboa

Contribution of the Unit: Joint responsibility; expert: Directorate General for Higher Education (DGES) and NARIC Portugal; BFUG expert: Sebastião Foyo de Azevedo

ROMÂNIA

Eurydice Unit
National Agency for Community Programmes in the Field of Education and Vocational Training
Calea Serban Voda, no. 133, 3rd floor
Sector 4
040205 Bucharest

Contribution of the Unit: Veronica - Gabriela Chirea in cooperation with experts from the Ministry of Education, Research, Youth and Sports: Ion Ciuca, Ovidiu Solonar and Camelia Sturza (as a member of BFUG)

SLOVENIJA

Eurydice Unit
Ministry of Education and Sport
Department for Development of Education (ODE)
Masarykova 16/V
1000 Ljubljana

Contribution of the Unit: Tatjana Plevnik, Darinka Vrečko, Janja Komljenovič

SLOVENSKÁ REPUBLIKA

Eurydice Unit
Slovak Academic Association for International Cooperation
Svoradova 1
811 03 Bratislava

Contribution of the Unit: Joint responsibility with experts from the Ministry of Education of the SR Jaroslav Juriga, Jozef Maculak

SUOMI / FINLAND

Eurydice Finland
Finnish National Board of Education
P.O. Box 380
00531 Helsinki

Contribution of the Unit: Joint responsibility; BFUG expert: Maija Innola

SVERIGE

Eurydice Unit
Vocational Training & Adult Education Unit
International Programme Office for Education and Training
Kungsbrogatan 3A
Box 22007
104 22 Stockholm

Contribution of the Unit: Joint responsibility; BFUG expert: Åsa Petri

TÜRKİYE

Eurydice Unit Türkiye
MEB, Strateji Geliştirme Başkanlığı (SGB)
Eurydice Türkiye Birimi, Merkez Bina 4. Kat
B-Blok Bakanlıklar
06648 Ankara

Contribution of the Unit: Osman Yıldırım Ugur, Bilal Aday, Dilek Güleçyüz

UNITED KINGDOM

Eurydice Unit for England, Wales and Northern Ireland
National Foundation for Educational Research (NFER)
The Mere, Upton Park
Slough SL1 2DQ
Contribution of the Unit: Sigrid Boyd

Eurydice Unit Scotland
International Team
Schools Directorate
2B South
Victoria Quay
Edinburgh
EH6 6QQ

Contribution of the Unit: Gerard Madill (national expert contracted by the National Unit)

OTHER COUNTRIES

Albania

Ministry of Education & Science
Rruga e Durrësit, Nr 23, Tirana
Contribution: Aleksandër Xhuvani, Arjan Xhelaj

Andorra

Ministry of Higher Education and Research
C/Prada Casadet, s/n Baixos
Contribution: Enric Garcia Lopez, Mar Martinez, Jordi Llobart

Armenia

Ministry of Education and Science
0010, Main avenue, Government House 3, Yerevan
Contribution: Mher Melik-Bakhshyan

Azerbaijan

Ministry of Education of Azerbaijan Republic
prosp. Katai 49, Baku 370008
Contribution: Azad Akhundov

Bosnia and Herzegovina

Ministry of Civil Affairs of B&H, Education Sector
Vilsonovo setaliste 10, 71000 Sarajevo
Contribution: Aida Durić, Sanela Turković

Croatia

Ministry of Science, Education and Sports
Donje Svetice 38, HR-10000 Zagreb
Contribution: Luka Juros

Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia

Ministry of Education and Science
9 Dimitrie Cuposki Street. 9, MK-1000 Skopje
Contribution: Marija Krakutovska, Snezana Bilic-Sotiroska

Georgia

Ministry of Education and Science in Georgia
52 Dimitri Uznadze Str, Tbilisi 0102
Contribution: Lela Maisuradze, Nino Svanadze

Holy See

Congregation for Catholic Education, University Office
Città del Vaticano,
I-00120 Roma
Contribution: Padre Friedrich Bechina

Moldova

Ministry of Education and Youth
1 Piața Marii Adunări Naționale
2033 Chișinău
Contribution: Galina Bulat, Ludmila Pavlov and Elena Petrov

Montenegro

Ministry of Education and Science of Montenegro
Rimski trg bb, 8100 Podgorica
Contribution: Biljana Misovic

Russian Federation

Ministry of Education of the Russian Federation
Mikluto-Maklaja St. 6 r.217
Moscow 117198
Contribution: Victor Chistokhvalov

Serbia

Ministry of Education and Sports of the Republic of Serbia
Nemanjina 22-26, 11000 Belgrade
Contribution: Radivoje Mitrovic

Switzerland

State Secretariat for Education and Research
Hallwylstrasse 4
CH-3003 Bern
Contribution: François Grandjean

Ukraine

Ministry of Education and Science
10, prosp. Peremogy
Kyiv 01135
Contribution: Ivan Babyn, Taras Finikov

OTHER

Eurostat (Unit Education and Culture)
Bâtiment Joseph Bech,
5 Rue Alphonse Weicker,
L-2721 Luxembourg
Contribution: Fernando Reis

European Commission
Directorate-General for Education and Culture
Avenue du Bourget 1 (MADO)
B-1140 Brussels
Contribution: Barbara Nolan, Christian Tauch, Sophia Eriksson Waterschoot

Bologna Secretariat
H. Conscience Building
Koning Albert II-laan 15
B-1210 Brussels
Contribution: Marlies Leegwater, Cornelia Racké

Focus on Higher Education in Europe 2010: The Impact of the Bologna Process

Eurydice

Brussels: Eurydice

2010 – 158 p.

ISBN 978-92-9201-086-7

DOI 10.2797/38158

Descriptors: higher education, Bologna Process, bachelor degree studies, master degree studies, doctorate, Diploma Supplement, European Credit Transfer System, joint study programme, higher education institution, quality assurance, branch of education, duration of studies, admission procedure, disadvantaged background, educational reform, evaluation of an educational institution, lifelong learning, ENQA, student mobility, incentive, comparative analysis, European Union, Albania, Andorra, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Georgia, Iceland, Liechtenstein, FYROM, Montenegro, Norway, Republic of Moldova, Russian Federation, Serbia, Switzerland, Turkey, Ukraine, Vatican City State

