



BOLOGNA PROCESS STOCKTAKING

REPORT FROM A WORKING GROUP APPOINTED BY THE BOLOGNA FOLLOW-UP GROUP
TO THE CONFERENCE OF EUROPEAN MINISTERS RESPONSIBLE FOR HIGHER EDUCATION,
BERGEN, 19-20 MAY 2005

REPORT



UTDANNINGS- OG
FORSKNINGSDEPARTEMENTET
Norwegian Ministry of Education and Research



Education and Culture

Socrates

This project has been funded with support from the European Commission within the framework of the Socrates Programme.

Table of contents

| | |
|---|----|
| Executive Summary | 5 |
| Acknowledgements | 8 |
| Chapter 1 | |
| The Bologna Process and Stocktaking | 9 |
| Chapter 2 | |
| Criteria and Benchmarks for Stocktaking | 15 |
| Chapter 3 | |
| Analysis of Results | 25 |
| Chapter 4 | |
| Conclusions and Recommendations | 42 |
| Appendix 1 | |
| Terms of Reference for the Stocktaking..... | 53 |
| Appendix 2 | |
| Consolidated List of Questions | 57 |
| Annex | |
| Country Scorecards | 63 |

Executive Summary

Context of the stocktaking report

At the Berlin Ministerial Meeting in September 2003, Ministers with responsibility for higher education requested the Bologna Follow-up Group to undertake a stocktaking exercise on the progress made in three priority action lines – *quality assurance, the two-cycle degree system and recognition of degrees and periods of study*. They also requested the group to identify corrective action where appropriate.

In March 2004, the Bologna Follow-up Group established a working group to carry out the stocktaking exercise. The working group has prepared this report for the May 2005 Ministerial Meeting in Bergen.

Findings of the stocktaking exercise: good news for the Bologna Process

This report concludes that there is good news for the countries involved in the Bologna Process: the collective and voluntary inter-governmental process is a success.

Common goals are being pursued and targets are being met by the great majority of countries. There is also good news for higher education institutions, who are working hard to implement the Bologna actions, and who can now see their achievements made visible. Finally, there is good news for students, because the Bologna Process is creating a better and more open world of learning, with enhanced mobility, transparency, transfer and recognition of qualifications.

Recommendations of the Working Group on Stocktaking

The Working Group on Stocktaking believes that additional mechanisms should be put in place to strengthen further the progress on the three action lines included in the stocktaking exercise, and makes the following five recommendations:

1. Initiate a process of formal engagement with employer organisations at national and European level
2. Establish a working group to identify the key issues associated with equitable access, and to develop possible benchmarks to measure action in this area
3. Each participating country should prepare an action plan to improve the quality of the process associated with recognition of foreign qualifications
4. Develop support mechanisms to assist participating countries in implementing the Bologna Process
5. Continue the stocktaking exercise, in collaboration with the Bologna Follow-up Group and with participating countries.

Methodology used in the stocktaking

This report presents the *Bologna Scorecard*, which the working group developed as a way of giving a “big picture” overview of progress on the three priority action lines. The scorecard is based on objective criteria and benchmarks, and it is a good way to show collective achievement of the targets set by the Ministers in Berlin. It also provides a useful set of baseline data against which progress can continue to be measured in the future. The scorecard for each country is intended as a progress chart, not as an absolute measurement. It is not designed to make comparisons between countries.

The Working Group on Stocktaking is confident that this report will assist Ministers in their deliberations in Bergen and will contribute to the further development of a collaborative model of stocktaking for the future.

Content of this report

Chapter 1 sets the context of the stocktaking exercise, and describes how the relevant stakeholders were involved in the process.

Chapter 2 explains the ten criteria and the colour-coded benchmarks that were used to determine the level of progress made by participating countries on the three priority action lines.

Chapter 3 analyses the results for each of the criteria and indicates the areas where progress has been especially strong or weak.

Chapter 4 reviews the outcomes of the stocktaking exercise, and identifies a series of recommendations that will further strengthen the implementation of the Bologna Process.

The terms of reference of the working group and a list of the data sources are included in Appendix A and Appendix B. The Annex to the report includes the scorecards for each of the participating countries.

Acknowledgements

This work was made possible as a result of financial support from the European Commission through the Socrates Programme. Thankfully, their support was not only financial, but was evident in their willingness to facilitate analysis of data from the 'non-Socrates' countries by EURYDICE. In addition, the Council of Europe generously supported the participation of representatives from Croatia and the Russian Federation in the working group meetings. The working group would like to pay particular tribute to Patricia Wastiau-Schlüter, Head of Unit, EURYDICE European Unit who not only endured 'constant adjustments' to their questionnaire at our behest, but who provided invaluable assistance in the preparation of this exercise. Similarly, the working group was fortunate to have an expert of the calibre of Cynthia Deane, whose experience and excellence guided the emergence of the objective criteria.

As chair of the Working Group on Stocktaking, I would like to pay tribute to my colleagues on the group whose contributions, energy and good humour made this innovative and challenging task feasible. I would also like to acknowledge the work of Sverre Rustad of the Secretariat in the Norwegian Ministry of Education and Research.

Finally, I would like to thank the Bologna Follow-up Group representatives from each of the participating countries who provided the material in the National Reports, which in turn forms the basis of the stocktaking report.

I am confident that the working group has produced a report which provides an objective statement of the level of progress made on the three priority action lines between Berlin and Bergen, and identifies some key issues to address as we move forward to 2010. I also believe that, while this first exercise has been a learning experience for all of us, the report provides a clear methodology for the next phase of stocktaking.

Ian McKenna
Chair, BFUG Working Group on Stocktaking

April 2005

Chapter 1

The Bologna Process and Stocktaking

Background to the stocktaking exercise

At the Berlin meeting in September 2003, Ministers with responsibility for higher education agreed that a stocktaking exercise should be conducted, to measure the progress made in implementing certain reforms within the European Higher Education Area. Specifically, the Berlin Communiqué stated:

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

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

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

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

The Working Group on Stocktaking

At its meeting in Dublin on 9 March 2004, the Bologna Follow-up Group established a Working Group on Stocktaking to undertake this task. The members of the working group were:

Ian McKenna (Ireland), Chair
Jan Levy (Norway)
Aleksa Bjeliš (Croatia)
Peter van der Hijden (EU Commission)
Germain Dondelinger (Luxembourg)
Marlies Leegwater (Netherlands)
Victor Chistokhvalov (Russia).

The working group meetings were also attended by Mirjana Polić Bobić, Deputy Minister for Higher Education, Croatia; Sverre Rustad, Norwegian Secretariat, and Patricia Wastiau-Schlüter, Head of Unit, EURYDICE European Unit.

The terms of reference for the working group are included in Appendix A.

The working group met five times:

21 April 2004 – Amsterdam
15 June 2004 – Dublin
26 January 2005 – Brussels
17–18 February 2005 – Dubrovnik
30–31 March 2005 – Glasgow.

In late 2004, the Norwegian Ministry of Education and Research engaged an expert, Cynthia Deane, to assist the working group in undertaking the analysis which forms the basis of this report.

Methodology adopted by the working group for the stocktaking exercise

The Working Group on Stocktaking wanted to ensure that its work would draw on a number of existing data sources, so that the completion of a questionnaire would not represent too great a burden in each country. The group spent its first two meetings determining the indicators to be used in the stocktaking process. When these were established, the working group consulted with partners including the European University Association (EUA), the National Unions of Students in Europe (ESIB) and EURYDICE to ensure that

- questions these bodies intended to raise in their surveys would not be repeated in the stocktaking;
- the partners were willing to raise the stocktaking questions with their constituents as part of their own surveys;
- where similar questions were asked, the results would be shared to build a complete picture of progress on the priority action lines.

Arising from these discussions, the working group identified the various sources of data for the stocktaking, as outlined in Appendix B.

National Reports

Along with the material prepared by EURYDICE, the National Reports represented the main source of information for the stocktaking exercise. To ensure clarity of response, a standard report template was developed, which was posted on the Bologna Process website (http://www.bologna-bergen2005.no/Docs/01BFUG/040614-B/BFUGB3_6_NReports-Template.doc). The National Reports allowed members to provide discursive or qualitative commentary on their progress on the priority action lines to complement the information in the EURYDICE report.

All forty participating countries in the Bologna Process completed their National Reports in accordance with the standard format. It is important to emphasise, however, that the working group relied upon each participating country to respond accurately to the questions in the structured report format. The group had neither the remit nor the resources to validate the content of National Reports.

EURYDICE Questionnaire

As part of the preparations for the Berlin Ministerial Meeting in 2003, EURYDICE prepared a report, *Focus on the Structure of Higher Education in Europe*. The detailed and quantitative analysis in this report was acknowledged as being particularly helpful in giving a sense of the scale of reform taking place in the European Higher Education Area. Building on the success of the 2003 report, EURYDICE had planned a similar report for the 2005 Bergen meeting.

The working group requested EURYDICE to extend its review beyond the 31 countries normally covered by its network, to provide a uniform analysis of the European Higher Education Area. With the acknowledged support of the EU Commission, EURYDICE generously agreed to undertake the analysis of data for the remaining nine participating countries, by issuing similar questionnaires to the respective Bologna Follow-up Group representatives in these countries.¹ The working group, through the Secretariat, supported the representatives in their efforts to complete the material. EURYDICE has indicated that a degree of caution must be exercised with regard to the outcome of the analysis for these participating countries, given that they were not familiar with EURYDICE verification and other procedures.

All forty participating countries of the Bologna Process completed EURYDICE questionnaires in the required format.

Other data sources

The Working Group on Stocktaking drew upon the expertise and information provided by a number of other partners as appropriate. As noted in Appendix B, ESIB agreed to pursue a number of issues with its members on behalf of the working group. However, since the ESIB survey covered only 32 countries, the scope to use its results was limited. Notwithstanding this, the results of the ESIB survey were incorporated into the initial scores issued to the relevant countries as part of the review stage.

¹ Albania, Andorra, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, the Holy See, Russia, Serbia and Montenegro, Switzerland, and "the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia".

The Council of Europe provided the information on the Lisbon Recognition Convention. In addition the EUA, which did not directly contribute to the stocktaking exercise, raised many issues in its *Trends IV* report (prepared by the EUA for its convention in Glasgow, March 2005) which complement the findings in Chapter 3 of this report. This also applies to the general conclusions of the survey conducted by ESIB.

It is important to note that with the diverse range of material presented to the Ministers at the Bergen meeting, it is quite possible that there will be differences in outcomes or emphasis. This is to be expected given the variety of data sources and the differing perspectives represented within each report. However, the working group wishes to emphasise that such minor differences should not detract from the essential messages of this report or of any other report to the Ministerial Meeting.

Procedures used in the analysis of data

It was clear to the working group that the Ministers required an objective measurement of progress in the Bologna Process, and this represented a very real challenge for the stocktaking process. The group formed the opinion that an analysis based only on the National Reports might create an unduly optimistic picture. On the other hand, there are very few examples of the application of rigorous scoring methodologies in the area of higher education policy reform. In seeking a solution, the working group had three overriding aims:

- (a) The report must provide an **objective** basis for Ministers to judge the level of progress within the EHEA;
- (b) Members of the Bologna Follow-up Group must have the confidence that the procedures adopted are **fair** and **representative**;
- (c) The conclusions should be **independently** determined.

The working group agreed that these objectives could best be achieved by developing a scorecard as the main stocktaking instrument. This is an effective methodology for establishing a broad comparative picture according to objective criteria. The approach is based on similar models, for example the *Lisbon Scorecard* developed by the Centre for European Reform and the *balanced scorecard* approach, which combines qualitative

(National Reports) and quantitative (EURYDICE statistical material) measures and can be applied in a range of organisational contexts.

At the beginning of 2005 the working group, together with the independent expert, developed a set of criteria and benchmarks for a scorecard, which would measure progress on each of the three priority action lines. At the meeting in Dubrovnik in February 2005, this work was completed. The methodology and procedure for the stocktaking process was agreed by the Bologna Follow-up Group at its March 2005 meeting in Mondorf, Luxembourg. The scorecard criteria and benchmarks are described in Chapter 2 of this report.

Based on an interpretation of the data from the sources mentioned above, initial scores on each criterion were assigned to each country. In March 2005, the initial scorecards were issued to country representatives, who reviewed the material to ensure that the interpretation accurately reflected the national picture. Where a country sought to adjust its initial score, it was required to provide appropriate supporting material, and the expert, in consultation with the working group where necessary, assigned final scores on the basis of this material.

Chapter 2

Criteria and Benchmarks for Stocktaking

Developing the Bologna Scorecard

The focus of the stocktaking exercise was to take account of the progress on the three priority action lines at the beginning of 2005. The data gathered also provide a useful benchmark against which future trends and progress in the Bologna Process can be measured. As mentioned in the previous chapter, during the early part of 2004 the Working Group on Stocktaking drew up a list of questions for the stocktaking process, linked to the main action lines identified in the Berlin Communiqué. For each of the questions, data sources were identified, and the process of gathering data began in autumn 2004. (Appendix B includes the consolidated list of questions and the data sources.)

Elaboration of scorecard criteria

The working group reviewed each of the three actions lines, and elaborated key criteria for each one. Each criterion was further expanded on the basis of five benchmarks, which would serve to measure the extent of progress. These were subsequently colour-coded, as shown in Table 2.1 below.

Table 2.1: Explanation of Colour Codes used in Bologna Scorecard

| | |
|-------------|-----------------------------------|
| Green | Excellent performance |
| Light Green | Very good performance |
| Yellow | Good performance |
| Orange | Some progress has been made |
| Red | Little progress has been made yet |

Criteria for *Quality Assurance*

At their meeting in Berlin, Ministers acknowledged that the quality of higher education is a central factor in the establishment of the EHEA. In particular, they stressed the need to develop mutually-shared criteria and methodologies for quality assurance.

The Berlin Communiqué continued:

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

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

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

Based on this statement, the working group established the following criteria for this action line:

1. Stage of development of quality assurance system
2. Key elements of evaluation systems
3. Level of participation of students
4. Level of international participation, co-operation and networking

The benchmarks for each of these criteria are shown in Table 2.2 below.

Table 2.2: Benchmarks for Quality Assurance (Criteria 1-4)

| | 1. Stage of development of quality assurance system | 2. Key elements of evaluation systems | 3. Level of participation of students | 4. Level of international participation, co-operation and networking |
|------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Green (5) | <p>A Quality Assurance system is in operation at national level and applies to all Higher Education*, with responsibilities of bodies and institutions clearly defined</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Fully functioning dedicated QA agency in place, OR ▪ Existing agencies have QA as part of responsibility <p>(*As defined in the Lisbon Recognition Convention²)</p> | <p>The following five elements of evaluation systems listed in the Berlin Communiqué are fully implemented in all Higher Education:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>internal assessment</i> ▪ <i>external review</i> ▪ <i>participation of students</i> ▪ <i>publication of results</i> ▪ <i>international participation</i> | <p>Students participate at four levels of the evaluation process:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ In the governance of national bodies for QA ▪ Within teams for external review ▪ Consultation or involvement during external reviews ▪ Involvement in internal evaluations | <p>International participation at three levels:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ In the governance of national bodies for QA ▪ In teams for external review ▪ Membership of ENQA or other international networks |
| Light green (4) | <p>QA system is in operation, but it is not applied to all programmes</p> | <p>All of the above elements are in place, but are not in operation in all Higher Education</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Four of the five elements are in operation</p> | <p>Students participate at three of the four levels</p> | <p>International participation at two of the three levels</p> |
| Yellow (3) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Legislation or regulations prepared, awaiting implementation, OR ▪ Existing system is undergoing review/ development in accordance with Bologna action lines | <p>Implementation of an evaluation system including two or three of these elements has begun</p> | <p>Students participate at two of the four levels</p> | <p>International participation at one of the three levels</p> |
| Orange (2) | <p>Preliminary planning phase</p> <p>OR</p> <p>No QA system in place yet, but initial debate and consultation has begun</p> | <p>Implementation of an evaluation system including one of these elements has begun</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Preliminary planning is in progress for implementing an evaluation system including these elements</p> | <p>Students participate at one of the four levels</p> | <p>Involvement in other forms of transnational co-operation in executing QA</p> |
| Red (1) | <p>No QA system in place and no plan to initiate</p> | <p>There is no evaluation system in place</p> | <p>No student involvement yet</p> <p>OR</p> <p>No clarity about structures and arrangements for student participation</p> | <p>No international participation yet</p> <p>OR</p> <p>No clarity about structures and arrangements for international participation</p> |

² The Lisbon Recognition Convention defines higher education as: *all types of courses of study, training or training for research at the post-secondary level which are recognised by the relevant authorities of a Party as belonging to its higher education system.*

Criteria for the Two-cycle Degree System

In 2003, Ministers noted the progress made on this action line as evidence of the wide scale and comprehensive restructuring of the European higher education landscape. The Berlin Communiqué stated that:

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

Ministers also noted that the objective of this reform programme was to offer improved access for students to the second and third cycles. Specifically, Ministers stated that:

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

Against this background, the working group developed the following criteria for this action line:

5. Stage of implementation of two-cycle system
6. Level of participation in two-cycle system
7. Access from the first cycle to the second cycle.

As already described above, the data for these criteria were sourced in the National Reports, and in the EURYDICE data. In addition, the ESIB survey provided some material on the third criterion, which was later validated by the countries as part of their review of the initial scorecards. The benchmarks for each of these criteria are shown in Table 2.3 below.

Table 2.3: Benchmarks for *Two-cycle Degree System* (Criteria 5-7)

| | 5. Stage of implementation of two-cycle system | 6. Level of student enrolment in two-cycle system | 7. Access from first cycle to second cycle |
|------------------------|--|---|--|
| Green (5) | A two-cycle degree system is being implemented on a wide scale in 2005 | 81-100 per cent of students are enrolled in the two-cycle system in 2005 | There is access* for all students to at least one second cycle programme without major transitional problems (*Access means having the right to apply for admission) |
| Light green (4) | A two-cycle degree system is being implemented on a limited scale in 2005 ³ | 51-80 per cent of students are enrolled in the two-cycle system in 2005 | There is relatively smooth access for the majority of students with minor structural or procedural problems |
| Yellow (3) | Legislation or regulations prepared, awaiting implementation OR Existing system is undergoing review/development in accordance with Bologna action lines | 25-50 per cent of students are enrolled in the two-cycle system in 2005 | There are a number of first cycle programmes that do not provide access to the second cycle |
| Orange (2) | Preliminary planning or pilot phase is being conducted | 1-24 per cent of students are enrolled in the two-cycle system in 2005 | Access is limited for the majority of students because of structural or procedural obstacles |
| Red (1) | A two-cycle degree system is not yet in place | No students are enrolled in the two-cycle system in 2005 | There are currently no arrangements for access from the first cycle to the second cycle |

³ Note: A score of *Light green(4)* on this criterion can correspond to a score of 4, 3 or 2 on the next criterion.

Criteria for Recognition of Degrees and Periods of Study

The Berlin Communiqué was very specific on the critical role played by various recognition instruments in the promotion of student mobility. On the Diploma Supplement, Ministers set the objective that

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

The *Convention on the Recognition of Qualifications concerning Higher Education in the European Region* – known as the ‘Lisbon Recognition Convention’ – has provided the legal framework for the recognition of other countries’ qualifications. Ministers regarded the convention as a critical instrument for students wishing to take up mobility opportunities. The Berlin Communiqué contained the following specific commitment:

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

Similarly, Ministers have acknowledged the role of credit systems, and have emphasised the important role of the European Credit Transfer System (ECTS) in this area. The Berlin communiqué stated that:

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

The working group identified the following criteria for this action line:

8. Stage of implementation of the Diploma Supplement
9. Ratification of the Lisbon Recognition Convention
10. Stage of implementation of ECTS.

The benchmarks for these criteria are shown in Table 2.4 below.

Table 2.4: Benchmarks for Recognition of Degrees and Periods of Study (Criteria 8-10)

| | 8. Stage of implementation of Diploma Supplement | 9. Ratification of Lisbon Recognition Convention | 10. Stage of implementation of ECTS |
|------------------------|--|--|---|
| Green (5) | Every student graduating in 2005 will receive the Diploma Supplement automatically and free of charge, issued in a widely-spoken European language | Convention has been signed and ratified and a national information centre (ENIC/NARIC) is in operation | ECTS credits are allocated in the majority of Higher Education programmes, enabling credit transfer and accumulation |
| Light green (4) | Every student graduating in 2005 can receive the Diploma Supplement on request and free of charge, issued in a widely spoken European language | Convention has been signed and ratified but a national information centre is not yet in operation | ECTS credits are allocated in a limited number of programmes, enabling credit transfer and accumulation |
| Yellow (3) | The Diploma Supplement will be issued to some students or in some programmes in 2005 | Convention has been signed and the process of ratification has begun | A national system for credit transfer and accumulation is in place, which is compatible with ECTS OR The national credit transfer and accumulation system is being gradually integrated with ECTS |
| Orange (2) | There are plans to begin implementing the Diploma Supplement in 2006 OR Preliminary planning/pilot testing, or initial debate/consultation has begun | Convention has been signed but the process of ratification has not begun | A national system for credit transfer and accumulation is in place, but it is not compatible with ECTS OR There are plans for future implementation of ECTS |
| Red (1) | There are currently no arrangements for implementing the Diploma Supplement | The Convention has not been signed | There is currently no credit system in place and no plans to introduce it |

Applying the Bologna Scorecard

The working group used the scorecard to analyse the information in both the National Reports and the EURYDICE reports. The benchmarks were applied with equal rigour to each participating country. As previously indicated, the initial scores were issued to country representatives in the Bologna Follow-up Group, who were invited to review the material in consultation with appropriate stakeholders. The working group considered this to be an important part of the stocktaking process. Not only did it ensure that the scores were valid, but it also addressed concerns that some countries had expressed about the methodology.

Thirty-four (34) countries responded to the working group, either requesting changes to their scores or verifying that the scores were correct. The expert revised scores on the basis of additional information provided, with the exception of ten (10) cases which were considered by the group. This resulted in an adjustment to the scores in seven (7) cases. In the remaining three (3) cases, the countries were advised of the reason why their scores were not changed. Table 2.5 below shows an example of how the scorecard was applied and how the “average” values were calculated.

Table 2.5: Example of Application of Bologna Scorecard

| | Country A | Country B |
|--|--|---|
| QUALITY ASSURANCE | 4.75=19/4 | 4.75=19/4 |
| 1. Stage of development of quality assurance system | 5 | 5 |
| 2. Key elements of evaluation systems | 5 | 5 |
| 3. Level of participation of students | 5 | 4 |
| 4. Level of international participation, co-operation and networking | 4 | 5 |
| | | |
| TWO-CYCLE DEGREE SYSTEM | 5.00 | 5.00 |
| 5. Stage of implementation of two-cycle system | 5 | 5 |
| 6. Level of student enrolment in two-cycle system | 5 | 5 |
| 7. Access from first cycle to second cycle | 5 | 5 |
| | | |
| RECOGNITION OF DEGREES AND PERIODS OF STUDY | 4.00=12/3 | 3.67= 11/3 |
| 8. Stage of implementation of Diploma Supplement | 4 | 3 |
| 9. Ratification of Lisbon Recognition Convention | 5 | 5 |
| 10. Stage of implementation of ECTS | 3 | 3 |
| TOTAL | 4.58 | 4.47 |
| Calculation of average score | $\frac{4.58 \sim 5}{=(4.75+5+4)/3}$ (Green) | $\frac{4.47 \sim 4}{=(4.75+5+3.67)/3}$ (Light green) |

Added value of the Bologna Scorecard

The working group considers that the Bologna Scorecard adds value to the stocktaking process for a number of reasons. Firstly, it is a systematic and effective framework of analysis that enables us to see the “big picture”, and to answer the question: how are we doing on these priority action lines? Secondly, it integrates quantitative and qualitative measures, with a five-point scoring system based on descriptive rubrics allowing a focused analysis of the different action lines. Thirdly, the scorecard is a good method for dealing with large amounts of material from different sources, and for taking stock of collective progress against objective criteria. Finally, it also generates baseline data that can be used to measure progress in the future.

However, the working group recognises that there are also certain risks in using such a methodology. For example it is inevitable that participating countries will compare their position relative to their neighbours or that some observers will seek to develop ‘league tables’. The working group was very conscious of this aspect, and it cannot preclude such actions. However, it urges that all should remain focused on the key objective – namely, making the EHEA a reality. Each participating country has voluntarily subscribed to this objective. The methods of implementation and the required legislative processes vary between countries. As such, the pace of implementation may differ from one country to the next. The outcome of this analysis merely reflects this.

The Working Group on Stocktaking is confident that it has made the best possible use of the available resources, both human and financial, and that the methodology adopted has brought appropriate transparency to the stocktaking process. For the future, however, the working group suggests that the stocktaking process should be integrated in parallel with the implementation of the Bologna actions, and that countries should be encouraged to use the scorecard as a self-monitoring tool.

Chapter 3

Analysis of Results

This chapter presents an overview of the scores for the three priority action lines and the ten scorecard criteria that were described in the previous chapter. An “at a glance” summary of all scores is shown on pages 40-41 below. The detailed scorecard for each country is included in the Annex.

The Bologna Process is working

Table 3.1 gives a summary of the number of countries that scored in each colour category for the three priority action lines: quality assurance, the two-cycle degree system and recognition of degrees and periods of study.⁴

Table 3.1: Summary of Average Scores for the Three Priority Action Lines

| Action lines | Number of countries in each colour category | | | | |
|---|---|-------------|--------|--------|-----|
| | Green | Light green | Yellow | Orange | Red |
| Quality assurance | 15 | 13 | 7 | 8 | 0 |
| The two-cycle degree system | 18 | 13 | 4 | 6 | 2 |
| Recognition of degrees and periods of study | 14 | 20 | 9 | 0 | 0 |
| Score for all three action lines | 10 | 19 | 11 | 3 | 0 |

⁴ While there are 40 countries, there are two separate scores for three of the countries: Belgium, Serbia and Montenegro, and the United Kingdom.

The key message is that the Bologna Process is working. Almost all participating countries have embarked upon the reform process along the lines articulated by Ministers in Bologna in 1999. The great majority of countries fall within the categories of 'Excellent Performance' or 'Very Good Performance' as defined within the stocktaking exercise. In that respect, Ministers can be confident that the European Higher Education Area (EHEA) is beginning to take shape.

While there is a more detailed analysis of each criterion later, it is worth highlighting here the aspects of the Bologna Process where participating countries have made most progress. The following criteria recorded the highest average scores:

- Ratification of the Lisbon Recognition Convention
- Implementation of the European Credit Transfer System (ECTS)
- Implementation of the two-cycle degree system.

It is also important to reflect on the criteria where participating countries had the lowest rate of progress:

- Participation of students in quality assurance processes
- Level of student enrolment in the two-cycle degree system
- International participation in quality assurance.

Measuring progress on *Quality Assurance*

The great majority of countries have made excellent or very good progress on developing and implementing their quality assurance systems.

The most important message is that there has been very good progress on the development of quality assurance systems. This is supported by a detailed analysis of each criterion. Table 3.2 gives a summary of the scores of the countries on the four quality assurance criteria.

Table 3.2: Summary of scores for *Quality Assurance* (Criteria 1-4)

| | Green | Light green | Yellow | Orange | Red |
|---|---|-------------|--------|--------|-----|
| Average for Quality assurance | 15 | 13 | 7 | 8 | 0 |
| Criteria 1-4 | Number of countries in each colour category | | | | |
| Stage of development of quality assurance system | 22 | 6 | 13 | 2 | 0 |
| Key elements of evaluation systems | 18 | 8 | 9 | 7 | 1 |
| Level of participation of students | 6 | 9 | 14 | 7 | 7 |
| Level of international participation, co-operation and networking | 12 | 16 | 6 | 9 | 0 |

Criterion 1 - Stage of development of quality assurance system

Almost all countries have a quality assurance system in place for higher education.

In 22 countries, a Quality Assurance (QA) system is in operation at national level and is applied throughout higher education. Allied to this, there is a clear definition of the responsibilities of agencies and institutions. In these countries, there is either a fully functioning dedicated QA agency in place, or existing agencies have QA as part of their responsibility. A further 6 countries have a QA system in operation, but it is not applied to all higher education programmes.

In 13 countries, the process of development is at an advanced stage, with either legislation or regulations awaiting implementation. Equally, it is possible that the existing system is being reviewed or developed in accordance with Bologna action lines. In 2 countries, planning for the establishment of a QA system is at a preliminary stage, or initial debate and consultation on the matter has begun within the higher education system.

Based on an analysis of National Reports, it is clear that there is a range of organisational models in QA agencies. Many are entirely independent agencies, set up specifically for the purpose of managing quality assurance across all higher education institutions. Others have evolved from existing agencies, and have had their functions or mandate expanded to include quality assurance along the lines suggested in the Bologna Process. In some countries, the quality assurance agency is located within a Ministry or other Government agency with responsibility for overseeing higher education.

Most QA agencies appear to have an inclusive and representative structure, especially in the composition of their governing body. They have a range of reporting relationships, usually involving some form of liaison between the Ministry of Education and other Government Ministries, the national rectors' conference, and other non-governmental organisations.

The nature of responsibilities undertaken by QA agencies usually include those that were described in the ENQA study of 2003:

- quality Improvement/ quality assurance
- disseminating knowledge and information
- accreditation.

In introducing and implementing quality assurance systems in higher education, countries mention in their reports some of the issues they have encountered, for example stakeholder support, availability of the required resources and expertise, and the difficulty in some cases of involving international peers because of language problems.

Many countries mention membership of ENQA, or participation in its activities as an observer by non-members, as being especially helpful in establishing QA policies and practices. This emphasises the value of promoting continued networking between countries as a way of promoting good practice and the sharing of experience.

Criterion 2 - Key elements of evaluation systems

Most countries have QA systems that match the criteria set out in the Berlin Communiqué.

In the Berlin Communiqué, the following five elements were identified as important elements in evaluation systems:

- internal assessment
- external review
- participation of students
- publication of results
- international participation.

In 18 countries, all five elements are fully implemented in all higher education. In a further 8 countries, either all of the elements are in place but they are not yet in operation in all higher education, or four of the five elements are in operation.

In 9 countries, implementation of an evaluation system including two or three of these elements has begun, and in 7 countries, implementation of an evaluation system including one of these elements has begun, or preliminary planning is in progress for implementing an evaluation system including these elements. In just one country, there is no evaluation system in place.

Student participation is the element that is most often missing, followed by publication of reports. In many countries, the structures for student participation are not yet fully developed. This indicates the need for enhanced collaboration between student organisations and QA agencies, both at national and international levels.

A further issue emerges with regard to the publication of results – this is critical to the openness and transparency of QA systems. In some countries, there is already a very open culture of making the reports of evaluations available to the public. In other countries, universities and other higher education institutions have traditionally operated independently, without public scrutiny, so the requirement to publish QA reports will require a level of culture change.

Criterion 3 - Level of participation of students

Many countries have made some progress in involving students in quality assurance.

Notwithstanding the earlier observation on student participation, many countries have made some progress in involving students in quality assurance. However, a small number of countries have not yet begun to involve students at any level in QA.

The working group reviewed this criterion, and determined that it was possible to measure student participation at four levels:

- in the governance of national bodies for QA
- within teams for external review
- consultation or involvement during external reviews
- involvement in internal evaluations.

In 6 countries, students participate at all four levels, and in another 9 countries, they participate at three of the four levels. Fourteen (14) countries involve students at two of the four levels, and in 7 countries they participate at only one of the four levels.

In 7 countries, there is either no student involvement yet, or there is no clarity about structures and arrangements for student participation.

An analysis of the National Reports indicates that students are most likely to participate in internal reviews. Only a small number of countries have students as members of the governing bodies for QA agencies. There is a need for the recognition of students as full partners in the QA process, with the capacity to contribute a unique and valuable perspective at all stages.

Criterion 4 - Level of international participation, co-operation and networking

The level of international participation, co-operation and networking is excellent or very good in the great majority of countries.

All countries have at least begun to introduce an international dimension to their QA systems. Formal international participation in QA is possible at three levels:

- in the governance of national bodies for QA
- in external review teams
- membership of ENQA or other international networks.

Twelve (12) countries have international participation at all three levels, and 16 countries have international participation at two of the three levels. In 6 countries, there is international participation at one of the three levels. Nine (9) countries are involved in other forms of transnational co-operation in undertaking QA, for example pilot projects or informal international networks.

Only a small number of countries have international participation in the governance of national bodies for QA. In some cases, legal or statutory reasons prevent it, while language may also present an obstacle in many cases.

It is also important to note that since 2003, ENQA has been reviewing its criteria for membership, and during this time it has not processed any applications for membership. (This situation is likely to change soon with its evolution into the European Association for Quality Assurance.) However, this criterion could also be met through participation in other international networks, such as the International Network for Quality Assurance Agencies in Higher Education (INQAAHE). It was acknowledged by many countries that such networking had a significant influence on the development of their QA policies and practice.

The nature of international participation in governing bodies for QA is worthy of comment. In most cases, a small number of people (usually only one or two) from another country are invited to become members of the governing body. They attend meetings, participate in policy making and perform an advisory role. A more active and meaningful form of collaboration is shown in the case of the joint agency that has been set up by the Netherlands and the Flemish Community of Belgium. In this case, the QA agency is jointly governed by the two Ministries, with full exchanges of practice at all levels of the process. This is a model which could be more fully explored by other countries, especially small countries and those that have a shared language.

Measuring progress on the *Two-cycle Degree System*

The great majority of countries have made excellent or very good progress in implementing the two-cycle system by 2005.

The target set by Ministers to have begun implementing the two-cycle degree system by 2005 has largely been met. With one exception, all participating countries have embarked on this process. In the remaining country, some experimental attempts have been made at introducing the two-cycle degree system. Table 3.3 gives a summary of the countries' scores on the criteria for the two-cycle degree system.

Table 3.3: Summary of scores for the *Two-cycle Degree System* (Criteria 5-7)

| Scorecard criteria | Green | Light green | Yellow | Orange | Red |
|--|---|-------------|--------|--------|-----|
| Average for the two-cycle degree system | 18 | 13 | 4 | 6 | 2 |
| Criteria 5-7 | Number of countries in each colour category | | | | |
| Stage of implementation of two-cycle system | 24 | 9 | 4 | 5 | 1 |
| Level of student enrolment in two-cycle system | 17 | 6 | 7 | 10 | 3 |
| Access from first cycle to second cycle | 19 | 12 | 3 | 7 | 2 |

Criterion 5 - Stage of implementation of two-cycle system

The two-cycle degree system is being implemented in the great majority of countries in 2005.

In 24 countries, the two-cycle degree system is being implemented in 2005 on a wide scale, while in 9 countries it is being implemented on a limited scale. Implementation in this instance should be taken to mean that countries have completed the legislative process and are introducing the two-cycle system in their higher education institutions in 2005 (i.e. either for the academic year 2004-2005 or for 2005-2006).

In 4 countries, either legislation or regulations have been prepared and are awaiting implementation, or existing degree structures are undergoing review or development in accordance with the Bologna action lines. Five (5) countries are engaged in a preliminary planning or pilot phase which will lead to the implementation of the two-cycle degree system, while only one country has not yet started work on putting the two-cycle system in place.

The level of change that was necessary to implement the two-cycle system in some countries has been considerable, while in others it was minimal. It has not been possible within this stocktaking exercise to measure the scale of effort required, and this should be borne in mind in any analysis of the results.

Some fields of study remain outside the two-cycle system in a number of countries: in particular, medicine and related fields, engineering, architecture and law.

Criterion 6 - Level of student enrolment in two-cycle system

In most countries, more than half of the students are enrolled in the two-cycle system in 2005.

In 17 countries, 81-100 per cent of students are enrolled in the two-cycle system in 2005, and in 6 countries, 51-80 per cent are enrolled. A further 7 countries have 25-50 per cent enrolment, and 10 countries have 1-24 per cent. In just 3 countries, no students are enrolled in the two-cycle system in 2005.

It should be noted that these figures are broad estimates based on the limited information that was available in the National Reports and in the EURYDICE summaries. While EURYDICE requested data for students enrolled in the autumn term of 2004, many countries have provided information that relates to estimated figures for 2005-2006. The scores for this criterion are therefore based on enrolments in 2005 - either for the academic year 2004-2005 or 2005-2006. Allowing for this wide definition, the fact remains that this criterion reflects the substantial progress being made with regard to the implementation of the two-cycle degree system.

Criterion 7 - Access from first cycle to second cycle

The great majority of countries have arrangements to allow access for all students to at least one second-cycle programme.

In the Berlin Communiqué, the principle of access is based on the definition in the Lisbon Recognition Convention – that is, having the right to apply for admission. In 19 countries, there is access for all students to at least one second-cycle programme without major transitional problems. In 12 countries, there is relatively smooth access for a majority of students with minor structural or procedural problems. Three (3) countries offer a number of first cycle programmes that do not provide access to the second cycle. Access to second cycle programmes is limited for the majority of students in 7 countries because of structural or procedural obstacles. In 2 countries, it is currently not possible to speak of access from the first cycle to the second cycle, as the relevant structures are not yet in place.

The scores on this criterion are based on the National Reports and on the information provided by ESIB. The National Reports provide information only on the position in principle, based on policy or legislation. The stocktaking exercise has gathered no information on the actual level of access and transfer of students from the first cycle to the second cycle.

Measuring progress on *Recognition of Degrees and Periods of Study*

There is good progress in almost all countries on recognising degrees and periods of study.

Of the three priority action lines, this records most progress, reflecting primarily the number of countries that have ratified the Lisbon Recognition Convention. Table 3.4 gives a summary of the scores on the three criteria for recognition of degrees and periods of study.

Table 3.4: Summary of scores for *Recognition of Degrees and Periods of Study* (Criteria 8-10)

| Scorecard criteria | Green | Light green | Yellow | Orange | Red |
|---|---|-------------|--------|--------|-----|
| Average for Recognition of degrees and periods of study | 14 | 20 | 9 | 0 | 0 |
| Criteria 8-10 | Number of countries in each colour category | | | | |
| Stage of implementation of Diploma Supplement | 17 | 10 | 12 | 2 | 2 |
| Ratification of Lisbon Recognition Convention | 29 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 3 |
| Stage of implementation of ECTS | 20 | 12 | 9 | 2 | 0 |

Criterion 8 - Stage of Implementation of Diploma Supplement

Almost all countries have introduced the Diploma Supplement in at least some programmes in 2005.

In 17 countries, every student graduating in 2005 will receive the Diploma Supplement automatically and free of charge, issued in a widely-spoken European language – these conditions were identified very specifically by the Ministers in Berlin. The remaining countries are at various stages of implementation. In 10 countries, it can be issued to every student on request. In 12 countries the Diploma Supplement will be issued to some students or in some programmes in 2005. Two (2) countries either plan to begin implementing the Diploma Supplement in 2006, or have begun preliminary planning, pilot testing or initial debate and consultation about its introduction. Only 2 countries currently have no arrangements in place for implementing the Diploma Supplement.

While it is acknowledged that there are various approaches to implementing the Diploma Supplement throughout the countries participating in the Bologna Process, it should be possible for the 26 countries that do not yet meet all of the conditions outlined in the Berlin Communiqué to adjust their processes so that they will comply with these conditions in the near future.

Criterion 9 - Ratification of Lisbon Recognition Convention

The great majority of countries have signed and ratified the Lisbon Recognition Convention and also have a national information centre in operation.

Twenty-nine (29) countries have signed and ratified the Convention and have a national information centre (ENIC/NARIC) in operation. In a further 5 countries, the Convention has been signed and ratified but a national information centre is not yet in operation. The Convention has been signed and the process of ratification begun in 5 countries, and in one country, it has been signed but the process of ratification has not yet begun. Finally, 3 countries have not yet signed the Convention.

The Lisbon Recognition Convention is the one legal instrument specifically acknowledged within the Bologna Process, and it is clear that

all countries attach due importance to it. However, as noted in Chapter 4, it alone cannot facilitate recognition – this requires a culture change within national higher education systems.

Criterion 10 - Stage of implementation of ECTS

The great majority of countries are implementing the European Credit Transfer System (ECTS) in at least some programmes.

In 20 countries, ECTS credits are allocated in the majority of higher education programmes, enabling credit transfer and accumulation, and in 12 countries ECTS credits are allocated in a limited number of programmes. In 9 countries, there is either a national system for credit transfer and accumulation that is compatible with ECTS, or the national credit transfer and accumulation system is being gradually integrated with ECTS.

Two (2) countries have either a national system for credit transfer and accumulation which is not compatible with ECTS, or they plan to implement ECTS in the future.

The pattern here is similar to the Diploma Supplement, with many countries in transition from a national credit system to ECTS. As a way of promoting further development, it might be useful to examine more closely the practice in countries which have already successfully adapted their national system to integrate it with ECTS.

Stocktaking confirms that there is good progress in the three priority action lines

The findings emerging from the detailed analysis in this chapter confirm the extent of progress being made by participating countries within the Bologna Process. This portrays a positive picture, and given that these action lines are central to the success of the process, this should come as no surprise. However, it is important that the results of this stocktaking exercise should be considered in the wider context of the various contributions to the Ministerial Meeting in Bergen. The implications of the findings for the future development of the process are discussed more fully in Chapter 4.

Bologna Scorecard Summary

Bologna Scorecard Summary

| | Quality Assurance | | | | | 2-cycle | | | | Recognition | | | | Total Score |
|-----------------------------|-------------------|--------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------|----------|----------------|-------------------|--------|---------------|--------------------|------------------------|--------|-------------------|-------------|
| | Development | Evaluation systems | Participation of students | International participation | Score QA | Implementation | Student enrolment | Access | Score 2-cycle | Diploma Supplement | Lisbon Rec. Convention | ECTS | Score Recognition | |
| Albania | Yellow | Yellow | Orange | Orange | Yellow | Orange | Orange | Orange | Orange | Yellow | Green | Green | Green | Yellow |
| Andorra | Orange | Red | Red | Orange | Orange | Orange | Red | Red | Red | Green | Red | Green | Yellow | Orange |
| Austria | Green | Green | Yellow | Green | Green | Green | Orange | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green |
| Belgium (Flemish Community) | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green | Yellow | Green | Green | Green | Yellow | Green | Green | Green |
| Belgium (French Community) | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green | Yellow | Green | Green | Green | Yellow | Green | Green | Green |
| Bosnia and Herzegovina | Yellow | Orange | Red | Orange | Orange | Red | Red | Orange | Red | Red | Green | Green | Yellow | Orange |
| Bulgaria | Yellow | Yellow | Red | Orange | Orange | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green |
| Croatia | Yellow | Orange | Yellow | Orange | Yellow | Green | Orange | Yellow | Yellow | Yellow | Green | Green | Green | Yellow |
| Cyprus | Green | Yellow | Yellow | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green |
| Czech Republic | Green | Green | Orange | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green |
| Denmark | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green |
| Estonia | Green | Green | Yellow | Green | Green | Green | Yellow | Green | Green | Green | Yellow | Green | Green | Green |
| Finland | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green | Orange | Green | Green | Green | Yellow | Green | Green | Green |
| France | Green | Yellow | Red | Yellow | Yellow | Green | Green | Green | Green | Yellow | Green | Green | Green | Green |
| Germany | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green | Yellow | Green | Green | Green | Yellow | Green | Green | Green |
| Greece | Yellow | Green | Yellow | Green | Green | Yellow | Green | Green | Green | Yellow | Red | Green | Yellow | Green |
| Holy See | Yellow | Yellow | Red | Green | Yellow | Green | Green | Green | Green | Yellow | Green | Orange | Yellow | Green |
| Hungary | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green | Yellow | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green |
| Iceland | Green | Green | Yellow | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green |
| Ireland | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green | Yellow | Green | Green | Green | Green |
| Italy | Yellow | Orange | Orange | Yellow | Yellow | Green | Green | Orange | Green | Yellow | Green | Green | Green | Yellow |
| Latvia | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green | Yellow | Green | Green | Green |

Bologna Scorecard Summary

| | Quality Assurance | | | | | 2-cycle | | | | Recognition | | | | Total Score |
|---|-------------------|--------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------|----------|----------------|-------------------|--------|---------------|--------------------|------------------------|--------|-------------------|-------------|
| | Development | Evaluation systems | Participation of students | International participation | Score QA | Implementation | Student enrolment | Access | Score 2-cycle | Diploma Supplement | Lisbon Rec. Convention | ECTS | Score Recognition | |
| Liechtenstein | Green | Green | Yellow | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green |
| Lithuania | Green | Green | Yellow | Green | Green | Green | Green | Yellow | Green | Green | Green | Yellow | Green | Green |
| Luxembourg | Yellow | Orange | Red | Orange | Orange | Yellow | Green | Green | Green | Red | Green | Green | Yellow | Yellow |
| Malta | Yellow | Green | Green | Yellow | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green | Yellow | Orange | Green | Yellow | Green |
| Netherlands | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green | Yellow | Green | Green | Green |
| Norway | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green |
| Poland | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green | Yellow | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green |
| Portugal | Green | Green | Yellow | Green | Green | Orange | Orange | Orange | Orange | Yellow | Green | Yellow | Green | Yellow |
| Romania | Yellow | Yellow | Orange | Yellow | Yellow | Green | Orange | Red | Orange | Green | Green | Green | Green | Yellow |
| Russia | Green | Yellow | Orange | Yellow | Yellow | Green | Orange | Green | Yellow | Orange | Green | Yellow | Yellow | Yellow |
| Serbia and Montenegro/Serbia | Yellow | Orange | Red | Orange | Orange | Orange | Red | Orange | Orange | Yellow | Green | Orange | Yellow | Orange |
| Serbia and Montenegro/Montenegro | Yellow | Orange | Orange | Orange | Orange | Green | Orange | Yellow | Yellow | Green | Green | Green | Green | Yellow |
| Slovakia | Green | Yellow | Yellow | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green | Yellow | Green | Green | Green | Green |
| Slovenia | Yellow | Yellow | Yellow | Yellow | Yellow | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green |
| Spain | Green | Green | Yellow | Green | Green | Yellow | Orange | Orange | Orange | Green | Red | Yellow | Yellow | Yellow |
| Sweden | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green | Yellow | Orange | Green | Yellow | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green |
| Switzerland | Green | Green | Yellow | Green | Green | Green | Yellow | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green |
| "the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" | Green | Green | Yellow | Green | Green | Orange | Yellow | Orange | Orange | Orange | Green | Green | Green | Yellow |
| Turkey | Orange | Orange | Orange | Orange | Orange | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green | Yellow | Green | Green | Yellow |
| UK - England, Wales and Northern Ireland | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green | Yellow | Green | Yellow | Green | Green |
| UK - Scotland | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green | Yellow | Green | Green |
| Scores for criteria | Green | Green | Yellow | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green |

Chapter 4

Conclusions and Recommendations

Good progress on achieving the targets set in Berlin

The three priority action lines that the Ministers identified in the Berlin Communiqué set tangible targets for participating countries to achieve in the two-year period before the Bergen meeting. The goals of enhancing quality, promoting reform of degree structures and improving recognition for periods of study are critical factors for the successful realisation of the European Higher Education Area (EHEA).

The very good progress made on achieving these targets as measured in this stocktaking exercise represents real commitment on the part of all participating countries to making the European Higher Education Area a reality.

Good progress on *Quality Assurance*

In Berlin, Ministers acknowledged the importance of quality assurance in the establishment of the EHEA. More than half of the participating countries have quality assurance structures in place. Critically, almost half have systems built on the elements identified in the Berlin Communiqué. It is also encouraging to note that international participation and networking feature in many of the systems. This evidence, combined with the consensus which underpinned the work of the European Association for Quality Assurance (ENQA), augurs well for the continued progress in this area.

Students are not yet fully involved

However, this progress should not mask a deficit in quality assurance, and in particular the absence of student participation in quality assurance procedures. Four levels of participation were identified – governance structures, external review teams, consultation or involvement during external reviews, and involvement in internal evaluations – and less than 14% of participating countries have involvement at all four levels. This is

also borne out by the EURYDICE analysis. In material provided by ESIB to the working group, ESIB noted that the majority of cases of good practice with regard to student participation are based on the individual and voluntary effort of higher education institutions (HEIs), and conversely, other institutions make conscious decisions not to promote student involvement. While the working group would not go as far as ESIB – after all, most quality assurance systems have at least one level of student participation – there is a need to move as quickly as possible to accommodate student representation in keeping with the principles of good practice.

Quality assurance systems must lead to real quality improvement

Finally, while good progress has been made on establishing quality assurance systems, this is just the first step. Systems or processes will drift in the absence of committed ownership. *Trends IV* identified this as a challenge for the future. There is a risk that excessive emphasis on the process could actually displace the end objective – namely, the enhancement of quality in higher education. It is important, therefore, to view progress in this area as evidence of establishment of a system – it is not evidence that the culture of quality assurance has filtered through all strands of the higher education life. The ultimate success of this objective relies on the willingness of institutions, their staff and their students to embrace systematic quality assurance as central to their respective roles in the delivery of higher education.

Good progress on the Two-Cycle Degree System

The adoption of the two-cycle degree system, with its origins in the Sorbonne Declaration, is seen as critical to the future of the EHEA, and its implementation throughout the area is well under way. Already by 2005, at least 55 per cent of countries have the system in place on a wide scale, with a further 21 per cent having it in place in a more limited capacity. More importantly, the percentage of students covered by the two-cycle degree system is also increasing. It is safe to predict that the objectives of this action line will be achieved by 2010. The stocktaking analysis also indicates that access between cycles is available for all students in 44 per cent of participating countries, while some minor structural or procedural problems exist in a further 28 per cent of countries.

Some issues identified by students

It is on the issue of access that some controversy exists. The terminology used in the Berlin Communiqué defined access in terms of the 'right to apply for admission' – the definition provided in the Lisbon Recognition Convention. However, ESIB in their submission looked at access in the meaning of "admission" and factors influencing student choice. They cited transitional difficulties for students seeking to progress between cycles, for example the need to undertake bridging courses when moving between the university and non-university sector. They also mentioned restrictions that are placed on progression to the next cycle, including limits on numbers, enrolment examinations and selection procedures. Finally, they indicated that there were restrictions on movement between different fields of study in different cycles and that tuition fees also posed a barrier.

Clearly, such an analysis extends the definition of access into areas which could potentially create difficulty for stakeholders in many participating countries. It also extends the impact of the Bologna Process into other public policy domains, some of which lie outside the remit of Ministers with responsibility for higher education. Equally, it is clear that any extension of the definition of access must be done with a clear vision of the issue to be addressed. Moreover, it should be done in a manner which can be agreed and accepted by all within the Bologna Follow-up Group.

Need for engagement of social partners

Trends IV highlighted a key objective of the emerging two-cycle degree system. It is acknowledged that the degree awarded on completion of the first cycle should have different orientations, in order to accommodate a diversity of academic, individual and labour market needs. It is a matter of concern that qualifications issued by the authorities that have undertaken a programme of qualification reform in accordance with the Bologna principles have failed to secure support and suffer from a 'lack of credibility among students and employers'. Such perceptions clearly damage the reform process, and perhaps, more importantly, create wrong impressions for those outside the EHEA. It is vital that these issues are tackled as a matter of urgency, and while institutions and governments may pursue the line proposed within *Trends IV*, this goes deeper and must

be tackled at an appropriate level. A process of engagement with social partners, specifically employer representative organisations, must be initiated, to explain the developments within the EHEA. It is in the interest of all that there should be genuine choices, including employment, available to the student on completion of the first cycle. This may also illustrate the need for broader representation within the governance and decision-making structures of the higher education system.

Good progress on *Recognition of Degrees and Periods of Study*

This action line records the most successful progress of all, with the ratification of the Lisbon Recognition Convention by the great majority of the participating countries signalling genuine attempts by all to recognise other countries' qualifications. Many of the graduates of 2005 will have the Diploma Supplement issued automatically and free of charge, and to the extent that it assists mobility, this is a welcome development. The continued development of ECTS as the 'common currency' will also facilitate mobility. This progress will undoubtedly assist the implementation of other complementary policy initiatives such as EUROPASS.

Issues in implementing recognition tools

The stocktaking analysis did not review certain issues such as the quality of the Diploma Supplement. However, in its contribution ESIB noted that not all countries followed the format as recommended by the UNESCO/ Council of Europe guidelines, and this detracted from the usefulness of the document issued by the HEIs. Similarly, *Trends IV* illustrates a number of difficulties associated with the Diploma Supplement, including demands on student records systems, costs of translation and the substantial effort required to put in place the technology, such as software applications.

While many of the above may be classified as implementation difficulties, *Trends IV* highlights some difficulties associated with recognition, which is the purpose of tools such as the Diploma Supplement and ECTS. For example, a variety of validation procedures exist. It is also interesting to note that despite inter-institutional learning agreements, some individual academics continue to question the acceptability of qualifications awarded

by other institutions. While the level of awareness is increasing, ENIC/NARICs remain under-utilised in terms of co-operation with HEIs. All of these issues serve to illustrate that, notwithstanding progress on the structural dimension of recognition, more work needs to be done to convince all stakeholders to take the principles of the Lisbon Recognition Convention into the HEIs: it seems that there is a gap between the aspirations of Ministries to promote mobility and recognition and the exercise of academic autonomy by individual staff members.

Some of the issues identified by the Working Group on Stocktaking, ESIB and the EUA emphasise the need for progress to be made on the emerging European Qualifications Framework. The report of the Working Group on the European Qualifications Framework highlights the contribution that the framework will make in assisting and facilitating recognition.

Good progress overall, but....

Halfway towards 2010, the colour of overall progress for participating countries is 'light green'. This means that given the benchmarks developed, the Ministers in Bergen can be satisfied with progress on the three priority action lines. It is important to note however, that it was not possible to make a comparative analysis of progress over time, which has been dramatic, particularly in the case of late entrants to the Bologna Process. The working group also emphasises that even those countries in the 'green' category still have some work to do.

The strength of the Bologna Process has been its voluntary and collaborative nature. Since the original declaration, an additional eleven countries have joined the Process, and it is likely that this will increase further. However, while increased membership brings a richness in diversity to the Process, it emphasises the need to ensure consistency of progress – a chain is only as strong as its weakest link. It would do a disservice to the vision of the Bologna Process to develop on the basis of a two- or three-speed model, and therefore, members should be prepared to take responsibility to assist each other as we all move towards 2010. Some examples already exist, and the Council of Europe has played a strong role in applicant countries, such as Ukraine and Georgia. This support is also evident with other countries in the Bologna Process. However, all participating countries have responsibilities in this area, and it is vital that

new members, as well as those engaged in complex and major reform processes, are supported. This may take the form of study visits or receipt of delegations, for example. It is also important that a repository of information is built to promote sharing of experiences and networking. Membership of the Bologna Process must mean more than the opportunity to visit other countries or institutions – it must serve as a catalyst for change, not only for the HEI or the student, but for society in its widest context.

Good progress, but will it be sustained?

This is the first time that the Bologna Follow-up Group has ever objectively measured progress – prior to this, it relied on national reports as the means of assessing the current situation. In Ireland, there is a story of a lost visitor trying to find his way to his final destination, only to be told by the local villager that “if I were going there, I would not start here!” The journey of the Working Group on Stocktaking is similar. The work presented in this report should serve as an incentive to increase the level of sophistication of future exercises. In the first instance, it is the firm recommendation of the working group that this exercise should be repeated, with the data already collated serving as the basis for measuring future progress. However, it should not be an exercise of climbing the scale or changing the colour. If that becomes the case, the exercise loses validity and is reduced to the level of language and nuance rather than action.

It is also important that attention be given to developing benchmarks for the other action lines of the Bologna Process – after all, the three that we have measured represent only a third of the action lines. The next exercise needs to probe further the implications of the issues identified in this report, along with an analysis of other action lines.

Good progress, but what can we do to increase impact?

In the mandate given to the Bologna Follow-up Group, Ministers requested the identification of possible corrective action where deficiencies were identified. The picture is a positive one, and while the working group identifies a series of recommendations, there is nothing new in them. For many participating countries, the observations in this

report reflect the acknowledged concerns that exist in any major reform process. The Working Group on Stocktaking puts forward five recommendations for action, with a view to a report being prepared for the next meeting of Ministers in 2007.

Recommendation 1

Initiate formal engagement with employer organisations

While many governance structures in HEIs provide for representation of employer or business interests, it is clear that there is a need to communicate the objectives of the various cycles to a wider audience of employers. If the qualifications on completion of the first cycle do not lead to the prospect of employment for the graduate, then the reform process is not worthwhile.

The Working Group on Stocktaking recommends that, having regard to national competences, a process of formal engagement should be initiated with employer organisations at national level. The objective of such engagement should be to communicate the process of reform, combined with ensuring the employability of the bachelor graduate. This process of engagement should also take place at the level of the Bologna Follow-up Group.

Recommendation 2

Establish a working group on equitable access

While the Lisbon Recognition Convention provides a definition of access which can easily be incorporated within a legislative framework, it is clear that access means different things to different people. This debate will continue, and the issue may cause controversy within the Bologna Process. Equally, it is important to have clarity on precisely what is being measured.

The Working Group on Stocktaking recommends that a working group should be established to prepare a report on the issues associated with equitable access, and its conclusions should, if possible, recommend a series of benchmarks to measure action in this area.

While the composition of the working group is a matter for the Bologna Follow-up Group, it is important to have representatives of the EUA, EURASHE, ESIB, the EU Commission and the Council of Europe, along with a number of participating countries.

Recommendation 3

Promote action on recognition of foreign qualifications

Ministers have repeatedly committed themselves to increasing the mobility of students. The recognition of qualifications is a key factor in achieving this goal. The Working Group on Stocktaking notes that a large number of participating countries have ratified the Lisbon Recognition Convention. However, as reported in *Trends IV*, implementation is critical to achieve the smooth operation of recognition processes. It is clear that decisive action in this area can only be effected where all stakeholders are committed to the objective.

The Working Group on Stocktaking recommends that each participating country should prepare an action plan to improve the quality of the process associated with the recognition of foreign qualifications.

This plan, which should form part of the country's National Report for the next Ministerial Meeting in 2007, should detail the processes in place in HEIs, along with the identification of key measures to improve the recognition of foreign qualifications.

Recommendation 4

Develop support structures for the Bologna Process

It is evident that a substantial level of reform has been required in some countries to achieve the objectives of the Bologna Process. It was not possible for the stocktaking exercise to measure the scale of such effort. Yet, we must ensure that all of the participating countries reach 2010 with a consistent level of progress across all the action lines. This requires providing increased support to the newer members and to countries that are undertaking an extensive reform process. The need for such support is

likely to increase as new instruments, such as national frameworks, are introduced.

The Working Group on Stocktaking recommends that the Bologna Follow-up Group should encourage bilateral and multilateral support mechanisms to assist participating countries in the implementation of the various action lines of the Bologna Process.

Recommendation 5

Continue the stocktaking exercise

This stocktaking exercise has been enlightening for all who were involved, and while the approach may have generated certain concerns, the outcome has identified a number of issues that would not necessarily have emerged from a 'free-form' National Report. Within the limits of the resources available, it has laid the foundation for future exercises, and with further development it will undoubtedly assist Ministers in achieving the Bologna goals.

The working group would like to point out that the focus on the three priority action lines may to some extent distract the participating countries from the remaining and equally important action lines of the Bologna Process.

The Working Group on Stocktaking recommends that the stocktaking process should continue to report on progress for each Ministerial Conference. The process should be resourced appropriately, and mandated to address the action lines as approved by the Bologna Follow-up Group.

Conclusion: Realising the Bologna Vision

The Bologna Declaration stated that

A Europe of Knowledge is now widely recognised as an irreplaceable factor for social and human growth, and as an indispensable component to consolidate and enrich the European citizenship, capable of giving its citizens the necessary competences to face the challenges of the new millennium, together with an awareness of shared values and belonging to a common social and cultural space.

The millennium is now with us, and these aspirations remain as real as they did when they were first expressed in June 1999. This stocktaking exercise is a contribution to realising the Bologna vision, and with the above recommendations, it can assist in moving the Process forward in the coming years.

Appendix 1

Terms of Reference for the Stocktaking

TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR BFUG WORKING GROUP ON STOCKTAKING

INTRODUCTION

In Berlin, 19th September 2003, Ministers with responsibility for Higher Education stated:

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

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

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

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

BFUG RESPONSE

The Secretariat developed a working paper on the stocktaking process, which was submitted as a draft to the BFUG Board meeting in Oslo in January 2004. The Board approved the thrust of the draft paper, which subsequently formed the basis of the document submitted to the BFUG meeting in Dublin in March 2004. The issues were progressed by an interim group, which comprised of the Chair, and Vice-Chair of BFUG and representatives from the EU Commission and EUA. The Secretariat supported this group.

This group charged with the responsibility of identifying data sources and scoping the stocktaking exercise. It identified a number of key documents and processes central to the stocktaking exercise, which are conducted by organisations such as EURYDICE, EUA, ESIB, ENQA and ENIC/ NARIC. It is important that the Working Group can work with these groups in order to avoid duplication of effort.

Notwithstanding approval of the terms of reference, the BFUG meeting of 9th March 2004 approved the establishment of a Working Group, to coordinate the work on the stocktaking. Its decision was:

Decision:

The BFUG takes responsibility for the conduct of the stocktaking exercise. Detailed reports will be prepared on the progress and implementation of the intermediate priorities set in the three priority areas defined for the period 2003-2005: quality assurance, the two-cycle degree system and recognition of degrees and periods of study.

The BFUG appoints the following members to a working group to carry out the stocktaking and report back to the BFUG:

*Ian McKenna, Ireland
Marlies Leegwater, Netherlands
Germain Dondelinger, Luxembourg
Jan Levy, Norway
Aleksa Bjeliš, Croatia
Victor Chistokhvalov, Russia
Peter van der Hijden, EU Commission*

The Working Group is asked to report on progress to the BFUG meeting in October 2004, and to prepare its final report in time for the BFUG meeting in March 2005. The final report should describe the progress of the Bologna Process by January 2005.

The Working Group will draw on expertise as appropriate, and will be assisted in its task by the BFUG Secretariat. (In this regard, it is important that the members of the BFUG undertake to give the Working Group access to all relevant national information resources as specified in the Berlin Communiqué).

The report of the Working Group will form the basis for a report by the Bologna Follow-up Group to the Ministerial Conference in Bergen in 2005. In line with previous conferences, the consultative members may present their own reports to the conference.

The Working Group will take as its starting point Document BFUG2 6 with the modifications agreed on in the meeting.

DRAFT TERMS OF REFERENCE

In order to realise the objectives set by the Ministers, the Working Group shall:

1. Identify the key measurements to be part of the stocktaking exercise
2. Collaborate with partner and other organisations in order to maximise use of data sources;
3. Define, where appropriate, the structure of separate questionnaire to be used in the stocktaking should this be required;
4. Prepare a structure for the national contributions to the stocktaking to be submitted by member States;
5. Prepare a report for approval by the BFUG in advance of the Bergen Conference

The Working Group will be supported in its task by the Secretariat, and shall draw on expertise as it considers appropriate.

The Group will submit reports to the BFUG, and shall have its working papers accessible for all BFUG members on the web.

Ian McKenna
Chair, BFUG

26th April 2004

Appendix 2

Consolidated List of Questions

BOLOGNA PROCESS STOCKTAKING – CONSOLIDATED LIST OF QUESTIONS

The questions are grouped according to the three priority areas defined by Ministers in Berlin as the focus for the stocktaking. A brief introductory text is provided for each heading to place the questions in context. References to the goals set in the Berlin Communiqué are given in italics. For each question the relevant data source is indicated.

1. QUALITY ASSURANCE

The quality of higher education has proven to be at the heart of the setting up of a European higher education area. Ministers commit themselves to supporting further development of quality assurance at institutional, national and European level.
(Berlin Communiqué)

Promotion of European cooperation in quality assurance is defined as an objective in the Bologna Declaration. The primary responsibility for quality assurance rests with the higher education institutions themselves. As stated in the Prague Communiqué, quality assurance systems play a vital role in ensuring high quality standards and in facilitating the comparability of qualifications throughout Europe. Cooperation between quality assurance agencies and the proposed development of agreed standards, procedures and guidelines will increase transparency and build trust across national borders and thus facilitate student mobility and recognition of qualifications, which is essential to the attractiveness and competitiveness of European higher education.

| | |
|--|--------------------|
| <i>National quality assurance systems should include a definition of the responsibilities of the bodies and institutions involved.</i> | Data source |
| 1. Does the country have a national quality assurance system? Is the system based in law? | EURYDICE |
| 2. Please specify the responsibilities of the bodies and institutions involved. | National reports |
| <hr/> | |
| <i>National quality assurance systems should include evaluation of programmes or institutions, including internal assessment, external review, participation of students and the publication of results.</i> | |
| 3a. Does the national system include evaluation of programmes ? | EURYDICE |
| 3b. If so, do evaluations include <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - internal assessment? - external review? - participation of students? - publication of results? - involvement of international peers? | EURYDICE |

| | |
|--|------------------|
| 4a. Does the national system include evaluation of <i>institutions</i> ? | EURYDICE |
| 4b. If so, do evaluations include <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - internal assessment? - external review? - participation of students? - publication of results? - involvement of international peers? | EURYDICE |
| 5. At what level(s) do students participate in evaluation processes? | ESIB survey |
| 6. Is there a national system for following up the evaluations? | EURYDICE |
| <i>National quality assurance systems should include a system of accreditation, certification or comparable procedures.</i> | |
| 7. Describe the system of accreditation, certification or comparable procedures, if any. | National reports |
| <i>National quality assurance systems should include international participation, co-operation and networking.</i> | |
| 8. Are international peers included in the governing board(s) of the quality assurance agency(ies)? | National reports |
| 9. What are the main networks of which the national quality assurance agency(ies) is a member? | Secretariat* |

2. THE TWO-CYCLE DEGREE SYSTEM

Harmonisation of degree structures is a central element in making European higher education systems more compatible, comparable and transparent and thus in promoting the ultimate goals of mobility, employability and attractiveness. In the Bologna Declaration adoption of a degree system essentially based on two main cycles, undergraduate and graduate, was therefore defined as one of six action lines (later expanded to ten).

| | |
|--|--------------------|
| <i>Implementation of the two-cycle system should have begun by 2005 in all member states.</i> | Data source |
| 10. Is a two-cycle degree system <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - in place? - being implemented? - on the point of being implemented? (with relevant dates) | EURYDICE |
| 11. To what extent is the implementation of the two-cycle system applicable to ISCED 5a and ISCED 5b? | EURYDICE |
| 12. Are two-cycle degrees optional or obligatory for the institutions? | EURYDICE |
| 13. What is the proportion of students in higher education enrolled in two-cycle programmes vis-à-vis programmes that do not conform to | EURYDICE |

* On the basis of information from web sites, reports, etc.

| | |
|---|-------------|
| the two-cycle model? Figures should be for the autumn term of 2004, with the census date specified. | |
| 14a. Do first cycle degrees exist which do not give access to second cycle programmes?* | EURYDICE |
| 14b. Do second cycle degrees exist which do not give access to third cycle studies?* | EURYDICE |
| 15. Do students experience transitional problems between the different cycles? | ESIB survey |

3. RECOGNITION OF DEGREES AND PERIODS OF STUDY

Recognition of degrees and periods of study including the possibility of credit transfer is a prerequisite for student mobility, the development of integrated study programmes leading to joint degrees and thus promotion of the European dimension in higher education. Recognition of degrees is also a prerequisite for employability. Several transparency tools have been developed at the European level to facilitate recognition, including the European Credit Transfer System (ECTS) and the Diploma Supplement. In the Berlin Communiqué, the Ministers “encourage further progress with the goal that ECTS becomes not only a transfer but also an accumulation system, to be applied consistently as it develops within the emerging European Higher Education Area”. They further “underline the importance of the Lisbon Recognition Convention, which should be ratified by all countries participating in the Bologna Process.”

| | |
|---|--------------------|
| <i>Every student graduating as from 2005 should receive the Diploma Supplement automatically and free of charge, issued in a widely spoken European language.</i> | Data source |
| 16. Will all students graduating as from 2005 receive the Diploma Supplement automatically and free of charge, issued in a widely spoken European language? | EURYDICE |
| 17. Are students experiencing problems in relation to the DS? | ESIB survey |

* Needless to say, a bachelor’s degree in one subject does not give access to a master’s programme in another, nor a master’s degree to a doctoral programme. The question therefore applies to programmes *in the same field*. “Access” is to be understood in the sense of the Lisbon Recognition Convention, i.e. “The right of qualified candidates to apply and to be considered for admission to higher education.” It does not, of course, imply any automatic right to admission. In countries with binary systems of institutions it is of particular interest to know whether a degree from one type of institution *precludes* admission to another, e.g. if candidates with a bachelor’s degree from a college or polytechnic are ineligible to apply for a master’s programme at a university.

| | |
|--|-------------------|
| <i>The Lisbon Recognition Convention should be ratified by all countries participating in the Bologna Process.</i> | |
| 18. Has the Convention been ratified? | Council of Europe |
| 19. If not, what is the time schedule for ratification? | Council of Europe |
| 20. Has a national information centre, as prescribed in Article IX.2 of the Convention, been established? | Council of Europe |
| <i>A system based on ECTS should be in use for credit transfer and accumulation.*</i> | |
| 21. Has a credit transfer system based on ECTS been implemented by national regulation? | EURYDICE |
| 22. If not, what is the time schedule for implementation? | EURYDICE |
| 23. Is the system also used for credit accumulation? | EURYDICE |

* No standard definitions exist for credit transfer and credit accumulation. In the report from Phase 1 of the *Tuning* project (see <http://www.relint.deusto.es/TUNINGProject/>), the difference between the two is explained as follows (excerpt):

ECTS was originally tested and perfected as a **transfer** system in order to make it possible for Universities in different European countries to describe the amount of academic work necessary to complete each of their course units and hence to facilitate recognition of students' work performed abroad.... Credits were allocated, for the purpose of transparency in description, to each assessed (i.e. marked or graded) activity on the basis of a judgement as to the proportion it represented of the complete year's workload. Hence credits were allocated on a **relative** basis....

In several countries ECTS or analogous national systems are used as official **accumulation** systems. This means that entire courses of study leading to recognised qualifications are described using ECTS credits. The basis for allocation of credits is the official length of the study programme: for example the total workload necessary to obtain a first cycle degree lasting officially three or four years is expressed as 180 or 240 credits. The single course units which must be taken to obtain the degree each can be described in terms of workload and hence of credits. Credits are only obtained when the course unit or other activity has been successfully completed and assessed (i.e. marked or graded)....

When ECTS or analogous credit systems become official, credits receive **absolute** and no longer relative value. That is to say, credits are no longer calculated on an *ad hoc* proportional basis, but on the basis of officially recognised criteria. We should note that national credit accumulation systems based on ECTS principles allow not only national transfer, evaluation and recognition of work performed but also international transfer....

Annex

Country Scorecards

| BOLOGNA SCORECARD | |
|--|--|
| Albania | |
| QUALITY ASSURANCE | |
| 1. Stage of development of quality assurance system | |
| 2. Key elements of evaluation systems | |
| 3. Level of participation of students | |
| 4. Level of international participation, co-operation and networking | |
| TWO-CYCLE DEGREE SYSTEM | |
| 5. Stage of implementation of two-cycle system | |
| 6. Level of student enrolment in two-cycle system | |
| 7. Access from first cycle to second cycle | |
| RECOGNITION OF DEGREES AND PERIODS OF STUDY | |
| 8. Stage of implementation of Diploma Supplement | |
| 9. Ratification of Lisbon Recognition Convention | |
| 10. Stage of implementation of ECTS | |
| TOTAL | |

Albania joined the Bologna Process in 2003. In the same year, the act on higher education was amended to pave the way for a two-cycle degree structure. The new structure has been introduced in some study programmes, with the intention to extend it to all fields (with a few exceptions) by the academic year 2005-2006. In electrical engineering and agricultural studies, the two-cycle structure has existed since 2001/2002 as a result of cooperation between Albania and Italy.

A national quality assurance agency was established in 1999, and a number of programmes have been evaluated. All higher education institutions have to be accredited within a four-year period. Following a national seminar on the introduction of the Diploma Supplement in 2004, practical steps for the implementation of the supplement have begun in the academic year 2004/2005. Transcripts of records accompanying qualifications from all study programmes will indicate both national credits and ECTS from the end of this academic year.

The above-mentioned reforms have been accompanied by a considerable increase in the state investment in higher education, with a corresponding rise in student numbers.

| BOLOGNA SCORECARD | |
|--|--|
| Andorra | |
| QUALITY ASSURANCE | |
| 1. Stage of development of quality assurance system | |
| 2. Key elements of evaluation systems | |
| 3. Level of participation of students | |
| 4. Level of international participation, co-operation and networking | |
| TWO-CYCLE DEGREE SYSTEM | |
| 5. Stage of implementation of two-cycle system | |
| 6. Level of student enrolment in two-cycle system | |
| 7. Access from first cycle to second cycle | |
| RECOGNITION OF DEGREES AND PERIODS OF STUDY | |
| 8. Stage of implementation of Diploma Supplement | |
| 9. Ratification of Lisbon Recognition Convention | |
| 10. Stage of implementation of ECTS | |
| TOTAL | |

Andorra joined the Bologna Process in 2003. It so far has no national quality assurance agency, but the question is under consideration. Some of the studies of the Universitat d'Andorra have been reviewed by the Spanish quality assurance agency located in Catalonia, AQU. Legislation establishing a Bologna-type degree structure is in preparation. At present the offer of second-cycle degrees is limited, but some are offered by e-learning. Andorra is not party to the Lisbon Recognition Convention, and only official degrees from France, Spain, Portugal and Quebec are recognised on the basis of legislation (France and Spain) or bilateral conventions (Portugal and Quebec). ECTS and the Diploma Supplement are in use from the academic year 2004/2005, and the latter can be issued in Spanish, French, Portuguese and English in addition to Catalan, which is the standard language.

| BOLOGNA SCORECARD | |
|--|--|
| Austria | |
| QUALITY ASSURANCE | |
| 1. Stage of development of quality assurance system | |
| 2. Key elements of evaluation systems | |
| 3. Level of participation of students | |
| 4. Level of international participation, co-operation and networking | |
| TWO-CYCLE DEGREE SYSTEM | |
| 5. Stage of implementation of two-cycle system | |
| 6. Level of student enrolment in two-cycle system | |
| 7. Access from first cycle to second cycle | |
| RECOGNITION OF DEGREES AND PERIODS OF STUDY | |
| 8. Stage of implementation of Diploma Supplement | |
| 9. Ratification of Lisbon Recognition Convention | |
| 10. Stage of implementation of ECTS | |
| TOTAL | |

Austria was a signatory of the Bologna Declaration. Around 85% of students in the country are enrolled at public universities, which are not required by law to undergo accreditation at institutional or programme level. However, measures for quality assurance will be specified in the performance agreements concluded between the universities and the Federal Ministry of Education, Science and Culture. Universities of applied science (Fachhochschulen) are accredited by the FH Council, and private universities by the Accreditation Council, both on a five-year basis. The Austrian Agency for Quality Assurance (AQA) is responsible for the development of standards and procedures for quality assurance and coordination of evaluation procedures. Students are usually involved in internal quality assurance processes, and are represented on the management board and general assembly of AQA.

The two-cycle degree system is being gradually introduced (since 1999). Medicine and higher secondary-school teaching programmes are exempted by law and may only be offered as "old-style" diploma studies. Around 10% of university students and 3% of Fachhochschule students were in two-cycle programmes in the academic year 2003/2004, as well as the students at the private universities.

| BOLOGNA SCORECARD Belgium (Flemish Community) | |
|--|--|
| QUALITY ASSURANCE | |
| 1. Stage of development of quality assurance system | |
| 2. Key elements of evaluation systems | |
| 3. Level of participation of students | |
| 4. Level of international participation, co-operation and networking | |
| TWO-CYCLE DEGREE SYSTEM | |
| 5. Stage of implementation of two-cycle system | |
| 6. Level of student enrolment in two-cycle system | |
| 7. Access from first cycle to second cycle | |
| RECOGNITION OF DEGREES AND PERIODS OF STUDY | |
| 8. Stage of implementation of Diploma Supplement | |
| 9. Ratification of Lisbon Recognition Convention | |
| 10. Stage of implementation of ECTS | |
| TOTAL | |

Belgium was a signatory of the Bologna Declaration. The Higher Education Act adopted in 2003 for the Flemish Community distinguishes between professionally-oriented bachelor's degrees obtained in non-university higher education institutions and university bachelor's and master's degrees. Holders of professionally-oriented bachelor's degrees may have access to master's programmes through bridging courses.

The Flemish Community introduced both Diploma Supplements and a credit system based on ECTS in the first half of the 1990s. Belgium signed the Lisbon Recognition Convention in March 2005, and the ratification process has been set in motion.

An interesting feature of the Flemish system is the close cooperation with the Netherlands both in the form of a joint accreditation agency (NVAO) and a transnational university (transnationale Universiteit Limburg).

| | |
|---|--|
| BOLOGNA SCORECARD Belgium (French Community) | |
|---|--|

| | |
|--|--|
| QUALITY ASSURANCE | |
| 1. Stage of development of quality assurance system | |
| 2. Key elements of evaluation systems | |
| 3. Level of participation of students | |
| 4. Level of international participation, co-operation and networking | |

| | |
|---|--|
| TWO-CYCLE DEGREE SYSTEM | |
| 5. Stage of implementation of two-cycle system | |
| 6. Level of student enrolment in two-cycle system | |
| 7. Access from first cycle to second cycle | |

| | |
|--|--|
| RECOGNITION OF DEGREES AND PERIODS OF STUDY | |
| 8. Stage of implementation of Diploma Supplement | |
| 9. Ratification of Lisbon Recognition Convention | |
| 10. Stage of implementation of ECTS | |

| | |
|--------------|--|
| TOTAL | |
| | |

Higher education in the French Community of Belgium is currently undergoing major changes following the adoption of a new decree in March 2004, complemented by other statutory provisions. From the academic year 2004/2005, all first-year students follow two-cycle degree programmes. ECTS credits are awarded for all programmes (but so far used for credit transfer only), and the Diploma Supplement has been adopted for general use and made compulsory.

An Agency for Higher Education Quality Evaluation has been operational since January 2004. The Agency is chaired by the Director General responsible for higher education in the Ministry of the French Community. There is no accreditation system in the strict sense of the word, but only institutions that comply with the relevant regulations may be recognised by the French Community, which fixes the list of diplomas that can be offered by decree. The establishment of new programmes thus requires a modification of the law.

Belgium signed the Lisbon Recognition Convention in March 2005.

| BOLOGNA SCORECARD Bosnia and Herzegovina | |
|--|--|
| QUALITY ASSURANCE | |
| 1. Stage of development of quality assurance system | |
| 2. Key elements of evaluation systems | |
| 3. Level of participation of students | |
| 4. Level of international participation, co-operation and networking | |
| TWO-CYCLE DEGREE SYSTEM | |
| 5. Stage of implementation of two-cycle system | |
| 6. Level of student enrolment in two-cycle system | |
| 7. Access from first cycle to second cycle | |
| RECOGNITION OF DEGREES AND PERIODS OF STUDY | |
| 8. Stage of implementation of Diploma Supplement | |
| 9. Ratification of Lisbon Recognition Convention | |
| 10. Stage of implementation of ECTS | |
| TOTAL | |

Bosnia and Herzegovina joined the Bologna Process in 2003. Immediately following the Berlin Ministerial Conference, a draft Framework Law on Higher Education was prepared laying the basis for implementation of "Bologna" reforms in the country, such as the two-cycle degree system, establishment of a quality assurance agency/ENIC/NARIC and implementation of ECTS and the Diploma Supplement. The law has yet to be adopted. In the meantime a Bologna handbook has been prepared and widely distributed, and a national seminar involving all major stakeholders is being planned.

| BOLOGNA SCORECARD | |
|--|--|
| Bulgaria | |
| QUALITY ASSURANCE | |
| 1. Stage of development of quality assurance system | |
| 2. Key elements of evaluation systems | |
| 3. Level of participation of students | |
| 4. Level of international participation, co-operation and networking | |
| TWO-CYCLE DEGREE SYSTEM | |
| 5. Stage of implementation of two-cycle system | |
| 6. Level of student enrolment in two-cycle system | |
| 7. Access from first cycle to second cycle | |
| RECOGNITION OF DEGREES AND PERIODS OF STUDY | |
| 8. Stage of implementation of Diploma Supplement | |
| 9. Ratification of Lisbon Recognition Convention | |
| 10. Stage of implementation of ECTS | |
| TOTAL | |

Bulgaria was a signatory of the Bologna Declaration. Amendments made to the Law on Higher Education in 2004 introduced a number of reforms in Bulgarian higher education, modifying the already existing three-cycle degree system and introducing the Diploma Supplement and ECTS on a legal basis. At the same time changes were introduced to the system of quality assurance, with institutional accreditation now explicitly linked to evaluation of the effectiveness of internal quality assurance processes and structures, rather than just compliance with state requirements. All higher education institutions are accredited on a cyclical basis by the National Evaluation and Accreditation Agency.

| BOLOGNA SCORECARD | |
|--|--|
| Croatia | |
| QUALITY ASSURANCE | |
| 1. Stage of development of quality assurance system | |
| 2. Key elements of evaluation systems | |
| 3. Level of participation of students | |
| 4. Level of international participation, co-operation and networking | |
| TWO-CYCLE DEGREE SYSTEM | |
| 5. Stage of implementation of two-cycle system | |
| 6. Level of student enrolment in two-cycle system | |
| 7. Access from first cycle to second cycle | |
| RECOGNITION OF DEGREES AND PERIODS OF STUDY | |
| 8. Stage of implementation of Diploma Supplement | |
| 9. Ratification of Lisbon Recognition Convention | |
| 10. Stage of implementation of ECTS | |
| TOTAL | |

Croatia joined the Bologna Process in 2001. The country is currently implementing a major reform that will bring its higher education system in line with Bologna principles and objectives. The Act on Scientific Activity and Higher Education, passed in 2003 and further amended in 2004, establishes the three-cycle degree system as the national standard, introduces a number of changes aimed at strengthening the quality assurance system, makes ECTS obligatory for all higher education institutions and makes provisions for the Diploma Supplement. Many of the changes will take effect from the academic year 2005/2006. A lot of activity is going on at the national level, with wide stakeholder involvement, in order to provide information about the Bologna Process and support the implementation of the reform.

| BOLOGNA SCORECARD | |
|--|--|
| Cyprus | |
| QUALITY ASSURANCE | |
| 1. Stage of development of quality assurance system | |
| 2. Key elements of evaluation systems | |
| 3. Level of participation of students | |
| 4. Level of international participation, co-operation and networking | |
| TWO-CYCLE DEGREE SYSTEM | |
| 5. Stage of implementation of two-cycle system | |
| 6. Level of student enrolment in two-cycle system | |
| 7. Access from first cycle to second cycle | |
| RECOGNITION OF DEGREES AND PERIODS OF STUDY | |
| 8. Stage of implementation of Diploma Supplement | |
| 9. Ratification of Lisbon Recognition Convention | |
| 10. Stage of implementation of ECTS | |
| TOTAL | |

Cyprus joined the Bologna Process in 2001. The country currently has one university, the University of Cyprus. Legislation is in preparation to establish two more public universities, the Technological University of Cyprus and the Open University of Cyprus, and furthermore to enable private institutions of higher and tertiary education to be upgraded to university level. More than 50% of the Cypriot student population study abroad, and the country also has a relatively large number of incoming foreign students.

The existing quality assurance agency, the Council of Educational Evaluation-Accreditation covers only private institutions of tertiary education. The establishment of a national quality assurance agency covering all higher education is being prepared. Proposed amendments to the legislation regulating higher education will make ECTS and the Diploma Supplement obligatory for all higher education institutions and programmes.

| BOLOGNA SCORECARD Czech Republic | |
|--|--|
| QUALITY ASSURANCE | |
| 1. Stage of development of quality assurance system | |
| 2. Key elements of evaluation systems | |
| 3. Level of participation of students | |
| 4. Level of international participation, co-operation and networking | |
| TWO-CYCLE DEGREE SYSTEM | |
| 5. Stage of implementation of two-cycle system | |
| 6. Level of student enrolment in two-cycle system | |
| 7. Access from first cycle to second cycle | |
| RECOGNITION OF DEGREES AND PERIODS OF STUDY | |
| 8. Stage of implementation of Diploma Supplement | |
| 9. Ratification of Lisbon Recognition Convention | |
| 10. Stage of implementation of ECTS | |
| TOTAL | |

The Czech Republic was a signatory of the Bologna Declaration. It passed the law laying the basis for Bologna-related reforms already in 1998, with amendments in 2001. Since then the two-cycle degree structure has been gradually introduced and the new study programmes accredited. Traditional long master's programmes still exist, but no new students are admitted. The percentage of students in two-cycle programmes will thus continue to increase.

All study programmes are subject to accreditation. The national quality assurance agency, the Accreditation Commission, carries out external evaluations as the basis for accreditation. The evaluations also serve the purpose of quality improvement through feedback to the institutions. With regard to recognition, ECTS is not laid down in law, but all public higher education institutions have ECTS or ECTS-compatible credit systems. The Diploma Supplement was issued on request until 2004, but will be issued automatically to all students from 2005. The institution will decide on the language, but a bilingual Diploma Supplement is strongly recommended.

| BOLOGNA SCORECARD | |
|--|--|
| Denmark | |
| QUALITY ASSURANCE | |
| 1. Stage of development of quality assurance system | |
| 2. Key elements of evaluation systems | |
| 3. Level of participation of students | |
| 4. Level of international participation, co-operation and networking | |
| TWO-CYCLE DEGREE SYSTEM | |
| 5. Stage of implementation of two-cycle system | |
| 6. Level of student enrolment in two-cycle system | |
| 7. Access from first cycle to second cycle | |
| RECOGNITION OF DEGREES AND PERIODS OF STUDY | |
| 8. Stage of implementation of Diploma Supplement | |
| 9. Ratification of Lisbon Recognition Convention | |
| 10. Stage of implementation of ECTS | |
| TOTAL | |

Denmark was a signatory of the Bologna Declaration. It had already introduced a two-cycle degree structure from the end of the 1980s, and legislation adopted in 2003 and 2004 made it mandatory in all study programmes. The use of ECTS has been mandatory since 2001, and the Diploma Supplement since 2002. The Danish Institute of Evaluation is the body responsible for external quality assurance, at all levels of education. The institute was a founding member of ENQA. Since 2000, the implementation of the Bologna action lines has been coordinated by a national Bologna follow-up group.

A main priority at present is strengthening the internationalisation of higher education as part of a national strategy for enhanced internationalisation of Danish education and training in general. For higher education this will include enhancing the international mobility of staff and measures to make Danish higher education more attractive to foreign students.

| BOLOGNA SCORECARD | |
|--|--|
| Estonia | |
| QUALITY ASSURANCE | |
| 1. Stage of development of quality assurance system | |
| 2. Key elements of evaluation systems | |
| 3. Level of participation of students | |
| 4. Level of international participation, co-operation and networking | |
| TWO-CYCLE DEGREE SYSTEM | |
| 5. Stage of implementation of two-cycle system | |
| 6. Level of student enrolment in two-cycle system | |
| 7. Access from first cycle to second cycle | |
| RECOGNITION OF DEGREES AND PERIODS OF STUDY | |
| 8. Stage of implementation of Diploma Supplement | |
| 9. Ratification of Lisbon Recognition Convention | |
| 10. Stage of implementation of ECTS | |
| TOTAL | |

Estonia was a signatory of the Bologna Declaration. It adopted the two-cycle structure for university education in 2002. Admission to old-style master programmes will cease after 2005. From the academic year 2005/06, not only universities but also professional higher education institutions will be able to offer master's level programmes in certain fields. A national credit system exists alongside ECTS, but ECTS will become mandatory from the 2006/07 academic year.

An accreditation system has been in operation since the mid-1990s. Accreditation is not required by law, but is necessary for an institution to acquire the right to issue officially recognised higher education credentials. A proposal for further development of the quality assurance system includes the introduction of measures geared more towards quality improvement.

| BOLOGNA SCORECARD | |
|--|--|
| Finland | |
| QUALITY ASSURANCE | |
| 1. Stage of development of quality assurance system | |
| 2. Key elements of evaluation systems | |
| 3. Level of participation of students | |
| 4. Level of international participation, co-operation and networking | |
| TWO-CYCLE DEGREE SYSTEM | |
| 5. Stage of implementation of two-cycle system | |
| 6. Level of student enrolment in two-cycle system | |
| 7. Access from first cycle to second cycle | |
| RECOGNITION OF DEGREES AND PERIODS OF STUDY | |
| 8. Stage of implementation of Diploma Supplement | |
| 9. Ratification of Lisbon Recognition Convention | |
| 10. Stage of implementation of ECTS | |
| TOTAL | |

Finland was a signatory of the Bologna Declaration. It introduced a two-cycle degree system in the university sector in the 1990s, but integrated master's programmes continued to exist. Following amendments to the Universities Act in 2004 the two-cycle degree system will be obligatory from 1 August 2005 except in the fields of medicine and dentistry. The reform has been supported by earmarked funding from the Ministry of Education. Polytechnics offer bachelor-level degrees. Postgraduate degrees requiring intervening work experience will be introduced on a permanent basis from 1 August 2005 following a pilot phase. ECTS will be mandatory for all higher education programmes from the academic year 2005/2006, replacing the previous national credit system. In the polytechnics ECTS was implemented from January 2005.

All Finnish higher education institutions have undergone institutional evaluation. In addition programme and thematic evaluations have been carried out. An evaluation system based on audits of the institutions' internal quality assurance systems is being introduced from 2005.

| BOLOGNA SCORECARD | |
|--|--|
| France | |
| QUALITY ASSURANCE | |
| 1. Stage of development of quality assurance system | |
| 2. Key elements of evaluation systems | |
| 3. Level of participation of students | |
| 4. Level of international participation, co-operation and networking | |
| TWO-CYCLE DEGREE SYSTEM | |
| 5. Stage of implementation of two-cycle system | |
| 6. Level of student enrolment in two-cycle system | |
| 7. Access from first cycle to second cycle | |
| RECOGNITION OF DEGREES AND PERIODS OF STUDY | |
| 8. Stage of implementation of Diploma Supplement | |
| 9. Ratification of Lisbon Recognition Convention | |
| 10. Stage of implementation of ECTS | |
| TOTAL | |

France was one of the four countries that signed the Sorbonne declaration in 1998, and has participated in the Bologna Process from the beginning. A decree adopted in April 2002 established the three-cycle *Licence/Master/Doctorat* degree structure, which has since been gradually implemented. Shorter, vocationally oriented higher education programmes continue to exist, with bridges having been developed to the *Licence* level. ECTS is seen as an important tool for making learning paths more flexible. All higher education institutions have to be periodically accredited, but based on an evaluation-type methodology. In general the Bologna Process is seen as an important trigger for national change, with higher education institutions taking an active role.

| BOLOGNA SCORECARD | |
|--|--|
| Germany | |
| QUALITY ASSURANCE | |
| 1. Stage of development of quality assurance system | |
| 2. Key elements of evaluation systems | |
| 3. Level of participation of students | |
| 4. Level of international participation, co-operation and networking | |
| TWO-CYCLE DEGREE SYSTEM | |
| 5. Stage of implementation of two-cycle system | |
| 6. Level of student enrolment in two-cycle system | |
| 7. Access from first cycle to second cycle | |
| RECOGNITION OF DEGREES AND PERIODS OF STUDY | |
| 8. Stage of implementation of Diploma Supplement | |
| 9. Ratification of Lisbon Recognition Convention | |
| 10. Stage of implementation of ECTS | |
| TOTAL | |
| | |

Germany was one of the four countries that signed the Sorbonne declaration in 1998, and has participated in the Bologna Process from the beginning. The country has a federal system, with higher education being the responsibility of the *Länder*. The legal basis for a two-cycle degree structure was established in 1998, and in 2003 the *Länder* agreed in principle to implement it as the standard system. For certain fields with state examinations (law, medicine, pharmacy) the necessary regulations have not yet been introduced. A Bologna Information Centre (*Servicestelle Bologna*), run by the national rectors' conference with backing from the Federal Ministry of Education and Research, provides online services, publications and events to support higher education institutions in implementing the Bologna Process. Germany aims to ratify the Lisbon Recognition Convention in 2005.

| BOLOGNA SCORECARD | |
|--|--|
| Greece | |
| QUALITY ASSURANCE | |
| 1. Stage of development of quality assurance system | |
| 2. Key elements of evaluation systems | |
| 3. Level of participation of students | |
| 4. Level of international participation, co-operation and networking | |
| TWO-CYCLE DEGREE SYSTEM | |
| 5. Stage of implementation of two-cycle system | |
| 6. Level of student enrolment in two-cycle system | |
| 7. Access from first cycle to second cycle | |
| RECOGNITION OF DEGREES AND PERIODS OF STUDY | |
| 8. Stage of implementation of Diploma Supplement | |
| 9. Ratification of Lisbon Recognition Convention | |
| 10. Stage of implementation of ECTS | |
| TOTAL | |

Greece was a signatory of the Bologna Declaration. Most of the Bologna action lines are currently the subject of active development. A three-cycle degree structure has been in place since the 1980s, and there has been particularly positive feedback about the access arrangements for students from one cycle to another. Priority is being given to establishing a quality assurance agency, with new legislation being implemented. Use of the Diploma Supplement is becoming more widespread, and a credit system based on ECTS is in place in many higher education institutions.

An extensive consultation process is currently being conducted by the Ministry of Education to disseminate information and to promote the Bologna targets among all partners, especially higher education institutions and students.

| BOLOGNA SCORECARD Holy See | |
|--|--|
| QUALITY ASSURANCE | |
| 1. Stage of development of quality assurance system | |
| 2. Key elements of evaluation systems | |
| 3. Level of participation of students | |
| 4. Level of international participation, co-operation and networking | |
| TWO-CYCLE DEGREE SYSTEM | |
| 5. Stage of implementation of two-cycle system | |
| 6. Level of student enrolment in two-cycle system | |
| 7. Access from first cycle to second cycle | |
| RECOGNITION OF DEGREES AND PERIODS OF STUDY | |
| 8. Stage of implementation of Diploma Supplement | |
| 9. Ratification of Lisbon Recognition Convention | |
| 10. Stage of implementation of ECTS | |
| TOTAL | |

The Holy See joined the Bologna Process in 2003. In addition to its two pontifical universities in Rome, it is a transnational provider of higher education both inside and outside the European Higher Education Area. Institutions in other countries conferring academic degrees under the authority of the Holy See go through an advance approval procedure and are then evaluated every three years with the assistance of national boards, e.g. bishops' conferences. A proposal to establish a separate body responsible for quality assurance is being discussed. A two- (three-) cycle degree structure is provided for in the basic legislative document "Sapientia christiana" of 1979. Special norms exist for certain fields of particular importance to the Holy See. A decision to implement both ECTS and the Diploma Supplement was taken in 2004.

| BOLOGNA SCORECARD | |
|--|--|
| Hungary | |
| QUALITY ASSURANCE | |
| 1. Stage of development of quality assurance system | |
| 2. Key elements of evaluation systems | |
| 3. Level of participation of students | |
| 4. Level of international participation, co-operation and networking | |
| TWO-CYCLE DEGREE SYSTEM | |
| 5. Stage of implementation of two-cycle system | |
| 6. Level of student enrolment in two-cycle system | |
| 7. Access from first cycle to second cycle | |
| RECOGNITION OF DEGREES AND PERIODS OF STUDY | |
| 8. Stage of implementation of Diploma Supplement | |
| 9. Ratification of Lisbon Recognition Convention | |
| 10. Stage of implementation of ECTS | |
| TOTAL | |
| | |

Hungary was a signatory of the Bologna Declaration. A national strategy for implementing the Bologna reforms was developed. On the basis of amendments to the Act on Higher Education adopted in 2003, implementation of the two-cycle degree structure has started and will be extended to all fields of study, with a few exceptions, by the academic year 2006/2007. The Diploma Supplement has been issued on request since 2003 and will become mandatory for bachelor's and master's degrees from 2005. An accreditation system encompassing all higher education institutions has been in operation since 1993.

| BOLOGNA SCORECARD | |
|--|--|
| Iceland | |
| QUALITY ASSURANCE | |
| 1. Stage of development of quality assurance system | |
| 2. Key elements of evaluation systems | |
| 3. Level of participation of students | |
| 4. Level of international participation, co-operation and networking | |
| TWO-CYCLE DEGREE SYSTEM | |
| 5. Stage of implementation of two-cycle system | |
| 6. Level of student enrolment in two-cycle system | |
| 7. Access from first cycle to second cycle | |
| RECOGNITION OF DEGREES AND PERIODS OF STUDY | |
| 8. Stage of implementation of Diploma Supplement | |
| 9. Ratification of Lisbon Recognition Convention | |
| 10. Stage of implementation of ECTS | |
| TOTAL | |

Iceland was a signatory of the Bologna Declaration. A national Bologna follow-up group with representation of higher education institutions and students was established in 2003 to coordinate the process and make proposals for possible legislative reforms and regulations. The two-cycle degree system is well established, with an exception for medicine and related fields. A separate division in the Ministry of Education, Science and Culture is responsible for external quality assurance.

| BOLOGNA SCORECARD | |
|--|--|
| Ireland | |
| QUALITY ASSURANCE | |
| 1. Stage of development of quality assurance system | |
| 2. Key elements of evaluation systems | |
| 3. Level of participation of students | |
| 4. Level of international participation, co-operation and networking | |
| TWO-CYCLE DEGREE SYSTEM | |
| 5. Stage of implementation of two-cycle system | |
| 6. Level of student enrolment in two-cycle system | |
| 7. Access from first cycle to second cycle | |
| RECOGNITION OF DEGREES AND PERIODS OF STUDY | |
| 8. Stage of implementation of Diploma Supplement | |
| 9. Ratification of Lisbon Recognition Convention | |
| 10. Stage of implementation of ECTS | |
| TOTAL | |

Ireland was a signatory of the Bologna Declaration. The country has a binary higher education system, with a two-cycle degree structure. ECTS has so far been implemented mainly in the non-university sector. The Diploma Supplement is being introduced since 2004 on the basis of a National Template.

There is no single national quality assurance system. Universities are required by law to establish quality assurance procedures, and cooperate in developing their quality assurance systems, since 2003 through the Irish Universities Quality Board. The Higher Education and Training Awards Council is responsible for agreeing and reviewing the effectiveness of quality assurance procedures in the non-university sector. The National Qualifications Authority of Ireland has a similar role in relation to the Dublin Institute of Technology. All institutional quality assurance procedures must include regular evaluation. A national Higher Education Quality Network was established in 2003.

| BOLOGNA SCORECARD | |
|--|--|
| Italy | |
| QUALITY ASSURANCE | |
| 1. Stage of development of quality assurance system | |
| 2. Key elements of evaluation systems | |
| 3. Level of participation of students | |
| 4. Level of international participation, co-operation and networking | |
| TWO-CYCLE DEGREE SYSTEM | |
| 5. Stage of implementation of two-cycle system | |
| 6. Level of student enrolment in two-cycle system | |
| 7. Access from first cycle to second cycle | |
| RECOGNITION OF DEGREES AND PERIODS OF STUDY | |
| 8. Stage of implementation of Diploma Supplement | |
| 9. Ratification of Lisbon Recognition Convention | |
| 10. Stage of implementation of ECTS | |
| TOTAL | |

Italy was one of the four countries that signed the Sorbonne declaration in 1998, and has participated in the Bologna Process from the beginning. Implementation of a new two-cycle degree structure began in 1999. Any study programme may be designed and delivered in cooperation between Italian and foreign universities, and the regulations provide explicitly for the possibility to award joint degrees. ECTS and the Diploma Supplement have been adopted by national law and are in the process of being implemented.

A national evaluation system for higher education is not yet in place. All universities are obliged to have Internal Assessment Units, which report annually on indicators defined by the National Committee for Assessment of the University System, including results of questionnaires submitted to students. The national rector's conference has organised assessments of bachelor courses at 70 of the country's 80 universities since 2001. An accreditation system has been established for new programmes.

| BOLOGNA SCORECARD | |
|--|--|
| Latvia | |
| QUALITY ASSURANCE | |
| 1. Stage of development of quality assurance system | |
| 2. Key elements of evaluation systems | |
| 3. Level of participation of students | |
| 4. Level of international participation, co-operation and networking | |
| TWO-CYCLE DEGREE SYSTEM | |
| 5. Stage of implementation of two-cycle system | |
| 6. Level of student enrolment in two-cycle system | |
| 7. Access from first cycle to second cycle | |
| RECOGNITION OF DEGREES AND PERIODS OF STUDY | |
| 8. Stage of implementation of Diploma Supplement | |
| 9. Ratification of Lisbon Recognition Convention | |
| 10. Stage of implementation of ECTS | |
| TOTAL | |

Latvia signed the Bologna Declaration in 1999, by which time a number of reforms in line with the Bologna objectives had already been initiated. A degree structure based on two main cycles was introduced in academic programmes from 1991 and in professional education from 2000. A small number of first-cycle programmes leading to professional diplomas with no bachelor's degree temporarily remain. A national credit system compatible with ECTS has been in use since 1998. A quality assurance system based on accreditation of both programmes and institutions has been in operation since 1996, with the first cycle of accreditations completed in 2002.

| BOLOGNA SCORECARD | |
|--|--|
| Liechtenstein | |
| QUALITY ASSURANCE | |
| 1. Stage of development of quality assurance system | |
| 2. Key elements of evaluation systems | |
| 3. Level of participation of students | |
| 4. Level of international participation, co-operation and networking | |
| TWO-CYCLE DEGREE SYSTEM | |
| 5. Stage of implementation of two-cycle system | |
| 6. Level of student enrolment in two-cycle system | |
| 7. Access from first cycle to second cycle | |
| RECOGNITION OF DEGREES AND PERIODS OF STUDY | |
| 8. Stage of implementation of Diploma Supplement | |
| 9. Ratification of Lisbon Recognition Convention | |
| 10. Stage of implementation of ECTS | |
| TOTAL | |

Liechtenstein has participated in the Bologna Process from the beginning. Amendments to the legislation regulating higher education adopted in 2004 provide the legal basis for the bachelor/master structure, ECTS and the Diploma Supplement. Higher education institutions are required to undergo external evaluations at least every six years. Liechtenstein cooperates extensively with other countries, particularly Switzerland and Austria, both in the provision of higher education and with regard to quality assurance.

| BOLOGNA SCORECARD | |
|--|--|
| Lithuania | |
| QUALITY ASSURANCE | |
| 1. Stage of development of quality assurance system | |
| 2. Key elements of evaluation systems | |
| 3. Level of participation of students | |
| 4. Level of international participation, co-operation and networking | |
| TWO-CYCLE DEGREE SYSTEM | |
| 5. Stage of implementation of two-cycle system | |
| 6. Level of student enrolment in two-cycle system | |
| 7. Access from first cycle to second cycle | |
| RECOGNITION OF DEGREES AND PERIODS OF STUDY | |
| 8. Stage of implementation of Diploma Supplement | |
| 9. Ratification of Lisbon Recognition Convention | |
| 10. Stage of implementation of ECTS | |
| TOTAL | |

Lithuania was a signatory of the Bologna Declaration. The country has a binary system of higher education. Following adoption of the Law on Higher Education in 2000, university studies conform to the two- (three-) cycle structure, whereas the colleges offer diplomas and professional qualifications. Long integrated study programmes continue to exist in medicine and related fields as well as law. A national credit system compatible with ECTS is in operation. The Diploma Supplement has been made mandatory by law and will be issued on request from 2005, and automatically to all students from 2006.

Study programmes are evaluated on a regular basis, and from 2004 a process of institutional evaluations has been instigated. New study programmes and institutions have to be accredited.

| BOLOGNA SCORECARD Luxembourg | |
|--|--|
| QUALITY ASSURANCE | |
| 1. Stage of development of quality assurance system | |
| 2. Key elements of evaluation systems | |
| 3. Level of participation of students | |
| 4. Level of international participation, co-operation and networking | |
| TWO-CYCLE DEGREE SYSTEM | |
| 5. Stage of implementation of two-cycle system | |
| 6. Level of student enrolment in two-cycle system | |
| 7. Access from first cycle to second cycle | |
| RECOGNITION OF DEGREES AND PERIODS OF STUDY | |
| 8. Stage of implementation of Diploma Supplement | |
| 9. Ratification of Lisbon Recognition Convention | |
| 10. Stage of implementation of ECTS | |
| TOTAL | |

Luxembourg was a signatory of the Bologna Declaration. The University of Luxembourg was created by Act of Parliament in 2003. The Act refers explicitly to the Bologna Process, establishing a two- (three-) cycle degree structure and defining programmes in terms of ECTS. Existing two-year courses are being redefined to meet the Bologna criteria. A quality assurance system based on international networking is about to be put in place.

| BOLOGNA SCORECARD | |
|--|--|
| Malta | |
| QUALITY ASSURANCE | |
| 1. Stage of development of quality assurance system | |
| 2. Key elements of evaluation systems | |
| 3. Level of participation of students | |
| 4. Level of international participation, co-operation and networking | |
| TWO-CYCLE DEGREE SYSTEM | |
| 5. Stage of implementation of two-cycle system | |
| 6. Level of student enrolment in two-cycle system | |
| 7. Access from first cycle to second cycle | |
| RECOGNITION OF DEGREES AND PERIODS OF STUDY | |
| 8. Stage of implementation of Diploma Supplement | |
| 9. Ratification of Lisbon Recognition Convention | |
| 10. Stage of implementation of ECTS | |
| TOTAL | |
| | |

Malta was a signatory of the Bologna Declaration. A two-cycle degree system already existed in most fields. ECTS has been implemented since 2003, and the Diploma Supplement will be issued from 2006. Quality assurance is so far limited to internal quality assurance at the only university, the University of Malta.

| BOLOGNA SCORECARD | |
|--|--|
| Netherlands | |
| QUALITY ASSURANCE | |
| 1. Stage of development of quality assurance system | |
| 2. Key elements of evaluation systems | |
| 3. Level of participation of students | |
| 4. Level of international participation, co-operation and networking | |
| TWO-CYCLE DEGREE SYSTEM | |
| 5. Stage of implementation of two-cycle system | |
| 6. Level of student enrolment in two-cycle system | |
| 7. Access from first cycle to second cycle | |
| RECOGNITION OF DEGREES AND PERIODS OF STUDY | |
| 8. Stage of implementation of Diploma Supplement | |
| 9. Ratification of Lisbon Recognition Convention | |
| 10. Stage of implementation of ECTS | |
| TOTAL | |

The Netherlands was a signatory of the Bologna Declaration. A binary system of higher education exists which distinguishes between academic and professional degrees. Introduction of a two-cycle degree structure with programmes described in ECTS credits started from 2002/2003. Old-style integrated degrees will continue to exist until 2007-2009. The Diploma Supplement is widely in use and is in the process of becoming mandatory. Ratification of the Lisbon Recognition Convention is in process, and the higher education institutions have been encouraged to implement the convention.

A supranational Dutch/Flemish accreditation organisation, NVAO, was established in 2004. All study programmes have to be accredited. NVAO bases its accreditation decisions on external reviews carried out by validation/evaluation organisations. The Inspectorate for education, which is an independent part of the Ministry of Education, is responsible for overseeing the quality of the entire education system.

| BOLOGNA SCORECARD | |
|--|--|
| Norway | |
| QUALITY ASSURANCE | |
| 1. Stage of development of quality assurance system | |
| 2. Key elements of evaluation systems | |
| 3. Level of participation of students | |
| 4. Level of international participation, co-operation and networking | |
| TWO-CYCLE DEGREE SYSTEM | |
| 5. Stage of implementation of two-cycle system | |
| 6. Level of student enrolment in two-cycle system | |
| 7. Access from first cycle to second cycle | |
| RECOGNITION OF DEGREES AND PERIODS OF STUDY | |
| 8. Stage of implementation of Diploma Supplement | |
| 9. Ratification of Lisbon Recognition Convention | |
| 10. Stage of implementation of ECTS | |
| TOTAL | |

Norway was a signatory of the Bologna Declaration. Most provisions of the Declaration have been incorporated in a general legislative reform of higher education, which was fully implemented in 2003. A new three-cycle degree structure has been introduced, and will apply to most programmes from 2006-2007. A quality assurance agency has been established, and is fully functioning. Use of the Diploma Supplement is compulsory, and a credit system based on ECTS has been introduced. The reform has also focussed on improving counselling of students, changing from a system oriented towards final examinations to one oriented towards teaching and learning, increased institutional autonomy, new forms of assessment and increased internationalisation.

| BOLOGNA SCORECARD | |
|--|--|
| Poland | |
| QUALITY ASSURANCE | |
| 1. Stage of development of quality assurance system | |
| 2. Key elements of evaluation systems | |
| 3. Level of participation of students | |
| 4. Level of international participation, co-operation and networking | |
| TWO-CYCLE DEGREE SYSTEM | |
| 5. Stage of implementation of two-cycle system | |
| 6. Level of student enrolment in two-cycle system | |
| 7. Access from first cycle to second cycle | |
| RECOGNITION OF DEGREES AND PERIODS OF STUDY | |
| 8. Stage of implementation of Diploma Supplement | |
| 9. Ratification of Lisbon Recognition Convention | |
| 10. Stage of implementation of ECTS | |
| TOTAL | |

Poland was a signatory of the Bologna Declaration. A two-cycle degree structure has been gradually introduced since 1990. A draft new Act on Higher Education will introduce it also in vocational education. Integrated studies will continue to exist in medicine and related fields as well as law. The Act will also give the use of ECTS and the Diploma Supplement a legal basis. The Diploma Supplement is mandatory from 2005.

A State Accreditation Committee accredits all new study programmes and institutions and evaluates the quality of education. Accreditation of existing institutions on a voluntary basis is organised by the Conference of Rectors of Academic Schools in Poland. Recognition of foreign degrees and diplomas is based on bilateral agreements and nostrification in addition to the Lisbon Recognition Convention.

| BOLOGNA SCORECARD | |
|--|--|
| Portugal | |
| QUALITY ASSURANCE | |
| 1. Stage of development of quality assurance system | |
| 2. Key elements of evaluation systems | |
| 3. Level of participation of students | |
| 4. Level of international participation, co-operation and networking | |
| TWO-CYCLE DEGREE SYSTEM | |
| 5. Stage of implementation of two-cycle system | |
| 6. Level of student enrolment in two-cycle system | |
| 7. Access from first cycle to second cycle | |
| RECOGNITION OF DEGREES AND PERIODS OF STUDY | |
| 8. Stage of implementation of Diploma Supplement | |
| 9. Ratification of Lisbon Recognition Convention | |
| 10. Stage of implementation of ECTS | |
| TOTAL | |

Portugal was a signatory of the Bologna Declaration. Comprehensive legislative changes are currently being made in order to implement the Bologna principles in Portuguese higher education. In order to prepare the transition to a two- (three-) cycle degree structure, reports have been drawn up for the different fields of study, with wide involvement of stakeholders. The necessary legislation is expected to be adopted in the course of 2005. Financial support has been made available to assist higher education institutions in applying and adapting to the changes. A system of parallel short courses at post-secondary, post-first cycle and post-second cycle levels is being developed with a view to lifelong learning and with possibilities for bridging to the three-cycle structure.

A law concerning the application of ECTS and the Diploma Supplement has been approved by the Council of Ministers and is in the process of promulgation. A quality assurance system based on internal and external evaluations is in operation and is being further developed. In addition, some professional associations have implemented accreditation schemes.

| BOLOGNA SCORECARD | |
|--|--|
| Romania | |
| QUALITY ASSURANCE | |
| 1. Stage of development of quality assurance system | |
| 2. Key elements of evaluation systems | |
| 3. Level of participation of students | |
| 4. Level of international participation, co-operation and networking | |
| TWO-CYCLE DEGREE SYSTEM | |
| 5. Stage of implementation of two-cycle system | |
| 6. Level of student enrolment in two-cycle system | |
| 7. Access from first cycle to second cycle | |
| RECOGNITION OF DEGREES AND PERIODS OF STUDY | |
| 8. Stage of implementation of Diploma Supplement | |
| 9. Ratification of Lisbon Recognition Convention | |
| 10. Stage of implementation of ECTS | |
| TOTAL | |

Romania was a signatory of the Bologna Declaration. New legislation adopted in 2004 will lead to full implementation of a two- (three-) cycle degree structure from the 2005/2006 academic year. At the same time ECTS and the Diploma Supplement will become mandatory. ECTS has been in use as a recommended system since 1998.

All higher education institutions undergo periodic institutional assessment at 5-year intervals. In addition all new study programmes must be accredited. A new law on quality assurance in education, proposing to set up a new national agency for quality assurance at all levels of the education system, is currently being debated.

| BOLOGNA SCORECARD | |
|--|--|
| Russia | |
| QUALITY ASSURANCE | |
| 1. Stage of development of quality assurance system | |
| 2. Key elements of evaluation systems | |
| 3. Level of participation of students | |
| 4. Level of international participation, co-operation and networking | |
| TWO-CYCLE DEGREE SYSTEM | |
| 5. Stage of implementation of two-cycle system | |
| 6. Level of student enrolment in two-cycle system | |
| 7. Access from first cycle to second cycle | |
| RECOGNITION OF DEGREES AND PERIODS OF STUDY | |
| 8. Stage of implementation of Diploma Supplement | |
| 9. Ratification of Lisbon Recognition Convention | |
| 10. Stage of implementation of ECTS | |
| TOTAL | |

Russia joined the Bologna Process in 2003, and a series of national and regional thematic seminars have since been held to make higher education institutions familiar with the principles and trends of the Process. A two-cycle degree structure was introduced on a limited basis in 1989 and has existed at the national level since 1992 in parallel with integrated 5-year programmes. Bachelor's degree programmes in Russia have a duration of 4 years. The application of the two-cycle structure is optional for the institutions.

Preparations for implementation of an ECTS-based credit system began in 2002, and a pilot project was launched in 2003. Institutions are recommended by the Ministry of Education and Science to use the system. A pilot project for implementation of European-type Diploma Supplements was also launched in 2003, and several seminars and workshops have been held.

An accreditation system is in operation at the institutional level. Quality assurance and evaluation are the responsibility of the Federal Service for Supervision in Education and Research, created in 2004.

| BOLOGNA SCORECARD Serbia and Montenegro/Serbia | |
|--|--|
| QUALITY ASSURANCE | |
| 1. Stage of development of quality assurance system | |
| 2. Key elements of evaluation systems | |
| 3. Level of participation of students | |
| 4. Level of international participation, co-operation and networking | |
| TWO-CYCLE DEGREE SYSTEM | |
| 5. Stage of implementation of two-cycle system | |
| 6. Level of student enrolment in two-cycle system | |
| 7. Access from first cycle to second cycle | |
| RECOGNITION OF DEGREES AND PERIODS OF STUDY | |
| 8. Stage of implementation of Diploma Supplement | |
| 9. Ratification of Lisbon Recognition Convention | |
| 10. Stage of implementation of ECTS | |
| TOTAL | |

Serbia and Montenegro joined the Bologna Process in 2003. However, activities related to the reform of the higher education system in the Republic of Serbia began in 2000. The universities of the Republic have entered a process of reform in accordance with the Bologna Process. Reforms of the curriculum were undertaken, a system of self-evaluation has begun and work has begun on introducing ECTS.

Since November 2004, the Ministry of Education and Sports has prepared a draft law on higher education, which is expected to be passed before the Bergen conference. This law is completely harmonised with the principles of the Bologna Process. It will introduce a system of quality assurance and accreditation in higher education, restructure degree courses in three cycles, extend the implementation of the Diploma Supplement and promote recognition of qualifications in accordance with the Lisbon Convention.

| BOLOGNA SCORECARD | |
|--|--|
| Serbia and Montenegro/Montenegro | |
| QUALITY ASSURANCE | |
| 1. Stage of development of quality assurance system | |
| 2. Key elements of evaluation systems | |
| 3. Level of participation of students | |
| 4. Level of international participation, co-operation and networking | |
| TWO-CYCLE DEGREE SYSTEM | |
| 5. Stage of implementation of two-cycle system | |
| 6. Level of student enrolment in two-cycle system | |
| 7. Access from first cycle to second cycle | |
| RECOGNITION OF DEGREES AND PERIODS OF STUDY | |
| 8. Stage of implementation of Diploma Supplement | |
| 9. Ratification of Lisbon Recognition Convention | |
| 10. Stage of implementation of ECTS | |
| TOTAL | |

Serbia and Montenegro joined the Bologna Process in 2003. In October of that year, the assembly of Montenegro adopted the new law on higher education, which was created in accordance with the Bologna objectives. The government is in the process of comprehensively restructuring the entire education and training system according to its strategic plan for education reform. The first generation of students have been enrolled in the academic year 2004-2005 according to the new rules. The Diploma Supplement and ECTS are widely implemented.

Work on the establishment of a quality assurance system is well advanced. However, it is not proposed for the time being to set up a national agency for accreditation. Rather, it is intended to enter into collaboration with other countries to explore the possibility of setting up a joint agency.

| BOLOGNA SCORECARD Slovakia | |
|--|--|
| QUALITY ASSURANCE | |
| 1. Stage of development of quality assurance system | |
| 2. Key elements of evaluation systems | |
| 3. Level of participation of students | |
| 4. Level of international participation, co-operation and networking | |
| TWO-CYCLE DEGREE SYSTEM | |
| 5. Stage of implementation of two-cycle system | |
| 6. Level of student enrolment in two-cycle system | |
| 7. Access from first cycle to second cycle | |
| RECOGNITION OF DEGREES AND PERIODS OF STUDY | |
| 8. Stage of implementation of Diploma Supplement | |
| 9. Ratification of Lisbon Recognition Convention | |
| 10. Stage of implementation of ECTS | |
| TOTAL | |
| | |

The Slovak Republic was a signatory of the Bologna Declaration. Since then there has been extensive reform of higher education to implement the principles of the Bologna Process. In recent years, new legislation has been introduced which enables the Bologna principles to be implemented in higher education institutions. The government has established the Accreditation Commission as an advisory body to monitor, assess and independently evaluate the quality of educational, developmental, artistic and other creative activity of higher education institutions and to promote its improvement.

The Diploma Supplement is currently available at the request of graduates. All students who start a study programme in the academic year 2005-2006 will receive the Diploma Supplement automatically and free of charge when they graduate.

| BOLOGNA SCORECARD | |
|--|--|
| Slovenia | |
| QUALITY ASSURANCE | |
| 1. Stage of development of quality assurance system | |
| 2. Key elements of evaluation systems | |
| 3. Level of participation of students | |
| 4. Level of international participation, co-operation and networking | |
| TWO-CYCLE DEGREE SYSTEM | |
| 5. Stage of implementation of two-cycle system | |
| 6. Level of student enrolment in two-cycle system | |
| 7. Access from first cycle to second cycle | |
| RECOGNITION OF DEGREES AND PERIODS OF STUDY | |
| 8. Stage of implementation of Diploma Supplement | |
| 9. Ratification of Lisbon Recognition Convention | |
| 10. Stage of implementation of ECTS | |
| TOTAL | |

Slovenia was a signatory of the Bologna Declaration. In 2004, the country adopted three Acts of Parliament which implemented the legislative priorities set out in the Berlin Communiqué. The Acts also enable the implementation of other developments in higher education in Slovenia. The two-cycle system will be implemented in all institutions and programmes starting in the 2005-2006 academic year. The new legislation also introduced important features in the area of quality assurance. It extended the composition of accreditation and evaluation bodies to include representatives of students and employers, introduced new procedures including regular external evaluations and established a new Council for the Evaluation of Higher Education.

ECTS has been implemented since 1998 for graduate programmes and since 2002 for undergraduate study programmes. From 2005 onwards, the Diploma Supplement will be issued in an EU language automatically and free of charge to every graduate.

| BOLOGNA SCORECARD | |
|--|--|
| Spain | |
| QUALITY ASSURANCE | |
| 1. Stage of development of quality assurance system | |
| 2. Key elements of evaluation systems | |
| 3. Level of participation of students | |
| 4. Level of international participation, co-operation and networking | |
| TWO-CYCLE DEGREE SYSTEM | |
| 5. Stage of implementation of two-cycle system | |
| 6. Level of student enrolment in two-cycle system | |
| 7. Access from first cycle to second cycle | |
| RECOGNITION OF DEGREES AND PERIODS OF STUDY | |
| 8. Stage of implementation of Diploma Supplement | |
| 9. Ratification of Lisbon Recognition Convention | |
| 10. Stage of implementation of ECTS | |
| TOTAL | |

Spain was a signatory of the Bologna Declaration. Two royal decrees were approved in January 2005 to establish and define a new framework for degree structures in conformity with the Bologna principles. Higher education institutions are currently working on concrete proposals to implement the new structures from the academic year 2006-2007 onwards. The Council for Universities Co-ordination is currently preparing a proposal for the government including a complete catalogue of undergraduate official degrees, which will start in 2006-2007.

The National Agency for Quality Assessment and Accreditation (ANECA) was established in 2002 to co-ordinate quality assurance policies in universities. There are also eight regional agencies that undertake quality assurance activities in their respective geographical areas. A co-ordination committee was set up in 2003 to ensure transparency and co-operation between the national and the regional agencies.

The government has allocated specific funding in its 2005 budget to cover universities' activities for the development of the Bologna Process. The governments of the regions have also made allocations in their budgets to facilitate the process of adaptation to the new legal framework.

| BOLOGNA SCORECARD | |
|--|--|
| Sweden | |
| QUALITY ASSURANCE | |
| 1. Stage of development of quality assurance system | |
| 2. Key elements of evaluation systems | |
| 3. Level of participation of students | |
| 4. Level of international participation, co-operation and networking | |
| TWO-CYCLE DEGREE SYSTEM | |
| 5. Stage of implementation of two-cycle system | |
| 6. Level of student enrolment in two-cycle system | |
| 7. Access from first cycle to second cycle | |
| RECOGNITION OF DEGREES AND PERIODS OF STUDY | |
| 8. Stage of implementation of Diploma Supplement | |
| 9. Ratification of Lisbon Recognition Convention | |
| 10. Stage of implementation of ECTS | |
| TOTAL | |

Sweden was a signatory of the Bologna Declaration. In 2002, a working group was appointed in the Ministry of Education, Science and Culture to review higher education degree structures in accordance with the Bologna Process. The group also addressed the issue of adapting the Swedish credit point and grading scale systems to the European Credit Transfer System (ECTS). The review group proposes that degrees within higher education should be formally divided into three cycles, with clear procedures for access between cycles. The government will shortly decide on the proposals put forward by the review group, and it is estimated that new legislation and regulations could come into force in 2007.

Sweden has a high level of participation of students in quality assurance processes. However, Swedish legislation does not permit international representation in the governing bodies of public organisations such as the National Agency for Higher Education, which is the agency responsible for quality assurance.

| BOLOGNA SCORECARD | |
|--|--|
| Switzerland | |
| QUALITY ASSURANCE | |
| 1. Stage of development of quality assurance system | |
| 2. Key elements of evaluation systems | |
| 3. Level of participation of students | |
| 4. Level of international participation, co-operation and networking | |
| TWO-CYCLE DEGREE SYSTEM | |
| 5. Stage of implementation of two-cycle system | |
| 6. Level of student enrolment in two-cycle system | |
| 7. Access from first cycle to second cycle | |
| RECOGNITION OF DEGREES AND PERIODS OF STUDY | |
| 8. Stage of implementation of Diploma Supplement | |
| 9. Ratification of Lisbon Recognition Convention | |
| 10. Stage of implementation of ECTS | |
| TOTAL | |

Switzerland was a signatory of the Bologna Declaration. The implementation of the Bologna Process in the country is part of a wider reform currently under way in the higher education sector, which will be put in place by 2008. From the beginning of the academic year 2004-2005, a considerable number of study programmes are structured in two cycles and a large percentage of first year students is currently entering the new system. By 2010 all institutions and study programmes will be completely renewed.

Efforts are being made at the national level to ensure co-ordinated implementation of ECTS and the Diploma Supplement so that they become effective transparency tools, inside and outside higher education institutions. The use of ECTS in particular is being supported by providing information, training and examples of good practice.

| BOLOGNA SCORECARD "the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" | |
|--|--|
| QUALITY ASSURANCE | |
| 1. Stage of development of quality assurance system | |
| 2. Key elements of evaluation systems | |
| 3. Level of participation of students | |
| 4. Level of international participation, co-operation and networking | |
| TWO-CYCLE DEGREE SYSTEM | |
| 5. Stage of implementation of two-cycle system | |
| 6. Level of student enrolment in two-cycle system | |
| 7. Access from first cycle to second cycle | |
| RECOGNITION OF DEGREES AND PERIODS OF STUDY | |
| 8. Stage of implementation of Diploma Supplement | |
| 9. Ratification of Lisbon Recognition Convention | |
| 10. Stage of implementation of ECTS | |
| TOTAL | |

"the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" joined the Bologna Process in 2003, having started to change its higher education system from 2000 when the Ministry of Education and Science passed a new law on higher education. The law requires universities to start introducing ECTS and to design study and subject programmes according to the principles of the Bologna Process. It also provides the legal basis for establishing a national quality assurance system.

In 2005, the Ministry will prepare updates of the law concerning the degree structure, increased involvement of students and recognition of degrees. Some study programmes, predominantly in the technical disciplines, have been restructured according to the two-cycle degree system. Higher education institutions have accepted ECTS as a standard for a system of transfer and accumulation of credits. The system is being gradually implemented in the universities. Financial constraints are currently hindering the preparation of the Diploma Supplement, but interventions will be undertaken so that this task can be successfully completed.

| BOLOGNA SCORECARD | |
|--|--|
| Turkey | |
| QUALITY ASSURANCE | |
| 1. Stage of development of quality assurance system | |
| 2. Key elements of evaluation systems | |
| 3. Level of participation of students | |
| 4. Level of international participation, co-operation and networking | |
| TWO-CYCLE DEGREE SYSTEM | |
| 5. Stage of implementation of two-cycle system | |
| 6. Level of student enrolment in two-cycle system | |
| 7. Access from first cycle to second cycle | |
| RECOGNITION OF DEGREES AND PERIODS OF STUDY | |
| 8. Stage of implementation of Diploma Supplement | |
| 9. Ratification of Lisbon Recognition Convention | |
| 10. Stage of implementation of ECTS | |
| TOTAL | |

Turkey joined the Bologna Process in 2001. Higher education in Turkey is structured in two cycles, and the Diploma Supplement has already been introduced for some programmes. From the 2004-2005 academic year, all universities will issue the Diploma Supplement to all students, free of charge, in English and/or in Turkish.

Work on the establishment of a national quality assurance system has begun. Universities and programmes have already performed several assessment and accreditation exercises. It is the target of the Council of Higher Education to establish a national quality assurance agency in 2005 and to have a reasonable number of evaluations completed before the ministers' meeting to be held in 2007.

| BOLOGNA SCORECARD | |
|--|--|
| United Kingdom - England, Wales and Northern Ireland | |
| QUALITY ASSURANCE | |
| 1. Stage of development of quality assurance system | |
| 2. Key elements of evaluation systems | |
| 3. Level of participation of students | |
| 4. Level of international participation, co-operation and networking | |
| TWO-CYCLE DEGREE SYSTEM | |
| 5. Stage of implementation of two-cycle system | |
| 6. Level of student enrolment in two-cycle system | |
| 7. Access from first cycle to second cycle | |
| RECOGNITION OF DEGREES AND PERIODS OF STUDY | |
| 8. Stage of implementation of Diploma Supplement | |
| 9. Ratification of Lisbon Recognition Convention | |
| 10. Stage of implementation of ECTS | |
| TOTAL | |

The United Kingdom was one of the four countries that signed the Sorbonne declaration in 1998, and has had a high level of involvement in developing the Bologna Process. The basic structure of UK degrees already conforms to the Bologna model of three main cycles. Higher education institutions are beginning to implement the Diploma Supplement. The introduction of the Diploma Supplement has been encouraged by conferences and other events offered in collaboration between the UK Socrates-Erasmus Council, the UK NARIC and the Europe Unit.

The Burgess Report, published in November 2004, made a number of recommendations on measuring and recording student achievement in higher education, including the development of the European Credit Transfer System and the integration of the Diploma Supplement with other developments in describing, measuring, recording and communicating achievement.

| BOLOGNA SCORECARD United Kingdom - Scotland | |
|--|--|
| QUALITY ASSURANCE | |
| 1. Stage of development of quality assurance system | |
| 2. Key elements of evaluation systems | |
| 3. Level of participation of students | |
| 4. Level of international participation, co-operation and networking | |
| TWO-CYCLE DEGREE SYSTEM | |
| 5. Stage of implementation of two-cycle system | |
| 6. Level of student enrolment in two-cycle system | |
| 7. Access from first cycle to second cycle | |
| RECOGNITION OF DEGREES AND PERIODS OF STUDY | |
| 8. Stage of implementation of Diploma Supplement | |
| 9. Ratification of Lisbon Recognition Convention | |
| 10. Stage of implementation of ECTS | |
| TOTAL | |

The structure of Scottish degrees already conforms to the Bologna model of three main cycles, and there is a comprehensive national credit and qualifications framework that is consistent with the emerging European qualifications framework. The recently introduced Quality Enhancement Framework focuses on both teaching and learning, recognises the role of students in quality assurance and places an emphasis on providing clear public information about quality and standards.

Credit accumulation and transfer within Scotland is based on the Scottish Credit and Qualifications Framework, while ECTS is used for cross-border recognition. Higher education institutions are working towards introduction of the Diploma Supplement automatically for all students in 2005.